Some Corrections of Geiger’s Mahāvamsa Translation

PROFESSOR Geiger’s English translation of the Mahāvamsa, published by the Pali Text Society (1934), is admirable in many respects and the translator has spared no pains to make the work as reliable as possible. Yet the translation and the notes are, unfortunately, not totally free from mistakes. Some of these errors were pointed out by me to the translator in the course of correspondence, when he (Professor Geiger) was alive, and most of those corrections and suggestions were incorporated by him in an article published in Vol. IX, p. 107, of the Indian Historical Quarterly in 1933. In that article Professor Geiger himself has admitted:

“...There are in my translation of the Mahāvamsa some words and terms which are not precisely or even wrongly explained. This may partly be excused for the long distance which separated me (i.e. during my work) from Ceylon and the lack of reliable sources. To my venerated friend Buddhadasa Thera (Aggārāma, Ambalangoda) I owe a series of useful suggestions and corrections some of which I may be allowed to publish here with additional notes of my own”.

As this translation is generally used by students of Ceylon History, it is valuable to point out the most glaring inaccuracies to be found in it.

Ch. I, 10 and 11 are translated as: “having offered homage to these twenty-four Sambuddhas and having received from them the prophecy of his (future) buddhahood he, the great hero, when he had fulfilled all perfection and reached the highest enlightenment the sublime Buddha Gotama delivered the world from suffering”.

Immediately after this comes: “At Uruvelā, in the Magadha country, the great sage, sitting at the foot of the Bodhi-tree, reached the supreme enlightenment on the full-moon day of Vesākha”, as translation of the 12th verse. This appears as a repetition. If we take the 11th verse as direct words of the former Buddhas there is no repetition. The 11th verse is:

“Pāretvā pāramī sabbā, patvā sambodhim uttamaṃ,
uttamo Gotamo Buddhho satte dukkhā pānocayā”.

As a direct saying its translation should be: “The noble Buddha, Gotama, having fulfilled all perfections, will attain the perfect enlightenment, and will deliver the beings in the world from suffering”. The Sinhalese translation of Sumanāgala and Batuvantudawe clearly states this to be a direct saying.
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Geiger’s edition of the text has *pamocayi* for *pamocaye*. This is the word which has misled him. His translation is correct according to his edition, as the verb is in the past. *Pamocaye* is an optative.

Ch. I, 15.—*Bhaddavaggiyā* is translated as “companions of the company of Bhadda”. Its commentary does not mention a person of that name but says: *bhadda-sundara-vaggīye*, which means “members of the amiable company”.

Ch. I, 22.—*Saṅgāmabhūmi* is rendered as “(customary) meeting place”. This is never used to denote an ordinary meeting place, but a battlefield. The Sinhalese version has rendered it as “yuddhabhūmiya”. According to the context there is nothing to show that there was an imminent battle. It might have been a general meeting of the Yakkhas. Then Geiger’s translation is right, but not his edition of the text. If it was an ordinary meeting the word *saṅgāma* in the text should be corrected as *saṅgama*. *Saṅgamabhūmi* is a meeting place, but not a ‘battlefield’.

Ch. I, 38.—*Gīvattī* is rendered as “collar-bone”. This same work relates in Ch. XVII, how King Devānampiya-Tissa received the collar-bone and how he enshrined it in the Thūpārāma. Therefore to say that there was another collar-bone at Mahiyangana must be a mistake. *Gīvattī* is not the collar-bone but “the Adam’s-apple” or the gullet bone. The Pali word for collar-bone is *akkhaka*.

Ch. I, 49.—“His younger sister had been given (in marriage) to the nāga-king on the Kaṇṇāvaḍḍhamāna-mountain”. Here the name of the mountain is given as “Kaṇṇā-vaḍḍhamāna”. In some MSS. there are different readings Kaṇṭha and Kaṇṭhā for Kaṇṇā. Kaṇṭha means ‘black’ and Kaṇṇā could have no meaning whatever in this context. Kaṇṭhā is here preferable as the name of the Nāga-maiden. Then the translation should be: “His younger sister, Kaṇṭhā, had been given to the Nāga-king of the Vaḍḍhamānakā mountain”. The *Vamsatthapakāsinī* is silent on the name of the mountain but it gives the maiden’s name as Tiracchikā, which is not in the text. The Sinhalese version agrees with Geiger. But the *Samantakūṭavatpanā* clearly states that the name of the mountain was Vaḍḍhamāna and not Kaṇṇāvaḍḍhamāna. There the first line of verse 554 is:

“Tahim atirucirnāsa Vaḍḍhamānādisel’.

And the first two lines of the next verse are:

“Pacuru-mahinavutto Vaḍḍhamānācalasmiṃ
adhiputi bhujagānāṃ āsi Cūlodevavo”.

1. A Pali poem by Vedeha Mahāthera, composed during the reign of Parākrama-
Ch. I, 60.—“Both nāgas gladly gave up the throne to the Sage”. 61. “When the master, having alighted on the earth, had taken his place on a seat there”. The latter passage shows that the Sage sat not on that throne but on a certain seat. The Vamsatthappakāsini says: “Taitha āsane ti tasmin manippallāṅkāsane nisāditvā ti attho = Taitha āsane means having sat on that jewel-throne”.

The words nāga and bhujaga, in the 62nd verse of the same chapter, were translated as “snake-spirits”; it is better to use “nāgas”.

Ch. I, 75.—The words “kate ratanamanḍape” were rendered as “under a canopy decked with gems”. Manḍapa is not a canopy but a temporary shed or pavilion.

Ch. III, 1.—“When the conqueror . . . had lived eighty-four years and had fulfilled all his duties in the world”, conveys the meaning that the Buddha had lived 84 years. The word for this in the text is pañca-cattārīsa; I cannot understand how this mistranslation has occurred.

Ch. III, 5 to 9.—“When he had performed all rites due to the dead body of the Master and the bodily relics, the great thera, desiring that the doctrine of the Master might long endure, did, seven days after the Lord of the World . . . had passed into nibbāna, bethinking him of the evil words of the aged Subhadda, . . . and (bethinking him) that the Sage had commended the establishing of the holy truth, and (lastly) that the Sambuddha’s consent existed to make a compilation of the holy dhamma, appointed to this end five hundred eminent bhikkhus”.

This long sentence conveys the meaning that the great Elder, (Mahā-kassapa), appointed or selected five hundred eminent bhikkhus, on the seventh day after the Buddha’s death, in order to hold the first convocation. But this is not the fact. The first council was held some months later; nor did he select eminent Elders on the seventh day.

When this sentence is analysed it has “the great theru” as the subject; there are two predicates; “did” and “appointed”. There is no object for “did”, and it is not clear what he did. This confusion has arisen through the misplaced phrase “seven days after the Lord of the World . . . had passed”. The text is:

“Lokaniithe Dasabale sattāha-parinibbute
dubbhāsitaṃ Subhaḥdassā suddassā vacanaṃ saram;”

which means: “remembering the evil words spoken by the aged Subhadda on the seventh day after the demise of the Lord of the World who is endowed with the ten powers”.
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Geiger has connected the phrase "seven days after" etc., with the Elder Mahākassapa, while he should have connected it with Subuddha. The Vamsathappakāsinī clearly supports this construction; see Vol. I. p. 143.

In the same passage Geiger says: "(bethinking him) that the Sage had commanded the establishing of the holy truth", translating the lines "Saddhammatthapanatthāya muninānuggahām katām". There is nothing here to imply a command. The word he has taken for 'command' is anuggahāṇī, which never means a command. I am of opinion that this must be rendered as "bethinking him that the Sage has treated him in that way for establishing the holy truth".

Again Professor Geiger notes: "that the Sambuddha's consent existed to make a compilation of the holy dhamma", concerning the lines: "Kālum saddhammasaṅgitiṃ sambuddhānumataṃ satitām". Here he was misled by an incorrect reading of his edition of the text. The text printed in Ceylon and many of the MSS. have "sambuddhānumate yati" instead of "sambuddhānumataṃ satitām". According to this correction it means: "that (the Elder Kassapa) selected four hundred and ninety-nine Elders who were (mostly commended, for their proficiency), by the Buddha".

After these corrections the translation of these verses should be as follows:

"(5) When he had performed all rites due to the dead body of the Master and the holy relics, the great therī, desiring that the doctrine of the Master might long endure, (6) and recollecting the evil words of the aged Subuddha spoken seven days after the Lord of the World, gifted with ten powers, had passed into nibbāna, (7) and also bethinking him that He had given him His own garment and had thereby made him equal with Himself, and considering that the Sage had treated him in that way for establishing of the holy truth, (8-9) he selected, in order to make a compilation of the Scriptures, four hundred and ninety-nine Elders, who were (mostly) commended by the All-knowing One, were repeaters of the ninefold doctrine and versed in all its separate parts, and who had overcome the asavas. The selection of one less than five hundred was on account of the Elder Ānanda".

Ch. III, 20.—Anagghattharaṇāni is translated as "precious mats". Attharaṇā is not a mat but some other kind of sheet (made of cloth or skin). In verse 27 of the same chapter āsanesaṃ is given as "on chairs". There is no mention of chairs but of those paccattharaṇāni.

Ch. IV, 54.—"All these points are unlawful according to tradition" is the translation of "sabbāṇi tāṇi vaṭṭhāṇi na kappantī ti suttato". He has taken sutta as tradition. By the tradition of the Vajjiputtas all those points

2. Edited by Dr. G. P. Malalasekara and published by the Pali Text Society London, 1935.
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were lawful to them. Therefore to use the word tradition for *sutta* is not very safe here. *Sutta* is the accepted Canon; they were unlawful according to that Canon.

*Ch. V, 6.*—"And yet two more groups parted from the followers of the Thera-doctrine: the Mahimsasaka and the Vajjiputtaka bhikkhus". This is correct according to the text as it stands; but one must remember that Vajjiputtakas were persons who caused the Second Council to be held and who became the opponents of the Theravadins and established the Mahasanghika Sect. To say again that there was a sub-sect of the Theravadins, by name Vajjiputtaka, is not acceptable. This confusion has arisen through a corrupt reading; almost all MSS. have the same reading; but from the Northern records we learn that there was a sect named Vatsiputriya, which means "the sons of Vatsas". The Pali equivalent of it is Vacchiputtiya. Those familiar with Sinhalese characters are aware of the orthographic similarity between *ja* and *cha*. As Vacchiputtiya is a word not often met with and Vajjiputtiya is very familiar, later on the scribes have written Vajjiputtiya for both terms.

Again in the same chapter the 7th verse is translated as follows:—"And there parted from them likewise the Dhammattariya and the Bhadrayanika bhikkhus, the Chandagariya, the Sammiti and the Vajjiputtaka bhikkhus". Here "from them" refers to the Mahimsasakā and Vajjiputtakā in the 6th verse. To say "Vajjiputtiyas were parted from Mahimsasakas and Vajjiputtakā" is nonsense. The text is:

"Jātā tu Dhammattariyā Bhadrayānika-bhikkhavo
Chandāgarika—Sammitī—Vajjiputtaka-bhikkhavo".

The Vamsatthappakasini explains that Vajji (vacchi-) puttakas were divided into four sections, namely: Dhammattariya, Bhadrayanika, Chandagarika and Sammitiyā. If we correct the fourth line as Vacchiputakabhiṣkhāhi, there is no confusion whatever.

Here the word Chandagārika is not correct although we find it in the Sinhalese works like the *NikāyasāṅGRAHA*. Its equivalent in the Northern records is Shannagarika, which means "existing in six towns". Then the correct word in Pali must be Channagarika which Geiger himself has given as a different reading.

*Ch. V, 12.*—The words Pubbaseliya and Aparaseliya are rendered as "the first Seliya bhikkhus" and "the other Seliyā". Here *pubba* means 'the eastern', and not 'the first'; *apara* means 'the western' and not 'the other'. Pubbaseliyā are the "Eastern-mountaineers" and Aparaseliyā are "Western-mountaineers". Geiger’s introduction to the same translation confirms this statement.
Some corrections of Geiger's Mahāvaṃsa translation

Ch. V, 44.—When the headman of the caṇḍālas saw (the mother), he looked on her as his own wife, and kept her seven years with honour " is the translation of the verse :

"Disvā tam jetṭhacanḍālo attano sāminiṃ viya maññanto tam upaṭṭhāsi' sattavassāni sādhukami ".

The woman referred to here was Prince Nigrodha's mother and the wife of Sumana who was the elder brother of King Dharmāsoka. To say that such a princess lived with a caṇḍāla (= an out-caste) as his wife is a startling statement. Sāmini is never used in Pali to denote a wife. It is true that sāmi means a lord and a husband, but sāmini never gives the meaning 'wife', but 'mistress'. 'Mistress' also sometimes conveys the meaning 'wife', but here it must be taken in the sense of a master and a slave. Take for instance the lines " Tassā ca sāmini taltha Kuvannā nāma yakkhini " , (verse 11, Ch. 7) which is translated as " Her mistress, a yakkhini named Kuvannā ".

The princess did not even live within the house of the out-caste but in a separate house provided for her by the deity of the banyan tree. A Kshatriya princess would not even enter the house of a caṇḍāla not to say that she would live with him. Think of the pride of the Sākiyans who would not consent to give their legitimate daughter to such a powerful monarch as Prasenajit of Kosala; and of Mahānāma, the Sākyan, who drowned himself in a lake in order to avoid eating with Prince Viḍūḍabha at the same table. That prince was the son of Prasenajit and a grandson of Mahānāma himself. But the prince's mother was born to Mahānāma by a slave-woman. Sākiyans were so proud as to wash the seat on which Viḍūḍabha sat when he visited Kapilavatthu, Moriyas, in which clan Asoka was born, were said to be a branch of the Sākiyans. Such a proud lady would die instantly rather than live with a caṇḍāla.

Ch. V, 88.—" When one day the monarch heard of the nāga-king Mahākāla of wondrous might . . . he sent for him to be brought (into his presence) fettered with a chain of gold ". Here the monarch was Emperor Asoka; the translator says that the nāga-king, although he was of wondrous might, was brought in chains to the emperor. The text states that golden hand-cuffs were sent to him, (perhaps as a sign of the emperor's superiority), but does not say that he was brought chained or hand-cuffed. The statement immediately following the above is: " made him sit upon the throne under the white canopy, when he had done homage to him with various flowers, and had bidden sixteen thousand women surround him, he (the king) spoke thus ". Here the emperor has treated him as a person superior to himself, and not as an inferior brought to him as a prisoner.
Ch. V, 106.—"Drādasavassiko yeva vedaḥparagato caraṇaḥ" is translated as "at the end of the twelve years having come to the end of (studying) the Vedas". This is not correct. Drādasavassika means "at the age of twelve".

Ch. V, 108.—"Sabbadhammānaṇupatito ekadhammo hi māṇava, sabbe dhammā osaranti ekadhammamhi; ko nu so?" is translated as "A doctrine is come after all the doctrines, O brahman, yet all doctrines end in the one doctrine; which is that one?" The commentary says: "Sabbadhammānaṇupatito ti śaṅkhatāśaṅkhatesu sabbadhammesu anupatito" (= sabbadhammānaṇupatito means fallen on all composite and unconditioned things). Here dhamma does not mean 'doctrine', but every thing that exists in the world and beyond it. Therefore the translation should be as follows: "There is one thing pervading all other things; in one thing all other things are absorbed; O young man, what is that one thing?"

In the next verse nāma is translated as "name (of the true doctrine)". Here nāma means the immaterial factors such as consciousness.

Ch. V, 113.—Puthūjjanā is rendered as "those who yet stood outside (the religion)". The puthūjjanā are not outside the religion; they are common folk who have not yet attained some holy Path.

Ch. V, 115.—Māṇava is rendered as "young brahmans". Maṇava is a young man of any caste. This is not especially distinctive of brahmans. In this case their leader Soṇaka was a merchant's son. Brahman youths would never act as followers of a merchant.

Ch. V, 116.—"The therā said: ask thy teacher", for "tavāpuccha gurum", is not correct. The youth Soṇaka went from Kāsi to Rājaṭagaha together with his parents; his father was a caravan leader. Therefore here the word gurum means 'parent', and not 'teacher'. The parent's consent is necessary for a person who is willing to enter the Order, and he has nothing to do with his teachers.

Ch. V, 115.—"Therassa vacanaṃ suvaṃ so pasannamano dijo attano pākato tassa nīcanaṃ bhikkhaṃ adāpayi". Here pasannamano is rendered as "full of faith". And kamenassa pasidiṃsu sabbe pi ghamānaṃsā" is rendered as: "little by little did all of his household become believers". The word pasāda sometimes has the meaning, 'faith', but its general meaning is ' gladness '. Here the brahman, who was Moggali's father, still was an unbeliever and had no faith in Buddhism. He fed the Elder on account of the friendship gained by the Elder by frequenting his house for seven years. Neither he nor his household yet became Buddhists. Therefore pasannamano should be rendered as 'glad in mind', and pasidiṃsu as 'became friendly or confidential'.
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Ch. V, 139.—" Being come from the Brahmā world (this latter) loved cleanliness, and therefore were they used to keep his chair hung up for better care thereof " is the translation of:

"Brahmalokā āgatattā sucikāmo ahusi so; tasmā so tassa pallaṅko vāsaviṅva lagiyati".

The word vāsaviṅva here is left untranslated, and the translator says in a note: "This verse is suspicious; the Tīkā makes no comment on it ". There is nothing to comment; and the verse is free from corruptions. The only difficulty is to understand the meaning of vāsaviṅva. There are two meanings of vāseti: the causative of vasati has the meaning "to make live "; the Denominative from vāsa has the meaning " to be perfumed or scented ". The second meaning is to be taken here. Then "pallaṅko vāsaviṅva lagiyati" is to be translated as: "the seat is hung up after fumigating it with incense".

Ch. V, 146.—" Cittayamaka " is rendered as "the double thought ", in a note. This is not a double thought but "dyads concerning the mind ". There are ten Yamakas in the text known by that name, and one of them is Cittayamaka.

Ch. V, 162.—" He saw the therī Mahādharmakarikhi, the self-controlled, sitting at the foot of a tree, and fanned by a cobra with a branch of a sāla-tree ". Here the Pali word for cobra is nāga. It is not explained how a cobra can hold a branch with which to fan. Nāga does not mean only a cobra; it is often used to denote an elephant; an elephant is able to hold a branch with its trunk. It was an elephant who was fanning the elder. The Vamsatthapakasini clearly states: "nāgena ti aññatarena hatthinägena ".

Ch. V, 188.—" These wrought the miracle called the 'unveiling of the world ' to the end that the king Dharmāsoka might be converted ". Dharmāsoka was converted some years before this event; and to say that he was converted at the unveiling ceremony of the eighty-four thousand shrines, ordered to be erected by him, is meaningless. This confusion has arisen through the word pasadattham, which means, (as I have said once before), " to please him " or " for his joy ".

Ch. V, 193.—" When the king heard this he rejoiced yet more and asked: Nay then, is there a kinsman of Buddha's religion like unto me? " is the translation of:

"Tam sutva vacanam bhīyo tuttho rājā aṭucchī tam; Buddhāsāsanadāyādo hoti kho mādiso iti ".

Sāsanadāyādo is rendered as "a kinsman of Buddha's religion ". Dāyāda is not a 'kinsman' but 'an heir'. In this instance the king asked the Elder whether he had become an heir to (or a partner of) the sāsana.

Ch. V, 212.—Kuntakinnari is rendered as "a wood-nymph named Kuntī ". Kinnarīs are not a kind of wood-nymphs. The P.T.S. Dictionary states that
Kinnara is "a little bird with a head like a man's ". This is the idea prevailing among the Sinhalese, but they do not say it is of a small size, but of a very large size. I do not accept either of these notions; in my opinion Kinnaras are a clan of human beings, dwelling in the forests of Northern India, whose women, according to tradition, were very beautiful.

For Kunii the Sinhalese text has Kunta ; anyhow, this cannot be the name of the Kinnari, but a qualification of her as it is compounded with the latter. In my opinion it denotes a kind of Kinnaras.

Ch. V, 207. Note I, p. 44. — "Kammavacana akā; i.e. he was president of the chapter when Mahinda was ordained ". This is not correct. The reciter of the kammavacā is not the president of a chapter which confers ordination. The president thereof is called upajjhāya or preceptor. In this case the Elder Moggaliputta-Tissa was the president ; the Elder Majjhantika was the reciter of kammavacā ; he was not the president but the ācariya (= tutor) of Mahinda.

In another note on p. 31, Geiger says : "It appears from M.V. I, 25·6 ff., 32.1 ff., that there is no difference between the functions of the two. The ācariya seems, according to M.V. I., 32.1, to be only the deputy or substitute of the upajjhāya ". This is not so. The upajjhāya is a person who admonishes a novice concerning the disciplinary rules and his conduct. The ācariya is a person who teaches him Scriptures and other necessary things like grammar; the latter's position is almost similar to that of a teacher in a modern Pirivena, who imparts only the knowledge of languages, etc., to his pupils.

Ch. V, 216,—"But the thera set himself against pointing out to the king what things needful in sickness, and against going in search of the ghee after the midday meal " is the translation of :

"There noivedanam rañño gilanaapaccaye pi ca,
 sappi-attha ca caraṇam pacchabhattachati paṭikkhipi ".

The Sinhalese edition and the Vamsatthappakāsini have the second line as "gilanavattato pi so ". And the Vamsatthappakāsini explains9 that the suffering Elder prohibited his brother monk to ask the king for ghee, or to bring it from the king's dispensary i, or to go round the village, for that purpose, after noon. In my opinion there is no possibility of dividing this passage into three portions as explained in the Vamsatthappakāsini; and the translation does not convey the real sense. The real sense is: that the Elder prohibited him from informing the king even in case of such a sickness, and to go in search of ghee after noon. Both readings "gilanapaccaye pi ", and "gilanavattato pi " can have this meaning.


4. In this case the word must stand as gilanavattato, which is given as a different reading in the same book. The construction of the text in both ways does not allow it to be divided into three facts.
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Ch. VI, 28.—“Dammi raṭṭham tād’eva” is translated as “I will give thee at once the kingdom”. Here he has taken tād’eva for “at once”. Tād’eva = tam + eva; tam demonstrates raṭṭham. Then the translation must be “I will give thee that province (of the country which the lion is devastating).

Ch. VII, 5.—Uppalavanna is translated as “who is in colour like the lotus”. Uppala is not lotus but water-lily. Many European translators have not taken the trouble to distinguish padam and up pala. In a note Dr. Geiger states: “The allusion is to the colour of blue lotus (uppala)”. There are blue water-lilies, but we have never heard of blue lotuses.

Ch. VII, 62.—“Though fearing that evil should come of it” is the translation given for “bhītā pi sā agatiyā”. He has not grasped the sense of agati; it refers to her former misdeed of betraying her own relatives. So the translation should be “though fearing that evil should come (on account of her former misdeeds)”.

Ch. VII, 73.—“Every year he sent to his wife’s father a shell-pearl worth twice a hundred thousand (pieces of money)”, is the translation given for “ādāsi sasurassa tu, anuvassam saṅkhamuttaṁ satasahassa-dvayāraham”. He speaks of a single pearl the value of which was two hundred thousand, and that was a “shell-pearl”. All pearls are found within a pair of shells, so there is no meaning in “shell-pearl”. Here the singular number in saṅkha-muttaṁ indicates (that it is) a collective noun; saṅkha does not mean a mere shell but a chank. “The king annually sent two hundred thousand worth of chanks and pearls to his father-in-law”, is the real meaning here.

Ch. VIII, 19.—“Gantu aḷḷapadesena” is translated as “went to another tract of land”. The translator himself has shown, in a footnote in his Pali text, how the Vamsatthappakāsini has commented on this passage. It has given: “aḷḷapadesena ti vāppijjakamma-yojanaleseña”. Even then he has not been able to grasp the real meaning. He has taken aḷḷa + apadesa as aḷḷa + padesa, and translated as “another tract of land”.

The comment on this is very clear. Apadesa never means “a tract of land”. It is well known that many Sakyas pretended to be non-Sakyas when their race was demolished by King Viḍḍābhā. During this devastation this Paṇḍusakka has fled from there in disguise of a merchant. Therefore aḷḷapadesena means “by pretending something else”.

Ch. IX, 18.—“So he had intercourse with her and did not go forth till break of day”, is the translation of “tiya sadhīṁ śūvasitvā paccūse yeva nikkhāni”. It is not possible for a paramour to stay with his lady in her place till the day-break. It means that he went away (as stealthily as he came) before day-break. Paccūse = very early or before day-break.
Ch. IX, 23.—"The princes, from fear, did to death the herdsman Citta and the slave Kālavela, attendants on Gāmani, since they would make no promise". Here "herdsman" stands for gopaka; it may mean 'herdsman', but here it stands for 'a guard', as it is told that they were attendants on Gāmani.

Geiger has given a note on "since they would make no promise"; he states, "that is, they would not fall in with the design of the brothers to kill the boy who might perhaps come into the world". The question here is "What is the promise that they would not give?" Geiger has thought that it was to kill the unborn child. This is not meant here, the princes suspected these two persons of having some knowledge of this unlawful action of Gāmani, and when they were questioned about this they refused to acknowledge the fact, therefore they were put to death. Here patiṇām does not stand for a promise but for acknowledgement; then "patiṇām adente" should be translated as "since they would not acknowledge the fact".

Ch. X, 59.—Vāladhismim is translated as "by the mane". Mane = kesara, but not vāladhi; vāladhi = tail.

Ch. X, 74.—"Attano rajageham so tassa datvāna ayyako aṁnattha vāsaṇi kappesi; so tu tasmiṁ ghare vasi".

Geiger's translation of this is: "The great-uncle handed over his palace to him and built himself a dwelling elsewhere; but he dwelt in his house"; in the last passage it is not clear to whom he refers; according to the construction it may refer to the great-uncle. In the text so refers to Pāṇḍukabhaya, the king. Tasmim ghare refers to the palace given to him by his great-uncle.

Ch. X, 83.—Sara is rendered as "pond". Sara is a lake; a pond is not as large as a lake.

Ch. X, 87.—"Having gods and men to dance before him, the king took his pleasure, in joyous and merry wise", is the translation given for "dibbamānu-saṇāṭakam kārento bhūramī rājā . . .". By this rendering Geiger means that this king had some gods to dance before him. It is not so. Dibba-mānusanaṭakam means "plays concerning gods and men". All actors were human beings.

Ch. X, 102.—Sīvikā-sotthisālaṁ ca is rendered as "lying-in shelter and a hall for those recovering from sickness". Vamsatthappakāsinī explains sīvikā as: Sivalinga-patiṭṭhāpitā sālā, viṣayānagharam và. There viṣayānaghara is a lying-in-home; the other meaning of sīvikā is "a temple dedicated to Siva". It is probable that this king established a Saiva-temple here as he was not a Buddhist. Sotthisāla simply means a hospital.
SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S MAHĀVAṂSA TRANSLATION

Ch. XI, 41.—Sāmihite ratā is rendered as "rejoicing in the salvation of their king". This simply means "wishing the welfare of their master".

Ch. XII, 51.—"Tassa desaṣsa ārakkham ṭhāpetvāna samantato" is translated as: "When the thera had made a bulwark round the country". The words ārakkham ṭhāpetvāna do not give the sense of a bulwark; it means "having kept guards around".

Ch. XIV, 14.—"Great is the number there of arahants learned in the three vedas" is the rendering given for "teviṣṭa . . . arahanto bāḥu". The attribute "learned in the three vedas" is never applied to an arahant. The three vidyas of arahants are: (1) pubbenivasanāṇa, (2) cetopariyāṇa, and (3) āsavakkhayāṇa. (See under Viṣṭa in P.T.S. Dictionary for details).

In the 58th sutta of Tīkanipāta, Aṅguttara, (Vol. I, p. 163, P.T.S. ed.) it is explained how a brahman becomes a teviṣṭa. There Tīkan, the brahman, has spoken not only of three vedas but also of good birth and great earning.

Ch. XIV, 29-30.—"He took Bhanduka aside and asked him what the theras intended (to do)" is the rendering of "Bha!JuJ,u'f!l-neto'ekamantam pucchi theradhikāram so". Theradhikāra is the word mistranslated here. The Vaṃsatthappakāsinī has given a clear explanation to this. It has: "theradhikāra nama kulapadesādim adhikāram pucchit viulta hoti". King Devānampiyatissa took Bhaṅḍu aside and asked about the Elders' parents and such other facts. Here adhikāra = state.

Ch. XIV, 50.—"Hearing all this it became clear to the king that they would not sit on chairs", is the translation of verse 50. But after a few lines it states: "There, according to their rank, they took their seat on chairs covered with stuffs". (Verse 54). The mistake lies with the second statement; there duṣṣapīthesa is rendered as "chairs covered with stuffs", it should be rendered as "cushions".

Ch. XV, 11.—
"Tān Nandana dakkhiṇena nayam theram rathesabho Mahāmeṣhavanuvyānāṁ pācīnadvāraṁ nayi"
is translated as follows: "Southwards from Nandana the lord of chariots himself led the thera to the Mahāmegha-park, at the east gate". This indicates that Mahāmegha-park was at the eastern gate of the city. Anyway it cannot be at the eastern gate; therefore the word pācīnadvāraṁ must be taken as a qualification to Mahāmeghavana. Then the rendering must be "to the Mahāmegha-park whose gate is in the east".

Ch. XV, 27-28.—"Thero rājagharāma gantvā tassa dakkhiṇato thito rukkhhamhi picule atṭha pūpphamuttī samokiri"
is translated as: "the thera went to the royal dwelling and scattered eight handfuls of blossoms about the picula-tree standing on the south side".
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By this rendering it is to be understood that the tree was to the south of the royal dwelling; but the construction of the verse does not allow one to have this meaning. Thito is in the Nominative, and it is an attribute hto srerol which is in the same case. It cannot be taken as an attribute to picule which is in the Locative. Therefore "standing on the south side of it" must be connected with the Elder and not with the tree.

Ch. XV, 41.—"When the therā had eaten it he gave the kernel to the king to plant". Here they are speaking about a mango; its seed is to be planted and not the kernel.

Ch. XV, 88.—Dhammakaraka is rendered as "drinking vessel". It is a kind of water-strainer and not a drinking vessel. Dhammakarakas are not now found in Ceylon; but I have seen them in Burma.

Ch. XV, 180.—"Jinasāsanaṃ patiṭṭhitāvānu bhante" is rendered as: "Does the doctrine of the Conqueror stand, sir"? I will render it as "Has the doctrine of the Conqueror been now established here, Sir"?

(To be continued)

A. P. BUDDHADATTA