Some Corrections of Geiger’s Cūlavamsa Translation

CH. XXXVII, 95. Rājavatthumhi is translated as “royal territory”. It should be “palace precincts”.

126. Rājā’ha jāto sūlo’yam kadā’hōresi kūdisam? 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 kūdiso for kūdisam. Here there are two questions, viz.: When did this pain arise? What kind of food has been taken by you?

141. Vātābūdhena eko ṭi bhikkhu vutthāpi to ahu, gopānasigate lamhi dukkha 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 vutthā is the term for awaking from the state of absorption in meditation (samādhi)”. It is not used in this sense only, vutthāti or vutthāti is a verb very frequently used in the sense of ‘to rise from a seat’ or ‘to arise’. Āsanā vutthāsi = he rose from his seat; gāmo vutthāsi = 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 Sāṭhakantarato katvā satthavatthiṁ mahādayo. Satthavaṭṭi is not a “pocket for his knife” but “a bundle of surgical instruments”. Sāṭhakantarato 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 rājānubhojanam. 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”. Sanni-sinnaka is not ‘lying’ but ‘sitting’.

192. Bimbam 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 dhatu. Here Sambuddhadātuno bimbam means: 'an image of the Buddha having a bodily relic enshrined in it'.

200. Sankhām sodakam ādāya carat'āsana-āhovane 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. Paṭīhāriya-pakkha 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 Tikani pātā states: 'Ettha paṭīhāriya-pakkho nāma antovasse temūsam nibaddha-uposatho; tan na sakkontassa dvinnām pavāraṇānam ante ekanūsam nibaddha-uposatho; tan pi asakkontassa pathama-pavāraṇato paṭṭhāya eko addhamūso paṭīhāriya-pakkho yeva nāma' (= Here paṭīhāriya-pakkha 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 Paṭīhāriya-pakkha). 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: 'naṅgūṭham papphoṭetvā' from Milindapañha. It does not support his argument but stands against it. The squirrel (as we translate it), has a naṅgūṭha = tail, but the tail of a bird is not called naṅgūṭha but pīccha or piṇja in Pali.

205. Lohakunibhi 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 attuḷamhi IJutYīlYī is rendered as 'murdered him in a lonely spot'. Aḷḷhāna never can have the meaning 'a lonely spot'. It must be translated as 'unlawfully' or 'without reason'.

217. Pāṭañjālimataṁ parivattesi is rendered as 'elucidated the ideas of Patañjali'. There was no elucidation but recitation.

224. Ghoso hi Buddha viya maḥītale 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 Boddho 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 Sihala 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) laid before the three councils".

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

245. Theriyacariyā sabbe pālim 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 pācīnaadvārato bahi paṭhame cetiyaṭṭhāne ṭhātum nāgam saṃappayi 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". Pācīnaadvārato bahi gantvā means "having gone out of the eastern gate". Paṭhame cetiyaṭṭhāne ṭhātum nāgam saṃappayi means "he ordered the elephant to stay near the Paṭhama-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. Laddhā khīrodanāṁ bhūtvā sesam pattena 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 pattena 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.
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 “Citti-kārena theramhi bhattam pakkhippa bhūmiyam bhunji”; he has altogether ignored the word bhunji and the absolutive pakkhippa.

38. Kulinā kulagāmaṇā is rendered as “those who belonging to noble clans or to kinship villages”. This is not so. Kulinā kulagāmaṇā or kulaga-makā means “the nobles who were in possession of the villages received as nindagam”.

39. Tesām gāme gahetvāna gāmesvākāsi rakkhaṇe 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-ya-arākhalke. Rohaṇāgaṇma in the same verse is rendered as “who had come to Rohana”, which should be “who had come from Rohana”.

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

43. Mahāvihāram kātvāna pāṇiyuttām anākulaṃ 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. Kumārasenasā uppetvā pudabhogam visodhayi Kālavāpiṁhi bhaṅgaddham khetṭānaṁ ca satadvayaṁ 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 dvādasamaṁ vassaṁ bodhipujam akārayum is translated as “have instituted in every twelfth year (of their reign) a festival for the Bodhi tree”. Yāva dvādasamaṁ vassaṁ means “up to the twelfth year”. I cannot understand why he has confused this very clear phrase.

61. Phāṭikamma is rendered as “enlargement”. It is not enlargement but repair.
63. Unnaloma is rendered as "a tuft of down". Buddha’s unnaloma is not a tuft but a single hair wound like a watch-spring.

98. Māsodanaṁ maṁsaṁ sākuṇaṁ 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 kārōdanāṁ as ‘milk broth’. There is no difference between bhatta and odana; both simply mean ‘boiled rice’. Māsodanaṁ means rice mixed with beans. Sākuṇaṁ maṁsaṁ means flesh of any kind of bird.

114. Kīḷāpēsi pāṁsuṁ bhikkhuṁ 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 leddu in Pali; pānṣu is earth. What has happened is when Dhatusa was digging Kālavāpi 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 gahetvā laṁ bhuṇijissāṁ 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.—

Puraththiṁ Theriyānaṁ vihārā Kuntanāmaso anetvā āsanaṁ tattha ḍhāpasi 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 kuntanaṁ 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 Dumarājaka (at Abhayagiri).

44. Kārāpessāṁ'aham p'ajja rajjan ti parikappiya is translated as: "I will see that he has a merry reign". Geiger has taken p'ajja rajjan as one word mājjarajjam. 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, mājjarajjam cannot have this meaning, according to its construction; it must be mātta rajjam 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.
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try to reign now”. Aham pi ajja rajjaṁ 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 saddhachi, 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 therāṁ 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.—

Sandesarā deviyā vatvā tāya pabbjja sāsane
samāpīte’bhidhammanāhi saddhāṁ athakathāya hi
dhammāsanā samoruhyha nisīdiya mahūtale
“ehi rañño matākāraṁ dassehi yi 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 āgamaṁ
Abhidhammanā kathetvāna pattīṁ 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."

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 dhammasana is: "Dhammasana 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 therasana 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 videsiya or paradesiya. For āgamika he has āgāmika which he has taken to mean 'foreign'; āgāmika means something coming in the future and not a stranger. Here sabbāgamiyaka—bhikkhus are the monks who could recite various āgama (= nikāya) texts.

Ch. XLV, 3. Pālim sabbam sasaṅgahāṁ 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-parivena 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-parivena the monks of the Mahāvihāra protested against this. The mistake lies with his translation "added it to the same vihāra". The text has: taṁs'eva dápayi.

---

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

XLVI, 28. Geiger gives the 3rd line as taṁ Budhhabhelagāmaṁ ca while the Sinhalese edition has Tambuddhaṁ Bhelagāmaṁ 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 Budhhabhelagāma.

33. Pubbako pi kathānaggo ākulo viya bhāti me Yathāpadhānaṁ kathitam hetānaṁ uplakkhaṇaṁ.

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 Vīṣṇu who has very often destroyed Asuras, according to Hindu mythology.

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

64. Vāpāranīṁ abārānam, tathā Mānaggabodhiṁ Sabhattuddesabhogaṁ ca vihāre Abhayuttare.

Here Geiger has taken sabhattuddesabhogam 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. Gaṇghāpesi 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 sugāṇṭhike instead of ayopattesu gaṇṭhike.

77. Vihāre Jetanāme ca kalvā sovaṇṇayāṁ munīṁ vaṭṭhetvā bodhihehamhi pujāṁkāsi acintiyaṁ 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 vaç̄q̄̄hētvā is rendered as “on its delivery”. It has no such meaning; it means “having placed in”. By bodhīgehā 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:

Mahāpāliṇī ca vaç̄q̄̄hesī bhattagam avalokiyā,
tulabhāraṇī 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 tulabhāra occurs, Bestowal of tulabhāra 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 Mahāpāli Hall was not spacious enough, enlarged it, and bestowed precious things equal to his own weight to the poor”.

88. Bhikkhu cālavihāresu yāguṁ gaṇhanti osadham
Mahāvihāre; tāṁ 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 yāguṁ. In Ceylon we have many kinds of medicinal gruel which we call osadham. In a Sinhalese MS. I have found sabbadā 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 rājūnāṁ Paṇḍudesitanāṁ, and he has translated the 2nd word as “prescribed by the Paṇḍus for their kings”. But the Sinhalese Edition has rājūnāṁ Paṇḍudesinanāṁ, which means “of the kings of the country of Paṇḍus”. I believe that Geiger has taken 23 for 22 as he has not marked this reading in his footnotes:

So tāṁ disvā va jhāpetvā rājūnanaṁ Paṇḍudesinaṁ
sabbāṁ álāhane kiccam tassa kātum niyojaya.
"When he (=the Pandu king) saw it (= yuvarāja’s head) he had it burned and gave orders to observe all the ceremonies (prescribed) for the Pandu kings" should be the translation of this.

75. Yāgudānavān sakha jākām 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).

77. Siyigudin lo sakharin 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 yīigū, there is no doubt about its meaning (of sweetmeats).

78. Parurījakātara kīrara is translated as “misdeeds of the Pandu King”. Kīra never means “misdeed” but help or support. It is true that the Pandu king had at first subdued Lāṅkā but afterwards had handed the kingdom to Silāmegha and left the Island. So Silāmegha was much obliged to the Pandu king.

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

Ch. LI, 66. Ratanabhajane is translated as “jewelled goblets”. I do not no whether goblets were used to serve “milk rice”.

69. Suvaṇṇagahana koṭṭīma 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. “Pallalaṁ khuddako saro” is in the Abhidhmappadīpikā.

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

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

28. Paṁsukūlikamātānaṁ is translated as “to the mothers of the Paṁsukūlika (-bhikkhus)”. I like to translate it as “to the nuns who were wearing Paṁsukūla-robes”. 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 sūkaraṟūpaṁ ca guḷam 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. Mahāvihāravāsināṁ sārānām paṭīpattiyā bhikkhūnāṁ so adā sādhu ṭhapetvā vattam uttamaṁ 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. Coḷarājābhidhāno ca amacco tassa rājino parivenāṁ akā rammaṁ natthām tāṁ suppattīṭhitam

is translated as: “A minister of the king, called Coḷarāja, repaired the charming parivena that had been destroyed, so that it had again solidity”.

Here the word suppattīṭhitam is rendered as “so that it had again solidity”. In my opinion Suppatiṭhitam is the name of the parivena. It is customary to mention the name of a particular building when it is repaired by someone.

38. Saddho āgatamaggo va is rendered as: “He was pious, had reached the path of salvation”. Āgatamagga 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.

Khati-mettānubhāvena tesaṁ sāsanāsāminam
puṇṇiodayo ahu tesaṁ ubhinnam dipasāminam.

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 ānaro maggam rājā gantuva khamāpayi is rendered as: “At the head of the bhikkhus the king advanced towards them, obtained their pardon”. Purato maggam 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. Patimā-bhatta-vatthāni bhikkhūnam dharāṇīpati adā 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 ghataṭākāni 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 ghrta).

Pacchābhatte adā 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
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(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. Tulābhāraṁ adā dvaśu vairesu sa mahipati 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. Vihi is rendered as heaps of raw rice. Vihi is not rice but paddy.

37. Paṭṭakaṇṭukanapūjāhi Hemamōlikacetiyaṁ naccagṭlehi gandhehi pūpphehi vividhehi ca

38. Dīpamalāhi dhūpehi pūjāyiwan'anekadhā
tassa vatthāni bhājelvā bhikkhūnam dāpayi 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 mantals 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. Mātarā saha vattantam kaṇīthham tassa bhātaram is translated as: "his brother Mahāmalla who had committed an offence with his mother". The words saha vattantam 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. Chinnapaṭṭikōdhātukam 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 Pujaṇavaliya.

Ch. LVII, 23. Tass'ovādamārā'hesun bhikkhū'bhayagirimhi te is translated as: "His (the King's) counsellors were the bhikkhus of the Abhayagiri (—vihāra)". Ovādamārā are not counsellors or advisers but the inferiors who carry out one's orders. If it is anusāsakā or ovādamā it may mean counsellors or advisers. There is a great difference between ovādamā and ovādamārā. 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:
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Those bhikkhus of the Abhayagiri were receiving his (= of the Elder who was the Head of the Uttaramūla) advice.


Here mahāsāmi-padam 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-pradarśita. 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 tānirajjanirapekkhakā 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 Lāṅkā”, is Geiger’s translation of 25th and 26th verses. He has fallen into a grave mistake when he translated the last lines: sama so lasa Lāṅkāyaṁ sammā rajjānusāsino. He has taken sama to be an adjective and rajjānusāsino to be in the Nominative plural. Both are not so. Sama is a noun denoting ‘year’; rajjānusāsino is an attribute to Mahipassa 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 Devala and Lokitā, were born to King Mahinda, who has held sway in Lāṅkā for sixteen years”. The whole phrase “sama so lasa Lāṅkāyaṁ sammā rajjānusāsino” should be taken as one attribute, and the 27th verse, too, must be connected to the same sentence.

38. Tato paṭṭhāya vāsetvā rattiyam devapalliyaṁ devalāḥnumaṁ bhikkhum mūlaṭṭhāne ṭhapenti hi.

Geiger has given a note on devapalli and mūlaṭṭhāna 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 mūlaṭṭhāna as “the position of a premier and highest counsellor”. There were eight mūlaṭṭhānas of the Buddhist monks in Ceylon. Some of them are Uttaramūlayantana, Selantaramūlayatana, Mahānettapāsādamūlaya-
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tana, Kappūramūlayatana and so on. These were different fraternities or traditions of the monks, but they were not different sects as we have now. Mūlayatana is the Headquarters, and mūlathāna is the leadership of such a fraternity. Mūlapada, found in some verses elsewhere, means the same thing as mūlathāna.

Ch. LVIII, 7. Sippatthalakam āvasi is rendered as “besieged Sippatthala”’. 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 Maramaraṭṭha, whose capital was Pagan (= Arimaddana). Capital of the Rāmañña kingdom was formerly Sudhammapura, present Thaton, and afterwards Pegu (= Hanthawaddy).

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 Samaṇībhātuvamsajām sacīvān tādā”. In a note on this he states “I believe that by samaṇī the foster mother of the Buddha, Mahāpajāpati, is meant”. This statement is very far from the fact. Samaṇībhātuvamsa is the Menavara Clan, origin of which was in Ceylon itself. The Mahāvamsa does not relate its origin, but it is in the Mahābodhiyamsa: Tadā Bodhigutto Saṅghamittattheriyyā santike Hatthālhakārāme vasamānaṃ Moriyavamsajām Bodhimittattheriyyā kaṇiṭṭhabhaginīṃ Sunandāsāmanerīṃ dhavalavāsakaṃ acchādetvā . . . ānetvā attano gehe pātiṭṭhāpesi. Sumitto pi attano mātu nattāram Vedisapuravāsīṃiṃ Hatthālhakārāme vasamānaṃ apabhajilaiṃ Sunanaṃkumārikaṃ tath'eva ānetvā attano gehe vasūpesi. Prince Bodhigutta, who came here as a guardian of the Mahābodhi, married Princess Sunandā who was residing as a sāmaneri at the Hatthalhaka vihāra, and who was the younger sister of the Therī Bodhimitā 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 Mehenavara Clan. Meheṇa = samaṇī. Bhātus means a brother, but in this case it should be taken to mean a sister as Sunandā was a sister of Samaṇī Bodhimitā.