Vidyodaya J. Soc. Sc., Vol. 7 1 & 2 1996, pp. 13 - 45.

DHARMA PARĀKRAMABĀHU IX

- The Fake King of Ceylon Inflated by Portuguese Historians- - A Historiographical Perspective -

M. Rohanadeera

Prof. S. Paranavitana, the Chief Editor of **The University of Ceylon, History of Ceylon,** Volume, I, concluding political history of the relevant period has made the follwing observation.

> "Couto calls this King Jayavira Parakramabahu and gives him a reign of three years: According to **Rājāvali,** however, he reigned for twenty years. In actual fact, the reign of Vira Parakranabahu VIII, must have lasted for more than twenty years, for his sons and successors, Dharma Parakramabahu IX, and Vijayabahu VI, on the authority of contemporary records, began their respective reigns in 1508 and 1510. But already in 1505 before the reign of Vira Parakramabahu VIII had drawn to a close, the Portuguese had landed in Colombo and this is the limit set for the first Volume of the History." [1]

According to this statement Prof. Paranavitana has introduced Vira Parakramabahu VIII as the last king belonging to the relevant period, assigned him a reign of twenty four years (1484 - 1508 AD.) and has accepted him to be the king of Ceylon, at the time of the arrival of Portuguese in 1505 AD. This position taken by Paranavitana is in accord with the common view generally held by historians of the day, when the **History of Ceylon Volume I,** was concluded in 1960.

The common view was that the ruler of Sri Lanka, at the time, Lorenco de Almeida arrived in Ceylon,was Vira Parakramabahu, but his son Dharma Parakramabahu, looked after state affairs on behalf of his father and that he was the person who dealt with the first Portuguese visitors to Sri Lanka.[2]

Untill 1960, almost all text books on Sri Lankan history used in schools and even in Universities had the same story - that the King of Sri Lanka at the time of the arrival of Portuguese was Vira Parakramabahu with his son Dharma Parakramabahu assisting him.

This was the History taught not only at school levels but also at University level for more than half a century. Even Professor Paranavitana in his **University History of Ceylon** accepted the same view in 1960, as we saw earlier.

1. The Historical problem created by Prof. Paranavitana

However in the following year, 1961, Prof. Paranavitana made a surprising turn by eliminating Vira Parakramabahu VIII from the political scene in Sri Lanka around 1505AD., in his exhaustive paper entitled **'The**

Emperor of Ceylon at the Time of the Arrival of Portuguese in 1505', published in 1961, in the **University of Ceylon Review,** XlX. He pushed back Vira Parakramabahu's reign from 1484 - 1508, as given in the **UCHC.** to 1477 - 1496AD., while assigning Dharma Parakramabahu 1491-1513, almost the period of reign previously assigned to Vira Parakramabahu.[3] This adjustment has been done on the basis of a reinterpretation made by him about the date of the **Kelani Vihara Inscription.**

2. The Kelani Vihara Inscription

This Kelani Vihara Inscription was brought to the notice of the scholars for the first time in 1871, by Mahamudali Louis de Zoysa. He presented the text and translation of this slab inscription of Kelaniya, before the **Royal Asiatic Society,** in 1871.

He interpreted the King in the record as Dharma Parakramabahu and the year 2051 BE, (1508 AD.) as the accession year of the King. Accordingly the 19th year of the King's reign mentioned in the record was reckoned to be 1527 AD. counting from 1508 AD. By doing so de Zoysa remarked, that "according to Turnour, Dharma Parakramabahu ascended the throne in 2048 BE, 1508AD. but according to the inscription the date of his accession was 2051BE, 1505AD. three years later.[4] This interpretation of Louis de Zoysa in 1871, has come down unquestioned until 1960. Up till that time all historians and their text books on history of the period, including Paranavitana and his **University History of Ceylon,** had taken 1508 as the established date of the accession of dharma Parakramabahu lX.

The relevant part of the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** runs as follows:

> ***"gautama sarvajna rāj ōttamayāṇan vahansēṭa dedās ek paṇasvanu, Lankā rājjasriyaṭa pämiṇi Srimat Siri Sangabo Sri Parākramabāhu cakravarti svāmīn̈ vahansēṭa dasa nava vanu navayä pura ekolos vaka"***

The English translation rendered by de Zoysa and later by H. C. P. Bell; was as follows,

> "On the eleventh day of the month Navam in the 19th year of the reign of His Imperial Majesty, Srimat Siri Sangabo Sri Parakramabahu, who ascended the throne of Lanka in the year 2051 of the Era of the omnicient and supreme Gautama Buddha". Prof. paranavitana's new translation was,

> "On the eleventh day of the bright half of the month of navam of the year two thousand and fifty one unto Gautama the omniscient supreme lord; and the year nineteenth unto His Majesty, the Imperial Lord, the illustrious Sirisangabo, Sri Parakramabahu, who has attained to the regal splendour of Lanka."

The first part ***gautama sarvagna rājottamayāṇan vahansēṭa dedās ek panas vanu,***[5] ***Lankā rājjasriyaṭa pämiṇi*** in the original text has been translated by de Zoysa and Bell as "who ascended the throne in the year 2051 BE," thus adopting 2051 BE, 1508 AD. and the 19th year of the King as two separate years: 2051 BE. 1508 AD. as his year of accession, and 19th year of his reign as 1527 AD.

Prof. Paranavitana having rendered the phrase ***Lankā rājjasriyaṭa pāmini*** as 'who has attained to the regal splendour of Lanka' instead of "who ascended the throne" rendered by de Zoysa, and Bell; treated 2051 BE. and 19th year of the King as one and the same, equating 2051BE, 1508 AD with the 19th regnal year of the King, which was the year of executing the document. Paranavitana supported his premise by quoting similar instances from contemperory epigraphic records.

Based on this, paranavitana has adjusted chronolgy of Kings as follows.[6]

Vira Parakramabhu VIII	1477 - 1496
Dharma Parakramabahu IX	1491 - 1513
Vijayabahu VI	1509 - 1521

After reading this exhaustive article, the present writer felt that, in the event of the new interpretation and the chronology, presented by Prof. Paranavitana, proved to be correct and established, the entire political history of the period from the demise of Parkramabahu VI, in 1467 AD, to the end of Vijayabahu VI, in 1521 AD, given in the text books used in schools and Universities until 1960, would call for an urgent revising process. Having this in mind the present writer made a thorough and analitical study on the afore said paper of Prof. paranavitana. His study revealed that Professor's interpretation of the date given in the document is quite correct and convincing, but his acceptance of the King figuring in the document as Dharma Parakramabahu IX, - the identification originally attributed by Louis de Zoysa, - was completely wrong and the chronological order proposed by Prof. Paranavitana based on that wrong identification, was also equally wrong. The present writer's study has proved beyond dobut that the King figuring in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** was not Dharma Parakramabahu but his father Vira Parakramabahu VIII.

As such the question of a drastic revision of the relevant history would not arise. However the present writer still entertained a caution, that a future researcher with inadequate command on local sources such as literary and epigraphical records pertaining to the period, would follow Prof. Paranavitana's proposed chronology, and based on which will destort political history of the period.

As a safeguard he recorded the findings of his study on Prof. paranavitana's paper, in two chapters, chapter 5, ***Kotte Raja Parapura,* 1467 - 1592** (The Dynasty of Kotte Kings - 1467 - 1597) and chapter 6, ***Udarata Raja Parapura III, 1483 - 1514,*** "The Dynasty of Kandyan Kings - 1483 - 1514", in his book **Asgiriye Talpatin Alutvana Lankā Itihāsaya,** History of Lanka in the Light of Asgiriye Talpata (The manuscript from Asgiri Vihara in Kandy) which he published in 1972.

His instinctive caution proved to be correct when he read the **Political History of the Kingdom of Kotte** by G. P. V. Somaratne, published in 1975. This was the research thesis for which Somaratne, was awarded Ph. D, by the University of London. However Somaratne seems to have not seen the present writer's book which was published in Sri Lanka in 1971.

Prof. P. V. G. Somaratne has accepted Paranavitana's interpretation in totality and observed "This use of both the regnal year and the Buddhist year in the **Kelani Vihara Insciption** of Dharma Parakramabahu has been the deciding factor in solving many problems regarding the chronological order of events in the 16th century."

With this deciding factor of the wrong attribution of the **Kelani Vihara Inscription to** Dharma Parakranabahu Somaratne has further advanced Dharma Parakramabahu's reign by assigning 1489 AD. as the first regnal year of the King, relying on Paranavitana's new itrapretation, although he has failed to mention his source.[7]

Somaratne's chronological list is as follows:

Vira Parakramabahu	1477 - 1489
Dharma Parakramabahu	1489 - 1513
Vijayabahu Vi	1513 - 1528

Prof C. R. de Silva in **chapter l and ll; University of Peradeniya, History of Sri Lanka, Volume ll,** has taken Somaratne's chronology as authoritative and interpreted history during the period accordingly.[8]

This new chronological order adjusted by Paranavitana in 1961, and followed by Somaratne and C.R. de Silva, both specialized on so-called Portuguese period of Ceylon History, for their PhDs in London University, has not only eliminated Vira Parakramabahu from the political scene in the country around 1505, but also has projected Dharma Parakramabahu as the only king and paramount King to meet the first Portuguese visitors.

However, as also mentioned earlier, all school text books and University books, such as father S. G. Perera's **The Portuguese and Dutch periods,History of Ceylon,** H.W. Codrington's, **A Short History of Ceylon** and even Paranavitana's **University History of Ceylon,** the most popular

books of the day have portrayed Dharma Parakramabahu as only a regent looking after sate affairs on behalf of his father Vira Parakramabahu, the paramount King of the day.

This position will no doubt poses a series of questions for the students of Sri Lankan history today and future. They will be faced with the problem of revising history of the period, until 1960. The pioneer historians, who dealt with the period under discussion and whose contribution gifted us the present knowledge, may even be accused of adopting wrong history with wrong chronology.

"This absurd position", using Prof. Parananviana's own words, with minimal alterations- **"to which historians have been led by** 'Paranavitana's **new chronology, makes it necessary to question whether** the new chronology **is correct, or whether a diferent** chronological order based on Paranavitana's new interpretation itself **which does not give rise to such a strange historical problem is not possible."**[9] The present writer's study on this subject revealed in his book mentioned above seems to have not been attentively read by Somaratne and C. R. de Silva, perhaps because it was written in Sinhala. As such an attempt will be made in this paper, to discuss the whole problem afresh and more comprehensively.

We have already accepted that Paranavitana's rendering of the relevant part in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** - his equating 2051 BE, 1508AD. with the King's 19th regnal year, and not with the first year - as absolutely correct. with this correction the King figuring in the inscription should have ascended the throne in 1489 / 90AD.

The King figuring in the inscription is, ***"Srīmat Siri Sangabo Srī Parākramabāhu Cakravarti Svāmin Vahanse".*** Paranavitana has merely accepted the view of de Zoysa that the King was Dharma Parakramabahu. He seems to have not been concerned with the question whether this King could not have been another Parakramabahu; and why he could not have been Vira Parakramabhu Vlll, whom all historians including Paranavitana, accepted, until 1960, as the sovereign King of Sri Lanka about the time of the Portuguese arrival in 1505 AD.

Let us examine how and why Paranavitana was compelled to accept the King with the epithet ***Srimat Siri Sangabo Sri,*** as Dharma parakramabahu, whereas there were two more Parakramabahus during this period who used this ***'Siri Sangabo'*** epithet; namely, Parakramabahu Vl and Vira Parakramabahu Vlll. When one carefully reads through Paranavitna's learned paper on this problem, one would feel that the author's prime concern behind that exhaustive article was to correct the erroneous interpretation given to

the year mentioned in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription.** It is therefore reasonable to believe that the author was not much concerned as to which 'Parakramabahu' was mentioned in the record.

On the other hand, that this King was Dharma Parakramabahu, had been the unanimously accepted view among scholars upto that time. Dharma Parakramabahu was the giant figure in the minds of the historians who specialized on the so called "Portuguese period of Ceylon history". With this prejudice and the preoccupation of his mind on the correction of the wrong interpretation of the dates given in the record, Paranavitana would not have felt it necesary to querry over the identity of the King. He seems to have accepted the existing view and glossed over other circumstancial facts which would have pointed to a dfferent identity, if they were re-examined.

3. Historiography of Dharma Parakramabahu's entry

Before we explore the evidence for the identify of the real King figuring in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription,** it will be useful to critically look into the back ground and the circumstances which led the scholars believe that Dharma Parakramabahu was the King at the time of the first Portugues arrival, and that his accession year was 1508AD. How and when did this view originate and develop in the minds of the English educated scholars of the day?

The first modern writer to introduce Dharma Parākramabāhu in between Vira Parākramabāhu VIll and Vijayabāhu Vl in the list of Sri Lankan Kings, was George Turnour, who translated **Mahāvamsa** into English Language in 1837.[10] His source at that time would have been the **Rajavaliya** which categorically says that Portuguese arrived at Colomtota during the time of Dharma Parākramabāhu.[11] The **Rājaratnākaraya** written in the middle of the 16th century, therefore more contemporaneous than the **Rājāvaliya**, does not have Dharma Parakramabahu in the list of Sinhala Kings.[12] The fifth part of the **Mahāvamsa** written in the middle of the 18th century, has also not given a place for Dharma Parakramabahu.[13] Wjesinghe who translated the **Mahāvamsa** into English, in1917, has not included Dharma Parakramabahu in his geneological list of Sinhala Kings, [14] although he was aware of Turnour's assumption that Dharma Parakramabahu was the king at the time of the arrival of Portuguese. It is therefore, obvious that Turnour's view put forward in **1837**, was based only on **Rājavāliya** information. But on what basis Turnour gave 1505 as Dharma Parakrmabahu's year of accession is not clear, for his source **Rajavaliya** categorically says that Portuguese ship came to Colombo in 1522 AD[15]. It is possible that Turnour would have been aware of Queyroz's information that Lorenco de

Almeida discovered Ceylon in1505[16]. It would however be noted that the English translations of Portuguese documents on Ceylon were not at the disposal of Sri Lankan writers by 1837.

However, Turnour's inclusion of Dharma Parkramabahu in the list of Sri Lankan Kings of the time, with 1505 AD as his accession year, has created a "Strange historical problem" for Rhys Davids in **1870**, when he discovered the **Devundara Inscription,** which says that Vijayabahu, became King in Saka Era, 1432, 1509AD, contradicting Turnour's 1527 AD, as Vijayabahu's accession year. "It can scarecely be disputed that, unless this discrepancy can be satisfactorily explained away, our present days must yield to the authority of this undoubtedly contemporaneous record" [17] says, Rhys Davids.

This "Strange historical problem" of Rhys Davids was given a more compromising shape by Mahamudali Louis de Zoysa, who presented the text and translation of the **Kelani Vihara Inscription,** for the first time before the Royal Asiatic Society in 1871. De Zoysa identified the King ***"Sri Sangabo Sri Parākramabāhu cakravarti Svāmin Vahanse*** in the document as Dharma Parakramabahu, the 152nd sovereign King in the Turnour's list, during whose reign Portuguese first landed in Ceylon and were permitted to trade. De Zoysa interpreted 2051 BE. 1508AD in the record as the accession year of the King. "According to Turnour, King Dharma Parakramabahu ascended the throne in the year BE.2048, 1505.AD. three years later" said, de Zoysa. With regard to the "Strange historical problem" of Rhys Davids, de Zoysa's compromise was "that the assumption of the sovereignty by Dharma Parakramabahu was disputed by his brother Vijayabahu and at least for a time one part of the nation (probably those of the south) while acknowledged the latter as their King, the rest adhered to his brother and this derives support from Turnour's statement that Dharma Parkramabahu's reign was disturbed in the early part by the competition of his brothers, whom he succeeded in reducing to submission".[18]

It will now be clear that it was Mahamudali Louis de Zoysa who assigned **Kelani Vihara Inscription** to Dharma Parakramabahu, going by Turnour's view and also it was de Zoysa who interpreted 2051 BE in the document as the year of the King's accession. That was the position in 1871.

H. C. P. Bell, who also edited the same inscription later in 1882, accepted de Zoysa's identification of the King figuring in the Kelani Inscription as Dharma parakramabahu and 1508 as his accession year.[19] All historians from de Zoysa including Bell, Donald Ferguson, P. E. Peiris, E. W. Perera and many others acepted de Zoysa's identification of the King Parakramabahu mentioned in the Kelani Inscription with Dharma Parakramabahu and that his enthronement was in 1508 AD. This was the historical background of Dharma Parakramabahu's connection with the

Kelani Vihara Inscription. When Paranavitana's mind was at work for the task of correcting the year 2051BE, 1508,AD given in the inscription as the 19th year of the King, and not the year of his accession as had been accepted by scholars from 1873 up till 1960, Paranavitana would not have been concerned about the identity of the King, due partly to his obsession with the correction of the date and partly to his prejudice on the high projection of Dharma Parakramabahu by the historians for more than half a century.

Let us therefore bring back the earlier question whether King ***Siri Sangabo Sri Parakramabāhu cakravarti Svamin Vahanse*** in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** could be Vira Parakramabahu VIII, whom all historians including Paranavitana until 1960, had accepted as the overlord of Lanka at the time of the first Portuguese arrival.

The best way to ascertain whether this King who's 19th year becomes 1508, was Parakramabahu VIII or Parakramabahu IX, is to arrange the chronological order of Kings from the end of Parakramabahu VI in 1467 upto 1490, the initial year of the King figuring in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription.**

4. From Parākramabāhu VI to Parakrāmabahu VIII.

The reign of Parakramabahu VI was closed in 1467 according to all sources. After him the grand son, the son of Ulakudaya Devi was enthroned as jayabahu, II. Prince Sapumal who was in jaffna at the time rushed to Kotte, killed Jayabahu and became King as Buvanekabahu VI.

Budugunālankāraya was written when the third year of Buvanekabahu was expired in the year 2015 BE. 2472 AD.[20] On this evidence Paranavitana counted and established that Buvanekabahu VI's accession year as 1469.[21]

This king having subjected the leaders of the satara korale, set up the **Dedigama inscription** on the 13th day of the bright half of Poson (June) in his 9th year. [22] He also issued **Arankele Sannasa** on the full moon day of the month medin (February) in 2021 BE, 1479AD[23]and no information as to how long lasted his reign after this date.

The Portuguese writer do Couto informs us that after Buvanekabahu, his son "Caipura Bandara" became king. According to Couto he has not crowned more than four times when he was slained by the King of Satara Korale (Prince Ambulugala) and made himself emperor by force, calling himself Jaya Vira Paracura Mabago, Pandar[24], Jaya Vira Parakramabahu. Paranavitana who gave four years to Buvanekabahu's son Pandita Parakramabahu in 1960, **University History of Ceylon,** perhaps going by

this Couto's information, however, in the following year 1961, had to reduce his reign to even less than one year, making him almost a nonentity, in his lengthy paper which created the strange histotrical problem referred to above. Giving his reason for this sudden change, "The trend of the narrative in the **"Rajavaliya"** gives one the impression that Pandita Parakramabahu did not weild the scepter for even a year, at any rate Vira Parakramabahu would have considered himself the legitimate successor, and counted his regnal years from the demise of Buvanekabahu" says Paranavitana.[25] This obviously seems only a defensive excuse and a clumsy explanation.

But his genuine reason for this sudden change, one can clearly see, is to accommodate the 20 years reign of Vira Parakranabahu which had to be pushed back beyond 1490, as he merely accepted the wrong idenoification made by previous writers that the King in the Kelani Vihara record was Dharma Parakramabāhu.

Had the king been identified as Vira Parakramabahu Vlll, that king, as well as Paranavitana, could have come back to their former places held prior to 1961, while Somaratne who blindly followed Paranavitana and C. R. De Silva, who in his trun blindly accepted Somaratne would not have distorted Sri Lankan history of the latter part of the 15th century to that extent as has been done by chapters 5-7 in **Political History of Kotte** of Somaratne and chapters I and ll of C. R. de Silva in the **University of Peradeniya, History of Sri Lanka,** Volume ll.[26]

Referring to Pandita Parakramábāhu, Paranavitana says that the **Rajavaliya** is silent on the duration of that King's reign. But **Rājāvaliya** version edited by Vatu Vatte Pemānada Thera, says that this King enjoyed authority for nine years.[27] It implies that Pandita Parakramabāhu Vll lived upto his 10th regnal year.

Queyroz writing almost contemporaneously with the author of the **Rājāvaliya** informs us that Buvanekabahu's son and the heir was of tender age. His mother **Danamanica Ratnavali** ruled for a span of six months, but troubles usual in the government of women increasing, they elected regents to rule until the Prince was ten years old, when he taking possession of the government; he was called Pandita Parakramabāhu.[28]

This Portuguese historian seems to have mixed up age and reign with each other when he refers to Sri Lankan Kings.[29] Queyroz, in this instance seems to have conveyed that after Mother Danamania's six months rule the regents looked after state affairs until the Prince was in his tenth year of "reign". Ten years of "age" in Queyroz's statement has to be treated as tenth year of king's reign.

When so taken it becomes clear that Parakramabahu lived till his tenth year - agreeing perfectly with **Rājāvaliya** that he enjoyed authority for nine years and with Queyroz that his reign ran upto tenth year under the protection of his mother and regents. These regents of Queyroz, could be **"Sirivardhana Patirāja"** of Kekulandola,and **kuragama himiyāna** who were released from the prison by Buvanekabahu, possibly to give protection to his heir young Prince. When we consider the performance of these two war lords during the **'Sinhala Sangaya'** and the decisive battle they fought against Prince Ambulugala, to protect Pandita Parākramabāhu,[30] it is quite possible that this Prince King with the protection of these two regents, could have lived up to his tenth year, when he was slained by Prince Ambulugala who ascended the throne as Vira Parakramabahu VIII; and when he ascended the throne will be revealed later.

Thus Pandita Parakramabahu's regnal years have to be counted from 1480, on the death of father Buvanekabahu VI. Earlier we noted that we did not have evidence to decide how long Buvanekabahu lived after his **Aramkele sannasa** dated in February of 1479AD. Now we know that he lived till 1480, his eleventh regnal year from 1469AD.

Queyroz's information that Buvanekabahu's son and heir Prince was at his tender age when he became King as Parakramabahu, gains support from **Attanagaluvamsaya** which was written by a pupil of Vidāgama Maithreya Mahāsvāmi, while it was being dictated by the Mahāsvāmi. The present writer's research on **Māhasāmi Sangharājas of Jayawardhanapura** has revealed that Vidagama Maithreya, became Mahāsvāmi only after 1479 AD. possibly in 1480.[31]

As Makuluduwe Piyaratana Thera has quite correctly pointed out Vidāgāma Mahāsvāmi had to dictate the book, because he would have been in extreme old age, at the time of writing the book. The Mahasvāmi had been invited to write the book by the then king ***"Srimat Sri Parakramabahu"***.[32] This Parakramabahu also has been identified as Parakramabahu VI, by many scholars.[33] But considering the strong evidence that Vidāgama Maithreya was not referred to in any source as Mahāsvāmi prior to 1480, and more such evidence, the present writer fully agrees with Makuluduwe Piyaratana Thera's view that King Parakramabahu who invited to write the **Elu Attanagaluvamsaya** was Parakramabahu VII and not Parakramabahu VI.

The king has been introduced in the **Attanagaluvamsaya** as ***"Kandarpa Darpapramathita Nava Yavvana Sri Niketa"*** The word ***"Navayavvana"*** is the most suitable sinhala word for "teen - age." This agrees fully with Queyroz's information that Parakramabahu came to throne at his tender age.

We noted earlier that King Parakramabahu, whose 19th year as 2051BE, 1508/9AD. in the **Kelani Vihara Inscrption** should have asscended the throne in 1489/90AD. we also noted that after 1479, the year of granting Aramkele sannasa, no information about Buvanekabahu Vl as to how long his reign lasted. As we saw earlier that his successor lived upto his 10th year, when he was slained by Prince Ambulugala who succeeded him as Vira Parakramabahu; Pandita Parakranabahu's last year and Vira Parakramabahu's first year becomes 1490 AD, which we saw was the year of accession of the King Parakramabahu, whose 19th year given as 2051BE, 1509AD, in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription.** Now two problems are solved. Firstly the view held by historians from Louis de Zoysa, H. C. P. Bell through Paranavitana, Somaratne to C. R. de Silva, that the King figuring in the **Kelani Vihara Inscrption,** was Dharma Parakramabahu IX has to be rejected and that he was Vira Parakramabahu Vlll has to be established. Secondly the assumption made by us that Buvanekabahu's last year and his successor Pandita Parakramabahu's first year was 1480 AD, and he was succeeded by Vira Parakramabahu Vlll in 1490 AD, has become a firm conclusion.

5. Vira Parakramabahu Vlll.

Let us now turn to Vira Parkramabahu Vlll. Fortunately we have enough source material, mostly his own epigraphical records which help us to arrange chronologieally the activities of this important king who ruled the coutry as the paramount sovreign of Jayawardhanapura Kotte, being second only to his father Parkramabahu the Vl. Unfortunately just as in the case of the **Kelani Vihara Inscription,** two more of his most important records have been taken away from him and attributed to other Kings by scholars. They will be dealt with in the ensuing discussion.

Let us first examine information from Sinhala sources about Vira Parakramabahu Vlll. **Oruvala Sannasa** dated in the 4th year of a King ***"Srimat Siri sangabo Sri Parākramabāhu cakravarti Svāmin Vahanse"*** has been attributed to Vira Parakranabah Vlll, by H.W. Condrington after a long discussion on its internal evidence both paleographical and historical.[34] It should be noted that the name and the epithets used for the King in this inscription are exactly the same as those used for the King in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** in question. It is therefore, clear that the King in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** was also Vira Parakramabahu Vlll. Only orher Parakramabahu who was introduced with the epithet ***"Srimat Siri Sangabo"*** in the 15th century documents, was Parakramabahu Vl,the most famous King of the century. His reign has been precisely decided as 1412 - 1467 AD. He therefore cannot be the Parakramabahu, referred to in the **Kelani Vihara**

Inscription, whose 19th year was 1509 AD. The King in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription,** therefore, is Parakramabahu Vlll. The date of the **Oruvala Sannasa** becomes 2035 B.E. 1492 A. D.

"Srimat Siri Sangaabo Sri Parakramabahu cakravarti Svamin Vahanse" figuring in the **Kudumirissa Inscription,** also has been identified as Vira Parakramabahu, based on the internal evidence. It records that the King granted some lands to improve the ***"Agrahāra dāna"***, ordered by his father, the great King, Parakramabahu for various Brahmins. Vira Parakranabahu in the **Kudumirissa Inscription** proclaimed the donation while he was seated on the throne in full regal grandeur attended by Kings, sub Kings and ministers in the ***"Chitra Kūṭa Mandapa"*** in front of ***"Sumangala Prāsāda"*** at Jayawardhanapura. The date was, ***"Vesanga Pura Dolosvaka"*, the 12th day of the bright half of Vesak (April/May) in the tenth year of the King's reign.**[35] The similarity of the epithets of this King with that of King Parakramabahu in the **Kelani Inscription** would suggest that both are one and the same King. The date of the **Kudumiṛissa Inscription** is 2042 B.E. 1499A.D

It is interesting to note that ***"Vesanga pura Dolosvaka"***, the date of the donation in the **Kudumirissa Inscription** has been introduced as the ***"Svarṇābhisheka Mangalya dinaya,*** the Golden Coronation Day of the fifth year of a King called ***"Srimat Siri Sangabo Sri Jayavira Parakramabahu chakravarti Svāmin Vahanse"*** in a slab inscription at Gadaladeniya.[36] **It is apparent that the Kings of Sri Lanka in the ancient and medieval times reckoned their regnal years from the day of their first coronation and that they performed coronation ceremony annually on the same day.** The Portuguese writer Do Couto was aware of this custom when he says, referring to rulers after Parakramabahu Vl "those Kings were accustomed to be crowned once every year on the same day as that on which they were first crowed and for this reason the years of thier rule were counted by the number of times that they were crowned.[37] It seems to have been customary that the ancient Kings commemorated thir Golden Coronation Day, ***Svarṅabhiseka Mangalyaya*** by performing meritorious acts such as making donations to religious persons and places and granting amnesties to his subjects just as is done today. Just as King Parakramabahu in the **Gadaladeniya Inscription** was busy in proclaiming amnesty for those who asked for it ,when he subjugated the hill country prior to this very day, **12th of the bright half of Vesak,** which was also his Golden Coronation day in his 5th year, Parakramabahu in the **Kudumirissa Record** performed a meritorious act by enhancing his father's ***agrahāradāna*** donation to Brahmins on this particular day, **12th of the bright half of the month of Vesak in his 10th year.**

These circumstances readily offer the conclusion that the two Parakramabahus figuring in the **Kudumirissa** and the **Gadaladeniya** records are one and the same. The King in the **Kudumirissa Inscription** has been precisely identified, on internal evidence as parakramabahu VIII, and therefore Parakramabahu in the **Gadaladeniya Insciption** too, easily could be identified as Vira Parakramabahu VIII. The date ot the Kudumirissa record is 2042 BE. 1499 A.D.

Codrington who edited the **Gadaladeniya Inscrption,** having considered the possibility of identifying its King with Vira Parakramabahu VIII, later abandoned that idea, because Vira Parakramabahu in the Kudumirissa and Oruvala documents did not have the epithet ***"Jaya Vira"*** with which the King in the Gadaladeniya record was introduced. However Codrington himself has pointed out that Parakramabahu VIII was introduced as Vira Parakramabahu by the **Rajaratnakaraya,** the **Culavamsa,** the **Rajavaliya** and also by Queyroz. Couto calls him ***"Javira Pracura Mabago"*** that is ***"Jayavira Parakramabahu"*** identical with the King in the Gadaladeniya record.[38] When all these sources have introduced Parakramabahu VIII with **'Vira',** or ***Jaya Vira*** 'it is strange that Codrington refused to identify "Jaya Vira Parakramabahu" in the **Gadaladeniya Inscription** as Vira Parakramabahu VIII, simply because he did not have 'Jayavira' only in two records. On the other hand it is still strange that Codrington, who was ready to accept ***" Srimat Siri Sangabo Sri Parakramabahu",*** without **"Jaya Vira"** as the name of Vira Parakramabahu VIII, had totally forgotten the fact that the King in the Kelani Vihra record in question, was also ***"Srimat Siri Sangabo Sri Parakramabahu"*** and that therefore, there is a strong possibility for identifying him as Parakramabahu VIII.

"In spite of the difficulty caused by the name, Codrington has been inclined to identify the King in the Gadaladeniya record as Dharma Parakramabahu", for one reason that the subjugation of the Hill Country, recorded in the inscription, fits in with the information attributed to Dharma Parakramabahu in the **Rajavaliya.**[39]

One has to Keep in mind that the **Rajavaliya** is extremely unreliable with regard to the chronology of events recorded therein pertaining to this period, the best evidence in support of which is the report on the first arrival of the Portuguese.

According to the **Rajavaliya** this event took place in 1522 AD. but it has been unanimously agreed on the authority of Portuguese documents that the date of the first Portuguese visit was 1505/6AD. The **Rajavaliya** date is 17 years later than the correct date. It can there fore be reasonably argued that

the events attributed to Dharma Parakramabahu, by the **Rajavaliya** should be pushed back 17 years beyond 1505. If we identify Parakramabahu whose 19th year of reign is given as 1509 in the **Kelani Inscription,** with Vira Parakramabahu VIII, most of the events recorded in the **Rajavaliya** as events that took place prior to the arrival of the Portuguese, could easily be attributed to Parakramabahu VIII and not to Dharma Parakramabahu as the **Rajavaliya** wants us to believe.

Thus the subjugation of the hill country, the killing of pearl fishing Muslims, fall within the reign of Vira Parakramabahu VIII. According to **Rajavaliya** the King of Kotte invaded the hill country because a certain personage having declared him self king, revolted against the King of Kotte. Some of the offences committed by this self proclaimed ruler of the hill country against the King of Kotte, were creating riots, refusing to pay tax; annoucing his self enthronement and ***"Paṇam Ran Gäsveema"***, issuing coins.[40] The King of Kotte who reacted to this situation by invading the hill country, can very well be Parakramabahu VIII whose activities have been erroneously attributed to Dharma Parakramabahu by the **Rajavaliya.**

According to the Gadaladeniya record, the leader of the people in the regions of the hill country, who were granted amnesty by the king was **Menavara Tunayā,** the son-in-law of ***Dodamvāla Parakramabāhu Äpā.*** In the second part of the inscription this ***Menavara Thunaya*** has accepted the grant by making a number of promises, such as, to be in complete loyalty to the King, and to refrain from riding on elephants, ***"Ran Paṇamgäsveema"*** issuing coins, conferring titles, and digging for precoious stones etc.[41] The offences committed by the Kandyan leader against the King of Kotte, according to the **Rajavaliya** are almost the same; note the special mention of ***"ranpṇamgäsveema"***, in both sources. It is therefore, obvious that both sources speak on one and the same event, namely the subjugation of the hill country by the King of Kotte. The self proclaimed King whose name was not given in the **Rajavaliya** can be known from the **Gadaladeniya Inscription** as ***Menavara Tunaya,*** the son-in law of ***Dodamvala Parakramabahu Äpā.***

Paranavitana has attributed the **Gadaladeniya Inscrption** to Parakramabahu VI and identified Dodamvala Parakrama Äpa With Parakrama Äpā, defeating whom Parakramabahu VI came to the throne in 1410 AD.[42] It should be noted at this point that there appears a ***"Dodamvala Parakramaya"*** in two slab inscriptions at Alutnuvara, set up by ***Senā Sammata Wickramabahu.*** It is quite probable that ***"Dodamvala Parakramayā"*** was the same person figuring in the Gadaladeniya Inscription as ***Dodamvala Parakrama Äpā. Dodamvala Parakramayā*** is one of the leaders of Satara Korale, who pledged loyalty to Wickramabahu, the King of the hill country.

Codrington who made a thorough study on ***Senāsammata Wickramabahu's*** epigraphical records, decided his initial regnal year to be 1472 or 1473.[43] However, the present writer also made a careful study on ***Senā Sammata Wickramabahu*** and ***Dodamvala Parakrama Äpā*** making use of new information found in the **Asgiriye Talpata.** His study has revealed that Senā Sammata's first year of reign as 1463 AD. and that the dates of the **Alutnuvara Inscriptions** to fall within 1472-1474.[44] It is therefore, impossible that the **Gadaladeniya Inscription** which mentions ***Dodamvala Parakrama Apā*** falls within the reign of Parakramabahu Vl, (1412 - 1467AD). The leader who pledged support to King Parakramabahu of the Gadaladeniya record was not ***Parakramabahu Äpā.***, but his son-in-law, ***Menavara Tunayā***[45] of the next generation. His date, therefore should be still distant to Parakramabahu Vl. Under the circumstances we have to reject Paranavitana's identification of the King Parakramabahu of the **Gadaladeniya Inscription** as Parakramabahu Vl.

The foregoing discussion has made it clear that there are no valid objections to identifying ***"Siri Sangabo Sri Jayavira Parakramabahu"*** in the **Gadaladeniya inscription** as Vira Parkaramabahu Vlll, on the strength of both **Kudumirissa** and **Oruvala Sannasa.** We can now conclude that the ***'Svarnabhiseka'*** day, 12th day of the brigt half of Vesak, was the date of the first consecration of Vira Parakramabahu and that was the first day of any regnal year of that king. The date of the **Gadaladeniya Inscription** is 2037 BE, 1494 AD. October

Let us now turn to another inscription which seems to be attributable to Vira Parakramabahu Vlll. That is the **Keragala Inscription** of ***"Srimat Siri Sangabo Sri Parakramabahu chakravarti Svāmin Vahanse"***[46] The inscription records a decree issued by the king in his 11th year to protect some lands including Keragala which were inherited to ***"Sri Rājaguru Vanaratana Mahāsvāmīn Vahanse".***

Paranavitana and many other scholars have identified this King as Parakramabahu Vl, because ***"Rājaguru Vanaratana Mahāsāmi"*** figuring in the inscripion was eulogized in the ***Hamsa Sandesaya,*** which according to those scholars, was written in the reign of Parakramabahu Vl. These scholars have mistaken that the Vanaratana Māhimi in Jayawardhanapura during the reign of Parakramabahu Vl, was the same as Keragala Vanaratana Māhimi. The present writer's research on **"The Sangha Rajas of Jayawardhanapura"** has revealed that ***Rājaguru Vanaratana Māhimi*** who resided at Keragala and who was eulogized in the **Hamsa Sanadesaya,** became Mahāsvāmi Sangharāja only after 1500 AD.[47] Some scholars who

did research on history of Sinhala literature, have argued strongly that Keragala Vanaratana Māhimi mentioned in the **Hamsa Sandasaya** was not the Vanaratana Māhimi mentioned in the **Parevi Sandesaya** and **Jinkālamāli.** The latter resided in jayawardhanapura during the reign of Parakramabahu Vl, (1412 - 1467) whereas Rājaguru Vanaratana Māhimi resided at Keragala during the time of a different Parakramabahu, i.e. Parakramabahu Vlll. Munidasa Kumaratunga was the first to advance this argument and the other shcolar who srongly supported this view was Rapiyel Tennakoon.[48]

Paranavitana who strongly believed that the king eulogized in the **Hamsa Sanadasaya** was Parakranabahu Vl, has made a very unsuccessful attempt to analyse a verse in the poem which gives the geneology of the King. Apparently he seems to have interpreted the verse to suit his theory. The verse in question is given below:

daḷa pärakum buja suratureka siri ga ta
duḷa buvaneka buja kaptura eyin pa ta
yaḷa me nirindu ehi kaṇda siri gata dimu ta
päḷa in ätiva vädenuya me siri lak ke ta

Paranavitana has taken ***"Daḷa Pärakum"*** as Parakramabahu V of Gampola, ***"duḷa Buvanekabuja"*** as Buvanekabahu V of Gampola. In order to maintain his theory that Parakramabahu Vl (1412 - 1467) was the King in the **Hamsa Sandesaya,** he had to bring in two previous kings with similar names disregarding the qualifications attributed to them in the poem.[49]

When king Parakramabahu eulogized in the **Hamsa Sandesaya,** is considered to be Vira Parakramabahu Vlll, the kings mentioned in the verse become more meaningful and fit in with the metaphorical expressions attributed to them by the poet. Then ***"Daḷa Parakumbuja"*** is Parakramabahu Vl, the greatest King of the era, who founded the daynasty, as such was like a ***"suratura"***, celestial tree. ***"Dula Buvanekabuja"*** then becomes Buvanekabahu Vl, Prince Sapumal, adopted son of the former, who was like ***"kaptura"*** one variety that comes under ***"suratura"***, he was the next important king of Kotte. Finally ***"me nirindu"*** the King ***"Parakumbuja"*** the brother of Buvanekabhu Vl, who was like the stem of the ***"Kaptura"***, Buvanekabuja. Under these circumstances the present writer strongly advocates that the king eulogized in the **Hamsa Sandasaya** was not Parakramabahu Vl, but Parakramabahu Vlll. Therefore the king Parakramabahu mentioned in the **Keragala Inscription** who ordered protections to Keragala lands of **Rajāguru Vanaratana Māhimi** who was also eulogized in the **Hamsa Sandasaya** was the same Parakramabahu Vlll. The date of the inscription is 2043BE. 1500AD.

We initiated this discussion in order to ascertain which Pakramabahu was the King mentioned in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** as ***"Siri Sangabo Sri Parakramabahu"***. Up to this point we have not seen any valid objection to identify him as Vira Parakramabahu VIII. On the contrary we have valid grounds to identify him as Vira Parakramabahu, while agreeing fully with Paranavitana's correction, that 2051 BE. 1509 is the 19th year of the King and disagreeing with his identification of Dharma parkramabahu IX as the king mentioned in the inscription. We can now conclude that the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** was set up by Vira Parakramabahu in his 19th year, 1509AD.

We concluded that the amnesty granter in the **Gadaladeniya Inscription** was also Vira Parakramabahu VIII. We also noted on the strength of information furnished in both Kudumirissa and Gadaladeniya records that the King's ***"Svarnābhiseka mangalyaya"*** the **Golden coronation day,** in other words, the date he was consecrated as the paramount King, was ***"Vesangapura Doḷosvaka"***. We know, now, on the strength of evidence from the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** that **King Parakramabahu VIII ascended the throne in the 12th day of the bright half of Vesak (April / May) in the year BE 2032.(1490 AD.)**

6. The Reign of Vijayabahu VI.

We saw that 1509 was the 19th year of Vira Parakramabahu VIII. The **Rajavaliya** gives him 20 years of reign. Going by the **Kelani Vihara Inscription,** Codringtion calculated, the Golden Coronation Ceremony day, the ***"Svarnābhiseka mangalyaya vesangapura doḷosvaka"***, 2051 B. E. of the king mentioned in this record to be 1st May 1509.[50] He also decided that the year of the accession of Vijayabahu was 1509 A. D.[51] This yeilds the result that Parakrmabhu VIII died some time after 1st, May, 1509. In other words, Vijayabahu VI ascended the throne within the period between 1st, May and 31st, December, 1509. Going by the calculation made by Codrington, using the dates mentioned in the **Kelani Vihara Inscription** of Vira Parakeamabahu VIII, and **Kadiraṇa Sannasa** of Vijayabahu VI, **it can be calculated that Vira Parakramabahu VIII died on the 7th of june, 1509, and Vijayabahu ascended the throne on the following day 8th, june, 1509 AD.**

The **Devundara Inscription** which records a grant to ***"Nagarīsa Nīla Kovila"*** in Devundara, is dated 5th waning moon of Poson of Vijayabahu's 5th year, 1513[52] **Kudagama Inscription**[53] records 15th bright

half of the month **"Hila"** (Nov) of Vijayabahu's 6th regnal year 1514. The 15th of bright half of the month *'Bak'* (April) of the 7th year, 1516AD, is mentioned in the **Veragama Sannasa** in which King Vijayabahu ordered grants to Pepiliyana Pirivena for the maintance of scribes who wrote books.[54] The **Kadirāna Sannasa** records a grant made to a Brahmin on 15th waning moon of the month of poson of the king's 9th year, 1517 june 18, when a full solar eclipse was sighted.[55] The **Keragala Inscription** set up in his 11th year 1520, having recorded the geneology of ***Rajaguru Vanaratana Māhimi,*** mentions, about the order issued by the king to protect Angoda Village, which was inherited by Vanaratana Māhimi.[56] Another inscription from Devundara records a grant of Hittatiya Village to Upulvan shrine, on 7th waning moon of poson (June) of 12th year of Vijayabahu. 1521,[57] while the 13th year 1521 AD. is mentioned in the Kappagoda inscription which was attested by Vijayasinghe Ekanayake perumal.[58] This Ekanayake Mudali was one who was on the side of his Lord Vijayabahu in the conspiracy which resulted in the death of Vijayabahu during the incident called 'Vijayaba Kollaya' which took place in 1521.[59]

The above Discussion revealed that there were two paramount kings, in Sri Lanka during the period of 31 years from 1490 to 1521, one after the other with no interregnum. They were Vira Parakramabahu VIII and his son Vihayabahu VI. Parakramabhu VIII, having asceneded the throne on ***"Vesanga Pura Dolosvaka"*** 12th of the bright half of vesk (May) 1490A.D., exercised his authority until 4th of the waning moon of poson, 7th june, 1509, issuing royal decrees in 1492, 1494, 1500, and 1509. Ater the father's death, Vijayabahu having ascended the throne on the following day, 5th waning moon of Poson, 8th June 1509, ruled until 1521 when he was slain in the "Vijayaba Kollaya". He has issued royal decrees in 1513, 1514, 1516,1517, 1520 and 1521. It is therefore clear that there was not even a day of interregnum between the two kings.

Thus Vira Parakramabahu VIII was the paramount sovereign of Sri Lanka around 1505 A. D. in full regal glamour not being a bit concerned of those white coloured handsome Portuguese sailors roaming hither and thither in Colomtota as the **Rejavaliya** wants us to beleive, but being occupied in performing his royal duties such as ensuring protection and maintenance of religious establishments like Kelaniya and Keragala.

We are now in a position to arrange events which took place during the reigns or two successive Kings Vira Parakramabahu VIII and son Vijayabahu VI from 1490 - 1521, which is given at the end as appendix 1.

7. Who Was This Dharma Parakramabahu?

-Only a nominal Figure head of no consequence, who led a shadowy and inglorious excistence - H. W. Codrington-

In the light of the facts revealed in the foregoing discussion a question arises as to where Dharma Parakramabahu IX could fit in the geneological order of the consecrated King's of Sri Lanka in the beginning of 16th century. He was supposed to be a son of Vira Parakramabahu VIII, and a brother of Vijayabahu VI. He was supposed to have dominated the Sri Lankan politcal scene around 1505 according to the **Rajavaliya,** Portuguese historians and Sri Lankan historians from 1834 - up till 1995. ie, from G. Turnour through Paranavitana to Somaratne and C. R. de Silva. But we saw in the above discussion that there was no interregnum between the demise of Vira Parakramabahu VIII on 7th June 1509 and the accession of his son Vijayabahu VI on the following day 8th June 1509 AD.

The only epigraphical record, the **Kelani Vihara inscription,** which has been presumed to give him recognition on a wrong interpretation now has been conclusively alienated from him. His only savior is the **Rajavaliya** which has created him and given him undue credit by attributing to him most of the heroic deeds of his father Vira Parakramabahu VIII. Without the **Rajavaliya** Dharma Parakramabahu becomes a nonentity. We can now understand why the **Rājaratnākaraya** written during the latter part of 16th century, and there fore, the more contemporaneous source than the **Rajavaliya** of the late 17th century, and also the relevant part of the **Mahavamsa** have not even mentioned the name of Dharma Parakramabahu.

However, it should be noted that during the discssion on Donald Ferguson's excellent paper, **Portuguese in Ceylon** presented before the Royal Asiatic Society in 1907, E.W. Perera mentioned about a **Munnesvaram Sannasa** issued in BE 2060 12th year of a king Parakramabahu. According to E.W.Perera, the Sinhala tradition attributed this Sannasa to Dharma Parakamabahu and according to the Sannasa his year of accession was 1504 A.D. The translation of the Sannasa had been filed in P.C. case, Chilawa, No. 15,482. In his final reply, referring to E.W. Perera's Munnesvaram Sannasa, Donald Ferguson put the question back "Is this genuine"? Thereafter this Sannasa was treated as a condemned source.[60] The **Asgiriye Talpata** has also mentioned the 10th year of Dharma Parakramabahu as 2057 B.E. 1514 A.D. This makes his accession year 1504 A.D.[61] the same date given in the **Munnesvaram Sannasa.**

If there is any substance in this information furnished by the **Munnesvaram Sannasa** and the **Asgirye Talpata**, there is a slight possibility of Dharama Parakramabahu's existence during 1504 - 1514, the tail end of his father, Vira Parakranabhu's reign and the initial regnal years of Vijayabahu VI. Even so **"he would have been only a nominal figure head of no consequence, who led a shdowy and inglorious existence"** as Codrington has correctly assessed him.[62]

8. Conclusion

The possibility is that Prince Parakramabahu being one of the sons of the King at the time, the early Portuguese would have made him a 'cat's paw' in their struggle to gain a foot hold in the political scene in the country around 1505 A.D. They would have introduced their puppet, Dharma Parakramabahu to their Emperor in Portugal as the emperor of Ceylon, with whom the first Portuguese are said to have signed a treaty favourable to them on their promise to support his struggle for the throne against his brother Vijayabahu VI. The motive behind such Portuguese propaganda was no doubt to impress their Emperor about the success of their adventurous mission in converting the "heathens" in Asia.

Such an infurrence in respect of the role played by Dharma Parakramabhu would not seem baseless, when we read through the lines of a letter sent by Affonso da Albuqurque, the viceroy at Goa, to Don Manual, the King of Portugal, dated 30th November, 1513, AD

"The King of Ceilam is dead, he had two sons, and there was a division between them over the succession, they told me, that one of them sent to Cochin to ask them to give him help, and saying that if they wanted a fortress he would give them a site for if" says Albuqurque -[63]

We noted earlier that after the demise of Vira Parakramabhahu VIII, on 7th june 1509, his son Vijayabahu came to the throne on the following day 8th June 1509. Albuqurque's letter on 30th November 1513, informs us that a brother of vijayabahu had attempted to overthrow Vijayabahu and capture the throne with military aid from Portuguese, promising them a site in Colombo for them to build a fortress, for which purpose the king of Portugal had beern giving orders repeatedly to viceroys at Goa.[64]

This son of the deceased king of Ceilam who had secret communications with the Portuguese authorities for military assitence to fulfill his ambition to the throne, promising a site in Colombo for a Portuguese fortress was none other than Dharma Parakramabahu, for the two sons of Vira Parakrama bahu VIII, the deceased king, were Vijayabahu and Parakramabahu, Vijayabahu was already on the throne by 1513, and therefore, Dharma Parakramabahu was the son who had secret dealings with Portuguese to oust Vijayabahu and capture the throne.

The sequent process can be collected from Joao de Borrows. According to Borrows, the new viceroy Lopo Sorez de Albergaria came to Colombo with a fleet of 17 ships for the purpose of building a fortress on the site

offered, possibly by Dharma Parakramabahu, who would have posed himself as the legitimate sovereign of Ceylon. When Lopo Sorez landed on the site to start work he was shocked, when he saw that the site had been encircled by mud walls with wooden defences, on which certain iron bombards and bowmen had been posted, and that was not all, news reached him that Portuguese messengers sent by him to the king of ceylon (Possibly to Dharma Parakramabahu) had been taken prisoners.[65]

Fernao de Queyroz gives more precise details about the incident. According to him under the circumstances Lopo Sorez had to retreat to his ships. However on the following morning, having being ready for a confornтation he came to the site and ordered his men **santiyago! fire**! There started the battle between Portuguese and Smhalese "there arose such doubt about the victory, that it deemed admitted on the side of the Portuguese and acclaimed on the side of the chingalas, **had not the heavens miraculously darkened and the night advanced more rapidly than required, and like another Egiptian wonder, there appeared to the natives a roaring and smoke of artillery, and to the Portuguese a column of fire which guided them to the sea, hindering the progress of the one encouraging the other to resistance.** It was never right to look for miracles, and if on the other occassions, the sun delaying assured the victory, here the anticipated shadows covered the retreat, **while the issue might have been different, had the governor not risked his person with so few. They retired to fleet with little loss.**[66]

This miracle of Queyroz's description was a **solar eclipse** which helped Lopo Sorez and the rest of his men to save their lives and retreat to the fleet.[66]

We have a local source which helps us to determine the exact day on which this solar eclipse took place in 1517 AD. The **Kadirāna sannasa** was issued by Vijayabahu Vl on the 15th of waning moon of poson, 2060 BE, 1517 AD. when a solar eclipse was sighted.[67] King Vijaya bahu, Vl, the right ful sovereign of Lanka, at a royal assembly held in his new palace at Udugampola, granted some donation, to a Brahmin, the reason is not given. However, this date has been calculated by Codrington and Paranavitana to be 18th June 1517.[68]

Queyroz gives us subsequent events on the following day. A king called Parakramabahu had come in person to Colombo harbour to meet the Viceroy, apologized for what happened and appealed to continue the friendship. Lopo Sorez pardoned him and forced on him a treaty. With much reluctance Parakramabahu agreed upon. According to the treaty, **he, the rightful king of ceylon shall become a vassal of the Emperor of Portugal,**

in return he should be assissted and protected from his enimies by the Emperor of Portugal, in addition he, the king of Ceylon shall pay an annual tribute consisting of 400 Bahares of cinnaman, 12 rings of rubies and 6 elephants

"The author of this war was his nephew" according to Queyroz, considering the offence at this fresh subjugation to a nation and over whelmed by this consideration and by the fear of future events, he, (the king) lost his reason, and his people judging him to be incapable of governing entrusted it to his "son" Vijayabahu who gave him poison of which he died" says Queyroz,[70]

According to Queyroz Parakramabahu who was involved in this Lopo Sorez episode seems Vira Parakramabahu VIII. Since we gathered from local evidence that Parakramabahu VIII died on 7th fune 1509, Quezyroz's Parakramabahu whose father was also a Parakramabahu and who waś involved in 1517 episode was none other than Dharma Parakramabahu, the son of Vira Parakramabahu VIII, and the brother of Vijayabahu VI.

The information so far gathered could be summarized as follows. Vira Parakramabahu died on 7th June 1509 AD. His son Vijayabahu VI came to the throne on the following day 8th June, 1509. Dharma Parakramabahu, the brother of Vijayabahu sought military assistence from Portuguese to over-throw Vijayabahu and capture the throne, for such assistence he offered a site in Colombo, for the Portuguese to build a fortress, posing himself as the rightful king of Ceylon. Lopo Sorez de Albergaria, the new Portuguese Viceroy, with a fleet of 17 ships came to Colombo habour for the purpose of building a fortress on the site promised, probably by Dhamra Parakramabahu. Announcing his arrival he sent, some Portuguese messengers to the king of Ceylon, whom he regarded as Dharma Parakramabahu, However the news aboat this secret deal between Portuguese and Dharma Parakramabahu, most probably would have reached the royal court of Vijaya bahu VI. the real king at Kotte. It is very likely that the site for the fortress was encircled by mud walls and defensive arrangements were made and also the Portuguese messengers were taken captives on the orders of Vijayabahu VI. It was Vijayabahu's forces that engaged in the battle with Lopo Sorez. Most probably the fake king Dharma Parakramabahu would have apologized to Lopo Sorez for what happened and surrendered him self to sign the disgraceful treaty. He would have probably been charged for high treason and had to face the death penalty by taking poison.

It will now be clear that this traitorous Prince Dhama Parakramabahu who betrayed himself, and his mother land to the Portuguese sea pirates in order to fulfil his ambition to the throne, and there by paved the way for portuguese to gain a foot hold in Sri Lanka, has been made the most powerful sovereign king of Ceylon both by early Portuguese historians, as well as by modern historians from Turnour through G.P.V. Samaratna to C. R. de Silva

Appendix, 1

Given below is the Chronological order of kings of Kotte, from Parakramabahu Vl to Vijayabahu Vl as revealed in the above discussion:

Parakramabahu Vl	1412 - 1467 A.D
Jayabahu II	1467 - 1469
Buvanekabahu Vl	1469 - 1480
Pandita Parakramabahu Vll	1480 - 1490
Vira Parakramabahu Vlll	1490 - 1509
Vijayabahu Vl	1509 - 1521

This may be compared with the chronology proposed by the present writer in 1971, in his **Asgiriye Talpatin Alut Vana Lankā Itihāsaya,** and the chronology proposed by Paranvitana in 1960 in the **University of Ceylon History of Ceylon Volume I,** and in 1961 in his paper under discussion, in **University of Ceylon Review** Volume XlX, and also with the chronology proposed by G.P.V. Somaratne in 1975 in his **Political History of the Kingdom of Kotte.**

The table below will help such a comparison

	Rohanadeera	Rohanadeera	somaratne	Paranavitana	
	in 1993	in 1971	in 1975	in 1961	in 1960
Parakramabahu Vl	1412-1467	1415-1467	1411-1466	1415-1467	1412 1467
Jayabahu II	1467-1469	1467-1469	1466-1469	1467-1469	1467-1469
Buvanekabahu Vl	1469-1480	1469-1478	1469-1477	1467-1477	1470-1478
Pandita Parakramabahu	1480-1490	1478-1488	1477	-	1480-1484
Vira Parakramabahu Vlll	1490-1509	1489-1512	1477-148	1477-1496	1484-1508
Dhama Pararakramabahu IX		1504-15181	1489-1513	1491-1513	-
Vijayabahu Vl	1509-1521	1510-1521	1509-1521	1509 -1521	-

Appendix II

The Kelani Vihara Slab Inscription

The Text of this inscription was first introduced by Maha Mudali Louis de Zousa in 1871 and published in the **JCBRAS** vol , 1871 / 72., pp. 40, 41. H. C. P Bell and Mendis Ginasekara in 1916 having improved some readings, published the plate and the Text in the **CALR** vol. l. plate, IX, pp, 150, 15. Paranavitana in 1961 having deciphered two lacunas of 4 aksaras in lines 4 and 5, gave improved reading of the first 7 lines in his afore said paper in **UCR. Vol. XIX**. pp. 21 - 22. The present writer on 20th July 1997, having compared the readings of the above scholars and checked them with Letter by letter on the stone slab now posted at the entrance of the Sanghāvāsa Kelani Vihara, gives the following text. With regard to his improved readings see his latest book in sinhala - ***Dharma parakramabahau, Purthugīsī*** **Mävū Sinhale Vyāja Rājayā,** 1997, Upagrantha II,

The Text

Svasti sri saddharmā dhirāja tribhuvanānan dakara Sākya Kulatilaka Sakala loka divākara amrta mahā nirvāṇa dāyaka Gautama Sarvajna Rājōttamayāṇan Vahansēta dedās ek panas vanu Lankā rājya Sriyaṭa pämiṇi trisinhalādhīsvara pararāja rajesvara sāmanta rāja kirīta ratnabhrngāvalīsevita pādambuja sisira kiranāyamāna Kīrti bandha bandhura sūra vīra guṇaratnālamkṛta srīmat siri Sanghabodhī sri Parākramabāhu chakravarti svāmin vahansēta dasa nava vanu navayä pura ekoḷosvaka rajamaha Käani vihārayehi budun väḍa väḍa hinda vaḷandā dharma dēsanā kaḷāvū uttamasthānyeka ehi me davasa jarāvāsava tibena pinkam kavarēdäy niyama däna caityayehi vū siyalu tän jīrṇava tibetäy asā rajagen noyek viyadamut dī karavanṭa kiyā gana nāyaka tänata hā parākramabāhu vijayakkōnāra amātyayāṇanṭa bhāra kaḷa pasu caityayehi suṇu piriya mādivū sunbun karmāntat karavā uturu diga säta riyan kaḷugal pavurak hā nägenahira Sandakadapahanakin yukta gal paḍiyakut bandavā samādhi piḷimageya nā piḷimageya mema vihārayehi pūrvadiga vāsala mema tana galpaḍiya kudā trivankageya telkatārageya sānghika väsikiḷiya basnāhira vāsala ätuḷu vū tän mulpisa karavā pasmahal pāya salapiḷima geya sivurudā geya yanādi vū mekī tän kaṭu kohol haravā anikut vihārayehi noyek sun bun karmāntat pirimasvā samrdha karavū pasu sri nāmayen mekiyana vihāryehi apage viridu nāmayak pavatinta vuva mänaväy geṇehi nāyaka tänaṭa sri rājaratna pirivan terat asvā vihāra santakayen ättala assala muḷutängeya ulupängeya ādivū noyek dhurāve ayata hā demaḷa sinhala aya ādivū noek denāṭa milayaṭa sitiyen hā praveṇiyaṭa sitiyen bijuvaṭa amuṇaka vapaṭa satara naliya gannā lāsen vi

depälak aya denavat polgas dasyakaṭa paṇamak bägin panduru denavat niyama koṭa hirasanda pavatnā tek pavatinā lesaṭa pinkama mudunpat karavū heyin enadavasa pamiṇena rāja rāja mahāmātyādin visin divuṇakva vardhana karavā pin puravāgannā lesaṭa salasvā silā lekhyayak karavā pihiṭuvana niyāyen jayavardhana Kōṭṭayehi sri māligāve Sinhāsanayehi väḍa hinda mudalivarun mäda vaḍāḷa mehevarin me silā lekhyaya liyā dun bavṭa sanhas Tiruvarahan perumā ḷumha, rajamaha Kälaṇiyaṭa him vattaḷa malsaṇtoṭay, Kuḍā mābolay galvalutoṭay, gongitoṭay godarabu galpottay ūrubōruva vā̈ liyadda ätuḷuva gōna sēne tämbay ranmudu älay kessaketūgalay vaṭa galay äsaḷa paḷuvay, pasuru toṭe ätuḷay diviyā mulle ätuḷay imtämbay mahagangay.

The Kelani Vihara Slab Inscription

Appendix iii

Majore vents, that took place during the period of two successive Kings, Vira Pārākramabāhu Vlll and Vijayabahu Vl - 1490 - 1521AD. in chronological order.

Vira Parakramabahu VII - 1490 - 1509AD

2032BE. ***Vesak Pura* 12**
1490AD, April / May
Waxing moon 12

- Ascended the throne, 1st year, first day.
1st *svranābhisheka Mangalyaya.*

2035 BE, ***Esala Pura Viseniya,***
Waxing moon, 5,
1492AD.July,
Waxing moon

Tun vannen matu avurudu,
In the year next to third
Issued the copper plate to Brahmins
Potā ojjhal and ***Auhala ojjhal*** reiterating
the grant of ***Oruvala*** made by
Parakramabahu Vl, the father, for the
service, as *Agra purohitas.*

Oruvala Sannasa, EZ.,lll. 64, 65

2036 BE, ***Vesak Pura 12***
1494 AD, April / May,
Waxing moon, 12

Svarnabhisheka Mangalyaya, The
Golden Coronation festival day. First
day of 5 th year, some time before this
date subjugated up country and promised
amnesty to revolt leaders.

2037 BE, ***Vap, Pura, Pälaviya,* 1**
1494 AD, October,
waxing moon, 1.

Set up **Gadaladeniya inscription**
granting amnesty for those who
appealed. On the same **day** ***Menavara***
Tunayā, the son-in-law of ***Dodamvala***
Parākramayā, accepted the amnesty
on behalf of up country people, pledging
support to King of Kotte.

Gadaladeniya Inscription, EZ.lV,22,23

2042 BE, ***Vesak, Pura,* 12**
1499 AD, May, Waxing moon 12

-1st day of 10th year. Granted the
village **Kosvinna in** the Siyanā Korale
to Brahmana Community in order to
enhance the ***agrahāradāna*** ordered by
his father, the great king Parakramabahu Vl.

Kudumirissa Inscription, JCBRAS.,X,96

2043 BE *Navam Pura* 15
1501 AD. January / February,
Waxing moon,15

-11th year.
Oredred protection to villages
including ***keraagala*** belonged to
Rajaguru Vanaratana Māhimi.

Keragala Insciption, JCBRAS; XXII 353.

2051, *Navam Pura* 11
1509 January / February

-19th year.
Effected some repairs in the Kälaṇi Viharaya, ordered sources of income.

Kelani Vihara Inscription, JCBRAS.
1873, pp.40-41

2051BE, *Vesak Pura 12*
1509AD., May 1

- *Svarṇābhiseka* day, the firsr
day of his 20 th year.

2052BE, *Vesak full moon day*
1509 AD.. May 4,

The first day of 2052.BE.

2052 BE. *Poson, Ava* 4
1509 AD. June 7,

- 20th year of Vira ParakramabahuVIII,
The demise of the King

VIJAYABAHU Vl, 1509 - 1521AD.

1432 *Saka Poson, Ava 5*
2052 BE. *Poson, Ava* 5.
1509 AD., June, 8

Vijayabahu ascended the throne.
1st day of 1 st year of Vijayabahu Vl.

2056 BE. *Poson Ava* 5,
1513 AD. June

" Satara vannen matu"
1 st day of 5th regnal year,
granted lands to *Nagarisa nila kovila,*

Devundara, Inscription

JCBRAS., 1870 / 71,p.25.

2057 BE. *Hila*, 15
1514 AD. November

6 th year of Vijayabahu granted lands to
Mottappuliya Kovila in the Kinigoda Koralaya

Kudagama Inscription, RKD.,p.87

2058, BE, *Bak Pura* 15
1516 AD. April

7th regnal year, granted sources of
income for the maintenance of the
scribes who wrote books for the library
of *Pepiliyana Pirivena.*

Veragama Sannasa, EZ,V. 447 - 451

2060 *Poson Ava* 15
1517, June, 18

9th regnal year, seated on the throne at the palace in Udugampola granted lands to a Brahmana on the occasion of a solar eclipse.

JCBRAS, 1873, Vol. V.pp.75 - 79 EZ. III. p. 58.

2063 BE
1520 AD

12 th regnal year granted ***Angoda Kusalangama*** inherited by *Keragala Rāja guru Vanaratana Māhimi* from *Nagasena Thera* of Dhambadeniya period

JCBRAS. XXII, p.352.

2063 *Poson Ava* 7
1520, June

12 th year of Vijayabahu, Issued a royal decree to the effect that the village **Hittatiya** in the ***Dolos Dahas Koralaya*** should belong to God Upulvan and having offered 10 Panam as an oblation to the God, the, income should be enjoyed by ***"Neketi"***, the astrologer, ***Vidyāsara,*** his son ***Tenuvarapperumāl*** and their *descendents.*

RKD.,p.96

2064 BE
1521, AD

13th regnal year odered protection to the Kappagoda Vihara. The inscription to that effect was attested by ***Vijaya Sinha Ekanayaka Mohotti*** from the royal court, mentioned in the **Hansa Sandesaya** and the same ***Ekanayake*** who stood by the King against the three sons' conspiracy, Vijayaba Kollaya in 1521. **RKD.p. 86.**

1521, AD.

Slain in the Vijayaba Kollaya.

-Rajavliya, ed. Suraveera. p. 56

Notes

1. **University of Ceylon, History of Ceylon,UCHC.**, , Paranavitana., S., 1960, p. 683.

2 Codrington, H.W., **A Short History of Ceylon, SHC.**,1947, pp. Vlll, pp 94,100

3. **University of Ceylon Review, UCR.**, XlX, pp. 10-29.

4. **JCBRAS.**, Vol. V, 1871/72, pp. 36-44.

5. According to Paranavitana there is no ***'Va'*** aksara in the word ***'vanuva'*** as read by de Zoysa and Bell. Therefore it had to be read ***'Vanu'*** **UCR,** XlX, note 50, p.21. The same meaning and interpretation given by Paranavitana in 1961 has been given by Ratanajoti Thera in his **Kelani Vihara Varnanāva,** Colombo, pp. 18-19,as far back as 1890, alth ough English only reading scholars would not have seen it.

6. **UCR.,** XlX, p.29.

7. Somaratne, G.P.V., **Political History of the Kingdom of Kotte, PHKK.**, 1975, p.38., Somaratne has given only a passing reference that Paranavitana corrected the errors of the earlier editions of the inscription, **op.cit** p.275. note 247,for his adjusted chronology, see, p.232.

8. **University of Peradeniya, History of Sri Lanka**, Vol. ll, ed. by K.M de Silva, 1995, Chapter l, Sri Lanka in the Early Sixteenth Century, Political Conditions, pp. 11-36, Chapter ll, Economic and Socail conditions, pp.37-60.

9. "This absurd position, to which historians have been led by the Kalani Vihara Inscription makes it necessary to question whether the interpretation of that record hitherto accepted is correct, or whether a different interpretion which does not give rise to such a **'strange historical problem'** is not possible", **UCR.**, XlX, p.21.

10. Turnour, G., **The Mahavamsa,** Cotta Mission Press, 1837, Epitiom of Sinhala Kings, p.60.

11. **Rajavaliya, RV.**, translated by Gunasekara, B., Colombo, 1954,p. 63.

12. **Rajaratnakanaya, RTK**., ed. Tissera, P.N., Colombo, 1929,p. 43. Prof. Somaratne has very poor impression on **RTK**. for the main reason that it has omitted Dharma Parakramabahu. He warns scholars to be careful in using information furnished by this work and also **Culavamsa, Dhambulu Vihāra Tudapata,** which depended on **RTK., op.cit** pp.29-30.

13. **Culavamsa,** ed. Gieger, W., **PTS**., Chap. ll. 92, vs. 1-4.

14. **Mahavamsa,** Govt. Press, Colombo, 1917, p. XXVlll.,

15. **Rajavaliya, RV.**, ed. Suraveera, A.V., M.D. Gunasena & Co. Colmbo, 1976, p.213.

16 Father Queyroz, Fernao de, **Conquest of ceylon**, translated by Father Perera, S.G., Colombo, 1930, p.177.

17. **JCBRAS.**, Vol. V, 1870/71, pp.25-26.

18. **JCBRAS.**, Vol. V, No. 17, 1873, pp. 36-41.

19. **CALR.,** Vol.l,pp.155-158, Bell, H.C.P., **Report on Kegalle, District, RKD.,** 1904. p.86.

20. **Budugunalankaraya**, verse, 669

21. **UCHC.**, p.678.

22. **EZ.,** lll, p.279.

23. Jayatilaka, D.B., **Sinhala Sahitya Lipi**, **SSL,** 1965 edition. p. 144.

24. **JCBRAS., XX,** No. 60, p.70

25. **UCR., XIX**, p.14.

26. Somaratne, **op. cit.** pp. 131-203.
de Silva C.R., **University of Peradeniya, History of Sri Lanka,** 1995, pp.11-36.

27. **Rajavaliya,** ed., Vatuvatte Pemananda Thera, 1959, edition p.78.

28. Queyroz, **op. cit.** p. 25. **Rajavaliya** narrative ends at the end of Rajasinghe ll in 1614 Saka, era, 1682 AD., **RV.**p 241 whereas Queyroz started his work in 1671 and completed in 1686, Perera, S. G. Introduction **op. cit**. p.18

29. When Queyroz says that a certain king of Ceylon ruled for 73 years, he actually seems to have meant that the king's reign ended at his age 73, and when he says ten years of age he would have meant 10 years of reign, cf. **op. cit,** pp. 24,25,195.

30. For details see, **UCHC.,** pp. 679-683.

31. Rohanadeera,M.,**The Sangha Rajas of Jayawardhanapura**, Deepani Press, Gangodawila, 1978, **SRJ.,** pp. 40-43.

32. **Elu Attanagalu Vansaya**, ed. Makuluduve Piyaratana Thera, Introduction, lV.

33. Jayatilaka D.B., **SSL**, p. 148, Sri Sorata Thera, Velivitiye, **Hamsa Sandesaya,** 1954, Sangīāpanaya, lll, Sannasgala, P.B., **Sinhala Sāhitya Vansaya,** p.162.

34. **EZ.**, lll, pp. 51-64.

35. **JCBRAS.**, X, p. 96.

36. **EZ., IV**, pp.21.23

37. **JCBRAS.**, XX, p.70.

38. **EZ.,** lV, p.17.

39. **EZ.,** lV, pp. 18-19.

40. **RV.**, ed. Suraveera, p. 212.

41. **EZ.**, lV, pp. 21-24.

42. **UCHC**.,p. 670.

43. EZ., lV, pp. 8-15.

44. Rohanadeera, Mendis., Senā Sammata Vickramabāhu and Dodamvala Parakrama ***Äpā.*** chapter 4, **Asgiriye Talpatin Alutvana Lanka ltihāsaya, ATI.,** Vidyodaya University Press, Nugegoda,1971, pp, 47-57.

45. For more details, see, Rohanadeera, **op. cit**., pp. 71-84.

46. **JCBRAS.**, XXll, 1912, pp. 353-355.

47. Rohanadeera, M. **Sangha Rajas of Jayawardhanapura, SRJ** Deepani Press, Nugegoda, 1987, pp. 53-57.

48. For more details about this debate, see Munidasa Kumaratuna, **Gira Sandasa Vivaranaya,** 1963 edition, Introduction, pp. 4-7, R. Tennekoon, **Hamsa Sandesaya,** 1953, *Sulamula,* p.lll; **Apē Asun Kav,** 1960, pp. 106-111.

49. **UCHC.**, p.662.

50. **EZ.,** lV, p. 19.

51. **EZ.,** lll, p. 58.

52. **JCBRAS.,** 1870/71, p. 25.

53. **RKD.,** p. 87.

54. **EZ.,** V,. pp. 442-472.

55. **EZ.,** lll, p.58.

56. **JCBRAS.**, XXll, p. 352. This inscription has been wrongly attributed to Vijayabahu V, of Gampola, by all scholars. But the present writer after a thorough examination has come to the conclusion that it was definitely of Vijayabahu vi

57. **RKD**., 96.

58. **RKD.**, p.86.

59. **UCR.** XlX.,p.19.

60. **JCBRAS.**, XlX, 1907, p. 393, 399. The name of the king given in the Sannasa is Nirabut Nawkabahu - see note. on p. 399

61. Rohanadeera, **ATPI.**, p. 64.

62. **UCR**, XlX., p.21.

63. Donald Ferguson, Portuguese in Ceylon, **JCBRAS.,** XIX, p.373.

64. Donald Ferguson, Portuguese in Ceylon, **JCBRAS.**, XIX, p.383

65. Donald Ferguson, Hirtory of Ceylon from the ealiest times to 1600, A. D. **JCBRAS.** XX. 1908, pp. 41-44.

66. Zueyroz, **Conquest of Ceylon,** p. 194

67. UCR., XIX, p.18

68. JCBRAS, 1873, Vol. V, pp. 75 - 79

69. Queyroz, **conquest.,** 194; Borrows. JCBRAS., XX, 44

70. Queyroz, **conquest.,** 196, 197.