Vidyodaya J. Soc. Sc., Vol. 7 1 & 2 1996, pp. 181 - 194

Mañjuśrī - vāstuvidyāśāstra: romanized transcript with a tentative edition, English translation and studies,

by M.H.F. Jayasuriya, Leelananda Prematilleke and Roland Silva.

Published by the Archaeological Survey of Sri Lanka and the Central Cultural Fund, 1995.

Walter Marasinghe

The Mañjuśrībhāṣita-Vāstuvidyāśāstra (also called *Citrakarmaśāstra*) is one of the earliest and most comprehensive Sanskrit *śilpa* texts on Buddhist art hitherto known to us. The discovery of the only surviving palm-leaf manuscript of this work from a Buddhist temple in Gampola in Central Sri Lanka and its subsequent acquisition by the Department of National Archives in 1972 is an important landmark in the history of Buddhist art of this part of the world. The text of this fairly extensive work containing some 1600 *ślokas* is divided into two parts of almost equal length, the first dealing with early Buddhist monastic architecture and designated *Vāstuvidyāśāstra,* and the second treating of the art of imagecraft and named *Citrakarmaśāstra*, in the colophons occuring at the end of chapters.

The *editio princeps* of this valuble work was prepared by the present writer together with an introduction and an English translation and published in two volumes by Sri Satguru publications, Delhi, in 1989 and 1991 respectively, in their Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Series as No. 67 and No. 81[1]. A fresh edition of the first part of this work forming the contents of Volume 1 mentioned above, has been prepared by three eminent scholars, M.H.F. Jayasuriya, formerly Professor of Sanskrit, University of Kelaniya, P.L. Prematilleke , formerly Professor of Archaeology, University of Peradeniya, and Roland Silva, former Commissioner of Archaeology and Director - General of Central Cultural Fund, Sri Lanka. This volume which is the subject of our discussion here was published in 1995 jointly by the Archaeological Survey of Sri Lanka and the Central Cultural Fund, as No. 1 of a new series named Bibliotheca Zeylanica.

Before proceeding further, the present writer wishes to draw the attention of the reader to certain inaccurate statements made by the Editors in the Preface to the new edition. The Editors say,

'When this scholar (i.e., Hans Ruelius) visited the University of Peradeniya, he was able to generate interest in this manuscript in Prematilleke..... At the beginning of 1976 itself, Prematilleke teamed up with Roland Silva and E.W.Marasinghe (a Sanskritist working in the University Library) to edit, translate and study the contents of the first three chapters which dealt with Buddhist monastic architecture. Accordingly, the team head, Prematilleke, made a request from the then Director of Archives, Amarawansa Devaraja, to grant permission to edit and translate the section of the manuscript dealing with architecture. The Director of Archives, having consulted the Sri Lanka Historical Manuscripts Commission, readily granted the necessary permission by his letter dated 31.03.1976.' [2]

It must, however, be mentioned that the above statement amounts to a misrepresentation of facts and it is, therefore, necessary to apprise the reader of the true facts lest he be mislead by what is said in the same Preface later on.•

Since Paranavitana died while a photocopy of this palm -leaf manuscript was being prepared by the Department of National Archives for his use, the photocopy was later sent to a certain Professor at University of Peradeniya with the request to prepare a tentative edition of the work. This Professor took no interest in the project and decided that the photocopy should be returned to the Department of National Archives. Accordingly, he handed over the photocopy to A. Senadeera, then Senior Assistant Librarian (currently Librarian) of University of Peradeniya, who was then a member of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, with the instructions to return it to Colombo. Senadeera who knew about my Sanskrit background brought the photocopy to me to find out whether I was interested in glancing through it before it was returned to the Director of National Archives. At a cursory perusal of a few leaves of the photocopy I found the language of the text was quite familiar to me as I had read by that time quite a number of Sanskrit *śilpa* texts in connection with my research on the Sanskrit theatre. I then expressed my desire to keep the manuscript for some time, whereupon Senadeera communicated with the Director of National Archives on my behalf and obtained the necessary permission for me to retain the copy for research.

It was only after learning from Senadeera a few months later that I was working on an important Sanskrit *silpa* text that Prematilleke became interested and offered to collaborate with me in the project. Some time later, Roland Silva too expressed his willingness to join the project and paid periodical visits to Peradeniya to take part in group discussions.

We had several sittings together at the University of Peradeniya Library and also at the residence of Prematilleke, with one or two sessions held at the University Library being attended by Ratna Handurukande,

Professor of Sanskrit, University of Peradeniya. I soon found that these sittings were a waste of time, the contribution of the other two collaborators being minimal as neither of them knew any Sanskrit. Furthermore, their preoccupation with the Cultural Triangle Project kept them too busy to devote sufficient time to the new project.

There was no written agreement among us as regards the *modus operandi*. The consensus reached by the three of us was that editing and translating the text was entirely my responsibility while the other two scholars took upon themselves the task of prefacing the work with a critical introduction. But this promised introduction was not forthcoming, most probably owing to the pressure of work on their part, but I continued my editorial work regardless and was able to produce a tentative edition and a literal English translation of the first three chapters covering the subject of monastic architecteture, by 1985. At this stage, to my surprise, one of the other two collaborators put forward a suggestion which I felt was not in the spirit of our earlier agreement regarding the editorial process. These developments and my keenness to bring out a satisfactory edition of the work together with an English translation without any futher delay prompted me to have it published in India by my publisher.

These submissions will explain the compulsion on the part of these two scholars to bring out a fresh edition of the *Mañjuśrībhāṣita - vāstuvidyāśāstra* just six years after the publication of its first edition. From the time I learnt about their involvement in the project, I was expecting a much improved text, a better translation and a more scholarly Introduction, but I am sad to say, the present edition falls far short of my expectations.

The book is attractively printed with a hard cover and contains 332 pages. It consists of two Parts, Part I containing three chapters, namely,an introduction by Leelananda Prematilleke, romanized transcript of the original text with a tentative edition by M.H.F. Jayasuriya and an English translation jointly by Jayasuriya and Prematilleke. Part 2 consists of a study of the contents of the work by Roland Silva also divided into three chapters, a comparison of the *ārāma* plans set out in the work with archaeological material (chapter 4), architectural elements associated with *pañcāvāsa* monasteries (chapter 5) and a comparative study of the contents of the text with three other South Indian *śilpa* texts, the *Mānasāra,* the *Mayamata* and the *Kāśyapaśilpa* (chapter 6), the last chapter written in collaboration with Prematilleke.

Place and Date of the Work.

The manner in which the Editors have dealt with the problem of the place and the date of the work leaves much to be desired. I have dealt with this question at some length in my Introduction to the *Vāstuvidyāśāstra Ascribed to Mañjuśrī,*[3] which these scholars appear not to have read. Again

in July, 1995, I presented a paper in which I discussed this problem more comprehensively, at the Symposium on Wilhelm Geiger held in Colombo, which was attended by a number of German scholars including Prof. Heinz Bechert.[4] Soon after my presentation, Bechert told me personally that he was convinced that *Mañjuśrī* was a Sri Lankan work. But these scholars, without making any reference to my work, leave alone refuting my arguments, seem to favour a South Indian origin. My main arguments for a Sri Lankan origin for the work are as follows:

(a) The description of the *ārāma* type known as Sīṃha-vikrānta (pali.*śīhavikkanta*) found in the *Mahābodhivaṃsa,* a Pali work composed in Sri Lanka in the 9th century,[5] bears evidence to the fact that the *śilpaśāstra* tradition of the *Mañjuśrī-vāstuvidyāśāstra* was still in vouge in the island during that period. The same account is repeated with little change in the two Sinhala classics, the *Saddharmālaṇkāra*[6] and the *Saddharmaratnākara*[7] (early 15th century).

(b) The occurence in the work of a large number of terms peculiar to ancient Sinhalese architecture and not found in any of the *śilpa* texts of Indian origin, for example, *pratimālaya, bimbālaya, bimbāvāsa* (all synonyms for the image-house), *bodhiveśman, bodhisthāna, rājavṛkṣa* (for the *bodhigṛha), gajastambha, gajapādaka* (for the *yūpa*), *chatradaṇḍa (yaṣṭi), chatrāvalī* (pile of umbrellas), *jagatīstambha* (guard- stone?), *vāraṇasthāna (vāhalkaḍa?), taruṇālaya* (hut where damaged statues are renovated), *bhaktālaya* (kitchen), *bhojanālaya, bhojanaśālā,bhuñjiśālā* (for refectory), *srutaśālā* (urinal) and *malamokṣa* (lavatory).

(c) The *aṣṭamaṅgala* described in the work represents the earliest type found in Sri Lanka (belonging to the Anurādhapura period).

(d) Similarity of the layout of the *pabbata-vihāras* of Anurādhapura and elsewhere in Sri Lanka to some of the plans discussed in the work, and the absence of such types anywhere in South India.

(e) The closeness of the *adhiṣṭhāna* patterns and the order of the mouldings thereof described here to those of the earliest types found in Sri Lanka.

(f) The description of the seated Buddha image in *sattvaparyaṅka* or *vīrāsana* posture,[8] a type not quite popular in India, and the absence of any reference to the *vajrāsana* or cross- legged position which is so characteristic of Indian examples.

(g) The *uttama-daśa-tāla* measure prescribed for Buddha images,[9] which is quite contrary to the Indian practice of allocating it for images of Hindu gods of the highest order.

(h) The close similarity of the eye-painting ceremony described in the work to the one currently followed by Sri Lankan temple artists.[10]

Before ascribing an Indian origin to the work, it is essential that these arguments are cited and refuted, which the Editors of the present edition have failed to do.

Still more unconvincing is the date they have suggested for the work, i.e., the period between the 11th and 12th centuries. This question of date of the work has been dismissed by the Editors in a little more than half a page. Here again they have conveniently overlooked my arguments for a much earlier date, which I have adduced on firm grounds. While admitting that the subject matter of the text should go back to a period much earlier than the 14th-15th century period to which the writing down of the present copy is attributed, and that the fashioning of the *gajastambha* and the *chatradaṇḍa* out of wood as described in the work represents an age old practice, they have assigned the work to the 11th or 12th century without giving any vaild reasons.[11] Their main line of argument appears to be that the absence of the *sabhā* (or chapter-house, one of the five major or sacred edifices belonging to an *ārāma* complex), in the early *pabbata-vihāras* and its presence at Māṇikdena which they assign to the close of the first millenium A.C.would suggest a date later than that. This argument is least convincing because the so-called 'early'*pabbata-vihāras* have, as I have already pointed out, been renovated and restored several times under Theravāda influence, which has resulted in certain alterations of their original layout. It is wrong to say that these *ārāmas* do not contain the *sabhā*. In fact they do contain that edifice, of course not at the centre as in the case of the Hastyārāma plans descibed in the work, but in the place originally occupied by the *prāsāda* (or monks' residence) which has now been pushed out of the sacred square to the lower platform surrounding it. This lower platform is the result of later enlargements, added to accommodate all the secular buildings which were originally included in the sacred square itself along with the sacred edifices. We are not in a position to ascertain the original layout of these *pabbata-vihāras* until and unless proper excavations are carried out in these sites.

But there are more convincing arguments for assigning the work a much earlier date. The mention that the *caitya* was capped by a *chatra* supported by a *chatradaṇḍa*, both made of wood, bears ample evidence for assigning the work to a period beyond the 7th century A.C. If it was compiled in the 11th or 12th century, one has to explain why the text is silent

about the *devatākoṣṭha* and the *kotkärälla* (or spire), two essential architectural members of the *caityas* of the later period. Similarly, no '*siraspata*' (ornamental flame inserted on the head) is mentioned in connection with the Buddha image which has only the uṣṇīṣa (crown or protuberance on the head). The *siraspata* is a regular feature of many Buddha images dating from the 8th century onwards.

Another piece of evidence in support of an early date is the description of the *aṣṭamaṅgala* diagram in several places of the work. In all these instances it represents the earliest type peculiar to Sri Lanka, as corroborated by the recent discovery of a bronze bowl decorated with the *aṣṭamaṅgala* symbols carved in low relief, from the site of an ancient foundry on the premises of the Abhayagiri vihāra complex. This archaeological find which is generally believed to belong to a period beyond the 8th century A.C. , is assigned by some to the 2nd or 3rd century A.C.[12] All the other *aṣṭamaṅgala* figures that have been discovered belonging to the Anurādhapura period comprise the same eight symbols, i.e., *aṅkuśa* (goad), *cāmara* (fly-whisk), *śrīvatsa* (an auspicious symbol), *pūrṇa-kumbha* (vase of plenty), *śaṅkha* (conchshell),*svastika* (mystical cross), *bhadrapīṭha* (auspicious seat) and *matsya-yugma* (double fish). Towards the later period some of these symbols were replaced by such symbols as the lamp, mirror etc.

The clay image of the Buddha which is the main subject of discussion in the second half of the work designated *Citrakarmaśāstra*, too belong to a very early period. There is no specimen of this type found in Sri Lanka among the Budha images belonging to the 2nd millennium A.C. This image must in fact be anterior to the earliest stone image found in Sri Lanka, for all stone images have been chiselled out after clay figures and had been given a clay coating to give them the semblance of clay images. This assumption finds support from the Buduruvagala images as well as the famous *samādhi* image at Anurādhapura, in the arm-pit of which remains of this clay coating are still visible. Unfortunatelly, none of these ancient clay images withstood the ravages of time, and we can , therefore, only conjecture as to how they exactly looked.

More reasons can be given to prove the antiquity of the work, but I believe the aforesaid evidence is sufficient to confirm the date I have already suggested, i.e., the period between the 5th and 7th century A.C. It is the accepted practice followed in serious research that, when a new theory is advanced, any views that have already been expressed are cited and challenged. I am sorry to say that the manner in which the place and the date of the work are discussed in the new edition is not in keeping with the academic distinction which the three eminent scholars are known for.

To me one of the most interesting areas of research for archaeologists seems to be the principles of measurement adopted in monastic architecture as set out in the work in specifying the various measurements of the several edifices in the *ārāma* complex. I have done some work in this regard, but much more remains to be done. [13]

The only redeeming feature in the present volume is Chapter 4 where Roland Silva makes a comparison of the different *ārāma* layouts discussed in the work with some of the existing archaeological sites in Sri Lanka. It enables the reader to get a bird's eye view of the various plans without laboriously going through the text or the translation.

Chapter 5 constitutes a study of the five major edifices, the refectory and the kitchen, the bath-house, the meditation-hall and a few other minor edifices based on the information furnished by the work.

The New Edition

In my edition I have given the amended version in the body of the text in the Devanāgarī script with the original readings given by way of footnotes. The text and the translation are given side by side for easy reference. In the present edition, the original text and the tentative edition are given side by side while the translation is given separately as Chapter 3. In the Editors' Note to Chapter 2 the following explanation is found on p. 36:

"Our task has been facilitated somewhat by the 'decipherment and translation' of this text by E.W.Marasinghe which has been published in the Sri Satguru Publications Series in Delhi in 1989. It should be noted, however, that our edition differs quite substantially from that of Marasinghe, both in point of structure and form and textual reconstruction, in serveral vital areas."

However, when the two editions are compared it will be revealed that more than 80% of my readings have been adopted in the present edition, some of them major amendments warranting acknowledgement but not considered so by the editors. As an example may be cited my reading '*palāṇḍvākāran*' (onion-shaped) for '*paṇḍalaṇḍākāran*' occuring in verse 5 in Chapter 3. A few of the more important of my amendments admitted to the new edition are as follows: (The page and line numbers cited refer to the new edition.

Page	**Line/s**			
42	5-6	vihārāntāgasāne	**read as**	vihārāntāgrasānau
,,	18	talunūvāluka	,,	tanuvāluka
66	5	prakristhalopari	,,	prakṛtisthalopari

,,	,,	jagmasthala	,,	janmasthala
68	11-12	bimbālayāpadmamaddhesu,,		bimbālayam āpavatseṣu
76	12	śālābāhye	,,	sālabāhye
,,	13	,,	,,	,,
78	18	pācinînṛti	,,	pacanāgāram
82	20	śṛtamālāś	,,	srutaśālā
86	16	purvvavatnavadevatā	,,	pañcaviṃśatidevatāḥ
86	17	ekādaśapadāndeva	,,	pañcaviṃśatideva-
92	2	-viṃśatibhiret	,,	-viṃśatibhirhṛte
96	3	grhamāccharaśālāni	,,	gṛhapñjaraśālāni
"	5	bhiktissopari	,,	bhitter upari
98	4	bimbālayantati	,,	bimbālayan tviti
100	2-3	ekahastamvātrihastānta	,,	ekahastan[dvihastaṃ] vā trihastāntam
"	10	saptalodvādaśa	,,	sapta daśa dvādaśa
104	18	prativyādvārddi	,,	prativyālādi
108	14	śeṣāṃśe	,,	ṣaḍamśam
144	11	tasyāgrembhematanmadhe	,,	tadeva syād agre kumbhe tanmadhye
,,	12	ajata	,,	ajādyam
146	13	saptadaśāyatā	,,	saptavidhāyatā
148	3	tasya siddhikaram	,,	sarvasiddhikaram
,,	,,	rājaśśoka-	,,	rājñaś śoka-
,,	7	ādravam	,,	ārdrakam
150	19	brahmakumbhāmbhayem	,,	brahmakumbhāmbhaso
152	5	grahaśārddhannam	,,	gṛhaśrāddhānnam
154	3	vastu	,,	vāstoḥ
,,	4	-mukham sthānayet kramaśah	,,	-mukhaṃ [sthitvā] sthāpayet

,,	17	daṇḍiramyā	,,	dṛṣṭiramyā
156	7-8	gṛhakaṣatamāsantā	,,	gṛhakṣatayamāntam
,,	10	pūrvvāgrāmadakṣiṇodbhava	,,	pūrvāgram paścimamūlam akṣobhyan tu tathāgatam

Editorial errors.

A large number of new readings in the present edition are either erroneous or unsatisfactory. Of them the most important ones are given below:

Page Line/s

56 13-14 *vivaśvapitropi* read as *vaivasvataputro 'pi*.Vivasvat is the father and not the son of Yama (Vaivasvata). The correct from should, therefore, be '*vaivasvatapitā*'

68 18 *dhutāṃśe* (taken in the sense of Bhṛśa). This interpretation is wrong because Bhṛśa is not the place for the *caitya*, for later on the *havyaś ālā* is assigned to that *koṣṭha*. In the *upapīṭha* plan no accessory building is accommodated in a *koṣṭha* along with a major edifice. I have, therefore, taken it to mean 'Aditi' which is the more likely place for the *caitya* in the Hastyārāma plan with the nothern entrance.

70 18 *dite* **read as** *uditau*. This is clearly wrong because 'Uditi' has no place in the *upapīṭha* plan. It should, therefore, be '*aditau*' (in Aditi)

72 18 *āryyāṃśe* (reading acepted). The Ārya *koṣṭha* has already been allocated to the image house. So the *pratiharmya* has to be located elsewhere, the most plausible location being the Sūryāṃśa (in the east).

,, 21 *aindrāṃśe* (reading accepted). This should be *aiśāṃśa*' (Iśāna), for Aindrāṃśa (i.e., the Āditya *koṣṭha* in the *pīṭha* plan)[9] has been set apart for the demons' lodge. Futhermore, the kitchen cannot be accommodated in the same *koṣṭha* along with the demons'lodge'. Since the refectory is located in the same *koṣṭha*, Īśa is the most suitable place for the kitchen.

85 16 *sūryyaṃśe* **read as** *yaṃāṃśe* This appears to be a genuine mistake. It should be '*sūryyāṃśe*'.

86 14 *bhuñjiśālā* (reading accepted). Actually this (i.e.,Iśa) is the place for the *caitya*. Not only '*bhuñjiśālā*' violates the metre but is also out of place here, for the refectory is never mentioned before the image-house.

88 11-20 A number of errors have been committed in the edition of this section dealing with the Cakrārāma layout with the main entrance in the west. Here, from the description of the Haṃsapakṣa onwards, the terms *'harmya'* and *'pratiharmya'* are indiscriminately used for the *prāsāda* as well as the *pratiharmya* proper. These must be scribal errors. In this particular instance, the '*pratiharmya*' occurring between the *sabhā* and the *bimbāvāsa* should be taken to mean the *prāsāda*, and the *pratimālaya* mentioned later on should stand for the *pratiharmya*, as the image house has already been assigned to the Sāvitra. The allocation of Yamāṃśa for the *caitya* creates a problem as it has later been set apart for the *homaśālā*. The Aindrāmśa is the most suitable place for the *caitya* as the *bodh*i- tree is located in the Rudra. Since the Bhṛśāṃśa is set apart for the oblation- hall as usual, the most suitable position for the *pratiharmya* is the Vitathāṃśa. The Āditya for the kitchen must be a mistake. It must be Aditi as the refectory is located in the Somāṃśa. Thus the positioning of the various buildings in the two editions may be compared as follows.

	Koṣṭha according to the first edition	*Koṣṭha* according to the new edition
Edifice		
Sabhā	Brahmā	Brahmā
Prāsāda	Āpavatsa	Āpavatsa (pratiharmya)
Pratimalāya	Savitṛ	Savitṛ
Caitya	Indra	Yama
Bodhiveśman	Rudra	Rudra
Bhojanālaya	Soma	Soma
Bhaktaśālā	Aditi	Āditya

Hayaśālā	Bhṛśa	Bhṛśa
Pratiharmya	Vitatha	Bhṛśa(pratimālaya)
Rogālaya	Mukhya	Mukhya
Puspamaṇḍapa	Sugrīva	Sugrīva
Vāriśālā	Bhṛṅgarāja	Bhṛṅgarāja
Homaśālā	Yama	Yama

92 10-*saptadhāssakam* **read as** *saptadhāṃśakam*. Here '*saptadhā*" (sevenfold) makes no meaning, for 4 out of 9 remainders in *aṃśaka* are deemed auspicious and the remaining five inauspicious, which should be avoided. So *'séṣam aṃśakam*' (the remainder is *aṃśaka*) is the best possible reading.

98 4 *ekadvitricaturbhikti-r-ādhikyam*. This reading is retained, but, I am at a loss as to how it is translated as 'an excess of the length by one, two, three or four *cubits*'? This is actually a translation of my reading.

102 12 *adhassthalāsīmānica*. The reading is retained, but its translation as *adhama* is at floor level' puzzles us. This is a direct translation of my reading '*adhamaṃ sthalasīmni ca*'.

106 5 *prāsādāṃśa*. The reading is retained, but it is wrong to translate it as 'features of a *prāsāda* .' So the correct reading must be '*prāsādāṅga*'.

108 1-2 *pratimadhyam paṭṭikāvardham*.This reading is accepted unedited and translated as '(the *masūraka*) extending up to the middle of the *prati* (and the other) extending as far as the *paṭṭikā*'. How can the height of a base be calculated up to the middle of the *prati* moulding and for what purpose.? This has, therefore, to be amended as "*pratyantam paṭṭikāvadhi*" (extending up to the upper limit of the *prati* and the *paṭṭikā*-limit), for one of these two, i.e., the *prati* and the *paṭṭikā*, generally constitutes the uppermost moulding of an *adhiṣṭhāna*.

108 21 *āliṅgaikatrikuñjakam*. The editors have taken '*āliṅga*' and '*kuñjaká*' as two different mouldings and translate it as '*āliṅga* one unit and the *kuñjaka* three units'. This is definitely wrong, for there is no moulding by the name '*kuñjaka*'. Futhermore, if they are taken as two separate mouldings, the total number of units constituting the particular base type will be 20 instead of the prescribed 19. The correct interpretation

110 12 *caturaścāśraṣaḍvṛttam* read as '*caturaśrañ ca ṣaḍvṛttam*'. How is it translated as 'four-sided, six sided or circular'? The correct reading would, therefore, be '*caturaśrāśraṣaḍ vṛttaṁ*'.

11810 *pāṣpamaṇḍapam* read as '*pārśvamaṇḍapam*' (a side-pavilion),but translated as'....pavilion supplying water to visitors'. In my edition I have read this as '*prapāmaṇḍapam*' which I have defined in my glossary as 'apavilion for supplying water to travellers!'

122 20 -124-7 In a number of places '*śālā*' has been wrongly used for '*sāla*' meaning a wall.

132 13 *jālakānta [ra]saṃyuktam*. This reading which is retained in the edition would mean 'equipped with latticed windows....'. but strangely enough, it has been translated as'equipped with vertical recessed chases', obviously following my translation. The word for vertical recessed chases is *jalakāntara* (or *salilāntara*) which I have adopted in my edition.

132 21 *mahatthalam* read as '*mahatsthalam*' and interpreted as 'a level ground'. This is definitely wrong and should be amended as '*mahatpathaḥ*' (a wide road) , for a similar road (*mārgaka)* is prescribed for the *madhyama* and *adhama* layouts as well.

138 9 *karuṇālayam*. This rading which is accepted is unsatisfactory. It should be amended as '*taruṇālayam*' which would mean 'a hut erected for the purpose of renovating damaged statues' The word is again found at xvi.145 in the *Citrakarmaśāstra*.

152 2 *vāturvvāstu vinyaset* read as '*caturvastu vinyaset*'. This is unsatisfactory for it is not clear what the 'caturvastu'(four objects) are. But soon after, the nine deities of the site are mentioned. Therefore, I stand by my reading '*vāstudevān tu vinyaset*'. (One shall install the deities of the site)

No attempt has been made in the present edition to decipher, edit or translate any phrase, line or passage I have left unedited and untranslated. The dotted lines and question marks which indicate such difficullt passages in the first edition appear unfailingly in the same places in the new edition too. However, in fairness to the editor of the text, it must be admitted that a few errors and oversights in my edition have been rectified in the present edition, but most of the other readings adopted, as has been shown in the few instances cited above, are far from satisfactory.

The Translation.

The translation is heavily based on mine, with more than 250 verses (out of a total of 775) copied almost verbatim from my translation, again without a word of acknowledgement. Even in the case of the remaining verses, with the exception of a very few, the translation seems to have laregly depended on mine so much so that in a number of instances as shown above, the text and the translation do not agree.

In conclusion it may be added that the present volume displays signs of a project hurriedly executed and contributes very little to the research already done in the field.

Prof.E.W.Marasinghe

E.W.Marasinghe is Professor of Sanskrit and Head of the Department of Languages and Cultural Studies,
University of Sri Jayewardenepura,
Sri Lanka.

Notes

1. The *Vāstuvidyāśāstra Ascribed to Mañjuśrī*, ed. & tr. by E.W. Marasinghe,Delhi, 1989.

   The *Citrakarmaśāstra Ascribed to Mañjuśrī*, ed.& tr. by E.W. Marasinghe,Delhi,1991.

2. p.iii.

3. pp.vi-xvi.

4. This paper has been published in The Kamburupitiye Sri Vanaratana Felicitation Volume, Colombo, Dept. of Cultural Affairs,1996.

5. *Mahābodhivaṃsa*, ed. by S. Arthur Strong, London, 1891, p. 137.

6. *Saddharmālaṅkāraya*, ed. by K. Jñānavimala Thera, Colombo, 1954, p.409.

7. *Saddharmaratnākaraya*, ed. by Śrī Sugunasāra Devānanda Thera, Colombo, 1955,p. 358.

8. *Citrakarmaśāstra Ascribed to Mañjuśrī*, xv. 19-37.

9. Op.cit., viii. 8; xiv.

10. Op. cit., xviii.

11. p. 16.

12. Ulrich von Schroeder, *The Golden Age of Sculpture in Sri Lanka*, Hong Kong, 1992,p.21.

13. E.W.Marasinghe, 'purātana vāstuśāstrayē boradam bhāvitaya', *saṃskṛtikṛa purāṇaya*, 1994 (Jan.-March), pp.18-22....., 'purāṇa vāstuśāstrayē māna nirṇaya', *saṃskṛtika purāṇaya*, 1955 (Jan.-March), pp. 25-30.