

Polyandry and its Practice in Premodern Sri Lanka

N.A. Wimalasena
Department of History
University of Peradeniya

Received: 20 June 2014
Accepted: 13 August 2015

Abstract

The history of human society is nothing but the description of the evolution and diffusion of various institutions designed toward perpetuation, maintenance and survival of society. The institution of marriage occupies a unique place in the realm of institutions and it is this institution which is instrumental in perpetuating human society through regulations of conjugal and filial ties. The institution of marriage is as old as creation of the world. As a social institution, it has taken different forms in different societies from time immemorial. The chief sources of our knowledge about the institution are the literary and archaeological data which give us a glimpse of the picture regarding progress in this sphere. There were various forms of marriage in ancient Sri Lanka such as love marriage, monogamous marriage, political marriage and polyandry etc. In the present study, attention will be focused mainly on Polyandry system up to the Kotte period in Sri Lanka as marriage and the males in partnership as husbands and the woman shared as wife. The meaning and definitions of polyandry, forms of polyandry, reasons for polyandry, the origin of this practice and the Sri Lankan context on Polyandry will be discussed in this article. The research will be mainly based on primary sources and wherever necessary material will also be obtained from limited secondary sources published on the marriage system of the island.

Key words: Polyandry, Marriage, Social institution, Adelpic polyandry, Social insecurity

Introduction

The history of human society is nothing but the description of the evolution and diffusion of various institutions designed toward perpetuation,

maintenance and survival of society. The institution of marriage occupies a unique place in the realm of institutions and it is this institution which is instrumental in perpetuating human society through regulations of conjugal and filial ties. The institution of marriage is as old as the origins of the world. As a social institution, it has taken different forms in different societies from time immemorial. The chief sources of our knowledge about the institution are the literary and archaeological data which give us a glimpse of the picture regarding the progress in this sphere.

Some scholars have dealt with marriages of different periods in history of Sri Lanka. M. B. Ariyapala in his work *Society in Medieval Ceylon as depicted in the Saddharmaratnāvali and other Sinhalese literature of the thirteenth century*, published in 1956, compared some passages in his sources with those of the Anuradhapura period. (Ariyapala, 1956: 292-301). Similarly *Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times*, a posthumous work of W. Geiger has briefly dealt with marriage using a few lines in two pages on Social Organization and Caste System during the Anuradhapura of *Mahāvamsa*. (Geiger, 1960: 37-38). Geiger's study is based almost exclusively on the main chronicle. For example, H. Ellawala has done research on the period from the fifth century BC to the fourth century AD. (Ellawala, 1969:). He has tried to analyze the marriage system of early Sri Lanka under the family organization. He has described marriage under the subtitle of traditions, pertaining to the age of marriage in Indian society, relationship of the ideal marriage partners, types of marriage in Indian society, equality of birth as the most important factor for a marriage settlement, polygamy and polyandry, divorce and re-marriage, marriage outside the normal practice, polygamy in Sri Lankan society, and widow marriage. But he says that the numerous lithic records which are still not deciphered are studied carefully and a careful and a systematic archaeological survey is made on the sites of early settlements of this country; But this analysis still remains incomplete. S. B. Hettiaratchi has detailed

study the fourth to the tenth century AD. He has dedicated a chapter on the marriage system of the respective period. He has designed it under the themes such as age of marriage, the customs of marrying daughters, cross-cousin marriage, the selection of marriage partners, and functions of marriage, love marriage, marriage of the ordinary people, dowry system and political influence and marriages. (Hettiaratchi, 1988: 55-88). In this article, an attempt is made to study the marriage and society in terms of polyandry approximately from the thirteenth century AD to the end of sixteenth century AD.

First the author has referred to the popular definitions of polyandry. According to the opinion of Sarva Daman Singh, the parent of the English term "polyandry", is made up of "poly+andr-, anēr+ia-y", referring to the "condition of [a woman] having many men", is a Greek word polyandria derived from polyandrios. Its antonym polygyny is composed of poly and gynia, signifies "the condition of a man having many women. Neither of the two words contains any etymological connotation of marriage. "Polygamy" is usually understood in the sense of a man marrying more than one woman, comes from poly and gamia meaning "many marriages", and in deep sense cover both polyandry and polygyny. (Singh, 1978: 27). Singh says quoting McLennan's statement that polyandry is used to imply the marriage of one woman to more than one man.

... It gives men wives. Till men have wives they may have tastes, but they have no obligations in matters of sex. You may be sure polygyny in the earlier stage never had the sanction of group opinion. They would all envy and grieve at the good of their polyginous neighbour. Polygyny, then did not at first give men wives. Wifedom begins with polyandry which is a contract. (Singh, 1978: 27).

Lubbock described polyandry as something “far from easy to distinguish between communal marriages a true polyandry”. (Singh, 1978: 28). Spencer thought polyandry “as one of the kinds of marital relations emerging from the primitive unregulated state; and one which has survived where competing kinds, not favoured by the conditions, have failed to extinguish it.” (Singh, 1978: 28). Briffault mentioned it as a remnant of group marriage. (Singh, 1978: 28). Sumner, Keller, Vinogradoff and Westermarck considered polyandry as a consequence of harsh living conditions. (Singh, 1978: 28). Westermarck opinioned his opposition to McLennan's notion of polyandrious evolution in the statement in an article on “Marriage” in the *Encyclopaedia Sexualis*. (Singh, 1978: 27)

To explain polyandry is to trace its causes and when this has happened, it is found that certain circumstances lead to unions in which the husbands are brothers and other circumstances to unions in which they are not so; but I see no reason whatsoever to assume that the former kind of union has developed out of the latter. It would indeed be rather surprising if a people so cultivated as the Nayers had preserved the primitive form while lower castes living in the same neighbourhood had grown out of it and changed their polyandry into fraternal. (Singh, 1978: 28).

According to the views of *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, two varieties of polyandry are generally recognized; in one of which husbands are brothers, while in the other they are not necessarily related to one another. (Hastings, 1964: 426). N.D. Wijesekera considered polyandry as an unexpected and unnatural form of human behaviour of society that one needs to examine the practice very carefully to ascertain its origin. (Wijesekera, 1967: 24). He has mentioned that it was practiced by many primitive peoples and continues among several tribes at a low level of culture. (Wijesekera, 1967: 24). He has mentioned

that there are varieties of polyandry. In the new world, cases of such practice of one woman being married to several men at the same time can be observed among certain South American Indian groups. This practice is also obvious among Eskimos in the Alaskan coast. In the Canary Islands group most women in the Island of Lancerate have three husbands who wait upon them alternately by months. (Wijesekera, 1967: 24). The practice is found in Madagascar among a few people of the continent of Africa, in some localities of the Malayan Archipelago and certain South Sea Islands. In the Marshal Islands and the Marquesas it has been practiced in large scale. (Wijesekera, 1967: 24) Strabo asserts that polyandry prevailed in Arabia-Felix. It occurs chiefly in India and its neighbourhood, and in Africa among the bahima and Bazito people. But the only definite example of polyandry, Wijesekera says as recorded in Africa occurs among a pastoral people whose culture possesses several features resembling that of the Todas very closely. In ancient time polyandry has been recorded among Arabs, Britons during Caesar's time, Picts and Guanches. (Wijesekera, 1967: 24).

Wijesekera described another form of polyandry which is related directed to monogamy. First husband is the chief husband in that form of polyandry. The other man or men who share the same woman act as husband and master of the house in the absence of the true lord. (Wijesekera, 1967:25). These husbands are not brothers. It is a caretaker arrangement necessitated by circumstances. Among the Nayars, a non-fraternal type of polyandry occurred, according to the under mentioned statement. "Among the Nayars a girl goes through the form of marriage with a man but later consorts with a number of other men who need not be related to one another. This can be better described as Cიცისბეი". Another form of polyandry has been mentioned by Wijesekera which occurred in India in which a young boy marries a wife who consorts with the boy's father or maternal uncle or some other man. (Wijesekera, 1967:25). The wife's offsprings are

considered as children of the boy-husband. When the boy becomes an adult, he will consort with the wife either of one of these children or of some other boy. According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Nayars of Cochin, Malabar and Travencore practiced non fraternal type of polyandry. (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. VIII, 178). According to the Nayar usage every girl, before she attained puberty, was subjected to a marriage ceremony, after which the nominal husband went his way and she was allowed to co-habit with any Brahmin or Nayar she chose. Usually, she had several lovers who co-habited with her by agreement among themselves but they did not live with her. According to the above analyzed facts, there was more than one type of polyandry. McLennan introduces the above two forms of polyandry as Tibetan, which is called fraternal type and it is also known as adelphic and Nayar as non-fraternal type. (Hastings, 1964: 427). The eldest brother is regarded as the principal husband in the fraternal type of polyandry. He chooses the wife and the contracts may confer matrimonial rights on all the other brothers. If these were brothers the eldest takes the lead and the various husbands live or co-habit in turn. Wijesekera says that there was a definite system of polyandry which was of Todas where she becomes the wife of all the brothers even of those born after the marriage. Polyandry of the fraternal type was practiced in Tibet and the neighbouring regions in the North. Usually, the eldest son of the family marries and as his brothers grow up they share his wife with them. Even if one of the younger brothers takes a wife, she becomes also the wife of the other brothers among the Todas. (Hastings, 1964: 427). In Tibet, as practiced in ancient time, the husbands are blood related brothers who live in the same household as members with their common wife. This is the general pattern frequently adopted in the Himalayan region from Assam to the dependencies of Kashmir, chiefly among the people of Tibetan affinities. (*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Vol. XVIII, 178). As has been pointed out earlier, the type of polyandry custom in Sri Lanka is of the Tibetan pattern.

Some scholars have pointed out the reasons for polyandry. Hayley observes : "It is one of the peculiar features of Kandyan custom that polyandry should have continued to be not merely tolerated but openly recognized and approved throughout the growth of the civilization which was reached in Ceylon." (Hayley, 1993: 170). Sing expresses the principle causes quoting *The History of Human Marriage of Westermarck*.

The first of these causes is the disequilibrium in the ratio of the sexes. There may be more men than women in a given society of reasons. Affluence is said to breed more females, and austerity males. Female infanticide may disturb the sex ratio, as does the selling of women out side the community. A sizeable immigration of male bachelors may also result in a scarcity of women, which may be accentuated by female deaths in child-bearing, or by the practice of polygyny among some peoples. (Sing, 1978: 29).

The second reason was economic. As has been pointed out by Sing, an inhospitable and poor terrain may necessitate curbs on the growth of population. (Sing, 1978:29). Where fragmentation of small properties would lead to economic perdition, the need to keep the family property undivided would make polyandry a panacea. It would reinforce the bond of fraternity and ensure the pooling of property and man power for purposes of production. Radcliffe- Brown mentioned about adelphic polyandry in terms of the unity and solidarity of the sibling group. When the wealthy practice polyandry that is because they want to keep their wealth undivided, and their influence unimpaired. When the bride price in some areas is too high for a single individual to afford, many men pool their resources to purchase a common wife. Peter Prince refers to the instance of near polyandry in modern France, where Polish coal miners working in the North clubbed together to have a woman in common.

(Prince Peter, 1963: 62). They all made equal contributions to support her, and were provided an evening meal and a night's entertainment at the woman's quarters, each according to his turn. There was no marriage; yet the affinity of such an orderly arrangements with the character of polyandry would be undeniable. Household expenses in some pastoral cultures may be more easily defrayed by pooling the heads of cattle amongst a given numbers of owners, made possible by their collective marriage to one woman. According to Peter Prince, The Toda polyandry provides a conspicuous exception to this proposition. He points out that the Todas have an unusual type of polyandry, apparently divorced from what is elsewhere always the essential correlate of the institution, namely, the non-division of the inherited family property. Toda brothers share one wife in common, but their buffaloes are at the same time individually owned, as is also any other form of property that they may have. (Prince Peter, 1963: 53).

Some people leave homes, because they are engaged in various professions to earn their livelihood. It has also led to polyandry in some societies to ensure protection and support for their wives by their kinsmen. Polyandry was originated as a fraternal character due to this reason. But regarding this case, Nayars polyandry was non- fraternal. Quoting the Sixth edition of *Notes and Quarries of Anthropology*, Sing defines polyandry as the institution or custom by which a woman is permitted to have more than one husband at the same time. It also defines cisibeism as a more or less permanent union of a woman with one or more men without giving them the full status of consort. (Sing, 1978: 33). E. R. Leach emphasizes economic reason as a cause of polyandry. He suggests that adelphic polyandry is to be understood as yet another variation on the same theme. If two brothers share one wife so that the only heirs of the brothers the children born of that wife, then, from an economic point of view, the marriage will tend to cement the solidarity of the sibling pair rather than tear it apart, whereas, if the two brothers have separate wives, their children will have

separate economic interests, and maintenance of the patrimonial inheritance in one peace is likely to prove impossible. (Leach, 1971: 107). He says that further a definition only in terms of legitimacy is inadequate, as several distinguishable classes of rights are discernible in the institutions commonly classed as marriage. The legal and social concomitants of marriage are not always and everywhere identical; and a comprehensive definition of marriage must include several subtypes of the institution. Leach says as follows; On the one hand, we have a formal and legal arrangement, by which, so far as Ceylon is concerned, a woman can only be married to one man at a time... On the other hand we have another institution of marriage, which is entered into quite informally but which nevertheless, by virtue of its public recognition, serves to provide the children with claims upon the patrimonial property of the men with whom the woman cohabits publicly resides... If we accept this second institution as a form of marriage then polyandry in Ceylon is a form of polygamy. If we confine the term marriage to the first institution, polyandry in Ceylon is a form of polykoity. (Leach, 1971: 110).

S. J. Tambiah has conducted a research on Polyandry in Ceylon with special reference to Laggala region. He says that economic factors have mainly caused polyandry. Polyandry in Ceylon as a customary form of marriage establishes the inheritance rights of children, and their full birth status rights common to normal members of their society or social stratum (Tambiah, 1966: 265).

Wijesekera notes the main reasons are behind for such a practice. These are said to be immemorial custom, predominance of women over men, absence of men on travels out of home, cementing marriage, peace and contentment as brothers will not quarrel, celibacy of a large number of men, poverty and avoidance of division of property (Wijesekera, 1967: 27). J. A. Gunaratna

emphasizes more on economic factor as the reason for the emergence of polyandry. He says that the custom is commonly believed to have originated in feudal times, when every householder was bound to give his personal attendance at the royal palace and at the residences of the higher chiefs. During the long intervals of absence enforced on a householder by this duty, it was necessary that someone should remain at home to look after his lands and generally to conduct his affairs, and a brother or some other close relative was usually deputed to perform the duty. This community of property is supposed to have eventually led to the community of wives. (Gunaratna, 1898: 1).

Before coming to the Sri Lankan context, the origin of this practice in India should be examined. Among the Vedic Indians, the practice of polygamy is abundantly proved by the direct reference to it in the *Ṛigveda* and other ancient texts. However, monogamy is recognized as normal and that having extreme faithfulness to one man and one wife. That is why chastity was held in such high regard as the essential virtue of Indian womanhood. No clear traces of the practice of polyandry can be discerned from ancient texts. The classic example is that of the five Pāṇḍava brothers, heroes of the *Mahābhārata* epic who are represented as marrying Draupadi and having her as wife in common. This happened under certain special circumstances. The position is elaborately explained and defended in the epic. Later, this form of polyandry is defended by Bṛahaspati (*Bṛahaspatismṛti*, 1941, XVII, 20) as practiced in the South and by Āpastamba (*Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra*, 1898: II. XXVII, 2) as an antiquated use. It is interesting to remember the region as South and the reasons as special circumstances and antiquated use. The practice was never widely spread among the tribes of early Sri Lankan culture. JatilaGautami had seven husbands and Varkshi married ten brothers. Asvin shared Sūrya with his twin brother. Wijesekera has mentioned that a similar practice is still found among Brahmins. (Wijesekera, 1967: 26). Rajput and Sindras are similar to Kumaon where the

children are shared, and among the hill tribes among the Punjab, the children are divided among the brothers. Among the Jāts of the Punjab the wife of the eldest brother has to serve as the wife of the younger brothers.

In Sri Lanka, polyandry has existed from very early times. But it is difficult to say at what precise period it came into being, whether it was imported by king Vijaya and his followers from the neighbouring continent, whether it existed among the people whom they found on their arrival here, and who were dominated by Vijaya early Sri Lanka. Ancient literature does not appear to have recognized or noted it as having any special significance. The *Rasavāhinī* contains no reference. The Sinhala writings of the 14th century make no reference to such customs. If any, it should occur in the *Saddharmaratnākara* and *Saddharmaratnāvali*. But, one hint can be obtained from a Jātaka Story, although it was of Indian origin. The only reference to the existence of polyandry in Buddhist literature occurs in the KuṇḍalaJataka where we find that princess Kanhā was allowed to marry five suitors selected by her in a *swyamvara* assembly. (*Jātakaṭṭakathā*, Vol. V, 1877: 426). Altekār resembles Kanhā to Draupadi. He says that Draupadi's polyandrous marriage seems to have been a historic event; otherwise the author of the *Mahābhārata*, who is at his wit's ends to justify it, would have quietly kept silence over it. (Altekār, 1938: 132).

But, MangulMahaVihara inscription of Vihāramahadēvi is a very important one on this topic as it gives information about the relevant period. This inscription has been found among the ruins of an ancient monastery, now known as MangulMahavihara, situated in the Panama Pattu of the Ampara District, about a mile to the south of the eighth mile stone on the road from Potuvil to Vāllavāya. The records describes us that Rūṇu-maha-vehera, the ancient monastery at the site, which was then an abandoned ruin in the wilderness, was completely renovated by Vihāramahadevi, the consort of the two brother kings

named Pārakumbā or Parākramabāhu, and that she endowed it with lands for its maintenance.

Rūṇuraṭṭā raja ka(rana) pārakumbādebā raja
 daruvandedenāṭaagamehesun ū
 vihāramahadevinammāvisinmulpisākaravādarugamva
 ṭanāpasaparivārasahitavā... (badavas)
 kotāmāvisinkaravanalada... (*EpigraphiaZeylanica*, Vol.
 IV, 165).

According to this inscription, both brothers had the name of Parākramabāhu and that Vihāramahādēvi was their common spouse. Therefore, this inscription throws a light; there was polyandry at least in elite society of the relevant period. Paranavitana pays attention about these two brother kings. (*EpigraphiaZeylanica*, Vol. IV. 162). One inscription tells that these two brother kings had vanquished the Cola army and were ruling the Rohaṇa principality. It is also apparent that both brothers had the name of Parākramabāhu and that Vihāramahādēvi was their common spouse. The pillar inscription appears to have contained a more detailed account of the Cola invasion which was repelled by these rulers. But unfortunately the record is mutilated just at the point where the reference to this historical event begins. This record also appears to have been set up after the demise of the brother kings, for Vihāramahādēvi is referred to therein as who was the chief consort of the two brother kings. Paranavitana has identified suggested Parākramabāhu of this inscription with Parākramabāhu V, and his brother Bhuvanekabāhu IV. From the inscription it becomes evident that the reigns of Parākramabāhu V and Bhuvanekabāhu IV ran concurrently. Codrington has also surmised that these two monarchs were brothers. (Codrington, 1926: 83, 88-89). Palaeographically, these inscriptions can belong to the time of Parākramabāhu V. But Paranavitana after further study of the

inscriptions with the help of better estampages prepared under his direction, has changed the opinion that his first identification is untenable.

The first inscription tells us that both brothers were known as Parākramabāhu. Moreover, the two brothers are described in the inscription as rulers of Rōhaṇa, whereas Bhuvanekabāhu IV and Parākramabāhu V had their respective capitals in the Māyā kingdom and claimed suzerainty over the whole of Sri Lanka, though their actual authority did not probably extend to some parts of the island. If her husbands had claimed the dominion of whole island, Vihāramahādēvi would not have been content with referring to them merely as rulers of Rōhaṇa. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the princes mentioned in these inscriptions are not identical with any of the monarchs figuring in the lists of paramount rulers of the island. Therefore, it can be supposed that they were petty kings who wielded independent authority in Rōhaṇa while the northern part of the island was in a state of confusion owing to an invasion from South India. And one king must have the one *aggamahesi* in Sri Lanka according to the sources. Therefore, these kings can be suggested as petty rulers in this region.

However, on the other hand, Vihāramahādēvi mentioned in the inscription of MangulMahaVihara became the spouse of King Bhuvanekabāhu IV and King Parākramabāhu V, because she would have descended from Kṣastriya dynasty and perhaps the dynasty of the two kings would not have been much strong. According to the describing pattern of this inscription, Vihāramahādēvi not only became wife of two kings, it shows that she also had a sufficient political power. Vihāramahādēvi has donated including *darugam* [the lands supplying]. (*Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. IV, 165). She says further that all these acts of merit performed by her should be maintained by kings, sub-kings and others who will flourish in the future. It shows that she had sufficient political hegemony. It can

be suggested that such kind of requests have been made only by the persons who have entered the main political realm. Mudiyanse expresses that there was a tradition of polyandry in this time, because Vihāramahadēvi had become the spouse of a two kings (Mudiyanse, 1960: 122). Although this could be true, it is unclear that this practice has been strictly established in the society.

However, this custom gradually expanded and the custom *ekageikāma* or polyandry might have emerged. R. W. Levers has described regarding polyandry as follows; Sri Lanka's first historical document is Knox's Historical Relation. He stated as follows; Regarding Ceylon literature on this subject, the first notice is in Knox's "Historical Relation." (Levers, 1898: 6). He mentioned it as an appendix as follows; In this country each man, even the greatest, hath but one wife; but a woman often has two husbands; for it is lawful and common with them for two brothers to keep house together with one wife; the children do acknowledge and care both fathers. (Levers, 1898: 8). But, according to the Rūḥumahavehera inscription which was pointed out earlier can be named as the first historical document with regard to polyandry in Sri Lanka.

Another important example for Sri Lanka's polyandry of medieval Sri Lanka can be gleaned from the *MayūraSandēśa*. *MayūraSandēśa* has described Queen Jayasiri after praising King Bhuvanekabāhu V. As has been pointed out in the 38th poem in the ten line ode of *MayūraSandēśa*, the messenger met the God Vibhīṣaṇa and requested the blessing to the King, Queen and three brothers who were husbands of her.

Vibisanasuravaranasirisaranavāndadanva

t

Sirinmudunniridunsahabisōsandu

n

Tarinbelendisitunbā^āmehimisandu n

Tesu raja mātiāmāti ā^ā senagaāmasamagi n

(*MayūraSandēśa*, 1993: v. 38).

The Sinhala word *himi* means husband. Here, the word *meis* mentioned before the word *himisandun*. Nothing has been mentioned about the three brothers in this book before we come across this ten line ode. Paranavitana says that if the word *himi* is mentioned before an important woman, it means the husband. According to the meaning of the above mentioned word, Queen Jayasiri should have had three husbands and they were brothers. *Ekageikāma* or polyandry system prevailed, when Portuguese arrived in Sri Lanka. It was maintained in the Udarata at same time. That custom existed also in royal families in Kotte as mentioned in the *Rājāvali* which will be described later. *MayūraSandēśa* gives information of the husbands of queen Jayasiri who were considered as three brothers, in another place of this book.

Pinānālakametunbā^āhiminve ta

Manānālovini'surudevaminsata ta

Dinānālesintedadiyuṇadiga ta

Dinānāvikumdunamānavidiya se ta

(*MayūraSandēśa*, 1993: v. 155).

After telling about the queen, the poem includes the line *tunbā^āhimi* which means the husbands as three brothers. These three brothers were Alagakkōnāra, Āpā and Dev himi (dēvaswāmi). The third person mentioned here can be certainly considered as the person *dēvamantrin* who was a brother of Alakēśvaraas described in Sagama inscription. (*EpigraphiaZeylanica*, Vol. IV, 308). Āpā, who is mentioned as the second person, should be Arthanāyakaas described in the *Eḷuattanagaluvaṃsa*. (*Eḷuattanagaluvaṃsa*, 1933: 1.)

Ampitiya inscription which can be attributed to the third year of King Vikramabāhu III described Āpā as a name of Arthanāyaka. Therefore, it can be said that polyandry system was maintained in the royal family. According to the above mentioned description, three brothers including Alakēśvara were the husbands of queen Jayasiri who was the mother of King Bhuvanekabāhu V. Therefore, Alakēśvara III is a father of King Bhuvanekabāhu V. He had a right to the name of Alakēśvara. It can be understood from the statement of *Rajaratnākara Alagakkōnāra Bhuvanekabāhu naming raja vī* as Alagakkōnāra becoming the king with the name of Bhuvanekabāhu. (*Rr*, 1995: 119). The son of Alakēśvara was Kumara Alakēśvara. He can be identified as Alagakkōnāra (Alakēśvara) IV. The title "Kumāra" was entitled to him, because he was a son of a queen. It is confirmed that Alakēśvara III was a co-husband of the queen can also be another person to prove that polyandry system prevailed in the royal family. If King Bhuvanekabāhu V ascended the throne in accordance with matrilineal tradition, he should be the son of King Vikramabāhu III. There is no doubt that he became the king according to the traditional customs. Accordingly, it can be thought that when King Vikramabāhu III reigned, three brothers including Alakēśvara were the co-husbands of the sister of King Vikramabāhu III. This kind of marriage can be named as adelphic and political polyandry.

It can also be inferred from several historical accounts that polyandry was prevalent among both wealthy and poor people as well as the commoners. In the Kotte period, the *Rājāvali* mentions that two brothers of the king of Kotte, Dharma Parākramabāhu, had at one stage in their lives, 'lived in one place and cohabited with one woman.' It is mentioned as follows;

On his death, his eldest son was raised to the throne under the title of Dharmaparākramabāhu. Prince Vijayabāhu and Prince Rājasinha built the city of Meṇikkadawara, and whilst young men, lived in one place and cohabited with one woman. (*Rājāvali*, 1900: 71).

It mentions further as follows;

It should be borne in mind that Dharma Parākramabāhu's uterine brothers, viz., Sri Rājasinha and Vijayabāhu, who lived in Meṇikkadawara, had as young men cohabited with the same woman... The princes Rājasinha and Vijayabāhu, whilst living together in one house, had three princes born to them. (*Rājāvali*, 1900: 74).

One fact has to be mentioned that the eldest of this family was Dharma Parākramabāhu. It is not the eldest brother who marries, but the second and third brothers, Vijayabāhu and Rājasinha respectively. Another point worth mentioning is that after the death of Rajasinha I and the queen, Vijayabāhu took a princess from Kīravālla as wife. During the Portuguese times the custom prevailed and the Portuguese courts recognized it. Tambiah cites Tennent as having reported that the king of Kotte Vijayabāhu VII shared a wife with his brother and that the Kandyan king Rājasinṁha I was born in polyandry. (Tambiah, 1966: 271). According to the above mentioned facts, the main characteristic of polyandry in this period was the adelphic polyandry. Ribeiro described Sinhalese marriages at the time of the Portuguese occupation as follows;

Their marriages are a ridiculous matter. A girl makes a contract to marry a man of her own caste (for she cannot marry outside it), and if the relatives are agreeable they give a banquet and unite

the betrothed couple. The next day a brother of the husband takes his place, and if there are seven brothers, she is the wife of all of them, distributing the nights by turns, without the husband having a greater right than any of his brothers. If during the day any of them find the chamber unoccupied, he can retire with the woman. If he thinks fit, and while he is within no one else can enter. She can refuse her-self to none of them; whichever brother it may be that contracts the marriage, the woman is the wife of all; only if the youngest marry, none of the other brothers has any right over her but he can claim access to the wives of all of them whenever he likes. If it chances that there are more brothers than seven, those who exceed that number have no right over her; but if there are two up to five, they are satisfied with one woman; and the woman who is married to a husband with a large number of brothers is considered very fortunate, for all toil and cultivate for her and bring whatever they earn to the house, and she lives much honoured and well supported, and for this reason the children call all of the brothers their fathers. (Ribeiro, 1685: 50).

Baldeus says that the practice of polyandry, universal in the Udarata, seems to have persisted in the littoral states even after a century and half of culture contact with Europeans. Baldeus states that "they recommend the conjugal duty to be performed by their own brothers," and gives the instance of a woman of Galle who had confidence enough to complain of the want of duty in her husband's brother on that account. (Baldeus, 1672: 366-367). John Davy has also expressed the polyandry system of the Kandyan period. He says that there was a polyandry system similar to that of Tibet. The joint husbands were always

brothers. Davy could get information about a woman with seven husbands. This custom was not limited only to a class or caste. This is common to all poor and rich persons. Poor peoples' attitude was that they could not afford a special woman. (Davy, 1821: 214-215). He further says as follows; And of the wealthy and men of rank, that such a union is politic, as it unites families, concentrates property and influence, and conduces to the interest of the children, who having two fathers, will be better taken care of, and will still have a father though they may lose one. (Davy, 1821: 215).

This kind of polyandry may have developed, because it started from medieval period in Sri Lanka. Pieris says that Muslims married Sinhala women in the Kandyan period. (Pieris, 1956: 100, n. 38). Muslims were the authorities before the arrival of the Portuguese. They developed commercial activities, even though there were Europeans in Sri Lanka. Due to the competition of business, the economy of the Sinhalese may have developed. With the economic development, polyandry may have also expanded. The husbands who were engaged in the polyandry will not say that they have a wife in common. They say that *apiekageirakshāvenavā* which means that "we earn our living in the same house". The wife also does not say that she is the wife of them. She says that *mama ē detundenāṭama bat uyādenavā* which signifies "I cook rice for those two or three". (Pieris, 1956: 205). We have little evidence other than adelphic polyandry. Some inscriptions of Kotte period mentions the terms *meka* and *meku* which mean this woman and of this man respectively. Those are specially mentioned in the Pāpiliyānalmpatraya. That inscription sometimes mentions as *meka put* and *meku put*. After the term *mekuput* which means the sons of this person, eleven sons have been named. It can be put down as follows; *mekuputpālāi, mahdevāi, pālāi, tirimāi, mahānīlāi, liyanadevāi, kandetirimāi, toṭageidevāi, mananamitāi, kuḍānilāi and lokādhurayāi*. Again it is mentioned as *mekuputtirimāi, sinhapālāi, kaluvāi, suvayāiatulu ū namvisihatarak*.

(Rohanadheera, 2007: 27). Twenty four sons have been mentioned in the Pāpiliyāna inscription. According to this inscription, a very large number of sons and daughters were offspring of one person. This could have been due to the polyandry system. A large number of sons means a large number of brothers. According to the above mentioned facts, adelphic polyandry has existed in Sri Lanka.

As has been pointed out by Jayasekara, it is possible that with the holding of lands by the Kerala troupes, they appear to have observed polyandry as part of their land tenure customs and the custom got engrafted into Sinhala society for the Malabars or Keralas practiced polyandry on a vast scale as shown by a number of European writers. Emil Senart who wrote an admirable book in French on the caste system of India called "Les castes dans l'Inde" emphatically points out the intimate connection of polyandry with Nair society. Senart says "aristocratiemilitaire des Nairs confine" sur la cote du Malabar est fondee" sur la polyandry- the military aristocracy of the Nairs confined to the coast of Malabar is founded in polyandry. In this connection we might state that the Kerala people follow the *Marumakattayan* system tracing descent through females. (Jayasekara, 1982: 85).

The polyandry system of marriage was widely in practice even to claim that this is a conspicuous change to occur in the marriage institution during the period. Before this period, the sources at our disposal do not contain the example of this aspect except for some vague allusions. Two varieties of polyandry are generally recognized: one of which husbands are brothers—adelphic polyandry; co-husbands are not necessarily related to one another is the other. In the context of Sri Lanka, we could see the first form where two brothers, three brothers or more cohabited with one woman. This was the system prevailed in Tibet. The major reason for this was the economic

condition of the society and social insecurity in family life, particularly, at a time of political instability. Under this system the wife is well protected from economic problems and security problems.

References

- Altekar, A. S. (1938), *The Position of Women in Hindu Civilization*, Benaras Hindu University, The Publication House.
- Ariyapala, M. B. (1968), *Society in Mediaeval Ceylon*, Colombo, Departmental of Cultural Affairs.
- Apastamba Dharma Sūtra*, G. Buhler, (ed.), (1932), Poona, Publication Center.
- Baldeus, Phillip (1672), *True and Extract Description of Ceylon*, (Tr.), Peter Brohier, London.
- Codrington, H. W. (1926), *Vidyodaya Dharma Shāstriya Saṃgrahaya*, Jayawardhanapura, Vidyodaya, pp. 374-377.
- Davy, John (1821), *An Account of the Interior of Ceylon*, Dehivala, Tisara Publishers.
- Ellawala, H. (1969), *Social History of Early Ceylon*, Colombo, The Department of Cultural Affairs.
- Eḷu Attanagalu Vaṃsa Vivaraṇa*, Munidasa Kumaranatunga, (ed.), (1933), Colombo, Books Publishing Press.

- Geiger, Wilhelm (1960), *Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times*, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrasswitz.
- Gunaratna, J. A. (1898), *The Custom of Polyandry as Practiced in Ceylon, Papers on the Customs of Polyandry*.
- Hastings, James (1964), *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VII, Edinburgh, T and T Clark.
- Hayley, E. A. (1993), *Sinhalese Laws and Customs*, Colombo, H. W. Cave and Company.
- Hettiaratchi, S. B. (1988), *Social and Cultural History of Ancient Sri Lanka*, Delhi, Sri Satguru Publications.
- Ievers, R. W. (1899-1900). "The Custom of Polyandry in Ceylon", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (C.B.)* Vol. XVI, Colombo: Government Printer, pp. 3-6.
- Jātakaṭṭakathā*, V. Fausboll, (ed.), (1877), Vol. V. London, P.T.S.
- Jayasekera, M. L. S. (1982), "Marriage and Divorce in Ancient Sinhala Customary Law", *Journal of Royal Asiatic of Sri Lanka*, Vol. XXVI, (N.S.), 77-96, Colombo, Royal Asiatic Society (Sri Lanka Branch).
- Leach, E. R. (1971), "Polyandry, Inheritance and The Definition of marriage: With Particular Reference to Sinhalese Customary Law", *Rethinking Anthropology*, New York, Humanities Press, pp. 105-113.

Mahābhārata, P. M. P. Abesinghe, (ed.), (1953), Colombo, M. D. Gunasena and Company.

Mudiyanse, Nandasena, (1960), "Niyamgampaya Inscription", *The Art and Architecture of the Gampola Period, (1341-1415 A.D.)*, Colombo, M. D. Gunasena and Company.

Mayūra Sandēśa, K. Jayatilake, (ed.), (1993), Colombo, Pradipa Publishers.
Paranavitana, S. (ed.) (1934), *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. IV, London, Oxford University Press.

Pieris, Ralph (1956), *Sinhalese Social Organization*, Peradeniya, The Ceylon University Press Board.

Prince Peter, H. R. H. (1963), *A Study of Polyandry*, The Hague, Mouton and Company Publishers.

Rājaratnākara, Karunadasa Rupasinghe, (ed.), (1995). Colombo: Godage and Brothers.

Rājāvali, B. Gunasekare, (1900), Colombo, government Printer.

Ribeiro, Joao (1925), *The Historic Tragedy of the Island of Ceilao*, (Tr.), P. E. Pieris, New Delhi, Asian Educational Services.

Rohanadheera, M. (ed.), (2008), *Inscriptions of Ceylon*, Vol. VIII, The Colombo, Department of Archaeology.

Sing, Sarva Daman (1978), *Polyandry in Ancient India*, New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House PVT LTD.

Tambiah, S. J. (1966), "Polyandry in Ceylon- With special Reference to the Laggala Region", *Caste and Kin in Nepal, India and Ceylon*, (ed.), Christoph Von Furer-Haimendorf, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, pp. 264-358.

Wijesekera, N. D. (1967), "Polyandry", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (C. B.)*, Vol. XI, Colombo, Apothicaries Company Limited, pp. 23-35.

