Some Corrections of Geiger’s Čulavamsa
Translation

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

CH. LX, II. Elakatihambha is rendered as “threshold pillar”. Threshold pillar is esikatthambha but not elakatthambha. In the MS. belonging to Ambarukkharâma I read phalika instead of elaka. Phalikaththambha is a pillar made of crystal, which is preferable to the reading in Geiger’s text.

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

54. Vihârâbhayacaritta-bhediniṁ mahisimā sakaṁ is rendered as “His own Mahesâ who disturbed the peaceful life of the vihâras”. What is meant by abhayacarīta here is, I believe, the safety of the criminals when they were within the vihâras.

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

84. Selantarasamâhamhi râjinâ râjinâkatâ kârcsi cûnapâsâdam is rendered as “in the Selantarasamûha- (vihâra) she, created Queen by the King, erected a beautiful, lofty pâsâda”. Though there is no pronoun indicating the queen, in the text. Instead of râjinâ râjinâkatâ the Sinhalese Ed. has râjina râjinâ saka (= king’s own Queen), which is very clear and free from grammatical errors.

CH. LXI, 53.

Pîśi/sim sakalám lokaṁ uddharantâ’dhikam balim
ucchâ va ucchuyante te khînatosâ dhanesino

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

73. “Anatthe nimitam nāma parivattam ti sabbathā”, iti vattabbataṁ n’eva, is translated as “‘What is based on wrong speedily changes’, this proverb was by no means true of the land of Lanka at that time”. The Sinhalese edition of the text has:

Anatthe nicitâ nāma parivallantī sabbathā
iti vattabbataṁ-n’eva yâlam Laṅkâtalaṁ taddâ.
believe this to be the correct reading of which should stand as: The proverb, "What is earned by unjust means changes speedily", was true of the Island of Lankā at that time.

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

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

Ch. LXVI, 14. Amhādisanum puttānam atthitānā nāmā (kevalām) is rendered as: "For sons such as I am is there not but one thing to do". Geiger has separated atthitaṁ into two words atti and lam. This is not a sentence with a final verb, but only a phrase which stands as the subject of the sentence, which covers the 14th and the 15th verses. It should be translated as: "The existence of such sons as I am".

28. "Pāne pariccajissāma mayam te'natthasambhave" iti tena sah'āyātā bhaṭṭa bhayasamākulā

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

87. Tikkhağgapadām āsajja vatīṁ kaṭakabhisānasāṁ is rendered as: ("When the soldiers) reached the enclosure consisting of terrible briers full of prickles from top to bottom". In a note on the same he says: "So I understand tikkhağgapa, where the top part (agga) and the foot end (pada) are sharp". Vātī is a fence. Tikkhağgapada means "having sharpened tops". So that was a fence or enclosure made of sharpened stakes. And what more? This fence was kaṭakabhisānasāṁ = terrible because of the prickles (interwoven with it).
104. *Disantābhikumkhe dise* is rendered as: ("chased the whole of the enemy to the world's end"). In a note he has explained *disanta* as "the end of the firmament". *Disanta* simply means direction; there is no great difference between *disā* and *disanta* as there is no difference between *sutta* and *suttanta*, *vana* and *vananta*.

108. *Vimūcīsikārā ratta-sambaddham jalasekato* is rendered as "he cleansed by the pouring over with water the blood stains from the sword and the hand". His text has *Vimuccāsikārā* instead of *vimūcā + asim karā*. The prince's hand was stuck to the hilt of the sword through the blood of the enemies that he had slain; so he had to pour water on it in order to release it from the sword. *Rattasambaddham asim jalasekato karā vimūcī* or *vimūcā* is the order of the words.

116. *Mamaṁ ṭhāpetvā ke vānīne santi te vassabandhavo?*

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

131. *Visāvijjā* is rendered as "mixing of poisons". It is not so, *visāvijjā* is curing those who are bitten by serpents.

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

150. The text of this verse is corrupt in both Geiger's edition and the Sinhalese edition. Therefore the translators of the Sinhalese version have given a meaningless phrase such as "ततो राजकुलाम e वेनाकरिनः नादाविधिनः निर्माणः किलिपदेसेनः विसिक्ष्यारियां गारामः". Geiger says in a note "W's translation is wrong. He has not realised that *tato rājakulaṁ* belongs still to the preceding. The Sinhalese translators S. and B. have overlooked it". Geiger also has missed the real point as his edition was corrupt. He has: *tato rājakulaṁ ; venākārinā madāvāvihīnā nīcācām kilīpadesena visiṣṭhāpaliyāṁ caramāṁ*, and has overlooked *veṇa* in his translation. *Veṇa* means a basket-maker; here it is an adjective qualifying an elephant. Nowhere in the Pali language is such an adjective found. So we must take this reading to be corrupt. I was able to find out the correct reading with the help of a palmleaf MS. obtained from Sailabimbārāma, Dodanduwa. The reading
there is: *Tato rājakulāvēna karinā madavāhīnā.* Rājakulāvena-nilakari is an elephant belonging to the royal family. Then the translation should stand as: "He (= prince Parākramabāhu) too, under the pretence of sport, used to go about the streets with a rutting elephant that belonged to the royal family, i.e. to the king".

*Ch. LXVII, 2.*

*Uddāmo mahiso dhītha-dīthē anihālayām
ganē vattitarattakkho tassābhimukhāh āpatī.*

"Then a terrible buffalo broken loose, that killed everyone it saw, with rolling bloodshot eyes sprang upon him" is the translation given for this verse. Geiger has left the word ganē untranslated. The Sinhalese version has it as "�වසන්ධී ආතා මගින් මහිස මෙහෙයි கණා" (= having bloodshot eyes kept on its cheeks). There is no sense in this translation. Both versions have suffered because the text is corrupt. The MS. from Sailabimbara has caṇḍo (= fierce) instead of ganē. With this correction there is no trouble in translating it.

44. *Sūkaraṇ ca yathāyāthābhīhiyantam abhiyātayi* is rendered as: "he brought down a boar . . . who attacked him as if it were a whole herd". *Yathāyāthābhīhiyantam* cannot have the meaning "who attacked him as if it were a whole herd". *Yathāyāthām + abhiyāntam* means "who was proceeding with its herd".

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

58. *Anāsaṅkasammate* is rendered as "who were known to be courageous". According to my knowledge anāsaṅka never means 'courageous', but 'unsuspicious'. I believe that his text is corrupt; the word nāyakasammate, which is in the Sinhalese edition and which he has not accepted, gives a better meaning than his reading. Wijesinjha's translation "reputed heads of the five trades" is acceptable to me.

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

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

*kathhamattam anāpajja rajje neyuttakena so
"rājajje me phalaṁ nāma nihaccā ripavo'khile
lokasāsana-samuddhi-siddhisambhūtiyam" iti,*
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"atikhuddan p’idam rajjam mama buddhivisesato
sampannattam pāpitam hi bhusam nekasamiddhiyā,
aṇñarajjamahantattam atiseti yathā tathā
khippam sampañdayissāmi iti cintiya . . .

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

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

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

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

Ch. LXIX, 24. Kappūravaadḍhakas are not ‘camphor producers’ but ‘camphor distributors’. Khuddakasevaka are pages or boy servants. Santikāvacara are attendants.

Ch. LXX, 11. Rāmucchawallika is Rambukwella. Dematthapādatthali is Dematagahagoda.

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

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

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

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

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

*Ch. L.XXII, 18.*

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

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

*tenāvijānalā Jambudīpapāṭvamanāmake ānīte Śiḥalāsimhi "nāyam Śiḥalāpāṭavō; Jambudīpanhi nissesa-verbājukulāntakaṁ etam ṭhapetvā ānehi sīgham Śiḥalāpāṭvam".*
The word Sīhalaśimhi is rendered here: "as Sihala sword". This word with the locative ending cannot have this meaning. The reading Sīhalaśiti in the Sinhalese edition, which Geiger has not accepted, can have this meaning. Again, he has attributed the phrase "that could put an end to all the lines of hostile kings in Jambudīpa" to a sword made in India. If it is so, the Indian sword seems to be superior to that of Ceylon; but the king refuses the Indian one and likes to get a Ceylonese one. In that case the Ceylonese one should have been the superior and not the other. No one would ask for an inferior weapon leaving aside the superior one. So this attribute "nissesa-verirāja-kulantakam must go with Sīhala-pāṭavam, and not with clam".

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

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

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

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

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

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

47. Patiti is rendered as ‘reward’, and he has a note on this. I prefer to render this as ‘share of merit’.

144. Apjam yu manusśānam hiṣyya nam suporiso, careyyādiṭṭasī so va is translated as: "Short is the life of the lamentable men; the pious man should live as if his head were in flames”. Geiger’s text has hiṣyyānam instead of hiṣyya nam. He has not realised the fact that this is a quotation from the Scriptures. It is from (S.I, 108) the Mārasamyutta. Hiṣyya is not an adjective but an Optative verb. This verse is translated as follows:

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

Kindred Sayings I, 136.

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

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

150. Līnānam is rendered as ‘‘for bhikkhus”. This word is never used to denote a monk; it means ‘a destitute’. And the word paṭṭhapela is rendered as ‘collect’; the correct meaning of which is ‘begin’.

Ch. LXXV, 57-58.

Ete kalirakhande va chinditvāna sapattake
nadījalesu pāletvā maccha-kaccha pagocare karissāma . . .

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

84. Bhasmasesatānaṁ yante veri sāmaṁpayogato rakṣhitum is rendered as ‘in order to protect the enemy whom the king’s majesty had turned to
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ashes, by the application of kindness”’. *Phasmasesattanam yante* should be rendered as “who are perishing”. *Sāmappayoga* is not “the application of kindness” but “negotiation of peace with them”.

110. Karontā gaganam sabbam divā tūrakitan vīya is rendered as: “starring the whole firmament as it were by day”, which gives the sense that stars usually appear at daytime. It should be rendered as “making the sky as if full of stars during the day”.

120. *Padadeso va sāminam saranem nāma anhaḥan* is rendered as: “Where our Lord sets his foot there is our refuge”. *Padadeso* may mean neighbourhood or the country belonging to the king.

171. *Tesam dāmarikatassā mālabhūtā tahin tahin dugge va le pavisani Sugalā yeva rājinī*

The third line of this stanza is corrupt, and should be corrected as *duggē vane paveseni*. The Sinhalese edition has *duggē vane pavesetti*.

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

48. *Tikkhagge vāraṇatthāya vāraṇānam ayomaye gokaṇṇaka nekasasahassassagaṇite ṭi ca*

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

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

91. Annotating on *ekodonināvē* he says “Doni must be taken here in the sense of a particular measure of volume, otherwise eka would be unintelligible”. But here we understand *ekodonināvē* as single canoe = ṭoṇaṇāvē ṭoṇaṇē, and *dvidodonināvē* as double canoe = ṭoṇaṇē. When I informed Geiger of this error while he was living he wrote to me as follows: (27th May, 1931). “Your second letter is full of valuable information for me. I spent a day to enter all your corrections in my copy of the Cūlavāmsa. I again see how easily one makes a mistake if one is so far away from the country and
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from the scholars where one can get reliable information. My device always was the verse of the Greek poet 'I grow old learning ever more'. Your definition of ekadoninivā is certainly correct. To ekadońi nearly corresponds our German 'Einvaum', lit. ekarukkho. Such ekarukkha were frequently used on our Alpine lakes, but they have almost disappeared now.

282. Laṅkāpuro tāṁ suttvāna " hutvā viṭaḥpayo sayam āgacchatā" ti vutvāna pesesi paṭisāsanam

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

286. Rājasihamahāle ca Veļugāme ca viṣṭute vinaṭṭhe paṭikavāna bandhiti vāpiyo duve

287. Tathā Siriyavala c'eva so Perumpayale pi ca bandhiṃpetvā duve vāpi kastikamman ca kārayi.

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

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

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

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

33. Tatthāyatanavāśivaṃ therānam thirasālināṃ mahagghe aṭṭha pāsāde kārāpesi tōbhūmāke
SOME CORRECTIONS OF GEIGER'S CŪLAVAMŚA TRANSLATION

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

35. Sante sappatiyatte pi vicitte pātimahi ca
tibhumipatimagehe nava appatisammate

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

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

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

Sāṅgho p'ettha purā-baddhasāṅkānivattiyā
nekaṭṭhāne tho odo katvā sīmāsamāhatiṁ
raño sālānusārena nimitte ārīkātayi
sabbasampattiyyutīyā kammavācāya sādhukṣm.
I wonder whether one can get a clear idea of this performance through this translation. The statement "the bhikkhu community took up a position at different points" is misleading, because it gives the idea that the community had separated itself into groups and stood at different points. In this performance not even a single bhikkhu is allowed to deviate from the acting community. All those who come to the place must stand in a single group; and if it is necessary the whole group must move to a different plot.

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

67.  **Buddhasimakapasāde pāncaterasayathhisu**
   **dīghato puthulenāpi buddhasimā ajāyatha**

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

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

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

**Ch. LXXX, 6.** Geiger explains Arimaddana to be the capital of Rāmaṇa (Lower Burma, Pegu). This is not correct. Arimaddana was the capital of
Upper Burma or Burma proper. In modern maps it appears as Pagan, and in Pali it had two names, Pūgāma and Arimaddana. The former capital of Rāmaṇa or Lower Burma was Sudhammapura, present Tathon, and afterwards Pegu, whose Pali epithet is Hansāvati, written by them as Hanthawaddy. Sometimes the whole of Lower Burma was called Pegu by some Europeans who were ignorant of the facts. The Lower Burma or Rāmaṇa was formerly divided into three portions, namely: Hansāvati, Kusima and Muttima, whose capitals were Pegu (45 miles north of Rangoon) Bassin, (west of Rangoon), and Martaban (east of Rangoon) respectively.

Ch. LXXXIII, 13.

Saṅgāmāvacare mattaverikūjārākesari sabbe pi Sīhākece tattha tathā nipesayi

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

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

Ch. LXXXIV, 13, 14.—Saṁs/huttaṁ dantadhūnuyā gandhacandanapākādiṁ dhammapāḷahatakaṁ tattha rājapābhatam ukkutthiṁ pesetvā Tambara-raṭṭhakam. These lines are translated as: “having sent a religious gift, incense, sandal-wood, food and the like which had been in contact with the Tooth Relic and likewise a choice and princely gift to Tambarattha”. It is possible to get incense and sandal-wood to come into contact with the Relic but it is impossible to get food to touch it. The authorities would never allow it to be touched by any kind of food. Instead of candana pākā in Geiger’s text the Sinhalese edition has candanapeñka, which is sandal-wood paste. This must be the correct reading and the correct rendering.

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

29. Attano’nujājam pi Bhuvanekabhujavhayaṁ sikkhāpetvāna so tisu piṭakesu visāradāṁ

I73
30. kārāpetvāna, tu'eva theradhāmmam mahāpati desāpetvā...

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

36. Sālanākaraṇa ca katvāna tattha bhikkhu-gane bahū pāḷiso nivasāpetvā sādāre va dine dine

37. pavattetvā mahāpājāsakkarān sakanāmato bahunnam sāmaṇerānam dāpetvā upasampadām.

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

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

Evaṃ atthopasampatti-mahāmaṅgalam uttamam satta satta dine rājā pavattesti naruttamo.

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

When I pointed out this error to Geiger himself he willingly admitted the correction and wrote to me as follows: (27-5-1931). "My translation of upasampatti in 84, 42 is indeed a big stumbling. I was led astray by two things: (1). The word upasampatti as synonym to upasampadā is missing
both in Childers' and in Rhys Davids—Stede's Dictionary. I therefore tried to understand it by its etymology = skr. upasampāṭi. I quite forgot that it occurs in the Mahāvamsa itself (60.7) as clearly as possible in pabbajjā upasampatiḥ kārayitvā... (2). I had the impression that by evam at the beginning of v. 42 this verse is closely connected with the preceding one. There the attha parikkhārā are mentioned, and I thus arrived at the conclusion that attha sampatthatyo might mean the same. You will now understand my stumbling. It is not excusable however”.

Ch. LXXXV, 36. Panasa is rendered as ‘bread-fruit’; panaṣa = jackfruit.

96. Mahāratana-caṇkama is rendered as “large jewelled cloister”. Caṇkama is not a cloister but a prepared walk.

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

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

jāte rājantare tasmin dāseyyam gamite bāhū
dandhā bhikkhusassā pi...

There is no word for “by marriage” in the text.

Ch. LXXXVIII, 81. Setum vāsāsavantīyā is rendered as “as a bridge over the stream of his hopes”. Āsāsavantī is not “the stream of his hopes”, but “the stream of craving”.

Ch. LXXXIX, 70. Geiger has written a note on udakukkhepasimā, in which he says “a term difficult to explain and occurring again 94-17, and 97-12” and so on. His explanation is not very clear. After my information on this term he published an article, entitled: “New Contributions to the Interpretation of the Mahāvamsa”, in the Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. IX, 1933. I reproduce here what he has written on this term in that article: “Udakukkhepasimā, lit. ‘boundary (made) by throwing up water’ (Mhvs., 89-70; 94-17; 97-12) is an interesting Buddhist ceremony, insufficiently
described by Wijesinha and by myself. According to Buddhadatta a note on the term should run as follows: Ecclesiastic acts must be performed within a sacred boundary (śīmā) and they can be performed not only on dry ground but also in water, either in a building erected on piles in a river or a lake, as we see so frequently in Ceylon, or even in a boat. If the act takes place in water, the boundary must be fixed in the following manner: After the chapter of the saṅgha has assembled, one of the priests takes water in a vessel or a handful of water from the lake or the river. He then throws the water with his hands to the four quarters. The boundary is marked by the furthermost points where the water has fallen. When doing so the bhikkhu who throws the water must stand within the hatthakāśa, in the immediate vicinity of the chapter”.

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

\[\text{Atha Devapure sīhasayitappatiṃāgharam} \]
\[\text{catudvārdavayam dīgham kārāpetvā dvihūmakanm.}\]

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

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

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

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

Ch. XCVI, 1. \text{Tato tahim tahim ̄thatvā manakālam narādhipā}. Here manakālam is rendered as “for a short time”. There is an indeclinable manam meaning ‘a little’; but I have never seen it compounded with another
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word. The Sin. Ed. has yatākālaṁ instead of this. With this the translation of these lines should be: These Rulers, sojourning in different places for various periods”.

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

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

Ch. XCVII, 2. “As his first mahesi he took the daughter of the mahesi in the town of Madurā who had been fetched thence” is the rendering of: Madhurāpurato nīla-mahesidūtaram va so katuva aggamahesiṇ ca. This translation is not clear. It is clear if it is rendered as: “As his first mahesi he took the daughter of the queen who had been fetched from Madurā”.

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

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

24. In a note on bhāṇavāras Geiger states: “For purposes of recitation the whole of the Tipitaka is divided into bhāṇavāras, sections of equal length... It seems to me, however, as if the word in our passage is used instead of nikāya. The commentary would then have embraced Dīgha-, Majjhima-, Saṅyutta- and Āṅguttara-Nikāya”. When I pointed out his mistake Geiger himself corrected it in an article published in the Indian Historical Quarterly (Vol. IX, 1933), which I reproduce here: “Catubhāṇavāra (Mhvs. 98, 24). We are told that king Vijayarājāsiha (1739-47) invited the sāmānera Saranaṅkara and had a commentary on the Catubhāṇavāra made by him in the language of Lankā (nimantevaṁ lass’eva catubhāṇavāraṇavāṇavam Lāṅkābhāṣāya kāretvā). It is well known that bhāṇavāra means a section of holy texts, and that the Tipitaka, for the purpose of learning and recital, is divided into a great number (2547) of such sections. But I did not know what by catubhāṇavāra is meant. Buddhadatta informs me that this is a name for Maha-piripotpota, ‘the great
Pirit-book’, *paritta*, i.e. a collection of holy texts, short hymns or sermons which are publicly recited on certain occasions with a view to warding off the influence of evil spirits. The description of a *Paritta* ceremony is found in my book, *Unter Tropischer Sonne*, p. 28 ff. The *Maha-pirit-pota* is called *Catuhãnavarã* because it consists of four such sections. Subsequently I saw that Saranãnkara’s commentary on the *Paritta*-book is even mentioned in L. de Zoysa’s, *Catalogue of Pali, Sinhalese and Sanskrit Manuscripts in the temple Libraries of Ceylon* (Colombo 1885), p. 6, under the title *Catuhãnavara-Atthakathi*, and that it is common in the island. Finally I may point to the fact that the phrase *Pirit Satar banaavar*, the four bhãnavaras of the *paritta* already occurs in the Sinhalese inscriptions of the first half of the roth century.

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

32. “It is accomplished, with success” uttering these joyful words, he assembled the inhabitants of the town” is the rendering of *laddhattã sañhalante me, ñãtivãcam pañãsetvã sammãtãtvetvã nãgare*. Instead of *laddhattã (= laddha + attã) Geiger’s text has *laddhaitham* (= laddha + attham). The Sinhalese edition has *laddhattã sañhalo iti*, which is acceptable and should be translated as: “the life which I possess is successful”.

64. *Tettimsatãsahassãci attahasatãdhikãchi ca tikoã-puppahaãjãhi puñãnarãsãci ca sañcayãi.*

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

Ch. XCIX, 47. *Brahmavesadharchi* is rendered as: “by people wearing the Brahman dress”. *Brahma* and *brãhma* are two different words. Here it is not *brãhma* but *brãhma*, which means a kind of deity. So *brahmave-...."
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sadāra means "one who is in the guise of a brahma", and not one in the dress of a brāhmana.

53. Amhākam rājarāja taṁ saddhā-paññāgunodayo
    anuvacchāram pavallentām āsālhihīkhaṇaussavam

54. Buddhappājam purakkhatvā pavallentām vicītiya

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

55. Geiger's text has: subhacandiradam gajam vibhāsanehi bhūsetvā.

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

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

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

Ch. C, 14.

Suvaṇnasāsanehi sattanikkhādhikehi ca
kārite manivāṇnaśām karandamhi manohare

These lines are rendered as: "After a splendid, jewel-encrusted casket had been made for two thousand suvaṇnas and seven nikkhas". Here "jewel-
encrusted' stands for *manivannasmin*. Vāṇṇa is never used to express the idea of encrusting. Moreover, setting of gems on this is explained below. The MS. from Ambarukkharāma has *munivanaṇṇa* instead of this. Munivanṇa or satthuvanaṇṇa is a synonym for gold. With this correction the translation should stand as "after a splendid gold casket had been made for . . ."

72. *Laṅkādīpe asante ca dhammadinaya-pothake suvanṇa-paṭibimbaṇ ca suvanṇa-pothakam varam*

73. *Laṅkādīpe mahārāje pasanno so mahīpāti pavaram rājasandesam paṇṇākāre ca nekadhā*

74. *Ayojjharājāmaicc ca rājā Vessantaro nibho so hi Laṅkam apesesi jinadhātegharam varam*

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