

Some Corrections of Geiger's Cūlavamsa Translation

(Continued from Vol. VIII, p. 96).

CH. LX, II. *Eḷakathambhaka* is rendered as "threshold pillar". Threshold pillar is *esikatthambha* but not *ḷakathambha*. In the MS. belonging to Ambarukkhārāma I read *phaḷika* instead of *ḷaka*. *Phaḷikatthambha* is a pillar made of crystal, which is preferable to the reading in Geiger's text.

12. The rendering of *narākiṇṇam* as "filled with people" is correct. But as an attribute of a monastery it seems unsuitable. Geiger himself has doubted its correctness and has given a note. If it is to be taken as *nirākiṇṇam* (= not crowded with people), every thing is in harmony.

54. *Vihārābhayacārita-bhediniṃ mahisiṃ sakaṃ* is rendered as "His own Mahesi who disturbed the peaceful life of the vihāras". What is meant by *abhayacārita* here is, I believe, the safety of the criminals when they were within the vihāras.

Gāhayitvā galamhi in the same verse is rendered as "had her led out (into the town) with an iron collar". In a note he has given the literal meaning, "by having her caught by the neck", which is preferable.

84. *Selantarasamūhamhi rājīnā rājīnikatā kāresi cārupāsādam* is rendered as "in the Selantarasamūha (-vihāra) she, created Queen by the King, erected a beautiful, lofty pāsāda". There is no pronoun indicating the queen, in the text. Instead of *rājīnā rājīnikatā* the Sinhalese Ed. has *rājino rājīnī sakā* (= king's own Queen), which is very clear and free from grammatical errors.

Ch. LXI, 53.

*Piḷsum sakalaṃ lokaṃ uddharantā' dhikaṃ balim
ucchū va ucchuyante te khīṇatosā dhanesino*

The words *khīṇatosā dhanesino* are rendered as "In their insatiability and money lust". I take the first word to be *khīṇakosā* (= who had their stores of wealth exhausted), though there is no support from MSS. for that reading.

73. "*Anatthe nimitaṃ nāma parivattaṃ ti sabbathā*", *iti vattabataṃ n'eva*, is translated as "'What is based on wrong speedily changes', this proverb was by no means true of the land of Lankā at that time". The Sinhalese edition of the text has :

*Anatthe nicitā nāma parivattanti sabbathā
iti vattabatañ-ñ-eva yātaṃ Lanākātaṃ tadā.*

believe this to be the correct reading the translation of which should stand as: The proverb, "What is earned by unjust means changes speedily", was true of the Island of Lankā at that time.

Ch. LXII, 11. *Devarājaghare seyyam kappayī sīlasamvuto* is rendered as "he camped one night in the temple of the King of the gods, observing the precepts of moral discipline". The word "camped" perhaps may be used for a king with his retinue. But in this instance the king has come there after handing over the whole administration of the kingdom to his ministers. In a note on this passage Geiger has stated that Sakka was meant by the word *devarāja*. Surely it has that meaning; but we see nowhere in Ceylon shrines dedicated to Sakka. The Sinhalese are accustomed to call any deva by the epithet *divyarājayo*. So this shrine, where the king slept, must have been one dedicated to Viṣṇu or some other deity like Nātha or Kataragama.

Ch. LXIV, 2. *Vajirāḥamoruḥpaññā* is rendered as "lightning-like intelligence". When compared with intelligence *vajira* means not "lightning" but "diamond", because it cuts through everything.

Ch. LXVI, 14. *Amhādisānam puttānam atthitam nāma (kevalam)* is rendered as: "For sons such as I am is there not but one thing to do". Geiger has separated *atthitam* into two words *atthi* and *tam*. This is not a sentence with a final verb, but only a phrase which stands as the subject of the sentence, which covers the 14th and the 15th verses. It should be translated as: "The existence of such sons as I am".

28. "*Pāne pariccajissāma mayam te'atthasambhave*"
iti tena sah'āyātā bhaṭṭā bhayasamākulā

is translated as: "'We must give up our lives if he benefits thereby', thought the soldiers who had come with him, and flurried by fear all . . ." Geiger's text has *ten'atthasambhave* (= *tena* + *atthasambhave*) instead of (*te* + *anatthasambhave*). His translation is correct according to his edition. According to my correction the translation should stand as: The soldiers who came with him saying: "We will give up our lives when you are in danger", became frightened.

87. *Tikkhaggaḥpadam āsajja vatim kaṇṭakabhimsanam* is rendered as: ("When the soldiers) reached the enclosure consisting of terrible briars full of prickles from top to bottom". In a note on the same he says: "So I understand *tikkhaggaḥpada*, where the top part (*agga*) and the foot end (*pada*) are sharp". *Vati* is a fence. *Tikkhaggaḥpada* means "having sharpened tops". So that was a fence or enclosure made of sharpened stakes. And what more? This fence was *kaṇṭakabhimsanam* = terrible because of the prickles (interwoven with it).

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

104. *Disantābhīmuḥke dīse* is rendered as : (“ chased the whole of the) enemy to the world’s end ”. In a note he has explained *disanta* as “ the end of the firmament ”. *Disanta* simply means direction ; there is no great difference between *disā* and *disanta* as there is no difference between *sutta* and *suttanta*, *vana* and *vananta*.

108. *Vimuñc’āsīm karū ratta-sambaddham jalasekato* is rendered as “ he cleansed by the pouring over with water the blood stains from the sword and the hand ”. His text has *Vimuccāsīkarū* instead of *vimuñca + asīm karū*. The prince’s hand was stuck to the hilt of the sword through the blood of the enemies that he had slain ; so he had to pour water on it in order to release it from the sword. *Rattasambaddham asīm jalasekato karū vimuñci* or *vimuñca* is the order of the words.

116. *Mamañ ṭhaṭevā ke vā’ññe
santi te’vassabandhavo ?*

In a note on this Geiger says : “ *vassabandhave*. I take *vassa* = Skr. *vaśya* as “ traceable, obedient ”. W. has “ kinsfolk . . . on your mother’s side ”. It should be taken as *avassa*, and not as *vassa*. *Avassabandhavo* are blood-relations, the proper word for which is *sālohitā* ; *avassabandhavo* has come into usage on the analogy of the Sinhalese word අලුටියන් නැයෝ.

131. *Visavijjā* is rendered as “ mixing of poisons ”. It is not so, *visa-vijjā* is curing those who are bitten by serpents.

133. *Damiḷādīsu nekesu naccagītesu kovide* is rendered as “ Amongst many *Damiḷas* and others, he made such as were practised in dance and song ”. It is better to take *Damiḷādīsu* as an attribute to *naccagītesu* and to translate : “ those who were clever in various methods of dancing and singing such as the method of *Damiḷas* and so on ”.

150. The text of this verse is corrupt in both Geiger’s edition and the Sinhalese edition. Therefore the translators of the Sinhalese version have given a meaningless phrase such as “ පසුව රජකුලය ද මදවහනය වන වන අනෙකු කරනනොට ගෙන නිත්‍ය ක්‍රීඩා ව්‍යපදෙශයෙන් ඕඕ සඤ්චාරය කෙරෙමින් ”. Geiger says in a note “ W’s translation is wrong. He has not realised that *tato rājakulaṃ* belongs still to the preceding. The Sinhalese translators S. and B. have overlooked it ”. Geiger also has missed the real point as his edition was corrupt. He has : *tato rājakulaṃ ; veṇakarīnā madavāhīnā niccaṃ kīḷāpadesena vīsikhācariyaṃ caraṃ*, and has overlooked *veṇa* in his translation. *Veṇa* means a basket-maker ; here it is an adjective qualifying an elephant. Nowhere in the Pali language is such an adjective found. So we must take this reading to be corrupt. I was able to find out the correct reading with the help of a palmleaf MS. obtained from Sailabimbārāma, Dodanduwa. The reading

there is : *Tato rājakulāveṇa karinā madavāhinā*. Rājakulāveṇakarī is an elephant belonging to the royal family. Then the translation should stand as : “ He (= prince Parākramabāhu) too, under the pretence of sport, used to go about the streets with a rutting elephant that belonged to the royal family, i.e. to the king ”.

Ch. LXVII, 2.

*Uddāmo mahiso bhīmo ditṭha-ditṭhe nighātayaṃ
gaṇḍe vattitarattakkho tassābhimukhaṃ āpati.*

“ Then a terrible buffalo broken loose, that killed everyone it saw, with rolling bloodshot eyes sprang upon him ” is the translation given for this verse. Geiger has left the word *gaṇḍe* untranslated. The Sinhalese version has it as “ කොපුල්ලි එලන ලද රනැස් ඇත්තෙ ” (= having bloodshot eyes kept on its cheeks). There is no sense in this translation. Both versions have suffered because the text is corrupt. The MS. from Sailabimbārāma has *caṇḍo* (= fierce) instead of *gaṇḍe*. With this correction there is no trouble in translating it.

44. *Sūkarāṇ ca yathāyūthābhīyantāṃ abhīghātayi* is rendered as : “ he brought down a boar . . . who attacked him as if it were a whole herd ”. *Yathāyūthābhīyantāṃ* cannot have the meaning “ who attacked him as if it were a whole herd ”. *Yathāyūtham + abhīyantam* means “ who was proceeding with its herd ”.

46. Geiger’s text has “ *puretaraṃ ettha enti yānā* ” *ti cintiya*, and he has translated it as : “ thinking they came at the head of the (pursuing) army ”. The Sinhalese edition has : *puretaraṃ ete etthāyūtā ti cintiya* (=thinking that they have come hither beforehand), which is clear and acceptable.

58. *Anāsāṅkasammate* is rendered as “ who were known to be courageous ”. According to my knowledge *anāsāṅka* never means ‘ courageous ’, but ‘ unsuspecting ’. I believe that his text is corrupt ; the word *nāyakasammate*, which is in the Sinhalese edition and which he has not accepted, gives a better meaning than his reading. Wijesingha’s translation “ reputed heads of the five trades ” is acceptable to me.

88. *Ñātasatthāgamo* is rendered as “ who knew the writings of the Master (Buddha) ”. He has taken this to be *satthu + āgama* instead of *sattha + āgama*. This compound is never used to denote Buddhism but to denote religion and science.

Ch. LXVIII, 1, 2, 3, 4.

*katthamattam anāpajja rajje neyuttakena so
“ rājatte me phalaṃ nāma nihacca riṭṭavo khile
lokasāsana-saṃvuddhi-siddhisambhūtiyaṃ ” iti,*

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVĀMSA TRANSLATION

“ atikhuddam p'idaṃ rajjaṃ mama buddhivisesato
sampaṇnattaṃ pāpitaṃ hi bhusaṃ nekasamidhiyā,
aññarajjamahantattaṃ atiseti yathā tathā
khiṃpam sampādayissāmi iti cintiya . . .

These lines are translated as follows: “ though now in possession of the royal dignity, he did not give way to empty boasting (such as) ‘ the reward of my royal dignity, after the subjugation of all my foes, consists (now already) in the gain of prosperity and a welfare for the laity and the Order ’, but he thought: “ It is true, I have by my extraordinary insight brought my kingdom, although it is small, so far that much in it has prospered, but I will now within a short time further it so greatly that it will surpass the greatness of other kingdoms ”.

Geiger himself admits that this is a difficult passage. He has taken “ *rājatte me phalaṃ* ” etc., to be “ his boasting ”. It is not so; two aspirations of the prince are related, beginning from *rājatte* up to *sampādayissāmi* in the last line. One of them is: “ The reward of my royal dignity consists in the subjugation of all my foes and in the gain of prosperity and welfare for the laity and the Order ”. The other is: “ I have by my extraordinary insight brought my small kingdom to prosperity and abundance; but I will now within a short time further it so greatly that it will surpass the greatness of other kingdoms ”. What was his boasting is not explained here; but the fact that he did not boast about his small kingdom is stated in the first line.

30. I do not understand “ day’s work fields ” in “ he had the great wilderness cleared and many thousands of days’ work fields laid out ”. I translate *khettānaṃ nekavāhasahassakaṃ* as “ many thousand acres of fields ”.

31. *Abaddhavīhisampunṇa-kotṭhasaṅkiṇṇa-bhāvato* is rendered as:— “ because the land was thickly studded with granaries full of untrussed rice ”. There is no meaning of “ untrussed rice ”, in *abaddhavīhi*. This word *abaddha* is corrupt in Geiger’s edition as well as in the Sinhalese edition, which has *akhaṇḍa* instead of this. My correction is *ābaddha* which has the meaning ‘ connected together ’; and this must be taken as an attribute to *kotṭha*, and not to *vīhi*. Then the translation should stand as: “ because the land was thickly studded with a continuous line of granaries full of paddy ”.

Ch. LXIX, 24. *Kappūravaddhakas* are not ‘ camphor producers ’ but ‘ camphor distributors ’. *Khuddakasevakā* are pages or boy servants. *Santikāvācarā* are attendants.

Ch. LXX, 11. *Rāmucchuwallika* is Rambukwella. *Dematṭha pādattalā* is Dematagahagoda.

13. *Yaṭṭhikaṇḍa* is Yaṭṭikinda.

54. *Mādisē buddhi-puññiddhi-vikkamātisaye sati* is rendered as "though people of my kind are there, possessing insight, virtue, miraculous power and extraordinary courage". All words in this phrase are in the locative singular; I cannot understand why Geiger has taken them in the plural sense. This refers to Parākramabāhu himself; therefore it should be translated as "when there is a person, possessing insight, virtue, miraculous power and extraordinary courage, like myself, (he has nevertheless acted thus)".

122. *Sattusāmantaśīsāni chatta-yānāvudhāni ca* is rendered as "the heads of the hostile officers, the umbrellas, chariots and weapons". Instead of *chatta* the MS. from Sailabimbārāma has *catta*. Then it means "the chariots and weapons abandoned by them".

145. Instead of *parakkamanikaṭamhi* (= in the neighbourhood of the scene of heroic deeds) the MS. from S. has *Parakkammakaṇṭakamhi* which seems to be the name of a locality.

314. *Rājānam* in the third line must be *rājāṇam* (= rāja + āṇam). Then *rājāṇam piṭṭhito katvā* should be rendered as: "not heeding to the king's command" and not as "without troubling themselves about the king", as Geiger has rendered it.

Ch. LXXI, 4. *Piṭṭhipāsāṇa* is rendered as "stone tablet". It is not a tablet but a natural rock which is flat and not very high.

Ch. LXXII, 18.

*Sasāmantaṃ palāpesi senaṃ sesaṃ disodisaṃ
samantābaddhasaṃrambhaṃ abbhakūṭaṃ va māhuto*

is rendered as "drove with a large force . . . just as the storm wind (scatters) a mountain of cloud so that its violence is scattered flutteringly on all sides". He has taken *samantābaddhasaṃrambhaṃ* to be an adverb while it stands as an attribute to *abbhakūṭaṃ* or *senāṃ*. As an adjectival compound it has the meaning "the army that was ready for battle from every side", or in the case of the cloud, "which showed the signs of raining from every quarter".

104. "Now when this man out of ignorance brought as Sīhala sword the weapon called Jambudīpa blade, he spake: 'That is not the Sīhala blade. Leave this (sword) that could put an end to all the lines of hostile kings in Jambudīpa and bring me quickly the Sīhala blade'", is the translation of the lines:

*tenāvijānatā Jambudīpaḥpāṭṭavanāmake
ānī'e Sīhalāsīmhi "nāyaṃ Sīhalaḥpāṭṭavo ;
Jambudīpamhi nissesa-verirūjakulantakam
etaṃ ṭhaḥpetvā ānehi sīghaṃ Sīhalaḥpāṭṭavam".*

The word *Sīhaḷāsīmhi* is rendered here: "as Sihala sword". This word with the locative ending cannot have this meaning. The reading *Sīhaḷāsīti* in the Sinhalese edition, which Geiger has not accepted, can have this meaning. Again, he has attributed the phrase "that could put an end to all the lines of hostile kings in Jambudīpa" to a sword made in India. If it is so, the Indian sword seems to be superior to that of Ceylon; but the king refuses the Indian one and likes to get a Ceylonese one. In that case the Ceylonese one should have been the superior and not the other. No one would ask for an inferior weapon leaving aside the superior one. So this attribute "*nissesa-verirājakulantakam* must go with *Sīhalaḷāḷavam*, and not with *etam*".

106. *Rājā "Sīhaḷādīḷpamhi āyudham mama bāhunā
gāhetum na samattho'tthi" cintetvā sāvadhādhāraṇam*

is translated as: "In Sīhaḷādīpa I am unable to grasp the weapon with my arm, and looked significantly . . ." The third line *gāhetum asamattho ti* in Geiger's text has led him astray. A proud king like Parākramabāhu would never say such a thing. What he has said is: "There is no one in Sīhaḷādīpa who is able even to hand me a weapon".

108. *Te ubho pi tadā katvā mahārājassa iṅgitam* is rendered as "And these twain carried out the hint of the king". *Iṅgitam katvā* has not the meaning "carried out the hint" but "having made a hint". The word *katvā* in Geiger's text should be corrected as *ñitvā*, which reading is found in the Sinhalese edition.

119. *Gāmam pañca-mahāsadda-saṅkhanādasamākulam
katvā sāmam anāyātam parivāram parikkhiya*

is rendered as: "He filled the village with the din of the five loud clanging shell trumpets and after he had himself (awaited) his retinue that had not yet appeared, and surveyed them". He has taken *pañcamahāsadda-saṅkhanāda* to be one thing, but the Sinhalese version has taken it as expressing two things: the five loud noises,¹ and the sound of the conch shells. I prefer the latter, as an army should make much more noise than that of shells.

The word *anāyātam* in Geiger's text is not correct; the reading *sāmam paṇ āyātam* in the Sinhalese edition is acceptable. It gives the meaning "(the retinue) which had come itself". When the king was carried towards Poḷonnaruwa, by his dignitaries, while he was sleeping, some members of his retinue were lagging behind. When he awoke and learned what had happened he stayed at that place until his missing followers came to him. When they themselves came to him he surveyed them and went forth. This is the meaning of these lines.

1. The noises made by the horses, elephants, vehicles, drums and so on.

243. *Kārayitvāna coramagge samantato* is rendered as: "he had robber paths made in every direction". These paths were not for themselves but for the enemy, as they had "posted sharp shooting archers on them". Therefore "robber path" is not a fitting term in this context, "false path" is more suitable.

Ch. LXXIII, 30, 37. *Dhana-dhañña* is rendered as: "money and money's worth". *Dhañña* simply means 'grain'.

47. *Patti* is rendered as 'reward', and he has a note on this. I prefer to render this as "share of merit".

144. *Appam āyu manussānam hīḷyya nam suporiso, careyyādittasāso va* is translated as: "Short is the life of the lamentable men; the pious man should live as if his head were in flames". Geiger's text has *hīḷyānam* instead of *hīḷyya nam*. He has not realised the fact that this is a quotation from the Scriptures. It is from (S.I., 108) the *Mārasamyutta*. *Hīḷyya* is not an adjective but an Optative verb. This verse is translated as follows:

" Brief time have sons of men on earth to live.
Let the good man herein much trouble take.
Acting as were his turban all a-blaze.
There is no man to whom death cometh not".

Kindred Sayings I, 136.

Even in this translation the meaning of the word *hīḷyya* is not well expressed. "Let the good man despise this brief life" is the correct rendering of this.

Ch. LXXIV, 22. *Niggatikā* is rendered as "deviated from the right way", and in a note on this he says: "The translation is uncertain". Wijesingha's rendering: "had become utterly helpless" seems acceptable. *Niggatikā* are those without any safety or support.

150. *Līnānam* is rendered as "for bhikkhus". This word is never used to denote a monk; it means 'a destitute'. And the word *paṭṭhapetha* is rendered as 'collect'; the correct meaning of which is 'begin'.

Ch. LXXV, 57-58.

*Ete kalīrakhaṇḍe va chinditvāna sapattake
nadījalesu pātetvā maccha-kacchapaḡocare karissāma . . .*

These lines are translated as: "Let us therefore break in pieces the foe like small sugar-canes, fling them into the water of the river and make them food for the fish and the turtle". *Kalīra* is not 'sugar-cane', but the soft upper part of any kind of palm tree or the sprouts of bamboo, sugar-cane, etc.

84. *Bhasmasesattanam yante verī sāmappayogato rakkhitum* is rendered as "in order to protect the enemy whom the king's majesty had turned to

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

ashes, by the application of kindness". *Fhasmasesattanam yante* should be rendered as "who are perishing". *Sāmaṅṅpayoga* is not "the application of kindness" but "negotiation of peace with them".

110. *Karontā gaganam sabbam divā tūrakitam viya* is rendered as: "staring the whole firmament as it were by day", which gives the sense that stars usually appear at daytime. It should be rendered as "making the sky as if full of stars during the day".

120. *Padadeso va saminam saramam nama amhākam* is rendered as: "Where our Lord sets his foot there is our refuge". *Padadeso* may mean neighbourhood or the country belonging to the king.

171. *Tesam dāmarikattassa mūlahūtā tahim tahim
dugge va te pavisanī Sugala yeva rājinī*

The third line of this stanza is corrupt, and should be corrected as *dugge vane pavesenī*. The Sinhalese edition has *dugge vane paveseti*.

Ch. LXXVI, 25. *Musala piḷanam katvā* is rendered as "had blocks of wood fastened to their feet", but Geiger has not explained how he arrived at this explanation. By this term we can only understand "having beaten their feet with pestles".

48. *Tikkhagge vāraṇathāya vāraṇānam ayomaye
gokaṇṇake nekasatasahassa-gaṇite pi ca*

"further gokaṇṇaka arrows of iron with sharp points, many hundred thousand in number for defence against elephants" is the rendering of these lines. The Sinhalese edition has *bānavāre* instead of *vāraṇānam*, which gives a clear sense. With that correction this translation should stand as: "to defend against the sharp-pointed iron arrows (of the Burmans) he ordered them to make many hundred thousands of shields from the hides of stags". Now we have a sense quite different from that given by Geiger. Instead of "Gokaṇṇaka arrows" here we have 'shields made of stag-hides'.

59. Geiger has not identified Kusumi or Kusimatittha in this verse. It is present Bessin in Lower Burma.

91. Annotating on *ekadoṇināvā* he says "Doṇi must be taken here in the sense of a particular measure of volume, otherwise *eka* would be unintelligible". But here we understand *ekadoṇināvā* as single canoe = ඵකකොඳ් ඔරුව, and *dvidoṇināvā* as double canoe = අනුඵක. When I informed Geiger of this error while he was living he wrote to me as follows: (27th May, 1931). "Your second letter is full of valuable information for me. I spent a day to enter all your corrections in my copy of the *Cūlavamsa*. I again see how easily one makes a mistake if one is so far away from the country and

from the scholars where one can get reliable information. My device always was the verse of the Greek poet 'I grow old learning ever more'. Your definition of *ekadoṇināvā* is certainly correct. To *ekadoṇi* nearly corresponds our German 'Einvaum', lit. *ekarukkhō*. Such *ekarukkhā* were frequently used on our Alpine lakes, but they have almost disappeared now".

282. *Laṅkāpuro taṁ sutvāna "hutvā vītatthayo sayam
āgacchatū" ti vatvāna pesesi paṭisāsanam.*

Geiger has taken the second line to be an attribute to Laṅkāpura. It should be taken as an attribute of the Tamil chief Puṅkoṇḍanādālvāra and not of Laṅkāpura. The first line of the next verse, *tato so vīlasāraḷḷo*, proves my statement to be correct.

286. *Rājasīhamahāle ca Veḷugāme ca vissute
vinatthe paṭikatvāna bandhitvā vāpiyo duve*

287. *Tathā Siriyavale c'eva so Perumpayale pi ca
bandhāpetvā duve vāpī kasikammañ ca kārayī.*

Translation of these two verses is: "The two villages which had been laid waste, Rājasīhamahāla and Veḷugāma by name he rebuilt and after he had dammed up two tanks in Siriyavala and two tanks also in Perumpalaya, he had the tilling of the fields taken in hand". If we take this translation to be correct the first two names of the villages should stand in the accusative, but they are in the locative. He has connected the fourth line of verse 286 with the first line of verse 287, and has given two tanks to each of the villages, Siriyavala and Perumpayala; while he has deprived the former two villages of tanks. One is not able to connect the 4th line of the first stanza with the second one as *tathā* stands at the beginning of it.

So the correct translation should be as follows: "He repaired two tanks that were ruined in Rājasīhamahāla and Veḷugāma by damming them up; and having repaired other two tanks at Siriyavala and Perumpayala, he caused the tilling of the land to go on.

Ch. LXXVII, 34. Maṅgalamavhayam is rendered as "called Maṅgalama". The name of the place should be *Maṅgalam* and not *Maṅgalama*.

Ch. LXXVIII, 7. Sāmaggiṁ ciradikkhitam is rendered as "conciliatory, long since consecrated". *Sāmaggi* is a noun indicating 'unity'; it is not an adjective having the meaning 'conciliatory'. The translation of the second word is correct. But I believe that these two words express one idea and should not be taken as two attributes. If it is taken to be one attribute, the rendering should stand as "one who was expecting unity for a long time".

33. *Tathāyatanavāsīnam therānam thirasīlinam
mahaggha attha pāsāde kārapesi tibhūmake*

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAṂSA TRANSLATION

This is rendered as : “ For the theeras dwelling there in the sacred district, firmly persevering in discipline, he built eight costly pāsādas, three storeys high ”. Here *āyatanavāsīnam* is rendered as “ dwelling in the sacred district ”. This is not so ; at that time there were eight āyatanas or Headquarters of separate units of monks, in Ceylon, such as Uttaramūlāyatana, Selantaramūlāyatana, Mahānettapaḍamūlāyatana, Kappūramūlāyatana and so on. What the king did was to have built eight pāsādas for the eight Heads of the āyatanas, within the boundary of the Jetavana monastery in Polonnaruwa, in order to accommodate them whenever they visited the town.

35. *Sante saṃpaṭṭiyatte pi vicitte paṭimāhi ca
tibhūmipaṭṭimāgehe nava appaṭṭisammate*

This is translated as : “ Also nine incomparable, three storeyed image houses (he built) furnished with all appurtenances and diversely adorned with images ”. Both, Geiger and the Sinhalese translators, have not taken the word *sante* into consideration. Here it is not an adjective indicating calmness, as it refers to some buildings ; it is a Present Participle having the meaning “ existing ”. Then there must be another word whose existence is denoted by it. That word is *saṃpaṭṭiyatte* in Geiger’s edition ; in the Sinhalese edition it appears as *sattatimatte*. Both these readings are incorrect because they were taken to be accusative plurals. The word grammatically related to *sante* must stand in the Locative (Absolute). The two MSS. that I have collated with, have the reading *saṃpaṭṭimatte*, which Geiger also has given in his foot-notes. This must be the correct reading, and with this the translation should go as : *Saṃpaṭṭimatte sante pi* = “ though there is the fact of having resemblance between themselves (i.e. of the image houses), he built nine incomparable, three-storeyed image-houses, diversely adorned with images ”.

39. In a long note on *tivaṅka* Geiger says : “ it is difficult to say what is meant by *tivaṅka* ”. Another possibility of this reading is *tivaṅga* which means ‘ having three postures ’, viz. sitting, standing and lying down. In Ceylon we have many image-houses containing images of these three postures.

61, 62. “ To remove all scruples regarding landmarks formerly drawn at this spot, the bhikkhu community took up a position at different points, after previously by a solemn act, bound to bring full success, removing in due order the ancient landmarks and made known to the king the landmarks along the furrow (which he ploughed ”), is the translation of :

*San̄gho p’ettha purā-baddhasīmāsān̄kānivattiyā
nekaṭṭhāne thito ādo katvā sīmāsamūhatim
rañño sītānusārena nimitte parikittayi
sabbasamṭṭiyutiāya kammavācāya sādhucaṃ.*

I wonder whether one can get a clear idea of this performance through this translation. The statement "the bhikkhu community took up a position at different points" is misleading, because it gives the idea that the community had separated itself into groups and stood at different points. In this performance not even a single bhikkhu is allowed to deviate from the acting community. All those who come to the place must stand in a single group; and if it is necessary the whole group must move to a different plot.

In the act of cancelling former *sīmās* the saṅgha divides the plot, on which they have intended to bind a new *sīmā*, into quadrangles of the size of a bed; then the whole group takes its stand in one quadrangle and recites the *kammavācā* prescribed for cancelling a *sīmā*. Then they move to another quadrangle and recite the same thing. Thus they must recite it as many times as there are separate squares or quadrangles. Having finished this cancelling or uprooting of the former *sīmā* or *sīmās* they then begin to establish a new boundary. Before they recite the *kammavācā* prescribed for establishment they must have new landmarks around that plot. A tree or a rock is allowed to be taken as a landmark; but for the sake of convenience stone posts are usually fixed around. In this case the king harnessed a golden plough and went round the plot making a furrow to mark the boundary. After his people had fixed stone posts at intervals on this furrow the community examined each post and having accepted them as the boundary marks finally fixed the *sīmā* by reciting the *kammavācā* prescribed for that purpose.

67. *Baddhasīmakaṭṭhāpāsāde pañcaterasayattḥisu
dāghato puthulenāpi baddhasīmā ajāyatha*

This is translated as: "At the Baddhasīmāpāsāda there was a fixed boundary of thirty-five staves in length and breadth". According to this rendering it should have been a square building; I cannot understand how he could calculate *pañcaterasa* as thirty-five. If it is 5×13 the number should be higher than this. In the Sinhalese version these numbers are taken separately to be the width and the length, which I believe to be correct.

99. The compound *thūḥattayam* appearing in this verse is omitted in its translation.

105. *Sattḥimahaṇṭaḥpāsādaṃ Sepaṇṇipupphanāmakam* is rendered as "Sixty large *pāsādas* (like) the one named *Sepaṇṇipuppha*". In order to have this rendering these two compounds must stand in the plural. The singular number in both shows that one is used to qualify the other. So it should be rendered as "the monastery named *Sepaṇṇipuppha* which had sixty large *pāsādas*".

Ch. LXXX, 6. Geiger explains *Arimaddana* to be the capital of *Rāmañña* (Lower Burma, Pegu). This is not correct. *Arimaddana* was the capital of

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

Upper Burma or Burma proper. In modern maps it appears as *Pagan*, and in Pali it had two names, *Pugāma* and *Arimaddana*. The former capital of Rāmañña or Lower Burma was Sudhammapura, present Tathon, and afterwards Pegu, whose Pali epithet is *Hansāvati*, written by them as *Hanthawaddy*. Sometimes the whole of Lower Burma was called Pegu by some Europeans who were ignorant of the facts. The Lower Burma or Rāmañña was formerly divided into three portions, namely : *Hansāvati*, *Kusīma* and *Muttima*, whose capitals were Pegu (45 miles north of Rangoon) Bassin, (west of Rangoon), and Martaban (east of Rangoon) respectively.

Ch. LXXXIII, 13.

*Saṅgāmāvacare mattaverikuñjarakesarī
sabbe pi Sīhalekacce tattha tattha nipesayi*

is rendered as : " Of all the Sīhales who on the field were as lions against rutting elephants—the enemy—he sent some hither, others thither ". Here, according to Geiger's text *sabbe* = all, and *ekacce* = some, stand as attributes to *Sīhale*. This is impossible. The Sinhalese edition has *naddhe* instead of *ekacce*. *Naddha* = *sannaddha* having the meaning 'armoured'. With this correction the translation should stand as : (He sent) all armoured Sinhalese soldiers who had some experience in battle and who were as lions to the rutting elephants—the enemy—(some) here and (some) there.

Geiger has taken *saṅgāmāvacare* to be in the locative and rendered it as " on the field ". It is an accusative plural and an attribute to *Sīhale* ; therefore I rendered it as " who had some experience in battle ".

Ch. LXXXIV, 13, 14.—*Samṭhutṭham dantadhātuyā gandhacandanapā-kādim dhammapābhatakaṃ tathā rājapābhatam ukkatṭham pesetvā Tambara-raṭṭhakaṃ*. These lines are translated as : " having sent a religious gift, incense, sandal-wood, food and the like which had been in contact with the Tooth Relic and likewise a choice and princely gift to Tambaraṭṭha ". It is possible to get incense and sandal-wood to come into contact with the Relic but it is impossible to get food to touch it. The authorities would never allow it to be touched by any kind of food. Instead of *candanapāka* in Geiger's text the Sinhalese edition has *candanapāṅka*, which is sandal-wood paste. This must be the correct reading and the correct rendering.

23. *Addavādiguṇopetā* is rendered as " with the virtues of renunciation ". There is no such word in Pali ; but we have *ajjava*, which is given in the Sinhalese edition and rejected by Geiger, because he did not find it in other MSS. *Ajjava* is derived from *uju*, and has the meaning 'straightforwardness'. *Ajjava* is found among the ten virtues of a righteous king.

29. *Attano'nujarājam pi Bhuvanekabhujābhayaṃ
sikkhāpetvāna so tisu piṭakesu visāradam*

30. *kārāpetvāna, ten'eva theradhāmmam mahāpati
desāpetvā. . .*

These lines are rendered as: "The Ruler caused his younger royal brother, Bhuvanekabāhu by name, to be instructed, so that he was versed in the three Piṭakas. He made him carry out the precepts for the theras and hold lectures of instruction thereon". This rendering is correct up to "the three Piṭakas". But there are no words in the text for the rendering: "He made him carry out the precepts for the theras". Geiger has fallen into this error as he has taken *kārāpetvāna* to be connected with the following verse, while it should have been connected to *visāradam* of the above verse. *Theradhāmmam desāpetvā* should be rendered as: "He made him preach the duties of an Elder".

36. *Sālanikāraṇ ca katvāna tattha bhikkhugaṇe bahū
pāḷiso nivasāpetvā sādaro va dīne dīne*
37. *pavattetvā mahāpūjāsakkāraṇ sakanāmato
bahunnam sāmaṇeraṇam dāpetvā upasampadam.*

These lines are rendered as: "This again he had adorned with divers coloured stuffs and made numerous groups of bhikkhus abide there by turn for the purpose of rest. Day by day full of zeal, he did them honour with a great festival of gifts in his name and granted to many sāmaṇeras admission to the Order". Here "made numerous groups of bhikkhus abide there by turn for the purpose of rest" does not give the exact idea of what has happened. There is no word for 'rest' in the text. *Pāḷiso nivasāpetvā* means "having made them sit in rows" but not "abide there by turn".

42. "Thus the King, the best of men, celebrated every seven days the great and superb festival of eight bestowals and after celebrating several times over the festival of admission into the Order, he made the Order of the Victor prosperous" is the translation of:

*Evaṃ atthopasampatti-mahāmaṅgalam uttamaṇ
satta satta dīne rūjā pavattesi naruttamo.*

Geiger has misunderstood the whole passage. He has taken *atthopasampattimaṅgalam* to be "festival of eight bestowals", while it stands for "eight festivals of granting higher Ordination". The correct rendering should be: "Thus the King, best of men, celebrated eight great festivals of granting upasampadā or higher ordination, each lasting for seven days".

When I pointed out this error to Geiger himself he willingly admitted the correction and wrote to me as follows: (27-5-1931). "My translation of *upasampatti* in 84, 42 is indeed a big stumbling. I was led astray by two things: (1). The word *upasampatti* as synonym to *upasampadā* is missing

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

both in Childers' and in Rhys Davids—Stede's Dictionary. I therefore tried to understand it by its etymology = skr. *upasamprāpti*. I quite forgot that it occurs in the *Mahāvamsa* itself (60.7) as clearly as possible in *pabbajjū upasampatiṅ kārayitvā . . .* (2). I had the impression that by *evam* at the beginning of v. 42 this verse is closely connected with the preceding one. There the *attha parikkhārū* are mentioned, and I thus arrived at the conclusion that *attha sampattiyo* might mean the same. You will now understand my stumbling. It is not excusable however".

Ch. LXXXV, 36. *Panasa* is rendered as 'bread-fruit'; *panasa* = jak-fruit.

96. *Mahāratana-caṅkama* is rendered as "large jewelled cloister". *Caṅkama* is not a cloister but a prepared walk.

Ch. LXXXVII, 3. The third and fourth lines of this verse in Geiger's text stand as: *nāhametteyya-devātidevānaṅ ca mahiddhinam*; and he has rendered them as: "for the protectors Metteyya and other miracle-working highest deities". He has taken *nātha* to be an adjective, and *devātideva* to mean 'highest deities'. *Nātha* here is a proper noun indicating *Nāthadeva*, who is well known in Ceylon but not known in any other country. He might be the Bodhisatva Avalokiteśvara of the Mahāyānists. *Devātidevānam* is corrupt; it should be corrected as *devādi-devānam*. Then the translation should stand as: "to the gods headed by Nātha, Metteyya and others who possess great miraculous power".

46. "Many kinsmen by marriage of bhikkhu community who had become enslaved during the period of alien dominion" is the rendering of:

*jāte rājantare tasmim dāseyyam gamite bahū
bandhū bhikkhugaṇassā pi . . .*

There is no word for "by marriage" in the text.

Ch. LXXXVIII, 81. *Setum v'āsāsavantiyā* is rendered as "as a bridge over the stream of his hopes". *Āsāsavanti* is not "the stream of his hopes", but "the stream of craving".

Ch. LXXXIX, 70. Geiger has written a note on *udakukkhepasīmā*, in which he says "a term difficult to explain and occurring again 94-17, and 97-12" and so on. His explanation is not very clear. After my information on this term he published an article, entitled: "New Contributions to the Interpretation of the *Mahāvamsa*", in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. IX, 1933. I reproduce here what he has written on this term in that article: "*Udakukkhepasīmā*, lit. 'boundary (made) by throwing up water' (*Mhvs.*, 89-70; 94-17; 97-12) is an interesting Buddhist ceremony, insufficiently

described by Wijesinha and by myself. According to Buddhadatta a note on the term should run as follows: Ecclesiastic acts must be performed within a sacred boundary (*sīmā*) and they can be performed not only on dry ground but also in water, either in a building erected on piles in a river or a lake, as we see so frequently in Ceylon, or even in a boat. If the act takes place in water, the boundary must be fixed in the following manner: After the chapter of the saṅgha has assembled, one of the priests takes water in a vessel or a handful of water from the lake or the river. He then throws the water with his hands to the four quarters. The boundary is marked by the furthest points where the water has fallen. When doing so the bhikkhu who throws the water must stand within the *hatthapāsa*, in the immediate vicinity of the chapter".

Ch. XC, 94. "In Devapura he built a long temple consisting of two storeys, provided with four pairs of gates for the image of the recumbent lion" is the rendering of:

*Atha Devapure sīhasayitaḥpaṭimāgharam
catudvāradvayam dīgham kārapetvā dvibhūmakam.*

For *catudvāradvayam* in Geiger's text the Sin. Ed. has *cārudvāradvayam* (= provided with two doors which are magnificent). It is not customary in Ceylon to build image houses with so many gates or doors. The remains of this image house at Dondra show only two doors.

Ch. XCI, 13. "When the time of this King—after he had held sway for twenty years—had expired, a man called Virabāhu attained the royal dignity" is the rendering of "*tassa rājassa kāle'ko Virabāhū ti vissuto pāpunivāna rajjam*". As it stands this passage of the text gives the idea that Virabāhu became king while the former king was still living. *Tassa rājassa kāle* cannot have the meaning: "When the time of this King had expired" as Geiger has rendered it. The Sin. Ed. has *tassa rājassa sāl'eko* instead of the above. *Sāl'eko* = *sālo* + *eko*, one of the brothers-in-law (of that king).

19. *Bhava-vibhavasukha* is rendered as "salvation in the present as in future existences". One is not able to form a clear idea with this rendering. I should render it as "mundane and supermundane happiness". The same rendering occurs in 36.

28. *Sāsanasāṅgaha* is rendered as "a summary of the teaching of the Buddha". It never gives that meaning, but "support to the religion". In a note on this Geiger quotes from Wijesingha's translation which has "encouraged the religion of the Buddha". This is quite correct.

Ch. XCVI, 1. *Tato taḥim taḥim thalvā manakālam narādhipā*. Here *manakālam* is rendered as "for a short time". There is an indeclinable *manam* meaning 'a little'; but I have never seen it compounded with another

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

word. The Sin. Ed. has *yathākālam* instead of this. With this the translation of these lines should be: These Rulers, sojourning in different places for various periods”.

17. In a note on *Pañcuddharatthagehe* Geiger states: “Here we have another example of the influence of the Sinhalese language. *-gehe* is equivalent to the Sinh. *-gē*, the genitive suffix, and is used as postposition with local meaning”. He has here fallen into a serious blunder on account of his incorrect separation of these words. The text is: *Pañcuddharatthageh'eva verīhi paṭhamam hi so*. The euphonic combination here should be separated into—*ratthagehi* + *eva*, and not as Geiger has done. *Pañcuddharatthagehi verīhi* means “with the enemies who were dwelling in the five highland provinces”.

26. The dates given in the note about Vimaladhammasuriya I appear to be misprints. I believe, 1937 and 1938 in that note to be 1637 and 1638.

Ch. XCVII, 2. “As his first mahesī he took the daughter of the mahesī in the town of Madurā who had been fetched thence” is the rendering of: *Madhurāpurato nīta-mahesīdhīlarām va so katvā aggamaheśiñ ca*. This translation is not clear. It is clear if it is rendered as: “As his first mahesī he took the daughter of the queen who had been fetched from Madurā”.

46. In a note on *Nāthasura* he states: “Like Nāthadeva (100-248) the name of Viṣṇu as protecting deity (nātha) of the island”. Here he has mistaken *Nāthadeva* for Viṣṇu. See note on *Ch. LXXXVII, 3*, of this article.

Ch. XCVIII, 14. *Bhāvanañ cā pi bhāventi* is rendered as “They worked for their perfection”. It should be rendered as “they engaged in the exercises of meditation”.

24. In a note on *bhāṇavāras* Geiger states: “For purposes of recitation the whole of the Tipiṭaka is divided into *bhāṇavāras*, sections of equal length. . . It seems to me, however, as if the word in our passage is used instead of *nikāya*. The commentary would then have embraced Dīgha-, Majjhima-, Saṃyutta- and Aṅguttara- Nikāya”. When I pointed out his mistake Geiger himself corrected it in an article published in the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Vol. IX, 1933), which I reproduce here: “*Catubhāṇavāra* (*Mhvs. 98, 24*). We are told that king Vijayarājasīha (1739-47) invited the sāmaṇera Saraṇaṅkara and had a commentary on the *Catubhāṇavāra* made by him in the language of Laṅkā (*nimantetvāna tass'eva catubhāṇavāravaṇṇanam Laṅkābhāsāya kāretvā*). It is well known that *bhāṇavāra* means a section of holy texts, and that the Tipiṭaka, for the purpose of learning and recital, is divided into a great number (2547) of such sections. But I did not know what by *catubhāṇavāra* is meant. Buddhadatta informs me that this is a name for Maha-piṭṭopā, ‘the great

Pirit-book', *paritta*, i.e. a collection of holy texts, short hymns or sermons which are publicly recited on certain occasions with a view to warding off the influence of evil spirits. The description of a *Paritta* ceremony is found in my book, *Unter Tropischer Sonne*, p. 28 ff. The *Maha-pirit-pota* is called *Catubhānavāra* because it consists of four such sections. Subsequently I saw that Saraṇāṅkara's commentary on the Paritta-book is even mentioned in L. de Zoysa's, *Catalogue of Pali, Sinhalese and Sanskrit Manuscripts in the temple Libraries of Ceylon* (Colombo 1885), p. 6, under the title *Catubhānavāra-Atthakathā*, and that it is common in the island. Finally I may point to the fact that the phrase *Pirit Satar baṇavar*, the four bhānavāras of the *paritta* already occurs in the Sinhalese inscriptions of the first half of the 10th century . . ."

Here Geiger has made another mistake taking *Catubhānavāraṭṭhakathā* to be the same as the Sinhalese *sanne* of the Saṅgharāja Saraṇāṅkara. Europeans often use the word 'commentary' for an exegesis written in Pali or any other native language. But we never use the word *atthakathā* for a *sanne* written in a vernacular. *Catubhānavāraṭṭhakathā* is a Pali commentary on the Paritta-book, which was written some seven or eight centuries ago. *Satara-baṇavara-sannaya* by Saraṇāṅkara is a quite different work. Dr. Malalaṣekara, the author of *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, has not mentioned the name of this *Catubhānavāraṭṭhakathā* in his book; and he has explained *Satara-baṇavara-sannaya* as "a paraphrase of several Suttas used in the Paritta".²

32. "It is accomplished, with success" uttering these joyful words, he assembled the inhabitants of the town" is the rendering of *laddhattā saḥalan ti me, pūvivācam paḷasetvā sannipātetvā nāgare*. Instead of *laddhattā* (= *laddha + attā*) Geiger's text has *laddhattham* (= *laddha + attham*). The Sinhalese edition has *laddhattā saḥalo iti*, which is acceptable and should be translated as: "the life which I possess is successful".

64. *Tettimsatisahasseehi atthasatūdhikehi ca
tikoti-pupphaḥujāhi puññarāsīṇ ca sañcayī.*

These lines are rendered as: "With an offering of three hundred thirty and three thousand, eight hundred flowers he laid up a store of merit". According to my understanding this amount should be "thirty million, thirty-three thousand and eight hundred".

Ch. XCIX, 47. *Brahmavesadharehi* is rendered as: "by people wearing the Brahman dress". *Brahma* and *brāhmaṇa* are two different words. Here it is not *brāhmaṇa* but *brāhma*, which means a kind of deity. So *brahmave-*

2. P. 282. *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*. 1928.

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVĀMSA TRANSLATION

sadhara means "one who is in the guise of a *brahma*", and not one in the dress of a *brāhmaṇa*.

53. *Amhākam rājarājā tam saddhā-paññāguṇodayo
anuvaccharam pavattentam āsāḷhichaṇaussavam*

54. *Buddhapūjam purakkhatvā pavatteturū vicintiya*

These lines are rendered as: "When our King of kings, dowered with faith, wisdom and other virtues, was wont every year to hold the Āsāḷhi festival, he was minded beforehand to celebrate a sacrificial festival for the Buddha". This is not the idea here. The author is speaking about the annual celebration held in the month of Āsāḷhi. Formerly it was held only as a military display; this time the king wanted to hold this in honour of the Buddha. So the translation should be: "Our great king, endowed with faith, wisdom and other virtues, thought of holding the annual Āsāḷhi festival having the prominent idea of honouring the Buddha". Here it should be mentioned that Geiger's text has *rājarājānam* instead of *rājarājā tam*, and *-guṇodayo* instead of *-guṇodayo*.

55. Geiger's text has: *subhacandiradam gajam vibhūsanehi bhūsetvā*. His translation of this is: "Then he had the elephant whose tusk was as the bright moon, decorated with ornaments". In a note he has stated: "*subhacandiradam*. I separate the compound thus, *candi* seeming to me to stand for skr. *candra* or *candrin*. The explanation is however, uncertain". Here his text is hopelessly corrupt, and so is the Sinhalese edition. In the MS. that I have obtained from Ambarukkhārāma the reading is *subbacam diradam gajam*, which means "a well-trained tusker".

103. *Brahmabhāvanam ekakam* is rendered as "the unique, sublimest spiritual perfection". The passage where it occurs is: "When the Great King, rich in virtue, saw his brother to whom he had granted the umbrella and other distinctions enter (in pomp) with royal retinue, he rejoiced, gazed at him again and again and realized thus in himself the unique, sublimest spiritual perfection". According to this context *brahmabhāvanam ekakam* is "one of the brahmavihāras", i.e. *muditā*. *Muditā* is one of the four *brahmavihāras*. It arises when one is rejoicing at other's happiness.

177. *Purise paricārake*, which is rendered as "nurses", should be 'attendants'.

Ch. C, 14.

*Suvaṇṇadvisahasseehi sattanikkhādhikehi ca
kārite maṇivaṇṇasmim karaṇḍamhi manohare*

These lines are rendered as: "After a splendid, jewel-encrusted casket had been made for two thousand suvaṇṇas and seven nikkhas". Here "jewel-

encrusted" stands for *maṇivaṇṇasmim*. *Vaṇṇa* is never used to express the idea of encrusting. Moreover, setting of gems on this is explained below. The MS. from Ambarukkhārāma has *munivaṇṇa* instead of this. *Munivaṇṇa* or *satthuvaṇṇa* is a synonym for gold. With this correction the translation should stand as "after a splendid gold casket had been made for . . ."

72. *Laṅkāḍḍīpe asante ca dhammavinaya-potthake
suvannaṇapaṭibimban ca suvaṇṇapothhakaṃ varaṃ*
73. *Laṅkāḍḍīpe mahārāje pasanno so mahīpati
pavaraṃ rājasandesam paṇṇākāre ca nekadhā*
74. *Ayojjharājāmacce ca rājā Vessantaro nibho
so hi Laṅkaṃ a pesesi jinadhātugharaṃ varaṃ*

The translation of these lines is : " These the Ruler who was well inclined to the Great King on the island of Laṅkā—like to King Vessantara—sent to Laṅkā, to the splendid relic temple of the Victor, and (with them) books on the doctrine and on monastic discipline which did not exist in the island of Laṅkā . . ." This translation conveys the idea that those things were sent to the Relic Temple of the Buddha. The Sinhalese translators, too, have fallen into the same error. All those things together with the envoys were sent to the king of Ceylon, and not to any particular place. *Jinadhātugharaṃ varaṃ* in the text should be taken as an attribute to *Laṅkaṃ*. In some documents sent from here to Burma or Siam I have seen this whole island compared to a shrine room of Buddha-relics as there are many important Relics of the Buddha deposited here. So the translation of these lines should be : The Ruler (of Ayojjha) who was well inclined to the king of Laṅkā, and who was (liberal) like Vessantara, sent to Laṅkā, which was similar to a shrine room for Buddha-relics, those books on the doctrine and discipline which were not existing here, a golden image, and a precious book written on gold plates, along with the Siamese envoys.

A. P. BUDDHADATTA