

To
Prof T. Nandayya
for
L. N. S. S.

AN ACCOUNT OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND GREEK CULTURE
IN A UNIVERSAL HISTORY WRITTEN IN THE REIGN OF MAHĀSENA

By Dr S. Paranavitana

A paper read to the University of London in
1963⁴ but not published.

The invasion of the Punjab by Alexander the Great, as is generally agreed, opened up communications between India and the Hellenic world, influencing each other's culture. It is therefore a remarkable fact that the name of the Macedonian conqueror has not been met with anywhere in ancient Indian literature. Apart from the mention of a city named Alasandā in the Mahāvamsa, Alexander's name has not also been met with in the ancient literature of Ceylon now extant. Recently, however, I have had the good fortune to discover documents which prove conclusively that fairly detailed and accurate accounts of Alexander and the Greek kingdoms which were founded by his generals, as well as those of other kingdoms and empires of which there is no mention in the works now extant, have been included in the Histories written in Ceylon in ancient times. These documents are of a unique nature, and I should briefly recount the circumstances in which I discovered them.

Six months ago, I examined an estampage of the Abhayagiri (miscalled Jetavana) slab inscription of Mahinda IV (Ep. Zey. Vol. I, No. 19) to ascertain whether it is possible to have a more complete text of this important document, than that published by Wickremasinghe. I then discovered that the lacunae in Wickremasinghe's text of this record are due, not to the fact that letters in these portions have been obliterated, but due to their forms being obscured by writings of a somewhat later date, in minute letters superficially but sharply incised. I was able to decipher a poem of twenty four Sanskrit stanzas, written in continuation of the five last lines of the original inscription of Mahinda IV. Examination of the two slabs, one lying on the ground, and the other set up, in the vicinity of this slab, revealed that they also contain later writing of a similar nature written not only between the lines of the original inscriptions, but also going over them. Later writings of this nature are very evident on the slab which is published as No. 20 of Ep. Zey. Vol. I. Closer examination indicated that this later writing has been executed, not once, but several times over and over again, so that in the same area of the stone, there are several layers of writings of various dates. Later, I examined estampages, readily supplied by Dr. C.E. Godakumbura, without whose co-operation, this study would not have been possible, of about twenty stones bearing records originally inscribed at various dates from the ninth to the twelfth century. Similar writing of later date.

In many of the stones, this later writing, along with the original inscription, has suffered badly from weathering. Fortunately, however, the same document is often written more than once on the same stone, and on many separate stones. The deficiencies of one can be supplied from another. Among these later writings incised on stone slabs and pillars, most contain the Sanskrit poem, called Sundarī-vṛttaṅta, already referred to, extracts from a Universal History, named Paramparā-pustaka, written by a Sthavira named Bhadra, who was the pupil of the Head of the Saṅgha of Suvarṇapura (Śrī-Vijaya), and who received his education at the Abhayagiri Vihāra at Anurādhapura. These extracts from the Paramparā-pustaka deal mostly with relations between Ceylon and Śrī Vijaya (generally referred to as Suvarṇapura), and those which both these states had with the kingdoms and empires of the Deccan and South India. There are also accounts of events which the author of the Cūlavamsa thought were best forgotten, which took place from about the twelfth century up to about the seventeenth. The pedigrees of the bride and bridegroom recited on the occasion of the wedding of Candravatī, the daughter of Parākramabāhu VI, have been incised on many of the stones examined, found at places in different parts of the island. Texts of literary works in full or in part, and the reading of old inscriptions, are found on some stones inscribed in this manner. Of the utmost importance as these documents are for the student of Ceylon history, I do not intend, in this paper, to refer to them, more than in this casual manner.

An interesting set of documents, incised on more than a dozen stone slabs and pillars from various parts of the island, is formed by the speeches made by the protagonists on both sides, in a formal debate about the relative merits of the Mahāvamsa, the well-known chronicle of Ceylon, and the Suvarṇapura-vamsa, a chronicle of Śrī Vijaya, now lost. In this debate, which was conducted in an Assembly presided over by the great scholar Śāriputra-sthavira, at the royal palace of Polonnaruva, beginning on a date equivalent to Thursday, May 17, 1173 A.C., the case, technically called sthāpanā, for the Mahāvamsa, was presented by Medhaṅkara-sthavira, a pupil of the well-known Pāli grammarian Maudgalyāyana. His opposite number on the side of the Suvarṇapura-vamsa was Buddhapriya, well-known as the author of the Pāli grammar Rūpasiddhi, and the poem Pajjamadhu. A debate on the same subject was also held at the royal palace at Kōṭṭe, in an assembly presided over by the learned Bengali Brahmin, Rāmachandra bhāratīśvara, beginning on a date equivalent to Friday, May 8, 1461. The

speeches made on both sides at this debate have also been incised on the same stones. The protagonists on both sides at these two debates, particularly Buddhapriya at the debate held at Polonnaruwa, have made use of evidence which we have been apt to believe, were not available to learned scholars of those times, or were not cared for by them. In order to prove the credibility of certain statements made in the Suvarṇṇapura-vaṃśa, Buddhapriya has cited the Greek classics, quoting as his authority the work of a Rūma-vāṇija (Byzantine merchant) named Alakṣandara (Alexander).

I give two instances where Buddhapriya quotes this authority to defend the chronicle of Śrī Vijaya. Those who criticised Suvarṇṇapura-vaṃśa, and sought to prove that it was not credible, pointed out what they thought was a discrepancy between that chronicle and the Paramparāpustaka, already referred to, in their account of Greek kingdoms. The Pp. has this statement: 'The Yavana (Greek) kingdoms were the provinces of the great empire founded by Mahālakṣandara-rāja (Alexander the Great)'. This has been confronted with the statements occurring in the Rājavaṃśa, of which more anon, that the Yavana kingdom in Pañcanada (Punjab) was founded by king Dhimitra (Demetrius), and in the Spv. that the founder of the Yavana Mahārājya (The empire of the Greeks) was Mahālakṣandara-rāja (Alexander the Great), in order to prove that these three works contradict each other, and therefore none of them is so credible as the Mahāvaṃśa. Buddhapriya's refutation of this argument is: 'It has been stated by the Rūma merchant named Alakṣandara, who had come to Suvarṇṇapura and stayed there, that Mahālakṣandara was the founder of the Greek empire, and King Dhimitra was the founder of the Greek kingdom in Pañcanada, that Pañcanada was a province of the Greek empire, and that therefore there is no contradiction between the Spv. (on the one hand) and the Pp. and the Rājāvaṃśa (on the other)'. Another instance of Buddhapriya quoting the authority of the Rūma merchant is as follows: 'It is stated in the Mahāvaṃśa that the son of Candragupta ... was Bindusāra. The name 'Bindusāra' is also given in the Purāṇas to the son of Candragupta. In the Spv. (this son of Candragupta) is said to have been Amitraghāta." As the Mahāvaṃśa is supported by the Purāṇas, and the statement in the Spv. apparently stands unsupported, the latter chronicle may be taken as untrustworthy in this respect. Buddhapriya's defence of the Spv. on this point is: 'Bindusāra is a Persian name; It has been stated in the Spv. that the royal family was of Persian origin. The prevalence of a Persian name in a royal family which was of Persian

origin is quite probable. On the other hand, it has been stated by Alakṣandāra, the Rūma merchant, that in Yavana books also, the name of the son of Candragupta occurs as Amitraghāta. The Suvarṇapura-vaṃśa is credible.

The above implies that the Rūma merchant took the name Sandrakottus occurring in Greek books to be the same as Candragupta of Sanskrit literature. The identification of these two names by Sir William Jones is rightly considered as having provided the sheet anchor of the chronology of ancient Indian history. According to Buddhapriya, this Rūma merchant came to Śrī Vijaya on a date corresponding to circa 1079, returned home after a short stay, came back to Śrī Vijaya two years later, and stayed there for five years, during which period he is said to have acquired a profound knowledge of Sanskrit and its literature, as well as of the Malay language. He also, it is said, translated into Greek an extensive history of Śrī Vijaya written in Malay, wrote a book in Greek (giving a summary in Sanskrit and Malay) about the classification of languages, and returned to his own land, where he died. He is said to have profounded a theory about the classification of the languages of the world into a number of families, and included the ancient and modern languages of North India and Europe (Sanskrit, Persian, Latin and Greek) as of the same family, thus anticipating the well-known discovery of Sir William Jones. Parākramabāhu VI of Kōṭṭe had exhaustive inquiries made about this Rūma merchant at Śrī Vijaya and Constantinople, but failed to obtain any information of such a personage, or of the book he is said to have written. In an assembly of learned men held at Kōṭṭe in 1452, the problem of the Rūma merchant was debated along with the linguistic matters arising out of the theory attributed to him, and it was decided that there was no personage called Alakṣandāra, the Rūma merchant, that it was a pseudonym adopted by Buddhapriya, and that the opinions attributed to the Byzantine merchants were in reality the views of Buddhapriya. This great scholar received his education in Sanskrit at Śrī Vijaya, and was, for some time, the Abbot of the Buddhist monastery at Nāgapaṭṭana. Later he came to Ceylon and resided at Polonnaruva before he returned to his own land and died there. In addition to his mastery of Pali, Sanskrit and Sinhalese, he is said to have been proficient in a large number of languages, including Persian, Greek, Latin and some of the European languages then current.

Reference has already been made to the Rājavaṃśa-pustaka, from which Buddhapriya has often quoted. Digitized by Noolaham Foundation. noolaham.org | aavanaham.org
Polonnaruva in 1173. Buddhapriya has given some details about the life of the

author of this work, Mahā Buddharakṣita-sthavira, extracted from the continuation of the Suvarṇapūra-vaṃśa written in the second half of the eleventh century. Mahā Buddharakṣita was a Sinhalese born in Ceylon. He entered the Buddhist Monastic Order and, having acquired a knowledge of the Buddha-dharma, went to the Panchnada country (Punjab), where he was active in preaching Buddhism to the people. During his stay of fifteen years in the Punjab, he acquired a proficiency in a number of languages, including Persian, Pehlevi, Greek, Latin, Sogdian, Tokharian, the language of the Saka people and many languages and dialects current among the people of the Punjab and the adjoining lands. He travelled extensively in those regions, studied the history, customs and manners of the people with whom he came in contact, and came back to Ceylon when Mahāsena was reigning (276-303). He saw Mahāsena and gave him an account of his travels, and of the people with whom he had come in contact. Mahāsena invited him to write a book giving the histories of the various lands known to him, provided for his lodging at the Abhayagiri Vihāra, and all his necessities. Mahā Buddharakṣita accepted this invitation, and undertook the task of writing a History of the World, called Rājavaṃśa-pustaka, which he completed in five years. The Rājavaṃśa was written in the Sinhalese language of that time, but was later translated into Sanskrit, according to one account by Mahā Buddharakṣita himself. Mahāsena, after having read the Rājavaṃśa, was so impressed with the book that he recommended it for study at all seats of learning in his kingdom. The elders of the Mahāvihāra, however, pronounced the book to contain heretical views, and its reading was prohibited to members of that fraternity. The book went into disuse after the suppression of the Abhayagiri fraternity in the reign of Parākramabāhu I, but Parākramabāhu VI is said to have obtained a copy of it from Śrī Vijaya for his own private library.

Based on the material gathered from this Rājavaṃśa of Mahāsena's time, and the Paramparāpustaka of the eleventh century, supplementing where necessary from his own knowledge, Buddhapriya has written, in Sanskrit, a number of essays, called Vṛttāntas (Accounts) of the history of different countries, which have been incised in the manner described above, on a number of stones. His account of the Roman Empire (Roma-rājya-vṛttānta) is brief, and the subject is dealt with only in a general way. The reason for this is that, a hundred years before his time, Garudācārya (the author of the Dharmmapradīpikā and the Anāvatura), had written a book of that name in Sinhalese, which was translated into Sanskrit. Buddhapriya, however, deals with the relations that Ceylon had with the Roman

Empire in considerable detail. According to him, the first embassy sent by a Sinhalese monarch to the Roman Empire was in the reign of Augustus, and not of Claudius, as said by Pliny. This is confirmed by the recent discovery, in the Eastern desert of Egypt, of records of Annius Plocamus dated in the regnal year of Augustus. Buddhapriya has also recorded the discovery made, when Garuḍācārya was at Anurādhapura, of gold coins of the Emperor Hadrian. Of these essays, the longest is that called the Yavana-rājya-vṛttānta (An Account of the Great Kingdoms), of which the greater part has been deciphered. What follows in this paper is from this essay of Buddhapriya.

Buddhapriya's Yavana-rājya-vṛttānta begins by referring to the ancient kingdoms of Greece, the ruling families of which claimed descent from the ancient heroes Hercules, Pārśava (Perseus), and the heroes of the epic of the great poet Gomāra (Homer). The stories of these heroes, it is said, resemble the legends in the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas, but not so replete with the marvellous. The opinions of the Rūma-vanija, Rājasundara Paṇḍita, Sundara-mūrti Paṇḍita and Sumangalācārya, about the resemblance of a story in the Mahābhārata and one in the Jātakas, to the story of Perseus, are also quoted. The rise of the city states after the decline of the ancient kingdoms is referred to and a brief account is given of the nature of the government of these. Hastinā-pura (Athens) Dālbhya (Delphi) and some other cities are particularly mentioned. It is then stated that many Greek cities passed under the rule of the Persian empire, ^{that} and these cities considered it advantageous to be within that Empire for the promotion of their trade. He then refers to the well-known history of the expeditions of Kṣayārṣa (Xerxes) and Aṛthakṣayārṣa (Artaxerxes) against the Greek cities, the victories obtained by Athens and Sparta, the capture of Athens by Kṣayārṣa, the destruction of the monuments of that city by ^{the} Persians, the subsequent victories of the Athenian republic, the rebuilding of the monuments on a more magnificent scale than before by the republic of Athens, the formation of a confederation of cities to wage war against the Persian empire, and the leadership of that confederation passing to Philip, the king of Macedonia, are passed in review, in general agreement with the accounts in well-known historical works. The genealogy of Philippa-rāja, the father of Alakṣandara, is next given. The founder of the Magadha (Macedonian) kingdom was an Alakṣandara, between whom and Alexander the Great, there intervened seven kings, each one the son of the preceding, who bore alternately the names of Philip and Alexander. This genealogy of Alexander, as given in the Rajavamsa, is pointed out, is longer than that

given in Greek books. Rājasundara, a Brahmin pandit, has pointed out that, in the Alexander legend that was then current in the Pāndya country, the genealogy of the hero is given exactly as in the Rājavamsa; he was of opinion that Mahā Buddhāraksita had adopted the genealogy as given in that legend. Buddhapriya does not agree with this view, but says that the author of the Rājavamsa has probably followed an account of Alexander that was current in the Punjab. There were Greek kings in the Punjab, and there must have been a history of Alexander current among the people of that land.

At this point Buddhapriya cautions his readers that the Magadha kingdom mentioned in this connection was in Parama Yavana, and different from the kingdom of that name in Jambūdvīpa. He then observes 'Magadha in Jambūdvīpa is where the doctrine of the Buddhas becomes manifest. Magadha in Parama Yavana was the birth-place of Alaksandara. Buddha is Dharmmarāja (the King of Righteousness); Alaksandarā was a Cakravartirāja (Universal Monarch). Then he utters this benediction:

Dharmmacakram Munīndrasye vājñacakram mahībhujam
Dharmasthasyastu lokasya hitaya ca sukhaya ca

'Like the Wheel of the Law of the King of Sages (Buddha), may be the Wheel of Command of the lords of the earth be for the welfare and happiness of the world established in Righteousness'.

Buddhapriya continues to give the story of Alexander as found in the Rājavamsa and states that, according to this source, the queen of Philip, i.e. the mother of Alexander the Great, was Candravarnna (Moon-Coloured), daughter of Arthabhanu, a satrapa of the Persian empire, Buddhapriya then points out, quoting the Rūma-vāṇija, that according to Yavana books, the consort of Philip was named Olympias, the daughter of Parādhisa (Perdiccas), king of Epirus. He then considers the view of Rājasundara Pandita that the name 'Olympias' has the meaning of 'Shining One' and 'Candravarnna' may be synonymous with it. Buddha priya rejects this explanation and given the opinion of the Rūma merchant that the city of Epirus was then within the Persian empire, that the satraps of that empire were often of royal rank, that Parādhisa (Perdiccas) may not be a proper name, but a title, that he might have borne a Persian name as he was a subject of the King of Kings, that, similarly, his daughter, before she married Philip, might have had a Persian name, of which 'Candravarnna' is the Sanskrit equivalent in meaning only, that the Greek books, for obvious reasons, had not given her original Persian name, but has given a Greek name which she might have adopted

after becoming the consort of Philip.

The future greatness of Alexander is said to have been prophesied at his birth by a Maga Brāhmaṇa. This detail is also said to have been in the Alexander legend that was in vogue in the Pāṇḍya country. It is conjectured that this detail had been taken from the account of the birth of Christ, and added to the story of Alexander. The Rājavaṃsa is next quoted to say that King Philippa entrusted Aristatalācārya (Aristotle) with the education of the young Alakṣandara, and that the latter went to Hastināpura (Athens), and pursued his studies in that teacher's Sarasvatī-maṇḍapa, which in Sanskrit, denotes a 'seat of learning'. The Rūma-vāṇija is again quoted as saying that, in the Yavana language, Aristātala's institution was known as 'Akadamayya', which really was the name of the village in which the institution was located, and that in the Yavana language, an educational institute is called skole, the meaning of the word is 'a quiet place'.

When Prince Alakṣandara returned to his own kingdom after having completed his studies at Hastināpura, Philippa-rāja, it is said, gave over the kingdom to his son and 'went to heaven'. This last expression, says Buddhapriya, quoting the Rūma-vāṇija, may be taken as saying that King Philippa died. But the expression may also refer to a practice that prevailed among kings of the Yavana lands. When they grew old, they spent their last days at the temple of a god, looking after their interests in this world as well as in the next.

From this point, the account in the Rājavaṃsa of the career of conquests of Alakṣandara, now installed as ruler of Magadha, is narrated without any explanatory matter breaking its continuity. We give a full translation, which is literal as far as possible, of this part of Buddhapriya's 'Account'.

King Alakṣandara, son of King Philippa, being established in the kingdom of Magadha in Parama-Yavana, and being desirous of conquering the Pārasika empire, made offerings to gods such as Dyaus (Zeus), the Sun god, the Moon god, and the god of the Sea, who had come down from ancient times in his kingdom, organised his armies, crossed the sea and arrived in the Ludiya (Lydia) kingdom, which was a province of the Pārasika Empire. He defeated the Pārasika satrapa stationed there, removed him from his post, and in his place appointed his friend the Minister named Anantapātra (Antipater), and directed him to protect Parama Yavana as well as the Ludiya kingdom. He ^{then} gave his soldiers their pay, made them content, made the commanders of his armies also content by giving them presents and entered the Pārasika kingdom which was the centre (mahāmandala) of the

Pārasika Empire, put to flight the Pārasika King of Kings, named Dhāryatvasu (Darius), and arrived in the city of Pārsakajaka (Pasargadae). He despatched the imperial treasures that were there to his own kingdom, gave his soldiers their pay and gladdened them, gave presents of gold and silver, etc. and garments, to his generals, and made them rejoice, and spent the three months of the winter there. When spring arrived, he proceeded to Pārśapura (Persepolis), despatched to his own kingdom the imperial treasures that were there, too, pleased the commanders of his army by giving them ornaments of gold and silver, and precious gems etc., and satisfied his soldiers by giving them their pay. He espoused Rocanā (Roxana), the daughter of the Persian King of Kings, and begot a son by her. He also made the Persian imperial servants content by giving them presents such as garments, ornaments, food, drinks, precious stones etc. When he was informed that the centre of the empire (mahamandala) had been pacified, he despatched the commanders of his army to conquer also the provinces of the Pārasika King of Kings, and the provinces also were conquered.

From the Central Pārasika kingdom, he proceeded to the kingdom of Bāveru (Babylon), defeated the Pārasika satrapa who was stationed there, and made the Bāveru kingdom also subject to the Central Pārasika kingdom. From the city of Bāveru, he proceeded to the kingdom of Miśara (Egypt), defeated the Pārasika satrapa who was stationed there, and made the Miśara kingdom also subject to the Central Pārasika kingdom. He proceeded to Lakṣapura (Luxor) and, standing on the circular terrace (mandala-mālaka) that had been established there, he gave presents to the dignitaries of the Miśara kingdom, and the learned men of the Miśara kingdom, and made them rejoice. Then he entered the great desert situated to the west of the Miśara kingdom, worshipped the Yavana god Dyaus who had his abode there, received his grace, and returned to Lakṣapura. From the Miśara kingdom he returned to Pārśapura, and being there, sent a command to the Murunda king of the kingdom of Takṣaśilā (Taxila), that he give over his kingdom to King Alakṣandara, and receive it back from his hands. The Murunda king of Takṣaśilā did not accept that command of King Alakṣandara. King Alakṣandara arrived in the kingdom of Takṣaśilā, fought a battle with the Murunda king, defeated him and gave back to him the kingdom of Takṣaśilā. He thereafter crossed the Sindhu river, arrived in the Pañcanāda kingdom (Pānjab), fought a battle with the Murunda king named Paurava (Porus), who was ruling there, and defeated him. He was pleased at the great victory.

kingdom to him. (Thereafter), he arrived at the river Śatrada (Sutlej) on the left side of the river Sindhu (Indus), and while he remained there, he sent command to King Dhanananda of the Magadha kingdom, intimating him that he give his own kingdom to King Alakṣandara, and receive it back from his (i.e. Alakṣandara's) hands. King Dhananda of Magadha sent King Alakṣandara a message in return, intimating that his own kingdom is given to King Alakṣandara. King Alakṣandara, having given back his own sovereignty to King Dhananda of the Magadha kingdom, and being desirous of returning to his own kingdom, sent Calukya Nikatora (Seleucus Nikator) along the left bank of the river Sindhu, and himself marching along the right bank, conquered the nations (jānapāda) and the Kṣatriyas located on both banks, and arrived at the mouth of the River Sindhu. There, he fought a battle with the Grāmapeya Kṣatriyas who inhabited that locality and defeated them. Being, however, pleased at the great valour of their leader, Siṃhala, he contracted a treaty to give his daughter in marriage to Siṃhala, and remained there for several days, engaged in pleasant conversations with Siṃhala. In order to return to his own kingdom, he entrusted one half of his army to Avanisukīrtta (Onesikritus) and Nayaraja (Nearchus) to travel by the sea route. He himself started, intending to enter the Desert of Vṛkavana (Makran), in order to travel by the land route. Siṃhala, on his part, remained entertaining King Alakṣandara with foods and drinks, accompanied King Alakṣandara on the return journey on the road to a distance of several day's marching, returned to his own kingdom and remained there.

Later (Siṃhala) wedded Suvarṇnāksī (Berenice), the sister of Calukya Nikatora (Seleucus Nikator) and, having remained (in his kingdom for some time), arrived in the kingdom of Puṇḍra (Malabar), uprooted the royal race that was (ruling) there, took possession of the kingdom of Puṇḍra, remained ruling the Puṇḍra kingdom, begot a son named Muruṇḍa Siva, and having remained for some time, died in course of time. Muruṇḍa Siva arrived in the Island of Tāmaparṇi, uprooted the royal race that was ruling there, took possession of the kingdom of Tāmaparṇi, remained administering the kingdom of Tāmaparṇi, built Anurādhapura, reigned for twenty seven years, and died.

King Alakṣandara entered the Desert of Vṛkavana, and having heard that his army was being harried by the barbarians who inhabited that region, fought with them and slew them, crossed the Desert of Vṛkavana with great effort, and arrived (eventually) at Pārsapura. Having stayed there for some time, he went to the City of Bāvera (Babylon) and, while residing there, was struck by a malignant fever from which he died.

will be noted, differs in some details from the well-known authorities on the history of the Macedonian conqueror. The King of Takṣaśilā is said here to have fought with Alexander before he submitted to the invader. It is not mentioned elsewhere that Dhanananda of Magadha sent an envoy, placing his kingdom at the disposal of Alexander, and received it back from him, that is to say that the Magadha ruler declared his allegiance to the Yavana king. These details, perhaps, are due to the story of Alexander being edited to suit the wishes of the later Greek rulers of the Punjab and the adjoining states.

The most startling discrepancy, however, is the encounter between Alexander and Siṃhala, the chief of the Grāmaṇeya Kṣatriyas, who later became, according to the Rājavaṃsa, the founder of the Sinhalese royal family. Buddhapriya has himself noted this, and has given the following observations: 'The word "Siṃhala" is not found in the Yavana (Greek) books. But it has been pointed out by Sumaṅgalācārya that the word "Grāmaṇeya" is synonymous with "Siṃhala". Even the word "Grāmaṇeya" is not found in the Yavana books, but the word "Bramanoi" is found in them, and it is the opinion of the Rūma merchant Alexander ... that "Bramanoi" is a scribal error for "Gramanoi". It has also been pointed out by Sumaṅgalācārya that the word "Grāmaṇeya" occurs in the Mahābhārata as the name of a Kṣatriya tribe that inhabited the banks of the Sindhu river'. (Incidentally, it may be mentioned that we have ourselves in our investigation into the origin of the Sinhalese, drawn attention to the mention of the Grāmaṇeya in the Mahābhārata.)

Buddhapriya discusses this point at length, and quotes the opinion of Rājasundara Paṇḍita, a Brahmin of Madhurā, who, like modern historians, understood the word 'Bramanoi' in Greek texts as a reference to Brahmins. In rejecting this view, Buddhapriya points out that Greek writings have 'Brhamanoi', with h, where the reference is clearly to Brahmins. He has, on this point, consulted two Byzantine envoys, one named Samuel and the other Paulus, who had at different times come to Suvarṇnapura. The second of these, Paulus, is said to have visited Polonnaru also in the twentieth year of Parākramabāhu I. Both these Byzantine diplomats have agreed with Buddhapriya that 'Bramanoi' may be a mis-election of 'Gramanoi'. The first had assured Buddhapriya that in manuscripts of the relevant Greek texts (Diodotus, XVII, 103, 1 for example; no specific books are referred to in this discussion), the reading 'Gramanoi' is actually found in place of 'Bramanoi'. Digitized by Noolaham Foundation. noolaham.org | aavanaham.org
Buddhapriya also refers to the similarity, in the Greek script of

those days, of b (beta) to g (gamma).

Buddhapriya also refers to the statements, on this point, made by Mahā Buddharaksita in his Rājavamsa. Mahā Buddharaksita assures us that he himself visited the home of the Grāmaneya Kṣatriyas at the mouth of the Indus (in the last quarter of the third century), and had discussions with the people as well as their ruler. This chief assured Buddharaksita that the founder of his family was named Sindhala. He also stated that the story about a previous chief of the clan who fought with Alexander, later became friendly with the Macédonian conqueror, and subsequently migrated to the Malabar country, was not only known to the average members of his clan, but has also been given in the written history of the clan (Paramparā-pustaka). It was also known that the son of this Sindhala migrated to Tāmrāparṇī Island from Malabar. Buddhapriya obtained a copy of this history, which was written in ancient Sindhi, brought it with him to Anurādhapura, translated it into Sanskrit and deposited it in the library of the Abhayagiri-vihāra.

Later, when the Sindh was conquered by the Arabs, the descendants of the Grāmaneya Kṣatriyas embraced Islam, and adopted Arabic names. But a memory of their ancient leaders named Sindhala still lingered among them. The Śrī Vijaya envoy to the ruler of Sind visited the region and made inquiries about this matter, probably at Buddhapriya's request. The results of these inquiries are said to have been given in a paragraph in the second continuation of the chronicle of Śrī Vijaya. Buddharaksita also refers to the prevalence, in his time, among the Grāmaneya Kṣatriyas, of the myth of the lion living with a princess, and begetting the founder of the clan. This totemistic myth, he has said, is also found in the Paramparā-pustaka of the Grāmaneyas. There was also a tradition, both oral and given in the history, that in earlier times, the Grāmaneyas occupied a territory on the upper course of the Sindhu river. According to the Rājavamsa, the son of Sindhala established his dynasty by uprooting a family which was then ruling the Island. The Pp. of the early twelfth century states that the originator of the Sinhalese royal family was a merchant named Pūrṇa who also came from the Sindhu country, to Puṇḍra, and that his son, named Sindhala, came to Tāmrāparṇī, and became the founder of the royal family which exercised sovereignty over the Island.

generals divided his empire (among themselves), and each one of them endeavoured to get hold of the share of the other. So it has been stated in the Rājavaṃśa. In the Spv., the history of Calukya Nikatora has been narrated. In the Pp. the history of Calukya Nikatora and that of King Philippa (of Macedon) have been narrated. The Spv. is a history compiled to narrate the history of the kings of Suvarṇapūra. Apart from the kingdom of Calukya Nikatora, the other Yavana kingdoms had no connection with the dynasty of Suvarṇapūra; therefore, their histories have not been narrated in the Spv. Thus it has been explained in the Pp. The Rājavaṃśa is a book composed to narrate the histories of all lands. So also is the Pp. After these remarks, which are meant to explain why the Spv. has not dealt with the same matters as the Rājavaṃśa, Buddhapriya continues: Calukya Nikatora, one of the generals of King Alakṣandara, received as his share of the conquests, the Suriya kingdom (Syria), the kingdom of Bāveru (Babylon), the kingdom of Pāraśika (Persia), the kingdom of Vāhlika (Bactria), the kingdom of Suvarṇakudya (Paropanisadae), the kingdom of Gandhāra, the kingdom of Takṣaśilā, the kingdom of Pañcanada (Punjab), the kingdom of Sindhu. He waged war with Candragupta, was defeated and ceded to him (i.e. Candragupta) the kingdom of Gandhāra, the kingdom of Pañcanada, the kingdom of Takṣaśilā, the kingdom of Suvarṇakudya and the kingdom of Sindhu. He also gave (Candragupta) his daughter Suvarṇākṣī (Berenice) and, returning with the force of elephants given in return by him (i.e. Candragupta), fought a battle with King Philippa at a place named Ipsus, made the Suriya kingdom an empire, and died after having reigned for thirty-seven years. Thus it has been narrated in the Rājavaṃśa. Pulumāya (Ptolemy) received the Miśare kingdom and died after having reigned there. King Philippa received the kingdom of Magadha, reigned there and died. The names of the successors of Seleucus Nikator are then given up to the last ruler in whose reign the Seleucid empire was conquered by the Parthava king Mithradatta (Mithradates). After this occurs the following statement: 'King Anantayogya (Antiochus), the grandson of Calukya Nikatora, was an ally of King Dharmāśoka and gave permission to preach the Dharma in his kingdom. Mahā-Mahendra-sthavira, the pupil of Maudgalīputra Tiṣya-sthavira, went to the Suriya (Syrian) kingdom, preached the Dharma, and after having returned from there, proceeded to the Island of Tāmbraṇṇipī.* In the same manner, the names of the successors of Ptolemy in Egypt are enumerated. We are told that Kalyapātrē

* The asterisk marks the place where the following statement: 'So it has been stated in the Rājavaṃśa', has been omitted in the translation.

Rājavarṇa that the doctrine of Ācārya Plātava is Citta-mātra-vāda (Idealism), and in many ways resemble the views of the Mahāsaṅghikas; the Pp says that it resembles the Viśiṣṭavāda. It is stated in the Pp, that the doctrine of Ācārya Aristātala resembles the Vaiśeṣika philosophy; the Rājavarṇa states that it resembles the philosophy of Sarvāstivāda; it is also stated in the Pp (that the doctrine of Aristātala) resembles the system of Sthavira-vāda. Rājasundara Paṇḍita states that it resembles the doctrine of the Vedānta: Śivaśarma Paṇḍita says that it resembles the system of Saṃkarācārya. Rājasundara Paṇḍita is of opinion that the doctrine of Ācārya Sakrtesa resembles that of the Brāhmaṇas, and that Ācārya Sukrtesa had come to Jambudvīpa (India), remained there, learned the doctrines of the Brāhmaṇas, and having returned to his own country, established his own doctrine. This opinion of Rājasundara Paṇḍita has not been accepted by Alakṣandara, the Rūma merchant. His view is that Ācārya Sukrtesa came to the Pārsika country and, while being there, had discussions with Māga Brāhmaṇas and scholars who had come from the Miśara kingdom. Having learned their doctrines, he returned to his own country and developed his own doctrine. It is not possible to accept the opinion of Rājasundara Paṇḍita. There is no evidence whatever that there was intercourse between Jambudvīpa (India) and the Yavana kingdoms before the reign of Candragupta. Therefore it is reasonable to accept the view of the Rūma merchant. It is stated in the continuation of the Spv., that there was intercourse between Jambudvīpa and the Yavana kingdoms even before the reign of Candragupta. It is stated there that Sūrya Nārāyaṇa, the father of Candragupta, went to the Yavana kingdom, stayed there, and having returned with an army given him by the Yavana king, fought and captured the Pāṭaliputra kingdom, reigned there and died. This story cannot be accepted as true, because it does not occur in any work earlier in date than the continuation of the Spv. On the other hand, there is also no evidence to prove that there was no intercourse between Jambudvīpa and the Yavana kingdoms, before Candragupta. Therefore, and as there is resemblance between the doctrines of the Brāhmaṇas and the doctrine of the Ācārya Sukrtesa, it is possible that he learnt the doctrines of the Brāhmaṇas, even though he did not actually come to Jambudvīpa, and developed his own doctrine out of it.

It has been said by the Rūma merchant Alakṣandara that Ācārya Sukrtesa established his doctrine by conducting disputations with the sophists (pāśāṇīyas) of Hastināpura (Athens). Digitized by Noolaham Foundation
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org Hastināpura took the side of Ācārya Sukrtesa, and did not wish to go to other teachers. The older people of Hastinā-

para took the side of the other teachers, went to the President of the Assembly (Saṅgha) of Hastināpura and made a complaint to him that the morals of the young men of Hastināpura have been corrupted by Ācārya Sukṛteśā. The President of the Assembly convened a meeting of the Assembly, summoned the accusers and the accused, investigated into the complaint, adjudged that Ācārya Sukṛteśā had committed an offence, passed the sentence of death on him, and had him executed. Thus it has been stated in the Pp and in the Rājavaṃśa. Alakṣandara, the Rūma merchant, states that it was possible for Ācārya Sukṛteśā to avoid the carrying out of the death sentence by leaving the city, but that Ācārya Sukṛteśā gave up attachment to life and faced death, which was brought about by making him drink poison. After the death of Ācārya Sukṛteśā, his statues were installed in all Yavana cities, and his doctrine was accepted as the doctrine (dharma) of the Yavanas.

It has been stated in the Pp that the republic (Saṅgha) of Hastināpura resembled the republic of the Licchavis. On the other hand, the Rājavaṃśa has stated that though there are some points of resemblance between the republic of Hastināpura and that of the Licchavis, the points of difference are many. It has been stated in the Rājavaṃśa that the laws of the republic of Hastināpura were made by a Paṇḍita named Solan, and that they have been recorded in a stone inscription. All the heads of free households are members of the Assembly of Hastināpura. The President of the Assembly is installed by the consent of all the heads of free families in the Assembly. It is possible for any one (among the heads of free householders) to obtain offices in the republic; but only a person who has received a majority of ballots by casting ballots in secret is placed in the position of President of the Assembly (or Republic). To other offices also, only those persons who have received a majority of ballots are appointed. The casting of ballots is done in the shrine of a god. In peace time, authority should be given to the President of the Republic by the approval of all the members (of the Assembly) to administer the business of the City. When there is war, the President of the Assembly has authority to conduct, according to his discretion, business necessary for the protection of the city, recruitment of armies, the organisation of the armies, provision of food to the armies as well as to the city, the mobilisation of the armies for war and other matters as well as measures necessary to be undertaken in emergencies like epidemics, famines etc. When the emergency is over, the business conducted by the President according to his discretion have to be notified to the

Assembly. If any business conducted by the President according to his discretion was really ^{un}necessary, the Assembly has power to charge the President on account of the affairs conducted at his discretion. The leading of the armies to battle may be done by the President himself or by a military commander. The President of the Republic is installed (in office) to superintend the affairs of the city for a period limited to four years. When the period of four years is over, the office of the President of the Republic has to be approved again. It is possible for a President of the Republic who has vacated office after having been in the office of the President of the Republic to receive again the office of President of the Republic. But there is no sanction for one (and the same) person to receive the office of the President of the Republic for a period exceeding four ~~times~~.

The President of the Licchavi republic is installed in office for a period limited by the end of his life, according to a rotation which is hereditary. The President of the Licchavi Republic has power equal to that of a king. Though there are seven thousand seven hundred and seventy seven members in the Assembly, the President of the Assembly (or Republic) should be one among seven (specified) members*. In the Licchavi Republic, the leading of the armies to battle should be done by the Commander-in-Chief (senāpati). The Commander-in-Chief is appointed by the President of the Republic. Appointments to offices can be made by the President of the Republic at his discretion; but such appointments have to be notified to the Assembly. An officer appointed to a post by the President of the Republic cannot be removed from his office by the Assembly. At the end of the life of a President of the Republic, the one who stands next to him in the order of rotation gets the office of President of the Republic. The Licchavi Republic lasted from the time of the Buddha up to the time of Samudragupta. Samudragupta is known as the daughter's son of the Licchavi. The Republic of Hastināpura lasted from the fifty-fifth year after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha up to the seventh year of King Philippa.

The Book which has regulated moral conduct in the Yavana kingdoms has been composed by Ācārya Aristātala. Though this is so, there are many other books which establish moral conduct.* Of the Yavana books mentioned by name in the Rajavamsa is the Compendium of History of Haradatta Paṇḍita (Herodotus), which was written by him after his return to his own country from travels in various

part of Suppāraka also, remained there for a time, and returned to his own country. But it has been stated by the Byzantine (Rūma) merchant Alakṣandara who had come to Suvarṇnapura, stayed there and returned (to his own country), that there is no evidence whatever to prove that Haradatta Paṇḍita had come and stayed at any place in Jambudvīpa, and returned (to his own land). The Compendium of History by Haradatta Paṇḍita is the foremost among history books. Historical accounts relating to Jambudvīpa narrated in the Compendium of History by Haradatta Paṇḍita are very few. But the historical accounts of the Pāraśika kingdom, a land which is a neighbour of Jambudvīpa, have been related (there) in an excellent manner, and in detail. The account of the establishment of the Pāraśika Empire has not been narrated in detail by any (historian) except Haradatta Paṇḍita.* The book of Haradatta Paṇḍita is written to narrate historical events, but there are (to be found in it) stories which are also connected with morality. So it has been stated in the Pp and in the Rājavaṃsa. It has been stated in the Rājavaṃsa that the book of Haradatta Paṇḍita has been translated into the Samskr̥ta language. But it has not been stated that the translation of the book of Haradatta Paṇḍita into the Samskr̥ta language has been (actually) seen by the author of the Rājavaṃsa, or by anyone else. Even the name of the book of Haradatta Paṇḍita is not found in the Spv. or in the Mv. Had the book of Haradatta Paṇḍita been translated into the Samskr̥ta language, it is reasonable (to assume) that its name (even) would be cited in the Spv. or in the Mv. Therefore it is reasonable to conclude that the book of Haradatta Paṇḍita has not been translated into the Samskr̥ta language. Haradatta Paṇḍita was possessed of the previous preparation necessary (upanīśraya sampatti) to become a Buddhist had been born in Jambudvīpa.

Among the books on history written in times after Haradatta Paṇḍita, the book of the Paṇḍita named Tuṣyaddiyuti (Thuoyddides) is the foremost.* In the book of Tuṣyaddiyuti Paṇḍita, the history of the war between Spārta-pura and Hastināpura in Paramayavanas has been narrated in great detail. The general of Spārta-pura was Rājadhāman (Archidamus) by name; the general of Hastināpura was Parikalya (Pericles) by name. The general of Spārta-pura having captured the city of Dālbhya (Delphi) which is the place in Paramayavanas where prophecies are made (when) questions (are asked) came to capture Hastināpura also, but was defeated by Parikalya, returned to his own kingdom, and died there in course of time. The account of that war has been narrated in great detail, and with great

The book of Lives of Plutarāja-pandita (Plutarch is one among the books on morality in the Yavana kingdom. Some of the stories in the Book of Lives of Plutarāja Pandita resemble Jātaka stories. The lives of the heroes of the Yavana kingdom and those of the Roma kingdom have been narrated in detail by Plutarāja-pandita. It has been stated in the Pp that the book of Lives of Plutarāja-pandita has been translated into Sanskrit by Rājasundara Pandita. It has been stated by Sundara-mūrti Nāyaka Pandita that the Samskrita translation of the Book of Lives by Plutarāja-pandita made by Rājasundara-pandita is current in the Pāndya country. It has also been stated by Sundara-mūrti Pandita that the Samskrita translation of Rājasundara Pandita has been translated into Tamil. It has been stated by Sumaṅgalācārya that this Samskrita translation by Rājasundara-pandita has been translated into Sinhalese during the reign of King Vijāyabāhu by Vidyācakravartti Pandita. Two stories of Lives by Plutarāja Pandita, taken from the Samskrita translation of Rājasundara Pandita, have been given in the Pp. In the continuation of the Spv, also, these stories from Plutarāja have been narrated. It is the opinion of Sumaṅgalācārya that there is a great connection between the Spv and the Pp. That the stories from Plutarāja in the Spv are taken from the Pp and have been interpolated is the opinion of Sumaṅgalācārya.

Among the poems in vogue in the Yavana Kingdoms, that which has to be reckoned in the first place is the epic named Ilyat, composed by the great poet Gomāra (Homer)+. The great poet Gomāra came from the Paramayavanas to the Parasika kingdom, and while being there, composed the epic named Ilyat. Having returned to the Paramayavanas, and while being there, he composed the second epic named Ayodhyesiya (Odyssey). After having remained there, he went to the Missara kingdom, and while staying there composed a third epic, and died there.+ The story which is the subject of the epic named Ilyat has been stated in brief in the Rajavamsa as follows: 'In olden days, all the kings in Paramayavanas had given an undertaking to protect Kalyāna Helen), wife of king Maṇyālava (Menelaus) of Spārta-pura. The prince named Pārśa (Paris) of the kingdom of Tripura (Troy), came to Spārta-pura (in the course of) wandering in various lands. While there he saw Kalyāna and, being enamoured of her, abducted her, came to his own kingdom and was remaining there. Maṇyālava sent a message to all kings in Parama-yavanas (requesting them) to go to Tripura kingdom and rescue Kalyāna in accordance with the undertaking given by them. All the kings of Paramayavana accepted that message and arrived in the kingdom of Tripura, each accompanied by his own army. King Agravamaṇa (Agamenon) of the city of Ayodhya (Ithaca), too, came to the kingdom of Tripura with his own army, and became the commander-in-chief of all the kings of Paramayavanas. Having

been unable to defeat Pārśa, after waging war for twelve years, he entered the city of Tripura by a deceitful strategem, slew Pārśa, his allies and his kinsmen. Rescued Kalyāṇā, and gave her to King Mānyalava. The kings returned to their own kingdoms, ruled over their kingdoms and in due course died. This story has been narrated in detail by the great poet Gomāra, with numerous episodes and descriptions of various sorts, in very charming and sonorous words (sulalita-praudha-padaibh)*. The second epic of the great poet Gomāra is named Ayodhyeśīyā. In that epic, the stories about the wanderings, in various lands, of Ayodhyeśa (Odysseus), brother of Agravāmana, have been described in detail.* The third epic of the great poet Gomāra is not available at present. His language is old Yavana, which differs from the language of Hastināpura (Attic) and Dvāraka-Yavana (Doric).* There are many other poems in the Yavana lands; there is no room here to give their names even*.

There are also many dramas in the Yavana lands; the Yavana dramas are better than Samskr̥ta dramas.* The writers of dramas in Samskr̥ta even have derived many lessons (gurūpdeśāni) from Yavana dramas.* The foremost among the writers of Yavana dramas is Yuvarūpadha (Euripides) by name*. The subjects of the dramas of Yuvarūpadha have been taken from history as well as from the lives of the citizens of the present.* In certain places in the dramas of Yuvarūpadha Buddhist morality has been praised.* The dramas of Yuvarūpadha have been staged at various places in the Pañcanada kingdom (Punjab)*. In certain places in the dramas of Yuvarūpadha, incidents that have taken place in Suvarṇnapura have also been mentioned.*

Many sciences have reached a high degree of perfection in Yavana lands*.

1. The treaties and other books of Ācārya Aristātala are utilised in the education of youth in the Yavana and other countries. In the Yavana kingdom, there are many edifices, statues, and paintings. Many images of the Buddha, Bodhisattvas and deities have been made by Yavana artists who, having come from Paramayavana (Greece) to the Gandhāra country, had remained there for a time and have gone back to their own land. There had been so images of the Blessed Buddha for a period of five hundred years from the Parinirvāṇa of the Blessed Buddha. Yavana artists who came to the Gandhāra country instructed the artists of Jambudvīpa with regard to the Canon (sampradāya) for the fashioning of the image of the Blessed Buddha, and returned to their own country*. After the

1. Lists of the works of Digitized by Noolaham Foundation. These have been omitted as the reading noolaham.org | aavanaham.org text has to be further examined.

Yavana artists who came to the Gandhāra country had returned to their own land, images of the Blessed Buddha have been fashioned in different styles by artists in different regions of Jambudvīpa.*

It has been stated in the message sent from Kustantinapura by the Rūma merchant Alakṣandara, who had come and stayed at Suvarṇapūra, that the language of the Yavana country resembles the Saṃskṛta language.

The method followed by Mahā Buddhārakṣita in finding Sanskrit equivalents for Persian and Greek proper names would form an interesting study by itself, and Buddhapriya has discussed the subject in some detail. Just as there are recognised phonetic rules for the equation of Prakrit words with Sanskrit, Buddhārakṣita appears to have followed certain rules for determining the Sanskrit equivalents of Persian and Greek names. The name of the Persian King of Kings defeated by Alexander is, as is well-known, given in Greek sources as Darius, and we are told by Buddhapriya that even in Pahlavī, the form of Persian current in Buddhārakṣita's day, the same form is found. But the name is given by Buddhārakṣita as Dhārayat-vasu. Buddhapriya quotes the authority of the Persian ambassador to the court of Śrī Vijaya at that time - by name Mahammad Rasik - to state that the form Dhārayat-Vasu is given in the Old Persian inscription at Bisitum. The name of one of the royal seats of the King of Kings is given in Greek as Pasargadae. Girshman says that this name is a corruption of Parsagada, meaning the 'camp of the Persians'. The Sanskrit form of the name given by Buddhārakṣita is Pārsā-kaṭaka, which has exactly the same meaning. Buddhapriya, again on the authority of the Persian ambassador, says that the old Persian form is Pārsā-gada, which is the equivalent of the Sanskrit form, not only in meaning, but also etymologically. In the Sanskrit kaṭaka, the last syllable is the svārtha suffix, and may be left out. As the Persian language has no cerebral consonants, and has sonants in place of the surds in Sanskrit, gada is etymologically the same as Sanskrit kaṭa. These old Persian forms, the Persian ambassador at Śrī Vijaya has stated, were known to very few even in his own country, and Mahā Buddhārakṣita's knowledge of Persian must have been very profound for him to have known them.

The author of the Pp has stated that Mahā Buddhārakṣita has followed three methods in finding Sanskrit equivalents for Greek proper names. Sometimes the Sanskrit equivalent agrees with the Greek in meaning as well as in form, i.e. etymologically. Rāja-dhāman for Greek

...chidamas. As an example for the form of the name in Sanskrit being identical with the Greek in meaning has been given Suvarṇṇa (Golden-eyed) for the Greek Berenice. Some authorities quoted by name have questioned whether there exists in Greek a word beren meaning gold. But a Byzantine envoy at Śrī Vijaya has given his opinion that there exists in Hesiod a form meaning 'gold', identical with or resembling beren. A Brahmin pandit has given his opinion that beren is equivalent to Skt. Suvarṇṇa and ice to Skt. akṣa, etymologically too. Suvarṇṇāksī occurs in Buddharaṣita's work as the name of the sister, as well as of the daughter, of Seleucus Nikator. The Greek sources do not give the names of these two princesses. Therefore, it is not possible to determine whether Suvarṇṇāksī really stood for Berenice.

As an example of the Sanskrit form of a Greek name agreeing with the latter in sound only, the Pp has given the example of Skt. Gomāra for the name Homeros of the famous poet. The Pp has quoted rules from the Prākṛta-prakāśa to justify the phonological processes which would come into play in Sanskrit Gomāra becoming Homeros in Greek. The Skt. Gomāra has the meaning of 'cow-killer', and Buddhapriya has quoted the Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya to prove that its synonym Go-ghna was a very respectable epithet in ancient India, and was applied to holy Rsis. These holy men were very fond of gorging themselves with beef - a dietary habit which they did not consider to be in any way incompatible with their holiness. If any of these holy men, in their perigrinations, honoured some one with a visit, it was obligatory on the part of the person so honoured to kill the fatted calf in order to entertain the holy visitor. This happened with such frequency that the epithet go-ghna, meaning the same as go-māra, came to signify a guest, who was more often than not a Rṣi. Buddhapriya has considered whether the name of the Greek epic poet could not have originated in the same manner. And Samuel, the Byzantine ambassador, who it is said was a profound Greek scholar, and had written a Greek lexicon before he came to Śrī Vijaya, had given his opinion that in Hesiod the word Homeros has a meaning identical with, or similar to, 'cow-killer'.

The name of the well-known heroine of the Iliad has been given by Buddharaṣita as Kalyāṇā, which in Skt. means 'the beautiful one'. The phonetic processes by which Kalyāṇā would have given rise to the form Helena are justified, and again, on the authority of the diplomat Samuel, it has been stated that in ancient Greek, Helena has been traced back to the Skt. Kalyāṇā. For this

meaning of the Greek word, helena, too, Samuel has appealed to the poems of
Hesiod. Buddharakṣita, in adopting these Skt. forms for the Greek names,
Heros and Helena, has, it was remarked by Samuel, exhibited a knowledge of
Greek much more profound than that possessed by the average scholar even in
Constantinople, which was at that time the home of Greek learning.

* * * * *

1st. October, 1964.