

Some Corrections of Geiger's Cūlavamsa Translation

C H. XXXVII, 95. *Rājavatthumhi* is translated as "royal territory". It should be "palace precincts".

126. *Rājā'ha jāto sūlo'yaṃ kadā'hāresi kīdisaṃ?* is rendered as "At what meal did this pain arise and of what kind is it?" He has taken it to be a single question, and for *āhāresi* he has the reading *āhāre ti*, and *kīdiso* for *kīdisaṃ*. Here there are two questions, viz.: When did this pain arise? What kind of food has been taken by you?

141. *Vātābādhenā eko pi bhikkhu vuttāpito ahu,*
gopāṇasigate tamhi dukkhā mocesi buddhimā

is translated as: "A bhikkhu was disturbed in his exercises by the writhing disease, as he had become (bent) like a roof-tree the wise (King) freed him from his ailment". Here the translator had taken the monk to be in his meditation, and in a note he has explained "The verb *vuttā* is the term for awaking from the state of absorption in meditation (*samādhi*)". It is not used in this sense only, *vuttāti* or *vuttāhi* is a verb very frequently used in the sense of 'to rise from a seat' or 'to arise'. *Āsanā vuttāsi* = he rose from his seat; *gāmo vuttāsi* = the village was disturbed. There is nothing in the text to allude to the *samādhi*. Therefore its translation should be: "a monk was disturbed by a windy disease; as he had become bent like a gable the wise King freed him from his ailment".

150. "Of his great pity he had a pocket for his knife made in the inside of his mantle", is the rendering of *Sāṭakantarato katvā satthavaṭṭiṃ mahādayo*. *Satthavaṭṭi* is not a "pocket for his knife" but "a bundle of surgical instruments". *Sāṭakantarato katvā* does not mean "made in the inside of his mantle" but "having kept (the bundle) in his waist-cloth".

181. "In the Mahāpāli Hall he had the remains of the royal table distributed" is the rendering given for *Mahāpālimhi dāpesi rājā rājānubhojanaṃ*. No one will do this in a Buddhist country; distribution of remnants of a table to the community of monks is considered to be a grave sacrilege. What is meant here is that the king ordered the distribution of choice food, similar to that provided at the royal table.

187. *Sayane sannisinnako* is rendered as "lying on his bed". *Sannisinnako* is not 'lying' but 'sitting'.

192. *Bimbaṃ sambuddhadhātuno* is rendered as "an image (wholly of gold) of the departed Buddha". And in a note on this he states: "As Buddha himself has entered Nirvāṇa, an image of his outward appearance as

he was in life can only be a 'relic' of him". We, Buddhists, do not know of such a usage of *dhātu*. Here *Sambuddhadhātuno bimbaṃ* means: "an image of the Buddha having a bodily relic enshrined in it".

200. *Saṅkhaṃ sodakam ādāya carat'āsana-dhovane* is rendered as: "was wont . . . to use for the cleaning of a seat a shell filled with water". What was this seat is not clear. *Āsanadhovana* is cleansing of the altars used for offering flowers.

202. *Pāṭihāriyapakkha* is rendered as "extraordinary festivals", and he has quoted the explanation given in the *P.T.S. Dictionary*, in a note. The Dictionary explains it as "an extra holiday, an ancient festival, not now kept". Both of these authorities have not given the real explanation. The Aṅguttara Commentary on the Tikanipāṭa states: "*Ettha pāṭihāriyapakkho nāma antovasse temāsam nibaddha-uposatho; tam na sakkontassa dvinnam pavāraṇānam antare ekamāsam nibaddhuposatho; tam pi asakkontassa paṭhama-pavāraṇato paṭṭhāya eko addhamāso pāṭihāriya-pakkho yeva nāma*" (= Here *pāṭihāriyapakkha* means the constant observance of eight precepts within the three months of the rainy season; one who is not able to do so may observe the same for a month beginning from the day of first Pavāraṇā and ending with the second Pavāraṇā; being not able even to do that, one may observe sīlas for the two weeks beginning from the day of first Pavāraṇā; this is called *Pāṭihāriyapakkha*). This is not now observed in Ceylon, but I have seen some persons observing it in Burma.

204. Geiger takes *kalanda* to be a bird. There is such a rendering of this word in the Chinese versions. In support of his rendering Geiger quotes: "*naṅguṭṭham paṃphoḷetvā*" from Milindapañha. It does not support his argument but stands against it. The squirrel (as we translate it), has a *naṅguṭṭha* = tail, but the tail of a bird is not called *naṅguṭṭha* but *piccha* or *piñja* in Pali.

205. *Lohakumbhi* is rendered as "a copper barrel". This is not a barrel but a cauldron. 206. "But after sunrise, full of wrath, he had the corpse burnt as if it had been the criminal" does not agree with the king's former action which is given in the same verse: "He then gave the criminal money and let him escape by night". Why such a kind person should have become wrathful next morning is a point to be raised. He was not actually 'full of wrath', but he appeared to be so.

209. *Tam atthānamhi mārayi* is rendered as "murdered him in a lonely spot". *Atthāna* never can have the meaning "a lonely spot". It must be translated as "unlawfully" or "without reason".

217. *Pātañjalīmatam parivattesi* is rendered as "elucidated the ideas of Pātañjali". There was no elucidation but recitation.

224. *Ghoso hi Buddho viya mahitale* is rendered as: "for his speech (resounded) through the earth like (that of the) Buddha". This is an im-

possibility. In my opinion this saying refers to the 242nd verse in this same chapter, the translation of which is: "Then the community satisfied and exceedingly well pleased, cried again and again: "without doubt this is Metteyya". According to this *Buddho viya mahitale* is to be rendered as: "as if he were the Buddha descended again to the human world".

228-9. Geiger has taken *Sīha laṭṭhakathā suddhā* to be a separate sentence and has translated: "The commentary in the Sīhala tongue is faultless" and so on. I prefer to translate these two verses together as follows: "There is a faultless commentary in Ceylon, compiled in Sinhalese, by the wise Mahinda who has tested the word of the Buddha and the preachings of the Ven. Sāriputta (and other Great Elders) laiḍ before the three councils".

243. *Dūrasaṅkare* is rendered as: "far from all unquiet intercourse". In my opinion this is the name of that *Vihāra*.

245. *Theriyācariyū sabbe pāḷim viya tam aggahum* is rendered as "all the teachers of the Theravāda accepted it as the original text". Buddhaghosa did not compile original texts but the translations of the Sinhalese commentaries. What is meant by these lines is that they accepted his commentaries as genuine just as they accepted the original texts.

*Ch. XXXVIII, 9. Katvā padakkhiṇam gantvā pācīnadvārato bahi paḥame cetiyatṭhāne ṭhātum nāgam samaḥpayi*¹ is translated as: ("The king mounted it), rode round the town with his right side towards it, and when he reached the eastern gate by the Paṭhamacetiya, he restored it to the Relic Temple". *Padakkhiṇam katvā* simply means "having gone round or circumambulated". *Pācīnadvārato bahi gantvā* means "having gone out of the eastern gate". *Paḥame cetiyatṭhāne ṭhātum nāgam samaḥpayi* means "he ordered the elephant to stay near the Paṭhamaka-shrine". There is no word to refer to "the Relic Temple".

19. Note 6. "We have to imagine that Dhātusena was sunk in meditation which even the inconsiderate conduct of the penitent could not disturb". Inconsiderate conduct of the monk was to throw some sweepings at Dhātusena's head; and the text states: "but he failed to disturb his spirit". There is no allusion whatever to meditation. If it was done when he was absorbed in meditation it cannot be considered as an action to test his patience.

27. *Laddhū khīrodanam bhutvā sesam pattenā tass'adā* is translated as: "he got milk broth (as alms); he ate thereof and put what was over into the alms-bowl of his nephew". This is not correct. *Sesam pattenā tass'adā* means: he gave the remainder together with his own bowl to his nephew. If it was given to him after putting the rice into Dhātusena's own bowl he would not have poured the rice on the ground for eating. Geiger himself has said: "The latter out of reverence for the Thera poured the rice on the ground".

1. Geiger has the wrong reading *kātum nagaram appayi* instead of this. Another MS. has the reading *kātum nagarānam appayi* which is better than that of Geiger.

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

If he poured it out of his own bowl it was not reverence but disrespect towards the Thera.

Here Geiger has made another mistake : he says that the novice simply poured the rice on the ground and does not explain why. The text is “*Cittī-kārena theramhi bhattam pakkhippa bhūmiyam bhūñji*”; he has altogether ignored the word *bhūñji* and the absolutive *pakkhippa*.

38. *Kulīnā kulagāmaṃ* is rendered as : “ those who belonging to noble clans or to kinship villages ”. This is not so. *Kulīnā kulagāmaṃ* or *kulagāmakā* means “ the nobles who were in possession of the villages received as *nindagam* ”.

39. *Tesaṃ gāme gahetvāna gāmesv'ākāsi rakkhake* is rendered as “ he deprived them of their villages and left their villages defenceless ”. Here “ left their villages defenceless ” is not correct. What he did is : he took off their *nindagam*-villages and made them keepers or guards of the same villages. Geiger's text has the incorrect reading *gāme kās-y-arakkhake*. *Rohanāgama* in the same verse is rendered as “ who had come to Rohana ”, which should be “ who had come from Rohana ”.

41. *Sālibhattam* is rendered as “ rice-fare ”, which should be “ boiled rice of *sāli* ” which we call *el-hāl* in Sinhalese.

43. *Mahāvihāram katvāna pantiyuttam anākulam* is rendered as : “ After he has provided the peaceful Mahāvihāra with bands of ornaments ”. Wijesingha has translated this as “ he improved the Mahāvihāra by adding regular walks thereto ”. But Geiger says : “ I do not know how *panti* can be made to mean “ walk ”. Wijesingha's translation is nearer the truth than Geiger's. What is said here is that the king demolished some buildings which were not in a order and made all buildings so as to stand in rows. *Panti* is neither “ a band of ornament ” nor “ a walk ” but “ a row ”.

53. *Kumārasenass'apṭetvā pubbabhogam visodhayi*

Kālavāpimhi bhāgaddham khetānañ ca satadvayam

is translated as “ To Kumārasena (his brother) he made his former revenues and fixed them exactly : (namely) one half to the Kālavāpi and two hundred fields ”. I do not know what idea one could get out of this ; I would translate this as follows : He restored the former revenues to Kumārasena by giving him one half (of the revenues) obtained from Kālavāpi and two hundred fields.

57. *Yāva dvādasamaṃ vassaṃ bodhipūjam akārayum* is translated as “ have instituted in every twelfth year (of their reign) a festival for the Bodhi tree ”. *Yāva dvādamam vassaṃ* means “ up to the twelfth year ”. I cannot understand why he has confused this very clear phrase.

61. *Phātikamma* is rendered as “ enlargement ”. It is not enlargement but repair.

63. *Uṇṇaloma* is rendered as “ a tuft of down ”. Buddha’s *uṇṇaloma* is not a tuft but a single hair wound like a watch-spring.

98. *Māsodanaṃ maṃsaṃ sākunaṃ ca* is translated as : “ bean soup and chicken ”. Geiger seems to have the idea that *odana* means ‘ soup or broth ; ’ in this same chapter he has translated *khīrodanā* as “ milk broth ”. There is no difference between *bhatta* and *odana* ; both simply mean ‘ boiled rice ’. *Māsodanaṃ* means rice mixed with beans. *Sākunaṃ maṃsaṃ* means flesh of any kind of bird.

114. *Khiṇḍapēsi paṃsuṃ bhikkhussa matthake* is rendered as “ he had a clod of earth flung at the bhikkhu’s head ”. There is no such sense in the verse ; ‘ clod of earth ’ is *leḍḍu* in Pali ; *paṃsu* is earth. What has happened is when Dhātusena was digging Kāḷavāpi he saw a monk absorbed in meditation in the neighbourhood. As he could not rouse him from his *samādhi* he ordered the people to put earth that was dug from the tank upon him and bury him alive.

Ch. XXXIX, 22. Rājā sutvā gaheṭvā taṃ bhūñjissāmī ti nikkhami is rendered as : “ When the King heard of it he thought : I will seize and devour him ”. This is an inhuman act ; a Buddhist king would never say so. Geiger has misunderstood the passage. The real meaning here is : “ I will catch him first and then take my food ”.

Ch. XLI, 31-32.—

*Purattimā Theriyānaṃ vihārā Kuntanāmaso
ānetvā āsanaṃ tattha haḥḥesi Dumarājake,*

is translated as : “ Here beside the Monarch of trees he set up throne called Kunta which he had fetched away from the eastern vihāra of the adherents of the Thera school ”. Geiger was misled by the word *Kuntanāmaso* which he has separated into two words *kuntanāma* and *so*. *Kunta* is not the name of the throne (rather the altar) but of the vihāra. This must be corrected as : “ he brought a slab (used for an altar) from the eastern vihāra, named Kunta, which belonged to the Mahāvihāra fraternity, and kept it in the monastery called Dumarājaka² (at Abhayagiri).

44. *Kārāpessāmaḥaṃ p’ajja rajjan ti parikaḥḥiya* is translated as : “ I will see that he has a merry reign ”. Geiger has taken *p’ajja rajjan* as one word *majjarajjan*. In a note he has explained this word as : “ lit. I shall see that his reign is an intoxicating draught. That means either a reign the pleasure of which is as short as that of an intoxicating drink, or in scorn a reign that will make as merry as an intoxicating drink ”. This is the first time that I have come across such a word ; however, *majjarajjan* cannot have this meaning, according to its construction ; it must be *mattarajjan* if it is to give such a meaning. What prince Moggallāna has said is : “ I also will

2. Geiger has translated this as “ Monarch of trees ” i.e. a bo-tree. It may be a bo-tree as well as a monastery.

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

try to reign now". *Aham pi ajja rajjam kārāpessāmi* is the order of the words.

59. *Nivāpa* is rendered as "sweetmeats". *Nivāpa* is any kind of food. The word for sweetmeats is *khajjaka*.

60. Note 5. "Here *nisā* stands for *nissā metri causa* and the latter for *nissāya* as expressing a local relation". This is not so; one need not take such trouble to solve this. *Nisā* means night, and it stands for the loc. *nisāya* (= in the night).

75. "Now during a famine a certain man, skilled in magic spells, in order to get alms, was wont to beg food from everybody clad in the robe of a bhikkhu". Geiger's text has the word *sabbehi* instead of *saddhehi*, which he has translated as "from everybody". In a famine one will not get alms from everybody but from the "faithful or devoted persons". For this purpose the magician has adopted the garb of a monk.

77. *Kampamāno nigacchati* is rendered as: "he sat down trembling". *Nigacchati* never has the meaning "to sit down". Therefore it must be that "he came out trembling".

Ch. XLII, 29. *Etissā mariyādāya theram netum niyojayi* is translated as: "he decided to set up (the image of) the Thera (Mahinda) on its dike". *Netum* does not give the meaning "to set up" but "to carry". The king gave orders to carry the image of the Thera along the bund of that tank (during the annual procession of carrying his image).

Ch. XLIV, 114, 115.—

*Sandesam deviyā vatvā tāya pabbjja sāsane
samāpīte'bhidhammamhi saddhim atthakathāya hi
dhammāsanaṃ samoruyha nisīdiya mahītale
"ehi rañño matākāraṃ dasshēti niyojito"*.

"(The high dignitary . . .) gave the queen the message. Together with her he underwent in the Order of the ceremony of world renunciation and after he had mastered the Abhidhamma together with the commentary, he came down (once) from the teacher's chair, and seated himself on the ground. At the Queen's request: come and show me how the King died", is the translation of these two verses. Here is a confusion of the two persons, the Prime Minister and the Queen. According to Geiger the person who learnt Abhidhamma was the minister; but the text refers that action to the Queen herself. The full message to the queen from the king was:—

109. "*Pabbajitvā Mahādevi, sajjhāyitvā ca āgamaṃ
Abhidhammaṃ kathetvāna pattim dehīti rājino*".

"Forsake O Great Queen, the world, recite the sacred texts, learn the Abhidhamma and transfer the merit to the King". According to this message the Queen had to become a nun and to learn Abhidhamma, and not the minister.

Geiger says that the minister too became a monk, because he has taken the word *tāya* to mean "with her". In my opinion this must be taken to mean "by her". Then the translation should be altered as follows: "The Prime Minister . . . gave the queen the message; and when she had left the world and had finished learning the Abhidhamma together with its commentary, she descended from the pulpit and sat down on the ground; the minister being ordered by her to show how the king died, (he seated himself in front of her and cut his throat.)"³

This action, i.e. cutting of his own throat, shows that the minister did not become a monk. A monk is prohibited to commit suicide or to cut any of his limbs himself.

Here Geiger's note on *dhammāsana* is: "*Dhammāsana* is a raised seat in the centre of the assembly-hall of the bhikkhus on which the priest, who recites the sacred text, takes his place, his face turned towards the east. It differs from the *therāsana* on which the head of the Chapter has his seat, facing north". I have not seen such a custom anywhere in Ceylon or Burma. Pulpits are found in every monastery and they are used to preach the doctrine to the people from the neighbourhood. There are no regulations for setting them either towards the east or any other direction.

149. *Sabbāgamiyabhikkhuhi* is rendered as "by all the foreign bhikkhus". The word for 'foreign' in Pali is *videsīya* or *paradesīya*. For *āgamika* he has *āgāmika* which he has taken to mean 'foreign'; *āgāmika* means something coming in the future and not a stranger. Here *sabbāgamika*—bhikkhus are the monks who could recite various āgama (= nikāya) texts.

Ch. XLV, 3. Pāḷim sabbam sasaṅgaham likhāpayi is translated as: "he had the sacred text written down with a short summary". It is not 'with a short summary' but 'together with the other treatises on the dhamma'.

29-30. "In the Abhayuttara-vihāra he built the Kappūra-pariveṇa and he built the vihāra called Tiputthulla and added it to the same (vihāra). As he was about to do this, the bhikkhus of the Thera School wanted to prevent him, because the vihāra was situated within their boundary". In a note on this Geiger says: "The passage is surprising. As the Abhayuttara is without doubt the northern thūpa it is difficult to understand how a boundary dispute can arise between it and the Mahāvihāra, the seat of the Thera Bhikkhus".

There is no difficulty of solving this problem if the vihāra named Tiputthulla is taken to have been built outside the boundaries of Abhayagiri. In fact it was built somewhere within the boundary of the Theravādins; and when the king was ready to hand it to the monks of Kappūra-pariveṇa the monks of the Mahāvihāra protested against this. The mistake lies with his translation "added it to the same vihāra". The text has: *tass'eva dāpayi*.

3. I added this portion, within parenthesis, to complete the sentence, though it is not included in the above verses.

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

31. *Assaddham taṃ viditvāna* is rendered as "saw in him an unbeliever". *Assaddha* is not an unbeliever but 'an undevoted'. Also 33 has the same rendering.

72. *Rattacīvare* is rendered as "red garments". Here *ratta* does not mean 'red', but "well dyed". *Ratta* = *rañjita*.

XLVI, 28. Geiger gives the 3rd line as *taṃ Buddhabelagāmaṃ ca* while the Sinhalese edition has *Tambuddham Bhelagāmaṃ ca*. I like to adopt the latter as we still have a village named "Tambuttegama". In his translation he has given this as a single village called *Buddhabhelagāma*.

33. *Pubbako pi kathāmaggo ākulo viya bhāti me*
Yathāpadhānam kathitaṃ hetūnam uplakkaṇam.

This is translated as: "Even the foregoing form of the narrative which gives but a survey of the most important matters, seems to me too long-winded". According to my opinion this should be translated as follows: "It seems to me that the former narrative (in Sinhalese) is confused, only the important matters that should be remembered are related by me".

Ch. XLVII, 25. Geiger says that *Nārāyana* should be taken as a name of Indra-Sakka, because he was an antagonist to Asuras. By this name we understand Vishṇu who has very often destroyed Asuras, according to Hindu mythology.

Ch. XLVIII, 34. *Mahāpālimhi dānaṃ ca dāpesi dasavāhakaṃ* is translated as "To the Mahāpāli Hall he gave an offering of ten cart-loads". This should be "In Mahāpāli Hall he caused alms to be given out of ten cart-loads (of rice, daily).

64. *Vāpāraniṃ akārāmaṃ, tathā Mānaggabodhikaṃ*
Sabhattuddesabhogaṃ ca vihāre Abhayuttare.

Here Geiger has taken *sabhattuddesabhogaṃ* to be a name of a vihāra. It is not so. This word has the meaning "endowed with the revenues for maintenance"; it must be taken as an adjective to *Mānaggabodhi*.

Ch. XLIX, 34. *Gaṇhāpesi ca bhikkhūnam ayopattesu gaṇṭhike* is translated as: "To those among the bhikkhus who were engaged in the hardest studies he presented bronze almsbowls". This translation is purely conjectural. There is nothing to allude to 'hardest studies' in this sentence, and *ayopatta* is not a bronze bowl but an iron bowl. "He caused the knots on the iron bowls of the monks to be removed" is the translation that is legitimate, which means that he caused the monks to have bowls with even surface, after removing those roughly made on which points of nails appeared. Geiger's text has *ayopatte sugaṇṭhike* instead of *ayopattesu gaṇṭhike*.

77. *Vihāre Jetanāme ca katvā sovaṇṇayaṃ muniṃ*
vaḍḍhetvā bodhigehamhi pūjam'kāsi acintiyam

is translated as: "For the vihāra called Jeta he made a golden image of the Master and on its delivery to the Bodhi temple he held a sacrificial festival of

unimaginable splendour". Here *vaḍḍhetvā* is rendered as "on its delivery". It has no such meaning; it means "having placed in". By *bodhigeha* he has intended the temple of the Great Bo-tree. There are Bodhigehas in every temple, which is a house near a Bo-tree. What this king has done is: he made a golden image of the Master and in the ceremony of placing it in the bodhi-ghara of Jetavana he held an unimaginable festival.

78. "He enlarged the Mahāpali Hall, and eager for the good of the refectory he dispensed as much (rice) as tallied with the weight of his body", is the rendering of:

*Mahāpālīṇ ca vaḍḍhesi bhattagam avalokiya,
tulābhāraṇ ca dāpesi.*

Bestowal of alms tallied with one's weight is not a wonderful feat that should be recorded in a chronicle, the rice that was distributed daily in the Mahāpali Hall would have been much more than the weight of a man. Geiger seems to convey the idea of bestowing rice wherever *tulābhāra* occurs. Bestowal of *tulābhāra* is done even today in India. Once we heard of weighing Prince Aga Khan with diamonds, and recently of weighing another person with silver. In the same way some Sinhalese monarchs caused themselves to be weighed with gold or other kinds of precious things and to distribute that wealth among the poor. Such an action is to be recorded in a history. Here too, king Aggabodhi IX "having seen that the Mahāpālī Hall was not spacious enough, enlarged it, and bestowed precious things equal to his own weight to the poor".

88. *Bhikkhū cūlavihāresu yāguṃ gaṇhanti osadham
Mahāvihāre; taṃ sutvā rājā nibbinnamānaso*

is translated as: "The bhikkhus in the smaller vihāras used to receive rice gruel as medicine in the Mahāvihāra. When the king heard of it he was displeased". There is no meaning in referring to "rice gruel as medicine". *Osadham* must be taken as an adjective to *yāguṃ*. In Ceylon we have many kinds of medicinal gruel which we call බෙහෙත්කෑද. In a Sinhalese MS. I have found *sabbadū* instead of this *osadham*.

In a note on this Geiger states: "What is meant are the smaller vihāras of Anurādhapura in contrast to the three great nikāyas". Small vihāras also were included in the three great nikāyas. There were no other sects in Ceylon smaller or greater. Therefore this note is quite misleading.

Ch. L. 32. Geiger's text has the second line as *rājūnaṃ Paṇḍudesitaṃ*, and he has translated the 2nd word as "prescribed by the Paṇḍus for their kings". But the Sinhalese Edition has *rājūnaṃ Paṇḍudesinaṃ*, which means "of the kings of the country of Paṇḍus". I believe that Geiger has taken 𑀧 for 𑀧 as he has not marked this reading in his footnotes:

*So taṃ disvā va jhāpetvā rājūnanāṃ Paṇḍudesinaṃ
sabbaṃ ālāhane kiccaṃ tassa kātum niyojayi.*

“ When he (= the Paṇḍu king) saw it (= yuvarāja's head) he had it burned and gave orders to observe all the ceremonies (prescribed) for the Paṇḍu kings ” should be the translation of this.

75. *Yāgudānam sakhajjākaṃ* is translated as “ rice soup with the solid food (belonging thereto)”. *Khajjaka* may be translated as “ solid food ”, but it is generally used to denote sweet-meats. When it is connected with *yāgu*, there is no doubt about its meaning (of sweetmeats).

85. *Paṇḍurājakatām kāraṃ* is translated as “ misdeeds of the Paṇḍu King ”. *Kāra* never means “ misdeed ” but help or support. It is true that the Paṇḍu king had at first subdued Laṅkā, but afterwards had handed the kingdom to Silāmegha and left the Island. So Silāmegha was much obliged to the Paṇḍu king.

Ch. LI, 61. Sapaṭisambhatta is translated as “ which had come to him ”. I like to give the meaning : “ prepared or made by himself ”. *Paṭisambhattam* again occurs in *Ch. LII, 14*.

Ch. LI, 66. Ratanabhājane is translated as “ jewelled goblets ”. I do not know whether goblets were used to serve “ milk rice ”.

69. *Suvannaghanakottima* is translated as “ of closely jointed gold mosaic ”. I take this compound to mean “ of solid gold ”.

114. *Pallale* is translated as “ tanks ”. *Pallala* is not a tank but a small lake. “ *Pallalaṃ khuddako saro* ” is in the *Abhidhānaṣṣadāpikā*.

133. ‘ Solid food ’ for *khajjaka* again occurs here. See *Ch. L, 75* above.

Ch. LII, 25. “ What disease was meant by *uṣasagga* is impossible to determine ”, says Geiger. It is a name for infectious diseases. The Sanskrit equivalent of this is *Ouṣasargika-roga*.

28. *Paṃsukūlikamātūnaṃ* is translated as “ to the mothers of the Paṃsukūlika (—bhikkhus) ”. I like to translate it as “ to the nuns who were wearing paṃsukūla-robos ”. I am of the opinion that the word *mātu* (= mother) was here used just like the use of the same word by the Roman Catholics to denote their nuns.

29. The word *guḷa* in *katvā sūkararūpaṃ ca guḷaṃ bhikkhūn'adāpayī* is translated as “ sugar ”, and in a note he states “ Guḷa always means sugar kneaded into a shape. We have to do here with some kind of form which may have had very little likeness to a pig ”. He has got into difficulty because he has taken *guḷa* to be sugar. If it is translated as ‘ jaggery ’. There is no difficulty whatever to make a figure of a pig with it.

32. *Mahāvihāravāsīnaṃ sārānaṃ paṭipattiyā*

bhikkhūnaṃ so adā sādhu thapetvā vattam uttamaṃ

is translated as “ handed it over to the inmates of the Mahāvihāra, laying down the best (requisite) for the attainment of the degrees of salvation the strictest fulfilment of duty ”. Geiger himself says it is a difficult passage. For my

part I translate it as follows :—“ handed it, with lofty regulations, to the inmates of the Mahāvihāra, who were rich in the observance of religious duties”.

34. *Coḷarājābhīdhāno ca amacco tassa rājino*

pariveṇaṃ akā rammaṃ nattham taṃ suppatiṭṭhitam

is translated as: “ A minister of the king, called Coḷarāja, repaired the charming pariveṇa that had been destroyed, so that it had again solidity”. Here the word *suppatiṭṭhitam* is rendered as “ so that it had again solidity”. In my opinion *Suppatiṭṭhitam* is the name of the pariveṇa. It is customary to mention the name of a particular building when it is repaired by someone.

38. *Saddho āgata maggo va* is rendered as: “ He was pious, had reached the path of salvation”. *Āgata magga* is a person who has attained one or more of the four Paths. This is impossible by a reigning king. Geiger has mistaken *ca* for *va*, and has treated as two attributes to the king. Each line of this verse has given each comparative attribute to the king. He has retained the comparative *viya* in the remaining three lines and removed it from the first. With this correction of the text the translation of this line should stand as: “ he was pious like a person who has attained the paths”.

77. “ Died of the upasagga plague ” must be “ died of an epidemic ”.

Ch. LII, 23.

Khanti-mettānubhāvena tesam sāsanasāminam

puñṇodayo ahu tesam ubhinnaṃ dīpasāminam.

The translation of the last two lines of this verse is: “ the good deeds of the Island princes told in their favour”. I like to translate this as follows: “ the good luck of both the lords of the Island came forth”.

26. *Bhikkhūnam purato maggaṃ rājā gantvā khamāpayi* is rendered as: “ At the head of the bhikkhus the king advanced towards them, obtained their pardon”. *Purato maggaṃ* does not mean “ at the head”. Why should he go at the head of the monks whose pardon he was to beg? What is meant by this passage is that the king went forth to meet the monks (who were coming to the city with the two princes) and obtained their pardon.

30. *Paṭimā-bhatta-vatthāni bhikkhūnam dharaṇṇipati adū* is rendered as: “ To the bhikkhus the ruler gave food and raiment for the images”. This is not so; he gave Buddha-images, food and raiment to the bhikkhus.

Ch. LIV, 22. *Gulāni ghatapākāni* is rendered as: “ Pieces of sugar baked in melted butter”. We never hear of such a preparation. Here it does not mean one thing, but two materials: balls of juggery and medicines seasoned with ghee (called *ghṛta*).

Pacchābhatte adū sadā, the fourth line of the same verse, is rendered as: “ he gave them always as dessert”. It seems that he has taken *pacchābhatte* to be in the accusative, while it is in the locative. It simply means “ afternoon”. A dessert means “ a service of fruits or sweetmeats at the close of a dinner or entertainment”. The things that are mentioned here are

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

(according to Geiger) : pieces of sugar baked in melted butter, juice of garlic, and betel. There are no sweetmeats or fruits, but things that are allowed to be used in the afternoon by the monks.

27. *Tulābhāraṃ adā dvīsu vāresu sa mahīpati* is rendered as: "the Ruler twice dispensed rice equal in weight to that of his body". See *Ch. XLIX*, 78, above for *tulābhāra*.

32. Geiger says that King Mahinda IV distributed rice cakes to apes and wild boars. *Vānarānam varāhānam* are the words found in the text. One can easily feed monkeys and pigs which frequent villages, but it is difficult to find out apes and wild boars to feed them.

33. *Vīhīrāsayo* is rendered as heaps of raw rice. *Vīhi* is not rice but paddy.

37. *Paṭṭakañcukapūjāhi Hemamālikacetiyaṃ
naccagūtehi gandhehi puṣpṭhehi vividhehi ca*

38. *Dīṣamālāhi dhūṣehi pūjayitvan' anekadhā
tassa vatthāni bhājetvā bhikkhūnaṃ dāpayī sayam.*

In the translation of these Geiger has left out the word *tassa* untranslated. The former six lines explain how the king (Mahinda IV) honoured the Mahācetiya. *Tassa* in the 7th line indicates the same shrine; therefore one should understand that the king at first offered some silken mentals to the shrine and afterwards distributed the same to the monks as they were heirs to the Buddha's possessions. Geiger has translated the last two lines as: "he presented the bhikkhus there with raiment which he himself distributed among them".

59. *Mātārā saha vattantaṃ kaṇiṭṭhaṃ tassa bhātaraṃ* is translated as: "his brother Mahāmalla who had committed an offence with his mother". The words *saha vattantaṃ* do not give such a sense but the meanings "who was living with his mother" or "who was following his mother's advice". The following verses indicate that there was some conflict between the king and his mother. In this conflict Mahāmalla, Sena's brother, has taken the side of the Queen mother.

Ch. LV, 17. Chinnaṭṭikādhātukaṃ is rendered as: "the relic of the torn strip of cloth". What is meant by this word is the piece of the Buddha's girdle received by King Mahāsena. The story how he obtained it from Sakka is related in the 34th Chapter of *Pūjāvaliya*.

Ch. LVII, 23. Tass'ovāḍakarā'hesuṃ bhikkhū'bhayaḡirimhi te is translated as: "His (the King's) counsellors were the bhikkhus of the Abhayagiri (—vihāra)". *Ovāḍakarā* are not counsellors or advisers but the inferiors who carry out one's orders. If it is *anusāsakā* or *ovāḍakā* it may mean counsellors or advisers. There is a great difference between *ovāḍakā* and *ovāḍakarā*. Here Geiger has mistaken *tassa* as referring to the king while it refers to his brother who became a monk. Then this translation should stand as:

“ Those bhikkhus of the Abhayagiri were receiving his (= of the Elder who was the Head of the Uttaramūla) advice ”.

24. *Janā tabbamsajā keci pabbajjānirapekkhakā
nivasanti yathākāmaṃ Mahāsāmiṇiṇi sitā.*

Here *mahāsāmiṇiṇi sitā* is rendered as : “ were addressed by the title of ‘ Great Lord ’ ”, and in a note he states that the Sanskrit equivalent of this word is *mahāsvāmi-pradarsitā*. I do not agree either with his translation or note. The title of Mahāsāmi was at first conferred to the Head of a community, but the *Mahāvamsa* itself bears evidence that it was afterwards used by some chieftains. In this place it refers to some chieftain, and with the last portion *sitā* this line gives the meaning “ (those people) who were relying upon the Great Lord ”. It appears that there was a ruler in Rohana, entitled Mahāsāmi, who was not dependant on the king.

The word *pabbajjānirapekkhakā* in the second line of the same verse is doubtful. *Pabbajjā* (= renunciation) does not give any sense here. I like to correct this as *taṃrajjanirapekkhakā* having the meaning “ not relying upon his kingdom ”, but I have no support for this correction from the MSS. of the text.

25, 26. “ From the pure race of this King Mānavamma versed in the law and in statecraft, that was propagated in sons and grandsons with Aggabodhi at the head, that was first among princely dynasties, there went forth sixteen (sovereigns) of equal birth who held legitimate sway in Laṅkā ”, is Geiger’s translation of 25th and 26th verses. He has fallen into a grave mistake when he translated the last lines : *samā soḷasa Laṅkāyaṃ sammā rajjānusāsino*. He has taken *samā* to be an adjective and *rajjānusāsino* to be in the Nominative plural. Both are not so. *Samā* is a noun denoting ‘ year ’; *rajjānusāsino* is an attribute to *Mahīpassa Mahindassa*, which is in the first line of the 27th verse, and therefore in the Genitive singular. With these corrections its translation should stand as follows : “ From the pure race . . . that was first among princely dynasties (27), two nieces, fair, and known by the names Devalā and Lokitā, were born to King Mahinda, who has held sway in Laṅkā for sixteen years ”. The whole phrase “ *samā soḷasa Laṅkāyaṃ sammā rajjānusāsino* ” should be taken as one attribute, and the 27th verse, too, must be connected to the same sentence.

38. *Tato paṭṭhāya vāsetvā rattiyāṃ devapalliyāṃ
devatānumatāṃ bhikkhūṃ mūlatṭhāne ṭhapenti hi.*

Geiger has given a note on *devapalli* and *mūlatṭhāna* of this verse. He has rendered *devapalli* as “ a small temple of gods ”, and says that *palli* means a hut. But I believe that this word simply means ‘ a deva-shrine ’. He has explained *mūlatṭhāna* as “ the position of a premier and highest counsellor ”. There were eight *mūlatṭhānas* of the Buddhist monks in Ceylon. Some of them are Uttaramūlāyantana, Selantaramūlāyatana, Mahānettapāsādamūlāya-

SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMSA TRANSLATION

tana, Kappūramūlāyatana and so on. These were different fraternities or traditions of the monks, but they were not different sects as we have now. *Mūlāyatana* is the Headquarters, and *mūlaṭṭhāna* is the leadership of such a fraternity. *Mūlapada*, found in some verses elsewhere, means the same thing as *mūlaṭṭhāna*.

Ch. LVIII, 7. *Sippatthalakam āvasi* is rendered as "besieged Sippatthalaka". *Āvasi* simply means "lived in".

8. In a note on 'Rāmañña' he says that Burma was meant by this. The whole country of Burma was never included in that name. Only the Lower Burma, which was formerly a separate kingdom, was known by that name. Upper Burma or Burma proper was known as Marammaraṭṭha, whose capital was Pagan (= Arimaddana). Capital of the Rāmañña kingdom was formerly Suddhammapura, present Thaton, and afterwards Pegu (= Hanthāwaddy).

10. In a note on Tambalagāma he states that it is situated in the Galle District. Again he says that "Tambala mentioned 45. 78 cannot be identified with Tambalagāma of our passage". Perhaps he was not aware of the existence of another Tambalagāmam in the Eastern Province.

Ch. LIX, 21. "The hero there sent on a general of the lineage of the brother of Samaṇī" is the translation of "*pesetvā Samaṇībhātu-vaṃsajaṃ sacivaṃ tadā*". In a note on this he states "I believe that by *samaṇī* the foster mother of the Buddha, Mahāpajāpatī, is meant". This statement is very far from the fact. *Samaṇībhātuvaṃsa* is the *Meṇavara Clan*, origin of which was in Ceylon itself. The *Mahāvamsa* does not relate its origin, but it is in the *Mahābodhivaṃsa*: *Tadā Bodhigutto Saṅghamittattheriyā santike Hatthāḷhakārāme vasamānaṃ Moriyavaṃsajaṃ Bodhimittattheriyā kaṇiṭṭhabhaginiṃ Sunandāsāmaṇerīṃ dhavalavāsakaṃ acchādetvā . . . ānetvā attano gehe patitṭhāpesi. Sumitto pi attano mātu nattāram Vedisapuravāsiniṃ Hatthāḷhakārāme vasamānaṃ apabbajitaṃ Sumanakumārikaṃ tath'eva ānetvā attano gehe vasāpesi.* Prince Bodhigutta, who came here as a guardian of the Mahābodhi, married Princess Sunandā who was residing as a *sāmaṇerī* at the Hatthāḷhaka vihāra, and who was the younger sister of the Therī Bodhimittā of the Moriya clan. This pair had two sons named Mahinda and Vidhurinda. Their lineage was known sometimes as Maurya Clan, sometimes as Kandavurukula or Meheṇavara Clan. Meheṇa = *samaṇī*. *Bhātu* means a brother, but in this case it should be taken to mean a sister as Sunandā was a sister of Samaṇī Bodhimittā.