

Some Corrections of Geiger's Mahāvamsa Translation

(Continued from page 118)

CH. XVI, 16.—“Then did he on the very same day in the Tumberu-mālaka, which was marked out as the first of all, confer upasampadā on all those who were weary of the pabbajjā” is the translation given for
“*Tesaṃ pabbajjāpekkhānaṃ akāsi upasampadam sabbesaṃ sabbapaṭhamam baddhe Tumberu-mūlake*”.

Here *pabbajjāpekkhānaṃ* is rendered as “those who were weary of the pabbajjā”, and the translator has further stated that *Pabbajjāpekkhānaṃ* stands for *pabbajjā + upekkhānaṃ*. To disjoin the compound in this way is quite wrong. If it is what he says its combination should stand as *pabbajjapekkhānaṃ* and not as *pabbajjāpekkhānaṃ*. It is a well-known fact that a candidate for upasampadā is called an *upasampadāpekkha*; the disjunction there is *upasampadā + apekkha*. *Apekkha* or *apekkhaka* means “one who expects”. Then *pabbajjāpekkhānaṃ* should mean “to those who expect ordination”.

There is another difficulty here: in this case the upasampadā was conferred on the 56 princes who were ordained as *sāmaṇeras* some weeks ago; they were *upasampadāpekkhas* and not *pabbajjāpekkhas*. The *Vamsatthapakāsini* has solved this problem by stating: “So saganō thero tattha sīmāya baddhadivase yeva tesaṃ Mahā-aritṭhapamukhānaṃ upasampadāpekkhānaṃ sabbesaṃ pabbajjāpekkhantānaṃ pabbajjatthāya upāgatānaṃ attanā baddhe Tumberunāmakamhi mālake sabbapaṭhamam upasampadam akāsi”. Here the 56 novices were *upasampadāpekkhas*, *pabbajjāpekkhas* were some other persons who came after their ordination. “Who were weary of pabbajjā” never could be applied here as it is stated (in the 11th verse) that “all these wise men attained to arahantship even in the shaving-hall”.

Ch. XVII, 30.—*Mahejjāvatthum* is rendered as “the building of the Great Sacrifice”. The Sinhalese MSS. have *Pamojavatthum* instead of this. The *Vamsatthapakāsini* explains it as *Pamojanāmena yakkhena pariggahita-devatthānaṃ* (= a shrine haunted by a demon named Pamoja). It is not clear why Geiger has not taken this into consideration.

Ch. XIX, 55.—

“*Mahāsamāgame tasmim pāṭihāriya-vimhite pakkam pācīnasākhāya pekkhataṃ pakkam akkhatam*”

is rendered as “Amid this great assembly, plunged into amazement by this miracle, there grew out of the east branch, even as they gazed, a faultless fruit”. It is not so, the fruit did not grow at the moment they were gazing; but it became ripe at that moment.

The sentence does not end here as the translator has thought, it connects the following lines :—“ *Thero patitam ādāya ropetum rājino adā* ”. Then the translation should stand as follows : “ Amid this great assembly, plunged into amazement by this miracle, a fruit, which was on the east branch, became ripe even as they gazed, and fell down unspoiled. The Elder took it up and gave it to the king to plant ”.

Ch. XX, 16.—

“ *Yā yā Mahāmahindena therena vasitā guhā
sapabbatavihāresu sā Mahindaguhā ahu* ”,

is rendered as “ But as for the grotto inhabited by the great therā Mahinda, in the vihāra built upon the mountain, it was called the Mahinda-grotto ”. Here the text refers not to a single cave but to several. Duplication of *yā* in the text and commentary clearly shows this fact. There is one Mahindaguhā at Mihintale and another at Isurumunivihāra in Anurādhapura. Some more would have existed in ancient times. Geiger thinking only of the grotto in Mihintale, has taken the reading “ *sapabbate vihāre* ” as correct and has translated according to it. The Sinhalese edition has the readings “ *Sapabbatavihāresu* ”, and “ *sā pabbatavihāresu* ”. “ *Cetiya-pabbata-sahitesu vihāresu yā yā Mahindattherena vasitā guhā, sā sā tad upādāya Mahindaguhā nāma jātā ti attho* ” is the comment given on this passage by the *Vamsatthapākāsinī*, which shows that the text is not speaking of one cell but of many.

Sapabbata-vihāra is not a “ vihāra built upon a mountain ”, but a monastery where there are mountains or rocks.

Ch. XX, 19.—“ Enshrining of Sambuddha’s collar-bone relic ” is mentioned as the sixth act done by King Devānampiyatissa while establishing Buddhism. In the text above no such act is mentioned. Enshrining of the collar-bone was the third action of the king. The sixth action is stated to be the establishment of Hatthāḷhaka-vihāra together with a relic-shrine. All MSS. have the word *gīvadhātu*, but according to fact this king has nothing to do with *gīvadhātu* (wrongly rendered by Geiger as “ collar-bone ”) but with *dakkhiṇakkhaka*, which is enshrined in the Thūpārāma.

In my opinion this refers to the second shrine built by this king in the nunnery of Hatthāḷhaka. The mistake lies in the corrupt word *gīvadhātu*, which should be corrected as *jīvadhātu*, bodily relic (of the Buddha).

Ch. XX, 22-23.—

“ *Hatthāḷhake osarivā bhikkhunīnaṃ upassaye
gantvāna bhikkhusaṅghena bhattaggaṇakaraṇā
bhattasālaṃ sūpacāraṃ Mahāpāḷikanāmakāṃ
sabbūpakaraṇūpetāṃ sampanna-paricārikāṃ* ”.

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S MAHĀVĀMSA TRANSLATION

These two verses are rendered as follows : “ for the accepting of food by the brotherhood of bhikkhus when they were visiting the dwelling of bhikkhunīs (called) Hatthāḷhaka (vihāra), the refectory called Mahāpāli, easy of approach, beautiful, stored with all provisions and provided with service ”.

By the words “ when they were visiting the dwelling of bhikkhunīs ” one will understand that monks received alms in Mahāpāli only when they were visiting that nunnery. It was not so. Mahāpāli was the place where many thousands of monks and nuns received alms daily. Geiger has rendered the word *osarivā* as “ visiting ”. *Osarivā* means “ having gathered together ”. Then the translation should be : (“ He built also) the refectory named Mahāpāli, having enough space around, stored with all provisions and provided with service, for the acceptance of food by the brotherhood after they have gathered together at the Hatthāḷhaka nunnery ”.

He has translated the word *sūpacāraṃ* as “ easy of approach ”. *Upacāra* is space around a building. “ Easy of approach ” must be rendered into Pāli as “ *gamanāgamanasampannaṃ* ”.

Ch. XX, 26.—In a note on “ Tissamahāvihāra ” Geiger states it is “ in South Ceylon, situated N.E. of Hambantota ”. It is true that there is a vihāra by that name in South Ceylon ; but Tissamahāvihāra of Rohaṇa was built by King Kākavaṇṇatissa, (see XXII, 23). Devānampiyatissa’s actions are related here ; therefore the author is speaking of a vihāra erected by him in Anurādhapura itself. Its establishment is stated in XV. 174. There it is named as Tissārāma, which was the first monastery built in Anurādhapura. Tissamahāvihāra of Rohaṇa did not exist at the time of Devānampiyatissa.

Ch. XX, 35, 36.—“ He caused the dead body of the therā to be laid forth-with in a golden chest sprinkled with fragrant oil, and the well closed chest to be laid upon a golden, adorned bier ; and when he had caused it then to be lifted upon the bier, commanding solemn ceremonies, he caused it to be escorted . . . ” is the translation of stanzas 35 and 36. I can understand the first portion of the sentence up to “ adorned bier ”; and the next clause “ when he had caused it then to be lifted upon the bier ” seems to be meaningless. What was lifted upon the bier is not clear. This confusion has arisen through a misreading in the text. The Sinhalese edition has “ *kūṭāgāraṃ gāhayitvā* ” instead of “ *kūṭāgāre ropayitvā* ” in Geiger’s edition. According to the first reading Geiger’s second clause must stand as “ when he had caused it (the bier) to be lifted ”.

Ch. XXII, 43.—“ While making a pillow for her head of a honeycomb one usabha long and resting on her left side in her beautiful bed ” is the translation given for :

“ *usabhamattāṃ madhugaṇḍāṃ katvā ussīsake sayāṃ
vāmetarena passena niṣannā sayane subhe* ”.

It is not possible for her to make a pillow of such a thing while she was lying on her bed. One usabha = 140 cubits. One is not able to put such a thing upon a bed. Here *ussīsake* means "at the side of the head". If it is to mean "a pillow" accusative (*ussīsakam*) must be used.

Geiger has taken *vāmantarena* for *vāmetarena* and has translated as "left side". The left side is *vāma-passa*, and not *vāmantara-passa*; he has not explained what was meant by *antara* though he had taken this reading to be correct. *Vāmetara-passa* is the right side. *Vāma + itara = vāmetara* is opposite to the left.

XXII, 46.—In "lotus-blossoms brought from lotus-marshes of Anurādhapura", he has again mistranslated *uppala* as lotuses.

XXII, 67.—"They shall wear the robe in such wise that the alms-bowl shall be uppermost" is the translation of "*Sabbe te uddhapattāṇi ca cīvaraṃ pāruṇantu ca*". The explanation of the *Vāṃsat'happakāsini* is "*āyataṇṇaṃ uddhamukhaṃ eva katvā pāruṇantu cā ti vuttaṃ hoti*". In this comment *āyataṇṇaṃ* (or *paṭṭaṇṇaṃ*) refers to the fringe of a robe, and not to a bowl. A certain way of wearing the robe is meant by this, which I myself am not able to explain as the robe now existing is somewhat different from that of ancient times.

XXII, 68.—"They shall lay aside the prescribed waterpot together with the umbrella (made of) one (piece)" is the translation given for "*Ekacchatayutaṃ dhammakarakaṃ nīharantu*"; and, giving a description of these things in a note he states: "The waterpot and the umbrella are two principal articles used by monks when going out. *Ekacchatta* or 'single umbrella' is an umbrella made of leaf, having its own handle. According to *Silānanda* *ekacchatayutaṃ* must be taken as 'provided with one handle' as an adjective belonging to *dhammakarakaṃ*. In this case the neck of the waterpot would be compared to a *chatta* on the top of a building".

In verse 88 of Ch. XV he has translated *dhammakaraka* as a 'drinking vessel'. This is neither a waterpot nor a drinking vessel, but a water-strainer. In Sinhalese it is called *dabarāva*, but it is not now used or seldom used here. It has the shape of an overturned wine-glass; a piece of cloth is fastened to the mouth of it. The handle is hollowed throughout in order to let the air in; being dipped into water the cup strains water into it. Then the person holding it shuts the hollow in the handle with his thumb and raises it from the water. If he wants to pour the water into another vessel he removes his thumb from the hole, and water flows down through the face of the cup.

Ekacchatta never can have the meaning "provided with one handle". An umbrella is not meant here by *chatta*, but the flattened top of the strainer, which has the shape of an umbrella. *Ekacchattayutaṃ* means: "provided with not more than one ring on the handle".

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S MAHĀVĀMSA TRANSLATION

XXII, 75.—*Sovāṇṇasaraka* is rendered as “ a golden spoon ”. *Saraka* is not a spoon but a plate for eating. In a different reading we have the word *tattaka*, which means ‘ a tray ’.

Ch. XXIII, 6.—“ They were used to bind the boy fast with a rope slung about his body, to a great mill-stone ” is the rendering given for *ābajjha nandiyā katyaṃ nisadamhi abandhisum*. *Nisada* is not a mill-stone, but a ‘ grind-stone ’ used in Ceylon for the purpose of grinding chillies, etc. .

XXIII, 30.—*Uppala* is rendered as ‘ lotus ’.

XXIII, 38.—“ The latter commanded that food from his own stores be given him ” is the rendering of *attano parihārena bhattam tassa adāpayi*. I do not understand how he could render *attano parihārena* as “ from his own stores ”. It means “ with the service equal to that of himself ”.

XXIV, 8.—Mahānuggala-cetiya is mentioned among the establishments of Duṭṭhagāmiṇī. The Extended *Mahāvamsa* has the reading *Mahāmaṅgala-cetiya*, Geiger himself has it in a foot-note. *Mahāmaṅgala* may be the right reading, which is the name of the shrine at Seruwila, Eastern Province.

XXIV, 35.—“ Leaping with the mare over the elephant he shot his dart over his brother, so that he wounded only the skin on the back (of the elephant) ” is the translation of :—

*Valavam laṅhayitvāna hatthinam bhātikopari
tomaram khipi cammam va yathā chijjati pitthiyam.*

According to the *Saddharmālaṅkāraya* the dart was thrown on the back of his brother and not that of the elephant. “ අන තිබ්බ කඩුපිටින් මලනුවන් පිට ලු සන්නාභය පිට ගැසුන ” is the passage there.

XXIV, 43.—“ Covered him over with a garment ” should be “ covered him with a yellow robe ”. *Cīvaram* is the word given in the text.

XXIV, 54.—“ The king said to the thera : It is known to you that we are now also your servants ” is the rendering of : *Rājā'ha theram : nāto vo dāsabhāvo idāni no*”. This rendering is not correct. The king wanted to blame the Elder because he was silent when they were fighting each other. Therefore the king asked the Elder “ Is it now that you understand the fact that we are your servants ? ” Further he said “ If you had but sent a *sāmaṇera* of seven years, our strife would have ended without any loss to our men ”.

XXIV, 56.—*Hessa'āgatakiccam vo, yāgādīm gaṇhathā ti so* is rendered as “ You will (first) have (to do) what is due to (guests) arriving. Take the rice-milk and the rest ”. There is no sense in the first part of this rendering. Guests are not bound with duties but the host. Geiger has completely misunderstood the passage. *Hessti āgatakiccam vo* is to be translated as “ your

mission will be successful". "Now kindly receive my hospitality" is the rendering of the remaining portion.

XXV, 55-56.—*Balakotthaka* is not a difficult word to translate, but Geiger has mistranslated this as "bodies of troops". A 'fortress' is meant by this, and not a division of troops.

"In these the king placed parasol-bearers and figures of a king; the monarch himself took his place in the innermost body of troops" is the translation given for the 56th verse which runs as follows:

*Rājacchattadhare tattha thapesi rājarūpake ;
abbhantare kotthake tu sayam atthāsi bhūpati.*

There is nothing difficult here; but Geiger has totally misunderstood the passage. He has taken *rājacchattadhare* and *rājarūpake* separately. The first word is an attribute to the other; so it should be translated as "figures of a king bearing a parasol". What meant by this passage is: the king ordered to construct thirty-two fortresses in a circular form and to place figures shaded by royal umbrellas in thirty-one of them; he himself took his stand under his parasol in the innermost fortress.

Geiger's "body of troops" occurs in 60th and 61st verses, which must be taken as 'fortresses'. "When the mighty (warrior) had in this manner scattered also other bodies of troops, he charged at the body of troops with which king Gāmaṇi stood", is the translation of the 61st verse. This must be rendered as: "When the mighty warrior had in this manner destroyed also other fortresses he came to the fortress in which king Gāmaṇi stood".

XXV, 66.—"The water in the tank there was dyed red with the blood of the slain, therefore it was known by the name Kulantavāpi" is the translation of the verse 66. In a note on this he has stated: "I would now like to adopt the form of this name as given in the Burmese MSS., as it gives good sense: 'End of the tribe'. The *Vamsatthappakāsini* has Kulatthavāpi. This, however, is no guarantee for the reading of the MSS." The Sinhalese edition has *Kulatthavāpi* which should be rendered into Sinhalese as *Kolluveva*. The water in which *kollu* (= *dolichos biflorus*) is boiled becomes dark-red and resembles the water mixed with blood. The tank has received its name on this account and not because of the reason that Geiger gives. He himself has corrected this in his latest edition brought out in 1934.

XXV, 102.—"Magnificent with nymphs in the guise of dancing girls" is the translation given for "*nāṭakajanayogena accharāhi*"va bhūsite". By this rendering he has given the sense that nymphs were dancing (in the palace of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi), which is impossible. What is meant by the author is "magnificent with dancing girls who appeared like nymphs".

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S MAHĀVAMSA TRANSLATION

XXV, 105.—“ Making known that they were come thither through the air they mounted to the terrace of the palace ” is the translation of “ *niveditabbhāgamanā pāsādatalam āruhuṃ* ”. He has taken *abbhāgamana* as “ coming through the air ”. There is possibility of giving this meaning. But this information, if it was given by them, causes a breach of an important regulation of Vinaya. A bhikkhu is prohibited to say to laymen that he possesses supernatural powers. Geiger has misunderstood the construction of this word. It is not *abbha + āgamana*, but *abhi + āgamana* = arrival. *Niveditabbhāgamanā* is to be translated as : “ having informed their arrival ”.

XXVI, 8.—*Upāyanasatāni* is translated as “ hundreds of offerings ”. *Upāyana* is not an offering, but ‘ a present ’.

XXVI, 12.—“ King’s soldiers came together and brought offerings of perfumes and flowers ” is the rendering of “ *gandhamālāhi pūjesuṃ rājasenā samāgatā* ”. I would render this as : “ the king’s soldiers came thither and honoured it with perfumes and flowers ”.

XXVII, 16.—*Sahassa-saṅkha-samsuttī* is rendered as “ with a thousand she’l-garlands ”. I would translate this as “ with many thousands of chank-marks (made of stucco) on walls ”, as I have seen in some buildings in India.

XXVII, 29.—“ And since he heard of Vessavana’s chariot which served as a car for the women, he had a gem-pavilion set up in the middle (of the palace) fashioned in like manner ”, is the rendering of :

*Nārivāhanayānan tu sutvā Vessavaṇassa so
tadākāraṃ akāresi majjhe ratanaman’apaṇi* ”.

Here the phrase “ Vessavana’s chariot which served as a car for the women ” is certainly misleading its readers. *Nārivāhana* is the name of his chariot, as *Vejayanta* is the name of Indra’s chariot. It is not a “ car for women ”, but it is a vehicle in the shape of a woman.

XXVIII, 19.—*Uppala-kuruwindehi missakāni* is rendered as “ mingled with sapphires and rubies ”. *Uppala* is never used to indicate sapphire. *Kuruwinda* is not ruby but a kind of brown quartz. On p. 191 of Geiger’s translation *kuruwinda* is rendered as ‘ cinnabar ’, which is a kind of vermilion. I think that neither of these things are meant here. In Ceylon පිඹිනමි and පුනකනමි are found mixed with gems, and I believe that those villagers brought those gems together with quartz and jades to the king.

XXVIII, 26.—“ he cut away the rind around the stalk with his knife and tore out the bottom of the fruit ” is the rendering of *vāsiyā vaṅṭasūmantā tacam chetvā aṇṭasayam muñcivā*. If he had done so the juice would have flowed down at once. By the next sentence : “ pouring the juice which filled the hollow forth into their bowls he offered the four bowls filled with fruit

juice", it is evident that was not so. According to Geiger's translation both ends of the fruit were cut open; then there would be no hollow to be filled with juice. This confusion has arisen as he was not familiar with the way of opening a ripe jak-fruit of the soft kind (වැලඳෙහිය). One can draw up the වැලඳ together with the stalk when one has cut the rind around the stalk. Then there remains a hollow, in the middle of the fruit, which may be filled with its own juice oozing from its sides.

XXVIII, 37—"six waggon loads" stands for *saṭṭhi sakatā*, which is evidently a misprint. The Sinhalese edition has *saddhiṃ samuddā* instead of the above reading.

XXVIII, 40.—*Nisadaṇḍa* is rendered as "a small mill-stone". *Nisadaṇḍa* is the upper roller of a grind-stone, which is called *galdaruwā* in Sinhalese.

XXIX, 20.—*Nahāpīte nhāpake ca kaṇṇapake ca* is rendered as "barbers and servants for the bath and for cutting the hair". Barbers are those who cut hair; *kaṇṇapakas* are not hair-cutters but hair-dressers.

XXIX, 27.—"A thousand and eight waggon-loads of clothes rolled in bundles did the king place in the midst" is the translation of : *aṭṭhuttarasahassāṃ so sātakāni thapāpayi puṭabaddhāni*. There is nothing to indicate "waggon-loads" in this sentence.

XXX, 7.—*Paṃsūnaṃ sakatāṃ* is rendered as "one waggon-load of sand". *Paṃsu* is not sand but soil. Same rendering appears in the 9th verse.

XXX, 20.—*Rājakammikā* is rendered as 'work-people'. They were not work-people but officers appointed by the king.

XXX, 23.—*Kutūhalaṃ* is rendered as 'dispute'. This word is never used in this sense. *Kutūhala* is curiosity, but here it should be taken as 'commotion'.

XXX, 25.—"I can only know (just so much) whether he be a bhikkhu from another land or of this country, Sire", is the rendering of : *ayam āgantuko bhikkhu ayam nevāsiko iti jānāmi deva*. *Nevāsika* here is an inhabitant of the town; *āgantuka* is an outsider. There is no question of this land or another country.

XXX, 82.—*Devorohaṇa-pāṭihīra* is rendered as "the miracle of the descent of the gods". This is not a descent of gods but "descent from gods", i.e. from the Tāvatiṃsa heaven.

XXX, 93.—"Above their heads were pitchers five cubits high, filled with fragrant oil, with wicks made of dukūla fibres continually alight" is the translation of :

*Tesaṃ sīse pañcahatthā gandhatelassa pūritā
dukūlavattikāpanti sadā pajjalitā ahu.*

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S MAHĀVAṂSA TRANSLATION

It is not clear how one can put wicks in so big a pitcher and light them. *Pañcahatthā* here does not mean ' five cubits high ' but ' having five branches (to hold wicks) '. They were not pitchers but bowls having five receptacles for wicks.

XXXI, 86.—*Dhātūnaṃ purato* is rendered as " on the east side of the relics ". *Purato* is not ' on the east side ' but ' in front of '. *Pañcasu thānesu* is rendered as " in the five regions ", and in a note on this he states : " By this is meant east, west, south and north, and north-east ". *Pañcasu thānesu* simply means " in five places ". If those directions are meant there is a repetition of ' east '.

XXXII, 5.—Geiger is doubtful about *kharaṭṭa*, and states " Skt. Kharaṭṭa is a name of different plants ". This is a rare word, which I render as ' tin '.

XXXII, 41.—" For the uposatha-festivals I have had oil for the lamps distributed one day in every month in eight vihāras on the island of Laṅkā " is the translation of :

*Uposathesu divasesu māse māse ca atṭhasu
Laṅkādīpe vihāresu dīṭṭelam adāpayiṃ.*

Geiger has taken *atṭhasu* to be an attribute to *vihāresu*, but he has not pointed out what were these eight vihāras. *Atṭhasu* is not connected with *vihāresu* but with *divasesu* : Then the translation should be : " I have distributed oil for lamps to every vihāra of Ceylon on the eight uposatha-days in every month ".

XXXII, 40.—In a note on jāla-cakes Geiger says " what jālapūva is I do not know ". In Sinhalese we call it *āssada*.

XXXIII, 25, 26.—" Moreover, he had a mantling made of stone for the Khandhakathūpa. When he had spent a hundred thousand for the Cetiya-vihāra he commanded that at the (consecration) festival of the vihāra called Girikumbhīla the six garments be distributed to sixty thousand bhikkhus ", is the translation of the two stanzas :

*Kaṅcukaṃ Kanthake thūpe kārapesi silāmayam
datvāna sataśassam vihāre Cetiya-vhaye.
Girikumbhīlanāmassa vihārassa mahamhi so
satthibhikkhusahassānaṃ ticivaram adāpayi.*

There is no connection between these two verses, though Geiger has taken them so. The first one is to be translated as : Moreover, having given a hundred thousand he had a mantling made of stone for the Kanthaka (= Kaṅṭaka) —cetiya in Cetiya-vihāra, (i.e. Mihintale).

The second one should be translated as : He commanded that at the consecration of the vihāra called Girikumbhīla the three kinds of robes be distributed to sixty thousand bhikkhus.

XXXIII, 33.—Name of the commander of troops is given as *Kammahārattaka* ; the Sinhalese edition and the Extended *Mahāvamsa* have the reading *Tam Mahārattako* where *tam* is a pronoun referring to *Mahīpatiṃ*. The Sinhalese translation has මහරත්නක නම් සෙනෙවිනෙමේ බලවතාගරාජ නම් වූ ඒ මිහිපලේනු නුවරදීම ගත්තේය. *Mahārattaka* is preferable.

XXXIII, 37.—*Rohaṇe Nakulanagare eko brāhmaṇacetako*
Tīyo nāma brāhmaṇassa vaco sutvā aḥaṇḍito

is translated as : “ a young brahman named Tissa, in Rohaṇa, in the city (that was the seat) of his clan, hearkened, fool that he was, to the prophesying of a brahman ”. Geiger’s text has *kulanagare* for *Nakulanagare*, and *Tisso* for *Tīyo* ; and he states in a note : “ I read *kulanagare* and understand by this *Mahāgāma* the town from which the dynasty of *Duṭṭhagāmaṇi* came ”. I have never found this word in this sense. The Extended *Mahāvamsa* and the Sinhalese edition have *Nakulanagare*, and we still have “ *Nākulugamuva* ” in that district. *Nākulugamuva* may be the village presented to the householder *Nakula* whose story is given in the *Rasavāhinī* and *Saddharmālan-kāraya*.

The word *Nakulanagarakaṇṇikā* appears in the 77th verse of Ch. XXIII ; there also Geiger has removed *ra* from that word although five of his MSS. have accepted the word *nagara*. It is fortunate that he could not remove *na* from that word. This word refers to the same locality in the South, which was the birth place of the warrior giant *Khañjadeva*. The Pali text *Rasavāhinī*, which quotes from *Mahāvamsa*, also has the reading *Nakulanagara*. (See. II, 99. *Rasavāhinī*, Sinhalese edition, B.E. 2439).

XXXIII, 44.—“ The great black lion is fleeing ”, is the rendering given for *paḷāyati mahākāḷasīhalo*, and he says this “ is a play on the word *siha* ‘ lion ’ and the name *sihala* ”. There is no harm if we translate this as “ the fat, black Sinhalese is fleeing ”.

XXXIII, 62, 63.—“ When one day, in Malaya, *Anulādevī* went to seek her (daily) portion the wife of *Tanasīva* struck against her basket with her foot ” is the translation of :

“ *Galāya tu nivāpatham Malaye’nuladeviyā*
bhariyā Tanasīvassa pādā pahari pacchiyam ”.

The translation is right according to the standing text. But in my opinion the text here is corrupt or some lines are missing. The words *nivāpa* (= food) and *pacchi* (= basket) suggest that they were gone for collecting some herbs etc. But it is impossible to think that an ex-queen and a wife of a headman

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S MAHĀVAMŚA TRANSLATION

of a province had gone for such a work. The commentary and the MSS. do not help to correct the text. In my opinion the word *nivāpa* stands in the place of *nivāsa*. Then the meaning of the passage should be : “ of the queen Anulā who had gone to live in Malaya ”. I suggest to do so on account of the narrative disconnected with the 53rd verse of the same chapter, which is as follows :

“ *Tassa so Tanasīvassa ratthikassantike tahiṃ
rājā cuddasavassāni vasi tena upatthito* ”.

It is natural to begin the narrative again with 62nd verse stating “ of the queen Anulā who had gone to live in Malaya ”.

In his edition brought out in 1934 Geiger has mentioned this correction and has said “ But I believe that *nivāpattham* is necessary to explain why the queen wore a basket (*pacchi* in *d*)”. My answer to this is : it is not *pacchi* but *kucchi* (= belly).

XXXIV, 31.—*Gharassa tassa purato* is rendered as “ to the east of this building ”. This should be “ in front of this building ”.

XXXIV, 34.—*Mahāvattu* is rendered as ‘ palace ’. This word occurs only in this text and seems to indicate “ palace grounds ”.

XXXIV, 51.—*Pottharūpehi* is rendered as “ figures modelled with clay ”. Clay figures only are not called *pottharūpa* ; it means plaster work. P.T.S. Dictionary explains it as ‘ modelled figure ’.

XXXIV, 62.—*Niyataṃ chandadānaṃ* is rendered as : “ And he gave alms at the preaching ”, and states (in a note) this is very doubtful. Certainly *chandadānaṃ* cannot have this meaning. The various readings in the Geiger’s text do not give any help to correct the passage. But a MS. obtained by me from the Ambarukkhārāma, Welitara, has the reading *niyatañjanadānam*, which means “ a continual gift of collyrium ”.

XXXIV, 69, 70.—“ He had *kiñcikkha*-stones laid as plaster on (the square of) the Great Thūpa and he turned the sand-pathway round (the thūpa) into a wide court ” is the translation of :

*Mahāthūpamhi kiñcikkha-pāsāṇe attharāpayi,
vālikamariyadañ ca kāresi vitthataṅganam*.

In a note Geiger refers to Sanskrit *kiñjalka* and to Childer’s statement “ *Kiñjakkhapāsāṇo* appears to be some sort of marble or other ornamental stone ”. Both have not understood the right meaning. *Kiñjakkha* is the correct word though Geiger has preferred *kiñcikkha* instead of it. *Kiñjakkha-pāsāṇa* is not a kind of stone but the stone slabs laid around a shrine in the shape of the stamens of a lotus. Think of a shrine which stands in the middle of a square platform and the pavement slabs spreading all around like the stamens of a lotus. It is simply these slabs that are meant by this word.

XXXIV, 71.—“ Since the building was not firm he lay down in that place, bethinking him of the merit of the Sage, risking his own life ” is the translation given for :

*Caye atitthamānamhi saritvā munino gunān
cajivāna sakam pānam nipajjittha sayam tahim.*

Here *caye atitthamānamhi* means “ when the foundation (of the shrine) was falling down again and again ”. *Caya* = masonry.

XXXV, 2.—*Chattāticchattam kāresi mahāthūpe manorame* is rendered as “ On the splendid Great Thūpa he caused to be made a parasol above the parasol ”. This is right, but his note “ i.e. he heightened the cone crowning the thūpa at the top ” is misleading. In former times there was no cone on the top of it, which is a later devise. See Ch. III of Paranavitana’s *The Stūpa in Ceylon*.

XXXV, 11.—“ And he commanded these evildoers to be flung into the caves called Kaṇira ” is the rendering of “ *ṭakkhipāpesi Kaṇiravhe pabbhāramhi asilake* ”. *Pabbhāra* is not a cave but a precipice or a slope.

XXXV, 62, 63, 64.—Geiger says “ Betel is chewed with powdered chalk ”. Surely it is not powdered chalk but lime prepared for that purpose ; sometimes it is called *chunnam*.

XXXV, 88, 91.—*Thūpaḡharam* is rendered as “ thūpa-temple ”. What was this temple is not clear. *Thūpaḡhara* is a building with a roof over a shrine.

XXXVI, 30.—*Pañcāvāse paṭikammaṃ akārayi* is rendered as “ he restored five buildings ”. *Pañcāvāsa* does not here mean five buildings but the five great monasteries in and about Anurādhapura.

XXXVI, 38.—On *Ariyavaṃsa* Geiger has annotated : “ Lit. ‘ book of holy ones ’, probably the life-histories of men eminent in the Buddhist Church, which were read aloud publicly for the edification of the people ”. This is not so ; there is a sutta on mahā-ariyavaṃsa, which explains how a monk should live a content life. In this connection Dr. E. W. Adikaram has said “ When the Dīghabhāṇaka thera Abhaya preached the Mahā-ariyavaṃsapāṭi-padā, the Papañcasūdanī tells us, the whole of Mahāgāma came to hear him ”. (*Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, p. 117.)

XXXVI, 67.—*Vajiracumbata* is rendered as “ a precious ring of crystal ”. *Vajira* is not crystal but diamond.

XXXVI, 77.—*Devo pāvassi tāvade* is rendered as “ the god poured down rain forthwith ”. *Devo* here does not mean a god but rain itself. “ Meghavalāhako devo pajjunno’mbudharo ”, etc. are synonyms of rain ; therefore it should be translated as “ it rained forthwith ”.

XXXVI, 81.—*Aggīhi uttāsetvāna* is rendered as “by the burning”.
Uttāsana is not burning but scorching.

XXXVII, 36, 37.—

Samugghātam karimhā ti pare bhikkhū amaññisum.

Tato sīmāsamugghāte vyāpāre parinitthite

Mahāvihāram vāsesum idh'āgantvāna bhikkhavo.

These lines are translated as: “The other bhikkhus thought: ‘We will begin to shift (the boundaries)’. Then, when this attempt to shift the boundary was given up, the bhikkhus came back hither and dwelt again in the Mahāvihāra”. It is very strange that he has taken *karimha* to be in the Future. What is said here is: the monks of the opposite party thought (after several attempts) that they have cancelled the sīmā-boundary of the Mahāvihāra when actually it was not so. When they have given up the attempt to cancel the sīmā the monks who had fled away came back and took their residence there.

One cannot shift a sīmā as one does with an ordinary boundary. *Sīmā-samugghāta* is done by reciting kammavācā by a chapter of monks who are within the same sīmā. There is nothing like shifting of boundary posts etc. What they do is cancelling of former kammavācā by which that sīmā was established. If there is some other monk within this boundary, who is not in the union of the reciters, the work of establishing or cancelling of a sīmā becomes ineffective. This is what has happened in this case.

A. P. BUDDHADATTA