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BSOAS  Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies  
DPPN  Dictionary of Pali Proper Names  
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MKPC  Mon Kyauksa Paung Chyok  
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MSSK  Myanma Cway Cum Kyam  
SMK  She Haung Myanma Kyauksa Mya

Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Documentation in this introductory chapter will be minimal, as subsequent chapters regarding the assertions made here will include complete citations. The Kalyani Inscriptions, often dated to 1476, were in fact not actually inscribed until 1479.

2. My use of the term “Burma” (or for that matter “Myanmar”) should not be construed as a political statement, but a matter of habit, although for official references I would no more refuse to use “Kampuchea” or “Mumbai” than I would “Myanmar.” Besides, for a Burmese speaker, using the term “Myanmar” as a noun by itself is awkward, as it is really an adjective and needs another word, like ပြည် (country), after it.

3. This title derives from a paper I presented in December 2001 in Yangon, Myanmar, at the annual meeting of the Universities Historical Research Centre, December 12–14.

4. Knowledge about the Third Buddhist Council, and hence Sona and Uttara’s journey to Suvannabhumi, was not unknown earlier in Pagan. Indeed, their story is represented as a mural on the Myinkaba Kubyaukgyi temple, thought to have been
built in the eleventh century. My point, however, is the connection suggested between Suvaṃabhūmi, Lower Burma, and the Third Council, a link I have not found in any of the standard Mon language texts of the precolonial era written between the Kalāyana Inscriptions and the twentieth century. The first Burmese source to connect Suvaṃabhūmi and Mon Lower Burma after Dhammazedi appears to have been U Kala’s work, written in Burmese, in which he displays an obvious uncertainty about even that claim (Mahāyazawingyi [Great royal chronicle], ed. Saya Pwa [Yangon: Hanthawaddy Press, 1960], vol. 1, p. 100). Half a century later, another Burmese-language palm-leaf manuscript entitled “Thatōn Yazawin” (Chronicle of Thatōn) was said to have been copied, probably verbatim, from a Mon chronicle (yazawin) around 1789. It mentions a Suvaṃabhūmi Myo (that is, “city of Suvaṃabhūmi”), which is curious since the Suvaṃabhūmi of Buddhist legend is a much larger entity, in fact, a whole region. At the end of the manuscript, the copyist wrote that the original was the old Mon-language yazawin “written by Gunawudhī and others,” which he had “corrected.” This Burmese version can be found as microfilm Reel 74 of the Toyo Bunko microfilm project on Burma under “Thatōn Yazawin.” The catalogue of the Toyo Bunko project itself is in English and published as List of Microfilms Deposited in The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, Part 8. Burma (Tokyo, The Toyo Bunko, 1976), p. 22.


6. Quoted in Harvey’s History, p. 28.

7. Michael Symes’s 1802 account of Ava may be the first by an English-language author to accept the Mon Paradigm. He wrote, “Much of Burmese civilization, including Hinayana Buddhism, had come to them from the Mons, whose independent kingdom with its capital at Thaton had been conquered by King Anawrahta in the middle of the eleventh century AD and incorporated in the empire of Pagan.” Michael Symes, Journal of his Second Embassy to the Court of Ava in 1802 (London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1955), p. xix.


10. The most recent and comprehensive view of the Mon Paradigm is that of
G. H. Luce, found in numerous works, but most completely developed in his three-volume *Old Burma, Early Pagan* (New York: J.J. Augustin, 1969), p. 31 especially, and passim. But Luce was merely perpetuating, albeit with much extrapolation, a perspective begun much earlier. Even non-Burma scholars of Southeast Asia, such as George Coedes, managed to get involved in this thesis regarding an early Mon Theravāda Buddhist state when he suggested that Theravāda Buddhism was introduced in the eleventh century to Lower Burma by refugees fleeing a cholera epidemic in Hariṇaśīla; see Coedes, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, ed. Walter F. Vella and trans. Susan Brown Cowing (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1968), p. 149. There are many recent works that are steeped in the Mon Paradigm, as the subsequent chapters and citations will demonstrate.

11. The most important and earliest generation of scholars involved in the reconstruction of early Burma at the time, such as Professor Pe Maung Tin, U Lu Pe Win, U Tun Nyein, and a little later, Mon Bokay were of Mon cultural background. G. H. Luce of course was not, but he married Pe Maung Tin’s sister and thus was intimately connected to that culture. In a country dominated by those whose cultural background was Burman, it is understandable why these scholars may have embraced the Mon Paradigm.


15. One Burma scholar of the post-Luce generation who has managed to escape the Mon Paradigm, but without directly questioning it, is Janice Stargardt, as demonstrated in *The Ancient Pyu of Burma*, Volume One: *Early Pyu Cities in a Man-Made Landscape* (Cambridge and Singapore: Publications on Ancient Civilization in South Asia and Institute of South East Asian Studies, 1990).

16. This re-creation can be found in G. H. Luce’s *Old Burma-Early Pagan*, vol. 1, opposite the Foreword.


18. Chapter Twelve is devoted to the origins and development of the Mon Paradigm where I discuss the issue in detail.


20. As I stated in the Preface, one of the best indications of this was the subsequent creation of a historical committee in Burma to investigate whether the paper I delivered in Yangon was sound.

22. Postmodernists might retort that this is impossible, but it is the best I can do at this time without getting into my subconscious.

23. I do not pretend to know the Mon language, but as of this writing, nearly all Mon inscriptions found in Burma have been translated either into Burmese or English. The former version is more important because the scripts for both languages are virtually identical in Burma. This means one can read the actual words of the Mon version while obtaining meanings from translations.


**Chapter Two: The Pyū Millennium**

1. He wrote that “the name ‘Pyū’ has merely been attached to it as a convenient label . . . but by no means to be accepted as final.” Archaeological Survey of Burma, *Epigraphia Birmanica: Being Lithic and Other Inscriptions of Burma* [hereafter cited as EB] (Rangoon: Government Printing, 1919), 1:61.

2. Stargardt, in her *Ancient Pyu*, had summarized and analyzed the many disparate pieces of scholarship that had hitherto contributed to the understanding of the Pyū. The latest scholarship on the Pyū is Hudson’s dissertation (see bibliography).


9. Apart from the possible links to Southwest India with regard to the Pyū writing system (this is contested, as we shall see below), there are other intriguing com-

10. *EB* 3, 1 (1923): 42. But Blagden, who translated this inscription, states (in note 9) that its meaning “has not been determined.”

11. Myanmar, Archaeological Department, *She Haung Myanma Kyauksa Mya* (Ancient Burmese stone inscriptions) [hereafter cited as SMK], 5 vols. (Yangon: Sape Beikman, 1972–present). The first known mention of “Pyū” as an ethnic term appears to be in 1200 AD, when a “Mr. Pyū” is mentioned, although the spelling could mean “Mr. White” as well. (SMK 1:71). However, in 1207, when the word is spelled correctly as “Pyū,” a “Pyū mound” was mentioned (SMK 1:83).

12. I should add a word of caution that not all students of the pre-Pagān millennium see its culture as necessarily uniform or continuous. To me, however, the evidence seems convincing enough.

13. Currently there are even two graduate students in western academia working on the Pyū.


15. King Kyantzittha’s palace inscription, assigned to 1102, is the first time that the term Rmeñ (Mon) appears in original, domestic epigraphy, with the inference that the Mon were contemporaneous with the Pyū (*EB* 3, 1:1–68). Luce’s conjectural map in *Old Burma* (see this book, Chapter One, Figure 1) suggests that the country was divided into three large ethnic blocks—the Mranmā on the north, the Pyū in the middle, and the Rmeñ in the south. In other words, Luce used conjecture as “evidence” to prove itself.

16. To be demonstrated below.

17. The Chinese sources mention nine walled cities (the latest count is a little more than a dozen, depending on what one counts) and 298 districts. See, for example, Parker, *Burma*, p. 12. For their locations, see my *Making of Modern Burma* on CD-ROM (Honolulu: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, 2001) under “Maps,” and Bob Hudson et al., “Origins of Bagan,” p. 64.

18. Michael Aung-Thwin, *Irrigation in the Heartland of Burma: Foundations of the Pre-Colonial Burmese State* (DeKalb, IL: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, 1990). These large Pyū cities were strategically placed to control the same three major areas...

19. U Aung Myint’s Kaung Kin Dat Pon Pon Hma Myanma She Haung Myo Taw Mya (Ancient royal cities of Myanmar from aerial photographs [hereafter Aerial Photographs]), Yangon: Ministry of Culture, 1998, is a most useful publication that sheds much light on the subject.


23. Wheatley, Nägara, Chapter I, “The City and Its Origins.” A partially dissenting view can be found in Richard O’Connor, A Theory of Indigenous Southeast Asian Urbanism (Singapore: Institute for Southeast Asian Studies, 1983) where he addresses Southeast Asian urbanism as an issue but not necessarily its link to state formation. See also the latter’s “A Regional Explanation of the Tai Muang as a City-State” in Mogens Herman Hansen’s edition of A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures (Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 2000), pp. 431–443.

24. As far as I can tell, the city of Beikthano is not mentioned in the chronicles.


26. Neither Mongmao nor Binnaka is mentioned as a Pyu city in the chronicles, but Bhinnakaraja, the “king of Bhinnaka” is, in The Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma, trans. Pe Maung Tin and G. H. Luce (Rangoon: Burma Research Society, 1960), p. 3. Interestingly, he is linked to the fall of Tagaung, the city long considered by Burmese speakers to be the origins of their culture.


28. The city is listed as “Bhinnaka-mrui kui kro kui con cactam ‘Sittan of Beinnaka’” [sic] in List of Microfilms, p. 29. The copy of the palm-leaf manuscript is on reel number 95, item no. 8, dated to 1833 AD.


32. Luce, Phases, 1:72, 78.
33. Man Shu, p. 90.
34. Man Shu, p. 90.
42. Aung-Thwin, *Irrigation*, pp. 68, 72, 73.
44. The present excavated city may have been a later construction, so that there could have been more than one Halin period, with an older one underneath that is more circular like its contemporaries in Arakan, Thailand, and Cambodia.
45. Myint Aung, “Excavations at Halin” p. 55, states that it is about two square miles. The hectare figure comes from Bob Hudson, personal communication.
47. See Harvey’s *History*, p. 320–321, for a description of this practice in the nineteenth century.
48. The miniature site plans of these two cities at the provincial museum of Arakan clearly show this. For the early history and culture of Arakan, see U Shwe Zan, *Golden Mrauk-U*. For a recent work on Arakan of this period meant for the general public, one should consult Pamela Gutman’s *Burma’s Lost Kingdoms: Splendours of Arakan* (Trumbull, CT: Weatherhill Inc., 2001). For a scholarly treatment of Arakan, see her Ph.D. dissertation entitled “Ancient Arakan: With Special Reference
to its Cultural History between the 5th and 11th Centuries," Australian National University, 1976.

49. The miniature site plan displayed at Sukhodaya archaeological park reveals a similar design and use of water.

50. U Tha Myat, Pyu Phat Ca, 22.


53. As noted above, G. H. Luce considered Halin the latest Pyu city.

54. Zatatawpon Yazawin (Chronicle of royal horoscopes), ed. U Hla Tin (Rangoon: Ministry of Culture, 1960), p. 36. Dwattabaung, however, is preceded by two brothers from Tagaung, the place to which the Burmese trace their origins. His story is similar to a much later (1825) Mon tale called the Lik Smín Asah, to be discussed fully in Chapter Six. It concerns Samala and Wimala, the two founding brothers of Pegu, who came from India to live as hermits in Lower Burma. Thus, this "quintessential" Mon tale may actually have been derived from the Zatatawpon or an even earlier Pyu tradition, since Śrī Kṣetra is also known as Yathe Myo or "City of the Hermit(s)." See Glass Palace Chronicles, p. 19. Moreover, it does not seem to be just a coincidence that of the seven auspicious individuals who founded Śrī Kṣetra, one was Rishi the Hermit (Zatatawpon, p. 36).

55. Indeed, the Zatatawpon, p. 35–37, explicitly states, and has a chart that illustrates, two distinct dynasties of Śrī Kṣetra.

56. The well-known phrase belongs to the late Stephen J. Gould, renowned paleontologist.


58. Man Shu, p. 90.


60. Man Shu, p. 90. Also, Parker, Burma, pp. 12–13, where the Chinese source states that the city "is built of greenish glazed tiles . . . " and elsewhere in the narrative, "with bricks of vitreous ware . . . " (p. 13). Chen Yi-sein, in his article "The Location of the Pyu Capital in the 800–832 Period," Proceedings of the Myanmar Two Millennia Conference 15–17 December 1999 (Yangon, Universities Historical Research Centre, 2000), pp. 1–12, writes that the word ch'ing-p'i in the Man-shu and Hsin T'ang shu are references to "ordinary bricks" (p. 10). Yet he translated the word ch'ing as "blue," "black" or "green," with the implication that they were glazed. I am not certain how the apparent contradiction is reconciled.

Geok Yian Goh, a PhD student studying early Burma at the University of Hawai‘i, with reading knowledge of classical Chinese, has also read the relevant passage in the Man-shu for me. She confirms Chen's translation that the word ch'ing is "blue," "black," or "green" and suggests that most probably ch'ing refers to a greenish-blue hue in the color of the glazed bricks. If true, it appears that the bricks used to construct the walls of the P’iao capital were indeed glazed with a blue or greenish color, a technique which was used quite regularly later during the Pagan period,
particularly on Jātaka plaques of temples, and, in one case at least, the entire stupa: the Ngakywènadaung.


62. Hudson et al., “Origins of Bagan,” p. 64, is one of the few, and most recent, to include Wati.

63. Maung Win Maung, “Binnaka.”

64. Luce, Phases, 1:68.

65. Parker, Burma, p. 11 and Chen Yi-Sein, “Lin-Yang,” p. 73. The number thirty-two is curious for it is often symbolic of the thirty-two deities of Tāvatīṃsa ruled by Sakka, as well as the “Thirty Myos” (cities or towns) of Lower Burma, a tradition hastily attributed to the Mon by Shorto.


75. Aung Thaw, “The ‘Neolithic’ Culture of the Padah-lin Caves,” Asian Perspectives 14 (1971): 123–133; Michael Aung-Thwin, “Origins and Development of the Field of Prehistory in Burma.” To be sure, some “neolithic” implements have been found in Lower Burma as well, but compared with the quantity, proliferation, distribution, and chronology of their counterparts in Upper Burma, the Lower Burma findings, at least to date, are hardly contenders for an alternative approach.

76. Aung-Thwin, “Principles and Patterns.”

77. I owe the phrase to W. Donald MacTaggart of Arizona State University. Personal communication, July 21, 1992.


80. Wicks, Money, Markets, and Trade, p. 115–116; Aung Thaw, Excavations at Beikthano (Rangoon: Ministry of Union Culture, 1968) and Historical Sites. The horde of coins found at Pegu almost surely belonged to the Pyu period and are quite distinctly Pyu, not Mon, and will be discussed in Chapter Three.


82. Stargardt, Ancient Pyu, p. 282.

83. Aung Thaw, Excavations; Stargardt, Ancient Pyu; Aung-Thwin, “Burma Before Pagan.”

84. Aung Thaw, Excavations. I do not want to get into a debate on whether this was “true” Roman or Indian rouletted blackware as per Bellwood. The point is that this kind of pottery seems to have been quite common to other areas of Southeast Asia around this time.


86. Luce, Phases, 1:68, 73.

87. Wheatley, Nāgara, p. 270.

88. Parker, Burma, p. 15.

89. See Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 31 and Stargardt, Ancient Pyu, plate 28a, for their photographic representation.

90. Aung Thaw, Historical Sites. Among others, the stone beads and sprinkler vessels found at Winga are identical, or nearly so, to those found at Beikthano.


93. Stargardt, Ancient Pyu, p. 200

94. Both Stargardt, Ancient Pyu, p. 192, and Richard M. Cooler, The Karen bronze drums of Burma: types, iconography, manufacture, and use (Leiden and New York: E.J. Brill, 1994), suggests a pre-Indic culture that was based on fertility, the seasons, rain, and other such natural phenomena.


102. Ray, Nihar-Ranjan, *Sanskrit Buddhism in Burma* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1936), chapter 3, pp. 40–61, 81. Also, U Tin, “Mahayan gaing Myanma naingnan tho sheuswa yauk thi akyauk,” *[The earliest arrival of the Mahayan Sect to Pagan, Burma]*, JBRs 19, 2 (1929): 36–42. According to Taranatha, the famous Tibetan monk who traveled in Southeast Asia during the sixteenth century, when Magadha was captured by the Turks (Turanus) in the tenth century, many monks and scholars fled to “Pukham,” among other places in Southeast Asia. Some of these included the Mantrayanas.


107. *EB* 1, 2:114.


111. Duraiselle, “Excavations at Hmauzma,” *Archaeological Survey of India*, 1927, pp. 171–181. He was one of the pioneers in Burma history and director of the Archaeological Department, Burma.

112. U Tha Myat has deciphered and translated into Burmese the entire twenty leaves. See his *Pyu Phut Ca*, pp. 23–33.


114. *EB* 1, 2:77, note 1.


118. Luce, *Phases*, 1, p. 163.

119. Luce, *Phases*, 1, p. 162.


121. All three can be found in Burma today, although the Soña and Uttara tradition eventually became the dominant one for the whole culture, but probably not
until after the Pegu Dynasty of the fourteenth century AD emerged and pushed that tradition, a topic to be discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

122. Ray, Sanskrit Buddhism, p. 21 and Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 32.

123. Ray, Sanskrit Buddhism. The issue here is not so much "the many faces of Maitreya," as Kitagawa aptly puts it in Maitreya, the Future Buddha, eds. Alan Sondheim and Helen Hardacre (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 7–22, but the presence of his “ideology” among the Pyu and centrality among the Burmese speakers in Pagán, all found well before evidence of Mon presence in Burma and certainly before proven Mon-Burman contact.


126. U Tha Myat, Pyu Phat Ca, p. 77, line 5 and 6 of Pyu inscription.


128. Ray, Sanskrit Buddhism, p. 43; Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 28.

129. Hence, the word hpaya in Burmese is used for both the Buddha and the temple.

130. To be sure, of the few found, cited in Luce, Phases, 1:125–177, none is dated.

131. Shorto, “32 Myos” and “dewatau sotāpan.”

132. It is possible to argue that it may have existed then, but there is no clear evidence of it. My earlier views in Pagán (p. 54) had concurred with Shorto’s, but I now have reservations about them.


135. EB 1, 2:114.


140. The best, concise work on the Pyu language is U Tha Myat’s Pyu Pha Ca. It contains comparisons of relevant Indic scripts of various periods in terms of all consonants and vowels with actual samples from the epigraphy found at the Pyu sites of Halin and Śrī Ksetra.


142. See Stargardt’s Ancient Pyu, pp. 192, and 290–295, on the presence of Brāhmi script at Beikthana.

143. C. O. Blagden, “The Pyu Inscriptions,” Epigraphia Indica 12 (1913–1914): 127–132; U That Myat, Pyu Pha Ca, pp. 50–51; Luce, “Ancient Pyu,” p. 310. The entire dating system on which the Pyu kingdom of Śrī Ksetra has hitherto been based may now have to be revised, or at least reconsidered. In 1993 a team of Burma
scholars discovered a stone inscription written in Pyū. From the information contained in that inscription, and a reassessment of other Pyū inscriptions, they concluded that the earlier dating scheme should be changed. Instead of 638 years added to Pyū dates to arrive at the AD dates, as has been customary, we now need to add only 319 or 320 years, which makes everything approximately 300 years earlier. The city and kingdom of Śrī Kṣetra may therefore have emerged as early as the fourth century rather than the seventh (see Tun Aung Chain, “The Kings of the Hpayahtaung Urn Inscription,” Myanmar Historical Journal, no. 11 (June 2003): 1–15; and San Win, “Dating the Hpayahtaung Pyu Urn Inscription,” Myanmar Historical Journal, no. 11 (June 2003): 15–22).

To be sure, the ultimate basis for this new dating system is interpretive. The team assumes that the fourth-century Gupta Calendar rather than the seventh-century Pyū calendar was used, since the script in the above Pyū inscription is thought to have been fourth-century Gupta, hence the reduction by 300 years. Yet as I show elsewhere in this book, paleography is hardly foolproof when precise dates are required, and unfortunately the stone itself does not state what era was used; only the numerical dates are given. Therefore it is still not clear what the AD equivalent of the Pyū years are. This is an issue that will be debated for many more years to come.

144. Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 31. However, Luce, Phases, 1:139, considers the script to be “Gupta” although I am not certain what that means.

145. Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 28. For a reproduction of the upper part of the inscription in Pyū identifying the Four Buddhas, see U Tha Myat, Pyū Pha Ca, page 34. However, he does not include the lines inscribed below that identify the disciples and the donors.

146. Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 31. Janice Stargardt, Tracing Thought Through Things: The Oldest Pali Texts and the Early Buddhist Archaeology of India and Burma (Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 2000) seems to disagree. My thanks to Shah Alam-Zalini, a graduate student at the University of Hawai’i working on the Pyū, for alerting me to this source. Stargardt mentions the two reliquary deposits from Khin Bā mound and criticizes the Kadamba hypothesis. Her analysis is based on Harry Falk’s “Die Goldblätter aus Śrī Kṣetra,” Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 41 (1997): 53–92. The origins of the Pyū script is eagerly awaiting exploration.


148. Aung Thaw, Excavations.

149. EB 1, 1:60.

150. Luce, Phases, 1:63.

151. Man Shu, p. 91.

152. Parker, Burma, p. 15. The problem may be in Parker’s translation or it may be in the Chinese texts themselves.

153. Personal communication, Sun Laichen, University of California, Fullerton, September 7, 2002, suggests it is not.

154. In Phases, 1:103, Luce writes that the “Mranma longed to escape the Nan-
chao yoke [and p. 106, the “Nan-chao tyranny”] so that they took their first opportunity to do so, in or after 835, by descending to the hot malarious plains of Central Burma, where Nanchao armies, used to the cold plateaux of Yunnan, durst not follow them except on a cold-weather raid."


156. Information regarding the last item can be found in Moe Kyaw Aung, "Excursions to the Thuyethamein-Kuseik Area," Forward 8, 21 (June 1970), 12–17, cite on p. 15, which revealed a passage from the "Paticcasamuppada," or the "Law of Cause and Effect."

157. SMK 1:83; 2:40; 3:202, 262, 235; 4:175. See also U Tha Myat, Pyu Pha Ca, p. 77, and Luce, Phases, 1:66–67. The word lin is usually reserved for “husband,” but sometimes used as “spouse” as well during the Pagán period.

158. The “coming of the Burmans” in the ninth century is a long-held conclusion that needs to be more thoroughly examined. I have provisionally accepted it here as it is, for at the moment, it is beside the point. For a recent analysis of this thesis, see Luce, Phases 1:98–108.

159. The issue here is not whether this Indic culture was borrowed directly from India—some of it certainly was—but whether the Burmese speakers obtained it from Lower Burma Mon speakers, as claimed by the Mon Paradigm.

160. Zatatawpon, p. 54.

161. Peter Grave and Mike Barbetti, "Dating the City Wall, Fortifications, and the Palace Site at Pagán," in Asian Perspectives Special Issue: The Archaeology of Myamna Pyay (Burma), ed. Miriam T. Stark and Michael A. Aung-Thwin (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002), p. 81. Thus, only a 131-year discrepancy exists between the Zatatawpon date of 849 AD and the 980 AD radiocarbon date.

162. However, this assumption may not be valid, as the Zatatawpon recalled that both the walls of the city and the palace within were built at the same time.


164. Aung-Thwin, Pagán, p. 22.


169. Thus, Pyuminhti’s successor was Hitinyin, then Yinminpaik, followed by Paikthelay and so on [all my emphases]. See Charles Backus, Nan-chao kingdom, p. 51, regarding this “patronymic linkage system” that seems to be Tibeto-Burman, not Austro-Asiatic. We can be assured, of course, that even the late chroniclers had no way of knowing they were documenting what we have come to recognize only in modern times as a patronymic system.


171. Man Shu, p. 90 states that “the common people all live within the city-wall.” Other Chinese sources state that “the people all live inside it” (Parker, Burma, p. 13).
172. Aung Thaw, *Historical Sites and Excavations*; also Myint Aung, “Excavations at Halin.” Subsequently, Stargardt in *Ancient Pyu* synthesized the best-known published works in English on this culture under one cover. See also Aung-Thwin, “Burma Before Pagan.”

173. Bob Hudson thinks it reveals the development of an elite core, most of whom lived inside the walled section (Hudson et al., “Origins of Bagan,” p. 66).


175. Aung-Thwin, *Pagan*; and “The Role of Sāsana Reform in Burmese History: Economic Dimensions of a Religious Purification,” *JAS* 38, 4 (August 1979): 671–688. There are many examples of this: donations made in the mid-eleventh century were still valid and considered glebe in the fourteenth century (*SMK* 3:285, 287). Indeed, during my several visits to Pagan during the 1970s and 1990s, I found lands still held today as religious property that had been donated during the mid- to late eleventh century AD.


177. U Myint Aung, “Suvannabhumi”; and his “The Excavations of Ayethama and Winka (?Suvannabhumi),” in *Essays Given to Than Tun on his 75th Birthday: Studies in Myanma History*, 1 (Yangon: Innwa Publishing House, 1999), p. 53. However, I have since discussed the issue at length with U Myint Aung and should point out that he is now also rather skeptical of the Mon Paradigm.

**Chapter 3: Rāmaññadesa, an Imagined Polity**


4. C. O. Blagden, “Etymological Notes: II. Mon and Rāmaññadesa,” *JBR* vol. 4, pt. 1 (1914), pp. 59–60; “Etymological Notes: VII. Mon, Rman, Ramañña,” 5, 1 (1915), p. 27. Note that the word is not *rmaññ* but *rman*. Although this might be baffling when reproduced in English, it is quite obvious in the Burma script with which the Mon language was written in the country. Nai Pan Hla’s reproduction in *The Significant Role of The Mon Language and Culture in Southeast Asia: Part I* (Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 1992), p. 3 makes this clear.


7. Christian Bauer, *A Guide to Mon Studies* (Monash University Centre of southeast Asian Studies Working Paper, no. 32 Clayton, Australia: 1984), p. 2. See also Jan Wisseman Christie, “The Medieval Tamil-language Inscriptions.” Both inscriptions that she cites, one dated to 883 and the other to 1021 AD, mixed place names and ethnonyms. For example, Champa (the place name) is followed by *Kmira, Kling*, and *Singhala*, all ethnonyms. Similarly, neither *Remman* nor *Remen* is a place name, and neither tells us where these people lived or came from. Blagden also refers to J. M. Krom’s article of 1914 in the *JRAI* (October 1914), p. 1026, regarding the two Javanese inscriptions that mentioned the forms *reman* or *remeñi*. Michael Vickery has also helped me by citing four cases where *remeñi* and its equivalents were mentioned in Khmer inscriptions of the relevant period (personal communication, Feb. 9, 2004).
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45. Luce, Old Burma, 1:40.
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109. SMK 1:345. Luce, however, in Old Burma, 1:84, note 12, thinks the stone may date from the early Ava period, although I see no intrinsic reason the date given on the stone (equivalent to 1176 AD) is not original. Either way, the Old Burmese Muttama still precedes the Old Mon Mattma.
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25. Luce’s list of place names in Old Burma, 2, “attachment,” cites Dhammazedi’s 1476 Kalyani Inscriptions as the earliest source as well.
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49. Legend of Queen Cäma, p. xxvi, note 2.

50. Legend of Queen Cäma, p. 106.


53. The editors of the Legend of Queen Cäma write (p. xxv) that the text noted earlier by Coedes is identical to the story of Cämadevī as translated by Auguste Pavie in Mission Pavie (Paris, 1898), based on a Luang Prabang manuscript dated 1646.

54. Coedes, Indianized, p. 149, dates it to the “first half of the 11th century” but fails to cite his source other than the Cämadevīvamsa.

55. Legend of Queen Cäma, p. 20.


57. Noted below.

58. It is true that another inscription (SMK 1, section “kha,” pp. 326–327) with a date of 1086 mentions King Aniruddha, who, it said, “displaying his might,” marched to “Ussa Paykū,” as Pegu and its region was known, and is still today. But the editors do not think this is an original inscription. Indeed, on line 16 of the inscription a date of 1105 is encountered, so the inscription cannot be dated earlier than that.

59. Sheaf of Garlands, xxix.

60. Sheaf of Garlands, 104.


63. Luce, Old Burma, 1:22, had also assumed the same.

64. In U Kala, Mahayazawingyi, 1:115, Śrī Kṣetra is called Yathé Pyí (the “hermit kingdom”).

65. Sheaf of Garlands, p. 104, note 2, quotes Coedes, p. 80. Coedes may have confused Punṇagāma with Pugārāma, by which Pagan is known. For example, see U Kala, Mahayazawingyi, 1:184, 249. The late eighteenth-century Myanmar Yazawin-thit (p. 85) also states that Aniruddha named Pagan Paukarama (i.e. Pugārāma). The early sixteenth-century Yazawingyaw (p. 77) uses the term Pukāṁ as do the Zatataw-
pon (p. 37) and the Maniyadanabon (p. 5), and not Puṇḍagāma. The Kalayani Inscriptions recalled a Pugama. Unfortunately, Luce also confused the two. See his Old Burma, 2:273.


67. It was compiled and published only in 1910.


70. It is on pages 9–34 and 45–61 of the Nidāna Rāmadhipati-kathā, which, upon binding, was named Rājāwaṁsa Dhammaceti Mahāpiṭakadhara, ed. Phra Candakanto (Pak Lat: Siam, 1912).

71. I am thinking mainly of the scholarship of Nai Pan Hla, a Mon scholar of Burma, who has not discussed this problem in any of his published works that I have seen.


74. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, p. 3.

75. Some of the contents in the Nidāna suggest that it is later than it is made out to be. It includes the story of Prince Asah’s fight with the Indian, which is not found until the Lik Smin Asah, and that work was not composed until 1825. See Halliday’s introduction to Lik Smin Asah, p. vi.

76. The author must have forgotten that they were not supposed to go back to India but to Lower Burma, since the story had already been shifted from India to Burma!

77. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, pp. 3–4.

78. This story is in Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, pp. 3–4. In SMK 1:355, an inscription of Pagān mentions that King Sithu (obviously Narapatisithu here), descended to Lower Burma in 1192 AD.

79. This tradition is also found in the Thai chronicles. See Mom Chao Chand Chirayu Rajani, Guide through the Inscriptions of Sukhothai, University of Hawai’i Southeast Asian Studies Program Working Paper, no. 9, (Honolulu: 1976), p. 15. Baker, “Ayutthaya,” (p. 50), also mentions this son-in-law relationship between the “kings” of Ayutthaya and the Chinese emperors.


81. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, p. 12.

82. SMK 1:355; SMK 3:196, 199.

83. Epigraphic Studies, p. 320. Indeed, both the Mülasaṁāna and the Jinakālamālī attribute the origins of Sinhalese Buddhism in Sukhodaya to Muttama.

84. Epigraphic Studies, 281 and passim.

85. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, pp. 1–3. See also “Yazadarit Ayedawpon,”
86. U Kala, *Mahayazawingyi*, 1:178–180. I am assuming that the two “Indian Brothers” refer to Samala and Wimala and not another pair of brothers, even though founding brothers are a common motif in the origin stories of every major city in Burma.


89. There is some confusion on this issue as well. In *The Talaings* (p. 129), Halliday stated that Schmidt’s title was *A History of Pegu in the Mon Language*, but on pp. 9–10 of the preface to his translation of the *Slapat*, Halliday calls it “Slapat Râjâwañ Datow Smin ron.”


92. Quotes by Jesuits visiting Lower Burma at the time can be found in Harvey, *History of Burma*, pp. 183–184.

93. Phayre, p. 30. However, I have not been able to find them among the dynastic lists provided by Nilakanta Sastri’s *A History of South India*, Third Edition (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).

94. By the very end of the sixteenth century, Pegu had rapidly declined in power, but its rulers had already developed plans for returning to the agrarian Dry Zone well in advance of its destruction. One might notice that much like the Mon texts themselves, I have deliberately collapsed two dynasties into one at Pegu in order to focus on the city itself: Yazadarit’s fourteenth-to-fifteenth-century dynasty, of which Dhammazedi was a part, and Bayinnaung’s Toungoo Dynasty, that established Pegu as its center in the mid-sixteenth century.


97. It appears that a general of Vijayanagara got confused with the notorious Portuguese adventurer de Brito, who had set out to carve a kingdom for himself in Lower Burma during the first half of the seventeenth century. *Lik Smin Asah*, p. 178. If this is indeed de Brito in the story, it would confirm the lateness of these legends.

98. He does not name them, but they are obviously Wimala and Samala.


100. Phayre, *History*, p. 29. In fact, all fifty-nine names on this list are given the title “raja” except Manuha, who is tacked on at the end with the Burmese equivalent, “min,” instead. The names seem to have been randomly picked from the *Mahâvamsa*.
102. Phayre’s list of the Thatôn and Pegu kings can be found in his *History* on pp. 288–289, while those of the *Cūlavamsa*, volume 2, can be found on pages ix–xv.


106. I have deliberately not used the phrase “contested narratives,” popular though it may be today, precisely because I feel that differences or “contradictions” do not necessarily imply competition or adversarial relationships in all contexts, however true that may be in the United States today. We certainly cannot impose that model onto either the premodern or the modern Asian world, especially while accusing colonial historians of doing the same thing. There is also often an assumption that differences imply changes, particularly when placed in a framework of linear time, which is not necessarily the case.


108. U Kāla, *Mahayazawingyi*, 1:178. It should be added, however, that the two brothers were not named but referred to as the two “Indian brothers” of Thatôn. That this account was written in the context of a conquest suggests one cannot get a more “contested” situation than that, yet the narrative was inclusive rather than exclusive. Note that the stories of Sona and Uttara and of Tapussa and Bhallika going to Lower Burma are also included in the *Sāsanavamsa*, an Upper Burma text espousing a different tradition.

109. It is interesting to note that the mythical founding fathers of Rome, Romulus and Remus were also said to have been brothers suckled by a she-wolf.

110. Shorto, perhaps mistakenly, states that Sūriyakumā was founder of the Thatôn Dynasty (“Gavampati Tradition,” p. 27), whereas in the Kalyani Inscriptions he was the last of that dynasty. Sūriyakumā was Manohor’s formal title. (*EB* 3, 2:187).


**Chapter Five: The Conquest of Thatôn, an Imagined Event**

1. The one exception, an inscription dated to 1067, is actually a late sixteenth- or seventeenth-century copy or recast, to be discussed below.

2. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:24, note 89. For the inscription itself, see SMK 1:322–323. Although Luce gives the date as 1068, the inscription itself gives Sakarāj 429, i.e. 1067. But he is referring to the same inscription being discussed.

3. Luce, “Mons of the Pagan Dynasty,” p. 10. Manuha per se is not even a Mon
name and therefore does not appear in Shorto’s Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions. Manohor, of course, is Middle Mon, but does not occur until 1476. As for “Makuta,” it is unclear where Luce got it since it is on neither of the two inscriptions, as we shall see. H. G. Quaritch Wales did mention it before Luce did, in his article called “Anuruddha and the Thaton Tradition,” JRAS 3–4 (1947): 155.

4. Htin Aung’s earlier response to Luce on this issue was mainly a good argument against Luce’s thesis. However, Htin Aung did not use any primary sources to demonstrate his point. Essentially, he also accepted the historicity of the conquest of Thatôn and of the existence of King Manuha and/or “Makuta,” although he does not consider them the same persons. See Maung Htin Aung, Burmese History Before 1287: A Defence of the Chronicles (Oxford: The Asoka Society, 1970), chapter V.

5. It is not, as I will demonstrate below, found on the Kalyani Inscriptions, as Luce claimed.


7. Luce, Old Burma, 1:24.

8. Luce, Old Burma, 1:24 himself wrote that “neither has a legible date . . . .”

9. Shorto, Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, x. Shorto does not explain this linguistic continuity, but I guess that early written Old Mon was relatively isolated, and that only later in the sixteenth century, when Pegu became the capital of the Upper Burma Toungoo Dynasty, did Old Mon make the kinds of contact with the dominant language in the country, Burmese, which may have produced the first noticeable changes.

10. To be sure, Nai Pan Hla has assigned 4 terracotta tablets inscribed in Mon, out of 131 pieces recovered from a place called Winga near Thatôn, to the sixth century AD on paleographic grounds. However, the only scientific dating of objects from Winga are late—fifteenth and seventeenth century—as already demonstrated in earlier chapters.

11. For the photograph of their rubbings, see IB, Portfolio IV, numbers 358 and 359, although the rubbing is scarcely legible.

12. MKPC part 2:1,3.


17. Epigraphic Studies, p. 311.

18. The Yazadarit does not begin with King Yazadarit, as one might expect, but with Magadu, probably the real founder of the first Mon Dynasty of Burma. All the Mon histories in translation I have consulted, after the usual two-brothers legends, begin with Magadu as well.

19. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, p. 10 onward.

20. Luce, Old Burma, 1:26, note 98.

21. SMK 3:274.

22. U Saw Tun, personal communication.

23. SMK 3:322–323. This is one of the reasons I think that the stone may be a late record, and its author may have been one of Bodawpaya’s ministers who was in charge of recasting, collecting, and cataloguing Old Burmese donative inscriptions in the eighteenth century.
28. That in itself is puzzling for the average annual rainfall at Pagān is only forty-five inches.
29. Htin Aung, *Burmese History*, page 17, quotes the “reverse” of the stone. I do not know where he got that information since he does not cite his source, but the original reverse, which I have seen, has nothing to do with the subject on the obverse. I think he may have been using a Bodawpaya copy that was recast in 1785. It can be found in *MM* no. 34, p. 306. It does say some of the things Htin Aung claims it says.
30. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:24, note 89.
34. Luce, *Old Burma*, 2:246.
35. Indeed, as we shall see below, a major story in the Pali chronicles of Northern Thailand records a clash between Aniruddha and the Khmers, which, in important ways, sounds very much like the story surrounding the alleged conquest of Thatōn and Manuha.
38. Thiripyanchi Ú Mya, *She Haung Ok Khwek Yokpwa Sintutaw Mya: Votive Tablets of Burma*, part 1, (Yangon: Archaeological Survey of Burma, 1961), p. 78. Only one votive tablet has been found in the present township of Thatōn, while one other was discovered at the Shwézayan Pagoda at Thatōn. Neither has been identified as having belonged to Aniruddha.
39. Ú Mya, *Votive Tablets*, part 1, where he lists and describes over one hundred such tablets, twenty-three of which belonged specifically to Aniruddha.
40. By the Burma script I mean the script the Burmese, Mon, Shan, and Arakanese used in Burma, starting at least by the Pagān period, to write their own languages.
41. Nai Pan Hla discovered two of “Aniruddha’s tablets” written in Mon; one at Momeit in Upper Burma and the other at Kalamyo, on the Chindwin River northwest of Pagan. See his “Old Terracotta Votive Tablets & New Theories on History of Old Burma,” *Traditions in Current Perspective: Proceedings of the Conference on Myanmar and Southeast Asian Studies 15-17 November 1995, Yangon* (Yangon: Universities Historical Research Centre, 1996), pp. 145–155. One wonders about their original provenance, as neither is dated. If they are Aniruddha-period tablets that Aniruddha inscribed personally, his conquest of the south—the Thatōn issue notwithstanding—is even better documented. As labor was in short supply throughout early Southeast Asia, he likely brought Mon speakers back with him and settled them in Upper Burma.
43. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:27.
44. Pe Maung Tin, “The Dialect of Tavoy,” *JBRS* 23, 1 (1933): 32–46. What is also very interesting about this subject is that the “Phongsawadan Môn Phama,” (Annal of the Mon of Burma) in *Prachum Phongsawadan* [Collection of historical papers], vol. 2, part 1 (Bangkok: Khurusapha 1963), p. 19–20, gives the same account that people at Inlé today still give about their Tavoy origins and how they were settled at Inlé by King Alaungsithu. The Thai source, translated from Mon to Thai in 1857, the compilation of which may have been as early as 1793, reads: “The king [A-lang-kha-cho] . . . rounded up the Raman people of Sittang and resettled them in Pagan. Pegu and Sittang thus became depopulated, and few people remained. He sent Burmese people to live at Tavoy, and thus the Tavoyans speak Burmese. Even though their dialect of Burmese has changed over a long period, the Burmese can still understand the Tavoyans. The Tavoyan language even today is not like the Raman language.” My thanks to Ken Breazeale for both the translation and the source.
45. King Kyanzittha’s Prome Inscription of 1093 is the earliest dated Mon epigraphic text found in Burma. See *MKPC* parts 1 and 2, and *Old Burma*, 1:55.
46. The latest and most complete collection of Old Burmese inscriptions of the Ava period can be found in volume 4 (and most of 5) of *SMK* if we date the Ava period as covering the years 1364–1527.
48. It could well have been from Śrī Laṅkā, as recorded in the Pali chronicles to be discussed in the next chapter.
50. *EB* 3, 2:188.
52. Most of the ten Kalyani Inscriptions are inscribed on both faces and each face contains about 70 lines of text, which comes to a total of approximately 1,400 lines of text.
57. Bode, *Pali Literature*, p. 8. See also Taw Sein Ko, *Burmese Sketches*, 1:89. The issue here is less about the “correctness” of the Buddhaghosa and Upagupta traditions than it is about Dhammazedi’s use of the upasampada tradition to effect his goals. Complicating the issue is the Mon jurist of the sixteenth century, also named Buddhaghosa, who translated the *Wagaru Dhammathat* into Pali (Bode, *Pali Literature*, p. 86).

**Chapter Six: The Conquest of Thatôn as Allegory**

1. Many such issues are raised in Kemper’s, *Presence of the Past*, an indispensable work for understanding the *vamisa* tradition. Similarly, Jonathan S. Walters’s “Buddhist History: The Śrī Laṅkān Pāli Vamsas and Their Community,” in Query-
time, precisely what Dhammazedi was doing in his conflation of time. See also
relevant issues with regard to time. In this chapter, however, I am concerned mainly
with the historicity of the Mon Paradigm and the relationship of Southeast Asian
chronicles to it.

2. Zatatawpon, p. 41, is the location where the story should appear.
3. Zatatawpon, p. 36. Tayôk Pye Min is the late thirteenth-century Pagán king
who came to be known as the “king who fled the Chinese,” while Thihathu (Sihasthi)
is one of the famous “Three Brothers” who repelled the Mongols. See Michael
Aung-Thwin, “The Myth of the ‘Three Shan Brothers’ and the Ava Period in Bur-
4. It could have been Pinya, founded in 1312.
6. The other mention occurs in the Zambu Kungya Po Yaza Mu Haung, as is
noted by Tet Htoot, “Nature,” p. 53. The Zambu survives as a copy dated to 1825 and
can be found in E. Chevilliot, comp., “Catalogue of Burmese Mss,” manuscript no.
3447 of The India Office, n.d. Tet Htoot states on p. 53 that the Zambu is the only
chronicle that mentions Disäpramok, which is not accurate.
7. Zatatawpon, p. 35.
8. The Zatatawpon’s criterion for “periodization” is the rise and fall of dynasties,
and its criterion for their labeling is the capital city. Thus the Tagaung, Śrî Kṣetra,
Pagán, Pinya, Sagaing, and Ava Dynasties are named for the cities which the dynasty
occupied. The reason the scheme does not include either the Toungoo or Pegu
Dynasties is probably that the author was writing earlier than either, and later addi-
tions to the chronicle were mainly horoscopes, not data of a historiographic nature.
10. Archaeologist Bob Hudson and his colleagues are on a quest to locate some
if not all of these villages. See Hudson et al., “Digging for myths,” pp. 9–21.
14. Zatatawpon, p. 41. This sentence, apparently by the original author, suggests
he had other texts, which he called “ancient,” that are now lost to us as originals.
15. Tet Htoot, “Nature,” p. 53. See also U Maung Maung, Story of Wunzin Min
Yaza and Duroiselle’s reference to it in “The story of Wunzin Min Yaza.” MSSK also
has a brief account of Min Yaza.
16. The quote is taken from The Maniyadanabon of Shin Sandalinka, trans. by
L. E. Bagshawe, Cornell University Southeast Asia Program Data Papers, no. 115
(Ithaca: 1981), p. 8, because the Zambu manuscript in the India Office is incom-
plete and does not contain this particular section. Bagshawe adds in a note that
“the author does not mention that this was a military looting,” revealing both a cur-
rent bias being projected onto the Ava period as well as his acceptance of the con-
tventional Aniruddha story as historical.
17. At least the first part of the *Yazawinkyaw* was said to have been finished on Sakaräi 864, or AD 1502. See Shin Thilawuntha *Yazawinkyaw* (Celebrated chronicle), ed. Pe Maung Tin (Yangön: Burma Research Society, n.d.) p. 75, and Pe Maung Tin, *Myanma Sañe Thamaing* (History of Burmese literature) (Yangön: Khettara Press, 1977), p. 97.

18. The author wrote that the first part of the chronicle, which deals with the kings of Sri Lanka was completed in 1502. But the second part, dealing with Burma’s kings was finished only by 1520. See Shin Thilawuntha, *Yazawinkyaw*, p. 75.


20. The long inscription can be found in SMK 5:21–33.

21. Another point to be noted is that the information contained in these stories do not necessarily appear in linear fashion, so that whereas Aniruddha is mentioned in the late thirteenth-century *Zatatawpon*, the king is not found in the early sixteenth-century *Yazawinkyaw*, but then does reappear subsequently.


28. A Thai poem, adapted from a Sanskrit work, deals with the love affair between Aniruddha, grandson of Krishna, and Usha, daughter of the demon King Bana with 1,000 arms. In the battle brought about because of the affair, Anirut (Aniruddha) wins, and he and Usha live happily ever after. It is curious that the demon is called Bana (Baña)—a Mon title of royalty—and that the story is reminiscent of Magadu’s eloping with the daughter of the Sukhodaya king. There may be some conflation, if not confusion, between the Aniruddha in Sanskrit and Thai literature with the Pali and Burmese Aniruddhas. The Thai poem can be found in *Saranukrom wattanatham thai phak klang* (Thai cultural encyclopaedia, central region), vol. 15, (Bangkok: Thai Cultural Encyclopaedia Foundation, 1999), pp. 7, 304–307. My thanks to Ken Breazeale for this valuable reference and translation.


34. *Sheaf of Garlands*, p. 156.


36. Woodward, p. 137, notes a tenth-century Khmer inscription that recorded Angkorian king Rajendravarman’s conquest of a Rāmañjana, thought to be within Thailand itself. Moreover, as noted in Chapter Three, a Rāmaññanagara appears to
have also existed in Northern Thailand, which was mentioned in the context of Haripuñyāja in the Cāmadevīvamśa.

38. Legend of Cāmadevi, p. 164.
41. Sheaf of Garlands, pp. 100, 142, 156. The word is spelled differently from Rāmañña, something Pali authors would immediately notice, so it is unlikely to be inadvertent.
42. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, p. 8.
45. An interesting note here is that the finakālamālī was written around the same time as the supposed “1067” inscription (the sixteenth century), which also contains the story of Manuha of Thatôn building his colossal statue. Perhaps there is a connection between this late inscription and the finakālamālī.
46. Old Burma, 1:42–43. Luce had compared dry, donative inscriptions meant as legal records with the allegorical tales in U Kala’s Mahayazawingyi to arrive at this conclusion. Why, then, not compare Kyanzittha’s prophetic and allegorical inscriptions with those accounts in U Kala that are historically factual? That would turn the conclusion around, making Kyanzittha’s original, primary, inscriptions the “sham” and U Kala’s words “true historiography.”
47. Harvey’s translation of this event in History of Burma, p. 27, said to have been taken from the 1910 version of the Uppanna, does not mention the crucial details. “Manuhaw,” incidentally, is spelled the way it is in the “1067” inscription.
48. Lik Smin Asah, p. vi.
49. “Ayedawpon” literally means “a royal story of great importance,” usually of famous kings. Some Burmese authors writing in English use the term “memoir” for “Ayedawpon.”
50. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, page hsa.
51. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, page sa.
52. See Nai Pan Hla, “Yazadarit Ayedawpon Kyan nhin Mon Thíchin mya” and his Yazadarit, p. 9. However, Tet Htoot, “The Nature of Burmese Chronicles,” p. 58, suggests that the version we have is in fact a translation from the Mon.
53. It is difficult to tell whether this is actually the same one mentioned in Harvey’s with a slightly different title.
54. Nai Pan Hla, Yazadarit, p. 9. Shorto, however, states that “the history of Thatôn is almost entirely legendary . . .” p. 66.
55. Duroiselle, in an article in the JBRs lists the Hanthawaddy chronicle as a publication only of 1910. See his “Talaing Nissayas,” JBRs 3, 2 (1913): 104.
57. One palm-leaf version of the Yazadarit is in the National Library (no. 2290).
59. Amatgyi Bannya Dala, Yazadarit, p. 175. Aniruddha’s inability to obtain relics in Burma, according to the Mon texts, contrasts sharply with his successful exploits in Sri Lanka and Thailand according to the Pali texts of Northern Thailand.
60. Shorto, “Gavampati,” p. 18. One should not confuse this unpublished text that Shorto translated with his article called the “Gavampati Tradition.”
63. Shorto, “Gavampati,” p. 3. The statement that Tavoy is the “boundary of the Mon country” strengthens my contention that the first Mon polity in Lower Burma emerged only after the expansion of Pagán into this area, as suggested by the Burmese dialect spoken at Tavoy. The Pagán word for cross-legged, tha’way, is Burmese, not Mon, and is found much earlier in the inscriptions of Pagán (see SMK 1:345 among others). In short, Mon sources themselves help verify the lateness of their own emergence in the region.
68. U Kala did mention Manuha’s exile in Pagán and his building of the colossal Buddha image there as found in the finakalamā. See U Kala, Mahayazawingyi, 1:184.
69. U Kala, Mahayazawingyi, I:nga.
70. The Burmese palm-leaf manuscript called the “Thaton Yazawin” is basically the story of Gavampati and his arrival at Suvañabhūmi Myo (or “city of Suvañabhūmi”), and about King Tissa Raja. Its copyist stated that the copying was completed in Sakaṇayi 1160 (AD 1789) on Tawthalin Lasan, 5th day (the fifth waxing day of the moon in the month of Tawthalin, about September). At the end, the copyist wrote that this was the old Mon language yazawin written by Gunawuddhi and others which he “corrected,” but he gave no further details. Until a more thorough comparison can be made with other original Mon manuscripts dealing with Thatôn, it is difficult to know what text was actually copied by whom and whether this was the one U Kala used. Reel 74 of the Toyo Bunko microfilm project on Burma is a copy of this “Thaton Yazawin,” (List of Microfilms, p. 22).
72. Wyatt and Aroonrut, Chiang Mai Chronicle, xxvii–xxx, state that there are many versions of the Chiang Mai Chronicle, but that they chose the one which they considered the best. It is that version to which I refer.
73. This chronicle has been recently published in English. See Sithu Gamani Thingyan, Zimme Yazawin.
75. Guides today will tell tourists that the style of the pagoda was taken from the shape of one of the queen’s breasts, a totally unfounded local tradition.
78. DPPN, 2:67.
79. The author confuses Mahāsamata with Mahāsamanta, p. 34.
81. Shorto, *Nidāna*, p. 64.
82. *Slapat*, p. 66.
83. *Slapat*, p. 55. She was said to have given her weight in gold, which, with her crown on, was twenty-five *viss*, not quite ninety lbs., making her a slight woman indeed.
84. Shorto, “Gavampati,” pp. 14–15. This is very interesting as the Trāp and pandit inscriptions, probably erected by Yazadarit, are the only ones to mention a Rakṣāpura.
86. *Maniyadanabon*, p. x.
87. Actually Min Yaza died about the same time.
88. The manuscript of the old version, according to Tet Htoot, is in the India Office Library. But the microfilm copy I obtained from them, using the catalogue number given by Tet Htoot, is actually dated to 1825 and has “pt. VI” written on the cover. The other parts (I–V), presumed to have been related to this manuscript, are actually not.
91. Bodawpaya could not have known at the time that later, under King Mindon, the author of the *Sāsanavamsa* found another direct link to the Third Council for Upper Burma’s saṅgha.
92. Twinthintaikwun, *Myanna Yazawinthit*, 1:90. I checked the manuscript on palm leaf and it has the phrase “lup kram” in there as well. See *List of Microfilms*, reel 70, on leaf (gu). The statement about the white elephants with which to bring back the Tipiṭakas is also here.
93. *MM* I:34, p. 306. Since Twinthin would have been very familiar with Old Burmese, and was in charge of recasting the Old Burmese donative inscriptions, I wonder what role he had, if any, with regard to the now infamous “1067” recast inscription.
95. For a brief synopsis of these issues, see Michael Aung-Thwin, “Burmese Historiography—Chronicles (Yazawin),” in Making History: A Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing, ed. D. R. Woolf. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1997). There are some serious problems with regard to the title of the second volume of Twinthin’s chronicle published in 1997. It appears as *Maha Yazawinthit* rather than *Myanna Yazawinthit*, which is the title of the first volume published in 1968. The difference is crucial and profound. The problem may lie with either the title of or the palm-leaf manuscript itself that was used for the 1997 publication. There are four versions of Twinthin’s work in the National Archives: two are handwritten copies of palm-leaf manuscripts, and two are actual palm-leaf manuscripts, one is numbered 1472, and the other, in two parts, is numbered 2089 and 2090. The 1997 publica-
tion, subtitled as volumes 2 and 3, which includes the Nyaung Yan or Second Ava Dynasty, used manuscript no. 2090. I have scrutinized that manuscript on microfilm and it is indeed titled “Mahayazawinthit.” But its colophon at the end states that it was “copied” in the year 1164 (1802 AD) on such and such a day, after three o’clock in the afternoon. It is therefore a copy and was completed during Twinthin’s lifetime since he lived until 1809. The copyist may have absentmindedly reverted to the common title of Maha Yazawin instead of using the new Myanma Yazawin. Since Myint Swe, editor of the first volume does not provide the number of the palm-leaf manuscript he used, I am not certain which of the four his work represented. It is unlikely, however, that he used no. 2089, for the Myint Swe publication goes up to the end of King Tabanishweti’s reign in 1550, as does the palm-leaf manuscript numbered 1472, whereas manuscript 2089 goes up to the end of the First Ava Dynasty in 1527. However, because the second part of that manuscript (no. 1472) is missing, we still do not know when it was actually written. In any case, it is not the same as the first part of the Maha Yazawinthit (that is, no. 2089) for the reasons given. The only way to settle this is to check the original title of no. 1472, said to be located in the National Library. The Toyo Bunko’s reel, no. 77, is listed as NL 1472 (National Library, 1472), but the palm leaf itself does not have an original title page, only the label put there by the microfilmer at the time of filming.

97. The other is the much earlier Zatatawpon Yazawin. However, as stated above, I do not wish to evaluate this chronicle on this particular issue unless I have the original or a microfilm copy of it. Its original organization may not be represented accurately in the published version.
98. Harvey, Burma, xxiii and p. 219.
99. Twinthinthaikwun, Myanma Yazawinthit, “Matika” (table of contents) and the text itself, passim. In the copy of the manuscript at the National Archives from which the 1997 publication was derived, Twinthin begins each dynasty with a clearly demarcated introduction, indented and set apart from the rest by using only half the palm leaf and centering it, so that his intent for organizing his text according to centers of power is quite clear. This intent is reflected in the published version, even though it followed modern publishing protocols such as chapters, titles, and subtitles. In other words the published version seems to have faithfully reproduced the original in terms of organization into periods determined by capital cities, as far as it could with modern formatting and binding considerations. However, the original still needs to be scrutinized to be certain.
100. Twinthinthaikwun, Myanma Yazawinthit, 1:89–91, describes the account.
101. The conventional translation of Mahayazawingyi is “great chronicle.” But the “maha” (great in Sanskrit) is the qualifier of “yaza” (king) not of “win” (chronicle, from the Sanskrit “vamsa” or genealogy). The literal translation should be “history (or genealogy) of great kings” not “great history of kings.” If the word “gyi” (great in Burmese) is also included in the translation, although here it is redundant, then the whole title should be “the great history of great kings.”
102. Hmannan, 1:240.
111. Most colonial authors considered Mindon a “good” king in contrast to Thibaw, his successor, in particular. Their criterion for his success and “goodness” was his willingness to accommodate the West and adopt western ways, such as developing the telegraph, Morse code, railways, a “modern” tax system, salaries, and so on. However, neither Mindon nor his subjects saw his success or failure in that way.
114. The Sixth Synod was also convened by a Burmese leader, U Nu in 1954. See U Nu, *Saturday’s Son* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975), p. 273.
115. Of course, if Nai Pan Hla is correct, Aniruddha’s conquest was not mentioned because Bannya Dala allegedly skipped the first part where, presumably, it would have been included, although the provenance and date of that first part was not provided and remains unknown, and may even have been compiled only later, perhaps only in these volumes.
116. It was edited by Phra Candakanto (Pak La: Thailand, 1910). Harvey calls it the *Paklat Talaing Chronicle* in his *History*, p. 383. One should also be aware that this same volume has another title, *Pathama Sudhamavati Gavampati, Rajadhiraj* (see Charles Duroiselle, “Talaing Nissayas,” *JBR* 3, 2 (1913): 103–145).
117. Shorto translated this work, which he said was located on pages 26–99 of the first volume of chronicles issued from Pak Lat. In “The Gavampati Tradition,” he stated that the manuscript from which this “Gavampati” text comes may go back to 1710 (p. 18).
118. Upon binding, it was titled the _Rājāwaṇa Dhammaceti Mahāpīṭakadhara_. Shorto translated this work, but it remains unpublished. My thanks again to Victor Lieberman for sending me a copy.
120. Halliday, in assessing the *Lik Smin Asah*, describes how this happened, and I suspect it happened in many other cases as well. It was not only a matter of people not knowing the older vocabulary, so that new words were substituted for the old ones without a secure knowledge of the former’s meaning, or of making careless “typos,” but it was also a deliberate attempt to rewrite what was currently thought to be the “truth” or an attempt to “improve” on the prose or verse of the older version. Sometimes, Halliday writes, long insertions were made, obscure words omitted with better-known ones taking their place, and a “manifest desire on the whole to make the text plainer” (p. v).
123. Harvey, History, p. 27.
124. It is true that the Nidāna is said to have mentioned the conquest also, but there is no way of knowing whether that portion of the text can also be dated to 1538.
125. Lik Smin Asah, “Introduction.”
126. Luce, Old Burma, 1:42.
127. Indeed, that Aniruddha “belonged” to other Theravāda Buddhist traditions is demonstrated by the many publications of the king by the Thai, such as “Anurut kham chan” (Anuruddha in Chan verse), published in BE 2502, and “Bot lakkhon anurut roi rueang khong khun suwan” (The play “A hundred accounts of Anuruddha” by Khun Suwan), published in BE 2503. My thanks to Ken Breazeale for this information. See also Maneepin Phromsuthirak, “Thai Interpolations in the Story of Aniruddha,” JSS 67, 1 (January 1979): 46–53.
128. Bayinnaung is regarded in the same manner by the Mon histories. He is called Jamnah Duik Cah, the conqueror of ten directions. Halliday, The Talaings, p. 132.
129. Luce explicitly cited the Kalyani Inscriptions in his Old Burma, 1:23; 2:286, as containing the conquest story.

Chapter Seven: The Mon Paradigm and the Origins of the Burma Script

1. By “the Burma script” I mean the written form of both the Mon and Burmese languages found during the Pagān period, which I also refer to as the “Pagān script” when the occasion warrants it. However, it is often disingenuously called the “Mon script” in early Burma scholarship so that its putative Mon origins are continuously underscored, even though those using the term know full well that the script was used more often to write Burmese (Luce, Old Burma, 1:52).
2. EB 1, 1:6. Also Halliday, in The Talaings, p. 120, writes that the alphabet “is practically the same as the Burmese, but it has two additional consonants and there are differences in the vowels.”
3. I do not want to get involved in the Dvāravatī controversy per se, summarized recently by Robert L. Brown in his Dvāravatī; I simply want to say that Luce attributes the Burma script to that kingdom, polity, state, or whatever it may have been. According to David Wyatt, in his “Relics, oaths and politics in thirteenth-century Siam,” JSEAS 32, 1 (February 2001): 3–65, here p. 6, notes 1 and 2, a stimulating synthesis of Dvāravatī’s history can be found in Dhida Saraya’s, (Si) Thavaravadi (Bangkok: Muang Boran, 1989). He also cites apparently the same work in English: Dhida Saraya, (Sri) Dvaravati: The Initial Phase of Siam’s History (Bangkok: Muang Boran, 1999).
5. Harvey, p. 307; List, p. iv; Emmanuel Guillou, The Mons, p. 80; and Tha Myat, Pyū Reader. Duroiselle, in List, p. iv, wrote that although the Pyū script comes from Kadamba, the “Talaing” script comes from “the Pallavas of Kāncipurā.” Aung Thaw,
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Historical Sites, p. 31; Harvey, History, p. 307, both concurred but did not provide any supporting arguments.


7. Luce, Phases, 1:162. See U Mya’s Votive Tablets, plate no. 87, which shows the script.

8. The Pyū script of seventh- and eighth-century Śri Kṣetra remained basically the same as that found on the early twelfth-century Myazedi Inscriptions, while the Old Mon script of Pagán showed no detectable changes until the mid-fifteenth-century inscriptions of Shin Saw Bu. This issue will be discussed below.

9. The two letters, according to Duroiselle, are the “b” and “mha.” He wrote that the Talaing invented them “to represent sounds in their language which no Indian letters could do adequately . . . .” (EB 1, 1:6).


12. By “alphabet” I presume Duroiselle meant script, for the alphabet itself ultimately comes from Sanskrit.

13. List, iv.

14. Luce, Phases, 1:74, note 16.

15. Sastri, History of South India, p. 15, and chapter VIII.


17. Much of the archaeological work done during the second and third decade of the twentieth century provided considerable new information on the so-called Pyū culture, a thrust led by Duroiselle, and published in the issues of the Archaeological Survey of India of the 1920s–1930s.

18. Blagden had begun to decipher the Pyū language almost immediately after the so-called Myazedi Inscriptions were found, and his results were published in the first issue of the Epigraphia Birmanica, although he had earlier published “A Preliminary Study of the Fourth Text of the Myazedi Inscriptions.” JRAS (1911): 365–388.

19. Indeed, the Mon Paradigm was difficult to let go. Thus Luce wrote: “. . . the unlettered Burmans, even from the first, had adopted Mon script in spite of their linguistic, and very likely racial, closeness to the Pyū” (“The Ancient Pyū,” p. 253).

20. EB 1, 1:7.

21. The Burmese alphabet is taken directly from the Pali/Sanskrit alphabet.

22. Chau ju-Kua, pp. 58–59. It is true that there is some ambiguity regarding the word Pagán (note 10), but the translators seem to think it was a reference to
that kingdom. Missions were sent again in 1007, 1020, 1030, 1042, 1050, 1053, 1056, and 1061. Luce, in Old Burma, 1:58, reading the Sung-shih of T’o-t’o places another diplomatic mission in 1106 AD.

24. Alexander Cunningham, Mahâbodhi, or the great Buddhist temple under the Bodhi tree at Buddha-Gaya, (Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1961), pp. 25–29, and plate XXIX. These dates are not without controversy (see Chapter Eight).
28. Luce, Old Burma, 1:97, where he wrote that the Burma script came via Dvâravatî from perhaps the Kañcipura script of South India. Emmanuel Guillon seems to agree, saying that the Dvâravatî script belongs to the Old Tamil of the Pallavas as well as other scripts used in South India around the lower river valley of the Krisna (Guillon, The Mons, p. 79).
30. Although I would have preferred to examine his theory on the basis either of his latest scholarship or an analysis specifically designed to address the issue at hand, as he left us none, this article is the best option we have.
32. Shorto, Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, xxviii.
33. Note that I am not speaking here of language evolution but of script evolution, which, in the writing of Old Mon in Burma spans a period from the late eleventh century to the mid-fifteenth century. It was only then that inscriptions written in Middle Mon proper appear. Even then, it differs from Old Mon “chiefly in certain archaic features of orthography,” Shorto, Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, p. x.
35. This is dealt with in detail below. But a quick glance at Tha Myat’s Mun Myanma makes the link between Śrī Kṣetra Pyū and Myazedi Pyū clear, and that between Kâlamba and Śrī Kṣetra highly probable.
37. Luce and Ba Shin, for example, accept the date for Dvâravatî from Coedes’s paleographic assessment of the Lopburi pillar (see “Pagan Myinkaba,” 307).
38. Wheatley, Nāgara, p. 203. among others.
39. H. Krishna Sastri, then assistant archaeological superintendent for epigraphy, Southern Circle, examined several inscribed terracotta tablets found at Pagān and concluded that on one, he recognized characters that were “partly Grantha” (Taw Sein Ko, Burmese Sketches, 2:284).
41. This sixteenth-century dating may, however, be debatable, because back in the 1930s Coedes dated two Haripunjaya inscriptions very tentatively to the thirteenth century: 1218 and 1219 AD (Epigraphic Studies, p. 187). In contrast, the most thorough and recent research that supports the statement that there is only one dated Mon inscription (to 1504) comes from “Charuk nai prathet thai lem 2 akson panlawa akson mon phuttha sattawat thi 12–21” (Inscriptions in Thailand, volume 2, Pallava and Mon Scripts, Buddhist Centuries 12–21), in Charuk nai prathet thai
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[Inscriptions in Thailand], 5 volumes (Bangkok: National Library and Fine Arts Department, B.E. 2529 [1986]), ed. Kongkaeo Wiraprachak. My thanks to Ken Breazeale for providing me with both this information and a synopsis of each inscription.

43. Diffloth, Nyah Kur, p. 27.
44. Diffloth, Nyah Kur, pp. 5–11. However, the Old Mon inscription of Ban Thalar, about sixty-five kilometers north of Vientiane, is a puzzle, with an early date conjecturally and tentatively assigned to it by Guillon.
45. Diffloth assigns the Old Mon inscriptions of Haripuñjaya, Mokhei near the Kra, and Nakhon Sri Thammarat to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. Nyah Kur, page 6.
46. Diffloth, Nyah Kur, p. 11. Notice that I am not referring to the language but to the script.
47. See Luce, Phases, 1:162–167, 175; U Mya, Votive Tablets, passim.
48. The first dated evidence of Old Mon in Burma is found in Kyazintha’s Old Prome Inscription of 1093, to be documented more fully below.
49. MKPC includes all known, dated and undated, Old Mon inscriptions of Burma discovered up to 1965. This includes three cited by Luce, in Phases, 1:172–177, found in Lower Burma, two of which he implied may be pre-Pagán. All are undated and written in the Pagán script. One is a votive tablet found in the Bingyi Cave at Thaton (and not included in MKPC), which U Mya, the scholar most renowned for his work with Burma’s votive tablets, assigns to a much later period. He thinks it postdates the reigns of both Aniruddha and Kyazintha and resembles the script found during King Narapatisithu’s reign, in the very late twelfth century. It may have actually belonged to the thirteenth century. (U Mya, Votive Tablets, pp. 54–55.) On the whole, he writes that the tablets found at Thaton are very much like Pagán votive tablets with some small differences. I include in this corpus of Old Mon inscriptions three additional votive tablets discovered after MKPC was published: one found in 1971 at Momeit, another at Kalaymyo in 1983, and a third, whose provenance was not given but is likely to be Pagán. These are described by Nai Pan Hla in “Old Terracotta Votive Tablets,” pp. 156–157. They are also undated and written in the already evolved Pagán script so they do not provide any new information on the present issue. And finally, two terracotta tablets written in Mon have been found at Winga, a Lower Burma urban site. U Myint Aung describes this site in his “Excavations,” pp. 52–53. He writes that Nai Pan Hla assigned their paleography to the sixth century since they were said to resemble those of Pharapathom in Thailand. If by Pharapathom he means Nakhon Pathom, where there is an inscription that Diffloth also assigns to the sixth century AD (p. 7), it has several problems. First, it is undated, and since, as stated above, Old Mon spans a long period of time, it is difficult to say to which century it belongs. Second, someone could have carried these votive tablets to Winga since there is no proof that they were made there. Third, Thai Mon scholars have assigned the date of the script on those tablets to the twelfth century. (Diffloth, p. 7). Finally, even if the script is sixth century and even if the tablets were produced at Winga, it still says nothing about the presence of a Mon kingdom or state there. Besides, as shown elsewhere, the earliest TL dates of Winga potsherds are late fifteenth to seventeenth century.

51. Indeed, no link between the script found at the pagoda and the Mon eth-
nic group has been established, just assumed, especially in Luce’s *Phases*, 1:162;
Besides, as noted, there are only seven fragmentary Old Mon inscriptions of the
alleged kingdom of Dvăravatī, even if one counts each separately. They are the two
fragments from Nakhon Pathom on one stone, which Shorto dates to the sixth cen-
tury, and four votive inscriptions on an octagonal pillar from San Sung, Lopburi,
which he guesses may have belonged to the seventh century (Shorto, *Dictionary of
Mon Inscriptions*, p. xxviii, and Diffloth, *Nyah Kur*, pp. 4–11.) Since Shorto’s publica-
tion, Guillon updates the number with five more fragments. (See Guillon, *The Mons*,
p. 81.) All are written on terracotta tablets, also without dates. This means that not
only are they too small in number to be of much use as a standard, their chronology
is not certain. And, they could have been made at any time during the five-century
span when Old Mon existed or could have been carried to or from anywhere.

52. Although this may put a damper on the 1067 Old Burmese inscription that
has been declared late because of its cursive style, it is the Tamil with which we are
here concerned.


56. As demonstrated earlier, there were, until very recently, a total of only about
twenty-five Mon inscriptions found in Thailand. Of these, only one has a date, of
1504. Shorto’s *Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions* also has a short paragraph on discov-
eries of Mon inscriptions too late to be incorporated in it (p. xxxiii). But it has been
supplemented by Diffloth’s, *Nyah Kur*, pages 4–11, and Bauer’s *Guide to Mon Studies*
and his newer “Notes On Mon Epigraphy.” None of these has materially affected my
analysis.

57. One of the coins appears to be a Pyū issue (Skilling, “Dvaravati,” p. 94, illus-
tration 24). If true, it suggests some contact between the Pyū of Śrī Kṣetra and
Dvăravatī. They were contemporaries, and the possibility raises some interesting
questions.

58. Robert Brown in his *Dvaravati*, p. xxi, said it best: “. . . it is almost totally
without a history. Not one monument or art object is dated. There are no indige-
nous texts associated with Dvăravatī. While there are a few Dvăravati inscriptions,
these are almost exclusively religious, consisting mostly of quotations from stan-
dard Indian texts. The only other written information regarding the culture comes
from some brief references in Chinese histories.”

59. See MKPC “Matika” (table of contents), pages sa to ta.


61. The number depends on how and what one counts.

62. Diffloth, *Nyah Kur*, pp. 4–11. Indeed, there is even a difference between
Dvăravatī Old Mon and Haripūrījaya Old Mon, which raises some very interesting
issues to be addressed below.


64. Indeed, the Wieng Mano Inscription of Lampun, the capital of Haripū-
ṛjaya, said to be the earliest Old Mon Haripūrījaya inscription is not dated, although
the dates assigned to it differ from individual to individual depending on their theoretical proclivities. Whereas Shorto assigns it to around 1100, Luce, not surprisingly, prefers a tenth-century date. But their grounds for dating it this early are based on the Mon Paradigm’s premises (see Epigraphic Studies, p. 186, for a discussion of this inscription.)

67. Diffloth, Nyah Kur, p. 10. For its translation, see Epigraphic Studies, pp. 185–189.

68. As for the language, unlike Dvāravati Old Mon, Haripūñjaya Old Mon not only represents a late phase of Old Mon which was just starting to show some characteristics of Middle Mon, but scholars are beginning to find linguistic differences between Burma Old Mon and Dvāravati Old Mon as well (Diffloth, Nyah Kur, pp. 10–11), suggesting that the journey taken by Old Mon may need even further reconsideration.

69. To be cited below.
70. Tha Myat, Mun-Myanma, p. 8.
71. He is listed, although rarely, as a “reference,” but one wonders whether his work was actually read. Shorto lists him in his Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, p. xxxvi and puts him in the bibliography. Luce properly credits him also, but cites his work only in a footnote, without any attempt to summarize his contrary thesis. Luce, Phases, 1:74, note 21.

72. U Tha Myat, who has studied the Pyū script carefully, comparing it with the major Indian scripts of the time, concludes that the Pyū writing on the Myazedi Inscriptions did not use Indian scripts of the same era (eighth to twelfth century AD) but of an earlier era without changing them, even when changes had occurred in India itself. See his Myazedi Khaw Gubyauk Kyi Pyū Kyauksa [The Pyū Inscription of the so-called Myazedi] (Rangoon: Democracy Publishing Co., Ltd, 1958?), pp. 7–8, and also his Mun-Myanma, p. 8.
75. See Luce, Phases, 1:61 for these details.


77. Even if Stargardt’s opinion of Falk’s article, “Die goldblätter” is correct, and the Pyū script came from Andhra instead of Vanavasi, it still does not mean that the Pagān script came from Dvāravati. Unfortunately Stargardt does not provide the necessary details in her Tracing Thoughts for me to determine whether Falk’s thesis is viable. The point being made here, in any case, is that the Pagān script did not come from the Dvāravati script.

78. Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 4.
80. Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, pp. 19–78. I have counted an inscription as distinct when the donor, place, occasion, or date are different.
81. Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, p. 37.
82. Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, p. 22.
83. Luce, Phases, 1:62. The reason for Luce’s date is complicated but clearly has to do with his thesis that Halin was the last capital of the Pyū, the one he said was raided by Nanchao forces. His identification that it was Halin is based on the notion that the Mi-no of the Man Shu was Halin, which makes it impossible for Halin to be earlier than Śrī Kṣetra.

84. This assignment is not altogether uncontested. Guillon does not agree with the date of at least one of those inscriptions in The Mons, p. 80. But the originally assigned date may have been the reason Luce wrote that "we need to remember that the earliest extant (Tircul) writing dates from the seventh century AD . . . ," which then places it later than sixth-century Dvāravati Mon, a convenient date. Phases, 1:62.

85. Shorto, Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, p. xxviii; Coedes, Indianized, pp. 76–77. Guillon also disputes some of this in The Mons, p. 79. Diffloth thinks the oldest may be the Phu Krang Inscription, which may be datable to the sixth century AD, while others (Thoem, Champa) think it may be twelfth century (Diffloth, p. 7).

87. U Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, p. 21.
89. U Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, p. 22; Luce, Phases, 1:66.
90. U Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, pp. 21–22.
91. Sastri, History of South India, p. 15.
92. Part of the confusion stems from scholars using dynastic names such as Kadamba and Pallava for the scripts they used.

90. Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, pp. 50–51.
92. Luce, Phases, 1:164.
93. ASI (1937): 80–81; Luce, Phases, 1:167.
94. Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, p. 77. Although neither this votive tablet nor the Shwēhsandaw is dated, the latter is thought to belong to Aniruddha’s reign.
95. Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, p. 78.
96. Bob Hudson et al., "Origins of Bagan."
97. Sastri had reason to think that the Burmese numerals of the early Pagan period, Aniruddha’s time, were “more allied to Telugu and Kannada than to Tamil.” (Cited in Taw Sein Ko, Burmese Sketches, 2, p. 317).
98. Finot assigns the script on these gold plates of Maung Kan to the sixth century on paleographic grounds and also thinks the script is Kadamba. (“Un nouveau document,” pp. 121–136) as recalled by Luce, in Phases 1:175.
99. Tha Myat, Mun Myanma, charts, passim.
100. That one numeral found on the gold-leaf manuscript discovered at Śrī
Kṣetra and assigned to the seventh century "looks more like Old Burmese" to Luce (Phases, 1:140) seems to confirm that suggestion.

107. Tha Myat, Mun Myanma, p. 15. For a large (approximately 4' x 5') comprehensive chart on the writing system of Burma, see Burma, Report of the Director, Archaeological Survey, Burma for the year ending 30th September 1958 (Yangon: Archaeological Survey, nd), back cover inset. This volume is actually in Burmese, although the English title cited herein also appears on the cover; the Burmese title actually has: “for the years 1957–58.”

108. Tha Myat, Mun Myanma, p. 15.


110. Tha Myat, Pyu Phat Ca and Myazedi make clear this link between the Burmese and Pyu scripts. See also Blagden’s discussion on this issue in EB 1, 1:60. 111. This is common knowledge, but see Halliday, The Talaings p. 119.

112. EB 1, 1:60; Luce, Phases, 1:63;
113. Luce, Phases, 1:140.
114. Luce, Phases, 1:63. Indeed, if we scrutinize the glossary provided by Blagden in EB 1, 1:64–68, the closeness of the two languages is astonishing. Taw Sein Ko had suggested prior to Blagden’s work not only that Pyu might be related to Lolo and Lisu, but that its living representative might well be Kadu. See Taw Sein Ko, “The Linguistic Affinities of the Pyu Language,” JBRS 5, 2 (1915): 102–110.

115. EB 1, 1:61.
116. EB 1, 1:59–68. Also Blagden, “A Preliminary Study.” The Pyu words for “wife” and “son” (or offspring), are not only exactly the same as in Burmese but are spelled in almost exactly the same way on the Myazedi, the only difference being the “yecha” (long vowel marker) used in the Burmese and left out in the Pyu. Even the tone markers for both are identical.

117. Luce, Phases, 1:64.
119. Luce, “Mons of the Pagân Dynasty,” p. 3.
121. Luce’s favored criterion is phonetics. See his Phases, 2, charts, passim.

123. Luce, Phases, 1:62.
124. Shafer, “Further Analysis,” found some changes in grammar and phonetics.
125. EB 1, 1:61.
126. Tha Myat, Pyu Phat Ca, p. 21.
127. Luce, Phases, 1:62.
128. The last mention of a Pyu king, Sihavikrama, dates to 718 AD (Luce, “Ancient Pyu,” p. 248).
129. Backus, Nan-chao, p. 98.
130. Backus, Nan-chao, p. 102. However, Luce disputes this in “Sources,” pp. 37–39.
131. Man Shu, p. 91.
132. Hall, Burma, p. 10.
133. The patronymic linkage system of most of the people of the Nanchao kingdom, whereby the name of a son always contains an element from that of his father, is also a feature in the Burmese chronicles' account of the early part of the Pagán Dynasty going back to a Pyūminhti (Umbrella of the Pyū King) (U Kala, Mahayazawīngyi, 1:140–145.) For a discussion of the issues and myths concerning Nanchao, see Backus’s treatment in Nan-chao kingdom, chapter 3. See also Blackmore, “The Rise of Nan-chao in Yunnan.”

134. After the “decline” of Śrī Kṣētra as the center of political power in Burma, only three Pyū inscriptions are found in the next five centuries, only one of which can be considered a script of any stature: the Pyū face on the Myazedi.


136. Luce, “Ancient Pyu.”

137. Tha Myat, Pyū Phat Ca, p. 77. This is a very interesting Pyū inscription, for it was a donation by a person with the title of “Samben Śrī Bañano,” which Mon Paradigm scholars say is a Mon title. Yet the word “Śrī” in the title does not use the unique Mon form of a dot in the middle of a nearly complete circle, but uses the form one finds in Burmese. The word in Pyū clearly predicates any found in Mon. See also Luce, Phases, 1:66.


139. SMK 1:83; 2:40; 3:202, 262; 4:175. In English, see Luce, Phases, 1:66–67. What is also interesting is the association made (in an Ava inscription, SMK 5:105) between “daughters of Brahmins and Pyū daughters” as if the two were synonymous.

Chapter Eight: The Place of Written Burmese and Mon in Burma’s Early History

1. Although there are two stones, they are not exact duplicates so that early epigraphists labeled them “A” and “B.” If parts of one were illegible, the other was used and vice versa. Although the presence of two originals in itself may seem curious, Taw Sein Ko in 1913 offered an explanation for it. He suggested that one was a copy, since it was struck on lower-grade (soft-grained) stone, used large letters that were not carefully struck, and was found near the Library. The other was inscribed on fine-grained stone, with precise, small, clear letters; it was obviously well made and was recovered near the assumed place of donation (Taw Sein Ko, Burmese Sketches, 1:65). If he is correct, that opens up the whole issue of whether copies in general are necessarily late and therefore unreliable. They could be contemporaneous to the original and should therefore be treated as primary, rather than secondary evidence.

2. I say “conventionally dated” because it is not entirely clear to what the dates on the stones refer. That they were erected between 1111 and 1113 (an issue to be discussed below), seems reasonably clear. But the date could be referring to the time Arimaddanapūra (Pagán) was founded, the accession of King Kyanzittha, or the time the donation recorded on the inscriptions was made. There are at least two different readings and translations of this first, important sentence on the Pyū face of the inscriptions. U Tha Myat, in his Myazedi Pyu Kyauksa, pp. 28 and 30, gives one. Blagden, the first to decipher the Pyū face of the inscriptions—he published

3. Shorto, *Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions* (ix–x, xxviii), considers this to be the first dated Old Mon inscription of Burma. U Chit Thein’s comprehensive collection of Old Mon lithic inscriptions supports Shorto’s assessment by showing that there is no dated Old Mon inscription of Burma before 1093. Luce, of course, could not concede this, as he had already assigned the Träp and Paññā inscriptions to “c. 1050,” even though they have no legible dates on them. Similarly, he assigns another Old Mon inscription, found thirty miles north of Maulamyaing (Moulmein) in the Kawgun Cave, also not dated, to “shortly before Aniruddha’s capture of Thatôn (c. 1057 AD)” (Luce and Ba Shin, “Pagan Myinkaba,” p. 308). Such self-serving conjectures aside, there is not a single original, *dated* Old Mon inscription of Burma that predates Kyawzithe’s Old Prome Inscription of 1093. Indeed, even Luce admitted that this inscription was “the earliest version of his [Kyanzittha’s] legend” (see *Old Burma*, 1:55).

4. One of the first to say this, back in 1912, was Taw Sein Ko in his *Burmese Sketches*, p. 271. Ba Shin, in his *Lokhahteikpan: Early Burmese Culture in a Pagan Temple* (Rangoon: Burma Historical Commission, 1962), reiterates it on pp. 20–43. Also Ba Shin and Luce, in “Pagan Myinkaba,” p. 277, wrote that the Burmese on the Myazedi was “the first known dated inscription in Burmese.” This statement has been repeated time and again until it has become “common knowledge” in Burma Studies. It is still being repeated by scholars of Southeast Asia, few of whom had actually done original research on the issue using primary sources. See, for example, David Bradley’s *Proto-Loloish* (Copenhagen: Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, 1979), p. 17; Guillon, *The Mons*, p. 53; and George Van Driem, *Languages of the Himalayas*, 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001): 270, 438, 439. My thanks to Lily Handlin for the Van Driem citation.

5. The first serious, scholarly study, by Duroiselle and Blagden, to compare Old Mon and Old Burmese from epigraphic sources used only the data on the Myazedi Inscriptions, whose Old Burmese was already assumed to be the earliest evidence of Burmese and later than Old Mon, so their was a foregone conclusion (EB 1, 1:1–67).

6. Even this information is not unambiguous. U Tha Myat’s translation of the same Pyu face states that the “1,628 years after the parinibbāna” was a reference to the official naming of Pagan as Arimaddanaṇṭu, not Kyanzittha’s accession (Tha Myat, *Myazedi*, p. 30).


8. Most Burma scholars assume cursive Burmese to be *late*, not early. The issue of whether cursiveness indicates earliness or lateness is inconsistently applied by scholars of Old Burmese throughout the literature.


13. Queen Ajawlat stated that she herself, not her mother, had the stone
inscribed, by several persons of stature, which would explain the fine quality of “Queen’s Burmese.” See SMK 1:29–31. Luce, who trained in English literature, probably knew the significance of “Queen’s English” in English history, and this may have informed his ideas about Queen Ajawlat’s inscription and its “standardization” of Burmese.

14. For example, see SMK 3:1, 2, 122–123, passim.

15. The inscription can be found in SMK 2:33–50, but the published version will not reveal those characteristics; one has to observe the actual stone or its rubbing. It appears that the scribe even had different size vowel circles for different consonants (which written Burmese is cognizant of today) in order not to obfuscate the text. I measured each letter of the rubbing hanging on my wall. The stretching of the rice paper on which the rubbing was made sometimes adds a millimeter to the letters in that stretched area, but otherwise, the letters are exactly the same size.

16. Compare, for instance, the inscriptions of any of the kings, queens, ministers, daughters of ministers, and so on, with any commissioned by commoners, of which there are many. The discrepancy is quite obvious. See SMK 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, passim.


18. Luce, Phases, 2:1–130.

19. There are many who have claimed this, but I cite only one: Ba Shin, Lokah-teikpan, p. 25.

20. Although not surprising, it is revealing, that three Old Mon inscriptions in Burma dated by Shorto to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were dated by Luce to the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, clearly to support the Mon Paradigm (see Shorto, Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, p. xxxii).

21. I am referring to both the so-called “Bodawpaya” volumes of inscriptions that were published in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, around the time Blagden published his theories in Epigraphia Birmanica. List, edited by Duroiselle, was also available shortly thereafter. Later, of course, the huge five-volume Inscriptions of Burma was published, which included a selection of inscriptions that Luce and Pe Maung Tin considered to be “original.”

22. Since I contend that the Mon Paradigm’s evolutionary sequence is flawed, I do not follow its sequence of Archaic, Standard Old, and Modern and will refer to all Pagan Burmese as Old Burmese.

23. In the extremely valuable List, Duroiselle counted fifty Burmese inscriptions that precede the Myazedi, both copies and originals. I take my count from SMK; Selections from the Inscriptions of Pagan; Pagan Kyauksa Let Ywe Sin [Selected inscriptions of Pagan], comp. E Maung (Rangoon: Pannya Nanda Press, 1958), volume 1; and MM, none of which is entirely comprehensive by itself, but taken together are nearly so.

24. MM.

25. MM, ka.


27. Duroiselle, List, p. v.

28. MM, pp. 1–133.


33. See, *MM* 1:1–216, inscription numbers 1–24. The one in question is a late copy, but it is clear, particularly the date. There are others as well. For example, see *Selections from the Inscriptions of Pagān*, nos. 1–4; *Pagan Kyauksa Let Ywe Sin*, 1; and *SMK* 1:321–329.

34. See *MM*, p. 1.


37. I have excluded the 1067 Inscription in this count for reasons discussed in Chapter Five. Besides, the Mon Paradigm scholars themselves date it to the sixteenth century.

38. *Pagān Kyauksa Let Ywe Sin*, p. 1. It is also found in *Selections from the Inscriptions of Pagān*, pp. 1–2.

39. There is a reference to 444 at the very end of the inscription but one cannot be certain it is a date since the term “Sakarāj” does not precede the number as it should. It is possible that the mason forgot to place the date at the beginning of the stone, where it is usually placed, and by the time he reached the end had no space left.

40. *Selections from the Inscriptions of Pagān*, nos. 1 to 4, pp. 1–8. I have not counted the obverse of the Hlèdauk Inscription since it includes thirteenth-century information.

41. Cunningham, *Mahābodhi*, p. 27.


43. See his “Sources of Early Burma History,” p. 39, where Luce said he read the “hand copy of his [Cunningham’s] plate XXIX rather than the photograph and came up with “[sa]karac [6]55 khu // siridhammarajakuru . . . (kusil//).”

44. *Zatatawpon*, p. 39.


47. See Cunningham, *Mahābodhi*, plate XXIX.

48. See Cunningham, *Mahābodhi*, plate XXIX.


50. Luce, “Sources of Early Burma,” p. 38. On pages 40–42, Luce was rather critical of Cunningham for “misreading” the date on the umbrella, but not those on the stone inscription. The reason Luce gave for criticizing Cunningham had to
do, ostensibly, with Cunningham’s being misled by the Ava scholars in reading the dates on the stone, not on the umbrella. It was another in a series of Luce non sequiturs.

51. *Inscriptions of Burma*, plate 299, Portfolio III.
53. J. C. Eade’s *Southeast Asian Ephemeris: Solar and Planetary Positions A.D. 368–2000* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program, 1989) confirms Cunningham’s findings. Luce, in “Sources of Early Burma,” cites Cunningham’s work in note 32, p. 39, which means he knew of Cunningham’s results regarding the impossible thirteenth-century dates, yet he is silent about this matter.

54. However, the inscription’s Friday, the 10th of Pyatho in Cunningham’s date of Sakaräja 441 actually falls on a Thursday. Eade’s mathematical calculations have taken into account the various intercalary months and leap years that allow a discrepancy of perhaps one “off” day. The off day can be affected by whether the following or preceding month is an intercalary one or the next month is the beginning of a new year, which in the case of Cunningham’s date, it is (Eade, *Southeast Asian Ephemeris*, p. 83).

55. Again, my thanks to Ken Breazeale for this information.
56. Luce, “Sources of Early Burma,” p. 41.
57. These have been calculated by Ken Breazeale from Eade’s work.
58. The calendar in the jacket pocket of the book belonged to U Ka whose help Luce acknowledged but the calendar is in Luce’s handwriting. He also cited Sir Alfred M. B. Irwin’s *The Burmese Calendar* (Bombay: British India Press, 1910) and Irwin’s *The Burmese and Arakanese Calendars* (Rangoon: 1909).

59. Disäpramok was minister to three successive kings of Pagán, Min Yaza to three at Ava, and Kin Wun Mingyi to at least two during the Kônbaung Dynasty.
60. Cunningham, *Mahâbodhi*, p. 27. There are several translations of the entire inscription, but Luce’s “Sources of Early Burma,” pp. 40–42, represents the most contested.

61. SMK 1:326–327. To make sure my reading was correct, I asked a noted expert in Old Burmese, U Saw Tun of Northern Illinois University, for his opinion. He, in turn, corresponded with another expert, U Tin Htwe of Heidelberg University. U Tin Htwe’s response amounted to seventeen pages of closely written Burmese regarding approximately four lines of this inscription, which shows the kinds of difficulties we sometimes encounter.

62. This date could be identical to Burney’s reading, depending on the day of the week and the month involved.
63. *EB* 1, 2:163–164.
64. Luce, “Sources of Early Burma,” pp. 41–42.
65. *EB* 1, 2:148, 150.

73. The dating of many undated Pagán temples has also been determined by the assumptions of the Mon Paradigm (discussed in Chapter Nine), so that one could make a case that the entire field of the art and architectural history of Pagán is open to reexamination. It will be interesting to see what kind of art historical sequence emerges from such a reexamination.
74. Cunningham, *Mahâbodhi*, plate XXIV.
75. U Mya, *Votive Tablets*.
76. Luce, *Old Burma*, 2:2–43.
79. Nai Pan Hla, “Old Terracotta Votive Tablets,” pp. 145–164, writes that two tablets thought to have been inscribed by Aniruddha were discovered in the 1970s and 1980s, both in the Dry Zone of Burma, written in the Mon language. Although it is difficult to make any conclusions about them, the fact that Aniruddha also wrote in Mon on his tablets should not be surprising, given his conquest of Lower Burma and his efforts at unification. The problem here lies with identifying these particular tablets with Aniruddha.
80. Luce, *Old Burma*, 2:2–31. Note that since Mon and Burmese scripts were the same, I have counted only those that had the actual Mon language represented, not those that are in Pali written in what is labeled as “Mon script,” for that assumes the Mon Paradigm is correct, therefore making the conclusion circular.
81. Gutman, *Burma’s Lost Kingdoms*.
82. U Mya, *Votive Tablets*, plate no. 39, description on page 76. But it is not certain these belonged to Saw Lu because the title on them could have represented another Pagán king, such as Kyazintha.
83. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:100.
85. The literacy rate in Pagán is, of course, not known. But the majority of the Old Burmese inscriptions of the Pagán period were erected by commoners and non-royalty (see Aung-Thwin’s *Pagan*, chart on p. 240), which suggests that such activity was not an elite monopoly. The first census after annexation of Upper Burma, according to J. S. Furnivall, *Colonial Policy and Practice: A Comparative Study of Burma and Netherlands India* (New York: New York University Press, 1956), pp. 13, 122, 208, reveals a male literacy rate in Upper Burma of 46.2 percent as opposed to that in British Burma of 44.3 percent. D. G. E. Hall, in *Burma* (p. 137), wrote that there was a “high degree of literacy throughout the country” when the British arrived, but he failed to cite his source.
86. MKPC. One original Old Burmese inscription that precedes King Kyanzittha’s 1093 inscription by nearly four decades is the Gavam Kyaung Inscription of 1058, also called the Let-the-she Paya Inscription. In addition, SMK 1, section kha; pages 321–322, 324, 325, has four inscriptions that precede 1093, not counting the controversial inscription dated to 1067 which most attribute to the sixteenth century or later. If we include one inscription contained in *Pagán Kyauksa Let Ywe Sin*, p. 1, dated to s444/1082, and the two at Bodhgaya, altogether there are eight Old Burmese inscriptions that precede 1093. Luce and Pe Maung Tin’s *Selections from the Inscriptions of Pagán*, pp. 1–3, also shows some that predate 1093, but these have already been counted in the above computation.
87. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:77, rightly places a “?” next to the date.
88. *EB* 1, 1:4; 1, 2:141.
89. During a visit in July 2002 to the Pagán museum, I read tablet no. “ca 500” from the Shwéhsandaw Pagoda with U Myint Aung and the assistant curator regarding the *Wutaka jātaka*. The script and the language is Old Burmese, with the museum caption stating that the “puṇā lojin [the Buddha] was a quail.” This means that if the date of the Shwéhsandaw given by Luce (the 1060s) is correct, it precedes the Myazedi Burmese by nearly half a century.
90. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:44, 262–264, where they are dated either before or during Aniruddha’s reign. The *jātaka* plaques are in the Pali language, but written in the Pagán script. However, Luce contends that they were written in the early Mon script, which is not wrong, as both Old Mon and Old Burmese were written in the Pagán script. But by saying the writing is in the Mon script is a bit disingenuous, for it “privileges” the Mon Paradigm.
92. Diffloth, *Nyah Kur*, p. 10. Diffloth’s contention is partially supported by Duroiselle, who earlier wrote that “no original inscriptions whatsoever were found in Pagán or elsewhere in Burma, written either in Burmese or in Mon, antedating the middle of the eleventh century, that is, the fall of Thatôn in 1057.” See *List*, p. vi. He is correct about the Mon, but, as shown here, not the Burmese.
93. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:54, himself calls Kyanzittha’s Mon inscriptions “literature” of a high order. But, of course, it is meant to support a different perspective.
94. The data in Tha Myat’s *Pyü Phat Ca* seems to suggest this evolution even if the author did not explicitly state it. However, he does caution us to be critical of accepting the notion that the Burma script derived from the Thatôn conquest. I owe this information to U Saw Tun of Northern Illinois University, who had studied under U Tha Myat.
95. Shorto notes that the “writing [the Burma script] was in use long before the floraison . . . .” See his *Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions*, p. xi.

**Chapter Nine: The Mon Paradigm and the Evolution of the Pagán Temple**

1. The origins of the solid stupa at Pagán is not, for the most part, relevant to the thesis of the Mon Paradigm, whereas the gu is. I have, therefore, separated discussion of the two as much as possible.
2. Although a few art historians of Burma have viewed certain of Luce’s interpretations with some gentle skepticism, as we shall see below, not a single one has questioned the existence of an earlier Mon polity in Lower Burma. That means they have not questioned the consequences of this assumption for art history either. Probably the most explicit statement regarding Mon influence in Pagán art was made by Quaritch Wales, who wrote: “The Mons . . . were primarily responsible for the constructions at Pagán . . .” (“Dvāravati in South-East Asian Cultural History,” *JRAI* 1–2 [1966]: p. 50).
4. Admittedly, Luce gives credit to the Pyū in several cases, but then it is almost immediately forgotten and the analysis returns to the assumptions held by the Mon Paradigm.

6. My analysis and assessment, represented by Figures 11 and 12, are based entirely on data taken from Pichard’s first seven volumes, although he states in “A Distinctive Technical Achievement: The Vaults and Arches of Pagan,” in *The Art of Burma: New Studies*, ed. Donald M. Stadtner (Mumbai, India: Marg Publications, 1999) that there are altogether over 2,800 monuments built at Pagan, of which 974 temples and 523 monasteries were constructed between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries. Pichard’s work will be well used and appreciated by scholars for many more decades to come. Among other reasons, the most important is that he makes little or no attempt to impose an assumed chronology of style or any other theory on the data. Rather, it is an inventory, as the title states, that scholars can treat as raw material with which they can then construct whatever broad patterns and theses they might envision, hopefully, as dictated by the evidence rather than by the political or art historical sentiments of the age in which they happen to write. My only reservation about Pichard’s work is his use of anachronisms, such as the term “slave,” when that term has been clearly demonstrated, for some time now, to be a late, perhaps nineteenth-century misnomer of an entirely different situation during Pagan times; see Aung-Thwin, “Ahi, Kyun Taw, Hpya Kyun: Varieties of Commendation and Dependence in Pre-Colonial Burma,” in *Slavery, Bondage and Dependency in Southeast Asia,* edited by Anthony Reid (New York: University of Queensland Press, 1983), pp. 64–89.


8. The introductory section to Strachan’s *Pagan* provides a brief summary of the first westerners who encountered Pagan.


10. *Narrative of the mission*, p. 43.

11. *Narrative of the mission*, p. 44.


13. Allegations have been launched by individuals and groups with obvious political agendas that many of the recent repairs, especially of the finials of stupas at Pagan, have been dictated by the military government. This could not be farther from the truth. I have personally quizzed U Aung Kyaing, currently director of archaeology for Upper Burma and previously of Pagan, and his assistants regarding this issue. The decisions were made at the local level and carried out by the Pagan Archaeological Department; the design of the repairs had nothing whatsoever to do with central policy. What U Aung Kyaing and his assistants did was scour all the wall paintings of Pagan temples to determine the period design of finials. The early Myinpyagu and the Lokahtheikpan wall paintings both contain examples of period stupa shapes and finials. (My thanks, again, to Lily Handlin for her excellent photo-
graphs taken from the Lokahteikpan.) U Aung Kyaing’s team also studied original stone finials that had fallen off during the earthquake of 1975, from the Mingalazedi, for example, and now preserved in the new museum to provide plaster molds or models of actual finials. Aung Kyaing and his crew also scrutinized the thirty-three encased stupas of Pagán whose outer layers had, for a variety of reasons, been fully or partially destroyed, thereby exposing the inner, Pagán-period stupas and revealing the original design of the finials. For this topic, see Kyawt Hmu Aung, “The Encased stupas of Bagan,” Myanmar Thaamaing Thutethana Sasaung [Myanmar historical research journal], 10 (December 2002), pp. 31–52. This information was then used to make the repairs we see today. The common metal finial, which we are so used to in modern times (such as that on the Shwédagôn at Yangôn), and the type that is being “lamented” by students of Burma in general, is actually a late design and not a Pagán period style at all. The righteous indignation of these political groups to the events of 1988 and afterwards have placed even the daily routines of the Archaeology Department at Pagán and its restoration activities into an authoritarian verses democratic framework which has no basis of fact. This sentiment is surely one reason why Pagán has not received World Heritage Site status, which it deserves far more than many other places that have it, such as Sukhodaya and Chiang Mai.


15. This is most evident in his following Luce’s chronology and the Mon Paradigm with regard to the Thatôn conquest. However, Strachan does seem a bit wary of Thatôn’s role (even if for the wrong reasons), for he did write that “there is no substantive evidence to suggest that the Mons originated the type of brick temple found at Pagán” (Pagan, p. 9).

16. His assessment of Luce is actually confined largely to a few notes, so that it is more a case of “no, it isn’t so” rather than an in-depth analysis and critique. For example, note 26, p. 144, which, along with the statement in note 15, is virtually his entire critique of Luce on Pagán architecture.


18. Although Gutman’s recent Burma’s Lost Kingdoms focuses on Arakan and discusses issues and problems in Burma’s art history, it is not concerned with the Mon Paradigm, nor with Pagán’s architecture per se, which is the focus of this chapter. For her latest work on some of these issues, see “A Burma origin for the Sukhothai walking Buddha,” in Burma Art and Archaeology, eds. Alexander Green and T. Richard Burton (Chicago: Art Media Resources, 2002), pp. 35–43.


22. Luce, Old Burma, 1:299.

23. Luce, Old Burma, 1:299.

24. Luce, Old Burma, 1:299.

25. Luce, Old Burma, 1:300.

26. Luce, Old Burma, 1:300.

27. For a more elaborated discussion of this topic, see Aung-Thwin, “Spirals in Burmese and Early Southeast Asian History.”


29. Pichard’s work through volume 7 lists 2,064 temples, but his volume 8 brings the total now to about 2,800.

30. In Chapters 13 to 20, from pages 257–422 of Old Burma, 1, Luce discusses all the temples and stupas that he had decided to include and date.

31. Of the 2,170 religious buildings of Pagan in the list noted above, only 77 of their original, donative stone inscriptions survive (Tun Nwe, “Pagan Paya Sayin Kyai Shadawpon” [Search for the broad list of Pagan temples] in Pagan Letthit nhin Achya Satan Mya [Fashionable Pagan and other essays] (Mandalay: Kyi Pwa Yei Press, 1996), pp. 61–105, and Appendix “kha,” pp. 78–81.) A more accurate and recent list paints a similar picture. Of the 2,064 mainly religious buildings erected in Pagan according to Pichard’s Inventory (up to volume 7), 1,627 are estimated to have been constructed during the early Pagan period (to 1300 AD). Of these, only 61 can be confirmed by epigraphy regarding their donors and dates. That is only about 3 percent.

32. Ironically, and significantly, they are precisely the kinds of sources Luce had throughout his career disparaged.


34. Luce, in Old Burma, 1:302–303, proposes a date of 1080. But, as shown, the first dated evidence of written Mon in the Pagan script is Kyanzittha’s 1093 inscription at Prome, so that the dating of the Pahtothamyà is once again based on a prior assumption that the Mon gave the script to the Burmese at Pagan. He also translates the word Páhtothámyà as “Pagoda with many children” (p. 304) which is quite wrong, mixing up the object with the subject. It should be “many sons of the pahta.”

35. Luce, Old Burma, 1:302.


37. Luce, Old Burma, 1:384–388.

38. Ba Shin, Lokahteikpan, p. 4. Lily Handlin of Harvard has been working on the Lokahteikpan Temple for the past several years, the only non-art historian of Southeast Asia that I know of in the West currently dealing with this topic. And although a professor of American history, her work has shown more depth and detail than that of many art historians of Pagan.


40. Ba Shin, Lokahteikpan, pp. 1 and 2.

42. Just as one example, see Benjamin Rowland’s chapter on Southeast Asia in *The art and architecture of India: Buddhist, Hindu, Jain* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1977); Heinrich Zimmer, *The Art of Indian Asia*, 1 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), pp. 5–6; and Rawson’s chapter on Pagan in his *Art of Southeast Asia*.


44. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:301. Sir John Marshall had written earlier that the sculptured stone found at East Zegu “plainly derives its style from the familiar Gupta work of Northern India. It can hardly be assigned to a later date than the seventh century A.D., and may be earlier” (cited in Taw Sein Ko, *Burmese Sketches*, 2:265).


47. The construction dates of these two temples have been estimated to be the eleventh century for reasons that I discuss in Chapter Ten.


49. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:300.


51. See Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:286 and passim. “Its” inscription, of course, is the now notorious, late sixteenth-century stone dated to 1067. Pierre Pichard, in “A Distinctive Technical Achievement: The Vaults and Arches of Pagan,” in *Art of Burma*, cited above, pp. 72–73, concurs that the temple “could have been renovated, if not rebuilt, at a later time.”

52. The overall treatment of architecture can be found in Luce’s *Old Burma*, 1, chapters 12–20. For a Burmese (although ethnically Mon) perspective, see Bo Kay’s *Pagan*. One need only glance at the illustrations in any major work of art history on Pagan to see that style does not reveal date.


57. Donald M. Stadtner, “The Art of Burma,” in *Art of Southeast Asia* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1998), p. 48. However, I cannot fault Stadtner entirely for placing these in the “Mon Suvannabhumi” section, since at the time he published, no one had yet challenged the Mon Paradigm. Besides, as he states, these are more reminiscent of the Puy in any case, and, he wrote, these “terra cottas . . . differed sharply from their nearest neighbors, the Dvaravati.”[sic] (p. 48) This suggests he had doubts about their Mon provenance.


63. The most authoritative scholarship on the subject to date is unquestionably Pierre Pichard’s article on the “Vaults and Arches of Pagan.”

64. Pichard, *Inventory*, 1:44–47.

65. The vaulted shrine found during excavations in Old Pegu by J. A. Stewart
(who was not an archaeologist) is not only late, but does not resemble Pagán arches. See his "Excavation and Exploration in Pegu," JBRS 7, 1 (1917): 17–18. As Pegu itself did not appear in original epigraphy until 1266 AD, this may well have been a late construction.

66. Dupont in his study of Dvāravatī did not find a single radiating arch there (L'archéologie môn, p. 125).

67. Unlike the case in Burma, most of the arches used in Southeast Asia that are contemporary or prior to the Pagán period are corbeled, not keystone, such as those in Angkor and Java, while those in India are late. Pichard mentions Debala Mitra’s work which suggests that the Buddhist site of Ratnagiri in Orissa used arches thought to have been built between the seventh and tenth centuries that show a strong technical similarity with the vaults of Pagán (see Pichard, “Vaults and Arches of Pagán,” p. 66). However, not only did the Ratnagiri vault span a small distance (some three meters), it also appears to be an isolated case and not securely dated. Like the Bodhgaya Temple, it also could have been repaired later by engineers from Pagán. Of the Mahâbodhi, even Luce wrote that “the brick work, voussoir and relieving voussoir there . . . , have all the marks of Early Pagán workmanship” (Old Burma, 1:347). Cunningham, whose work focused specifically on the Mahâbodhi Temple, agreed and stated: “This work [repairs of the west entrance] I believe to have been done by the Burmese, between A.D. 1035 and 1086” (Cunningham, Mahâbodhi, p. 25). But even if the Pagán arches came from Ratnagiri, where did the arches of Śrī Kṣetra come from, as they are earlier than those estimated for Ratnagiri? Indeed, Heinrich Zimmer in The Art of Indian Asia, 2, plate 99, dates the Mahâbodhi repairs to the seventh and eighth centuries AD, which suggests the Pyū may have been responsible for them. To use one small isolated example in India as evidence to conclude that it was responsible for 974 temples built at Pagán with the true arch is not very convincing. See also Helmut Loofs-Wissowa, “The True and the Corbel Arch in Mainland Southeast Asian Monumental Architecture,” in Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries, edited by David G. Marr and A.C. Milner, (Singapore: Institute for Southeast Asia Studies, 1986), pp. 239–253.

68. Luce, Old Burma, 1:302.
70. But Luce contradictorily concedes to their being “clear prototypes of Pagán architecture . . . ” Luce, Old Burma, 1:301; Department of Higher Education, p. 2; Luce, Phases, 1:133.
71. Luce, Old Burma, 1:246. Also Pichard, Inventory, passim.
72. EB 1, 1:65; Luce, Old Burma, 1:243.
73. Shorto, Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, between pages 234–240, where it should have been.
74. Luce, Old Burma, 1:235.
75. Luce, Old Burma, 1:243.
76. Luce, Old Burma, 1:236.
77. Luce, Old Burma, 1:238–239.
78. EB 1, 1:67.
80. Luce, Old Burma, 1:232.
81. SMK 1:63, line 3; also p. 300, lines 5, 9, for the Old Burmese, while the earliest evidence for the Mon is found during King Dhammazedi’s reign, in the late fifteenth century. Luce cites EB 4, 1:33, Inscription IV B, line 32, which is the Mon transliteration. The English translation is on page 42 of EB. Shorto, in his Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions, p. 2, also shows it to be Middle Mon.

82. Luce, Old Burma, 1:232, note 31, writes that srot in Old Mon is sarwat in Old Burmese. Yet Shorto does not include the word srot in his Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions. The closest he has is saray, which he defines as “(part of the name of?) material used in building of a pagoda (?)” (see p. 367). The source for saray is “late Old Mon of Lamphun,” which is later than the first appearance at Pagán.

83. See SMK 1:300, line 8.

84. Luce, in his “Economic Life of the Early Burman,” Burma Research Society Fiftieth Anniversary Publications No. 2 (Rangoon: Burma Research Society, 1960), p. 327, states that the word for “expert,” the suffix used for craftsmen, sanõ, was said to have come from Mon. It is only an assertion; there is no proof provided.


87. Luce suggests this. See his “Mons of the Pagán Dynasty,” p. 3.

88. The Pagán and National Museums have ample examples of gold and silver work excavated from Śri Kṣetra. See also Luce, “Ancient Pyu,” p. 313.


90. Pichard, Inventory, 5:269, inventory no. 1339.

91. Luce, Old Burma, 1:257, 280–281. Pichard’s Inventory shows numerous cases of this practice.

92. I saw this method in 1978 when I visited Sagaing.


94. Almost invariably the Pagán gu are several degrees off due north, either eastwards or westwards, as were the fourth-century Pyu temples.


97. Unless, of course, someone uncovers a four-faced style earlier than that at Śri Kṣetra.

98. Léon-Marie-Eugène de Beylié, Prome et Samara: voyage archéologique en Birmanie et en Mésopotamie (Paris: E. Leroux, 1907), p. 101; Luce, Phases, 2: plate no. 22; Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 20. Incidentally, the term Léymyu thana itself is Old Burmese and found throughout the Pagán period, whereas its Mon equivalent of kyak pan, is Middle Mon, and cannot be found earlier in epigraphy. See Luce, Old Burma, 1:245, note 160, where no citation is provided for this Mon term. Shorto has a long entry for the word kyak itself, pp. 59–60. As kyek, meaning Buddha or Buddha image, it appears in the Myazedi Inscriptions.

99. My analysis has included all the data contained in the seven volumes published by Pichard, and with a very few exceptions, I have tentatively accepted his estimated dates of construction.

100. There may have been earlier pentagonal and octagonal monuments elsewhere in South and Southeast Asia, but at Pagán, and in terms of the hollow tem-
ples, these appear to have been products of the earlier one-face and four-face designs.


103. The Sulamani and Gawdawpalin, one-entrance temples with two storeys, did have hidden vaulted corridors which were recently revealed by the earthquake of 1975 as well as with geophysical sounding devices. See Myanmar, Department of Higher Education, *Architectural Drawings*, p. 2.


108. As Pichard notes in “Vaults and Arches of Pagan,” p. 78, although some monasteries and temples were built in the fourteenth century with the Pagan vault, by the First Ava Dynasty it would have been rare to find one, and it certainly would not be of the same quality, size, and scale as those found at Pagan.

109. There is no literature on this topic, but I visited Pinya precisely to observe this phenomenon first hand. Of course, this conclusion is only preliminary.

**Chapter Ten: The Mon Paradigm and the Kyanzittha Legend**


2. Luce actually wrote that Kyanzittha was “highly sexed” (“The Career,” p. 56).


6. Luce used those very words, that “Kyanzittha was more democratic . . .” *(Old Burma*, 1:273).


8. Luce, “The career,” pp. 53–68. Luce also wrote of Kyanzittha’s “unmistakable attachment to Mon culture and religion . . .” *(Old Burma*, 1:51)

9. Although in *List*, pp. 208–213, edited by Duroiselle and published in 1921, no Old Mon inscription was listed under Kyauksé, two years later, in *EB* 3, 1 (1923): 70–73, also edited by Duroiselle, one short inscription appears, described and translated by Blagden. He wrote that the inscription “reminds one more of fifteenth-century orthography than of the eleventh-century . . .” (p. 70). Luce, in his “Old Kyauksé,” pp. 80–81, while admitting that there were more than 119 Old Burmese inscriptions found at Kyauksé, states that there may have been one in Old Mon. He was likely referring to Blagden’s. In U Chit Thein’s newer *MKPC*, p. 58, there is also only one listed.

10. This inscription can be found in *Selections from the Inscriptions*, pp. 2–3, line 3.

11. Luce, “Note on the Peoples of Burma,” Appendix F. I cannot account for
the contradiction between Luce’s date of 1204, said to be the first appearance of the word tanluin, and his own footnote in *Selections from the Inscriptions*.


16. U Kala states that during Kyazittha’s battle for the throne, the headman of Htilaing, north of the capital, gave the king his daughter in marriage and thereby became his client, from which Kyazittha received the name “Lord of Htilaing.” For the story’s first appearance in the chronicles, see *Mahayazawingyi*, 1:208–209.

17. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:50–51, makes it appear that the third stone is actually dated. It is not. In *List*, p. 139, Duroiselle states in a footnote regarding this inscription that “this is the date given in the *Hmannan Yazawin*. The inscription bears no date.”

18. The inscription is reproduced in SMK 3:304–305.


20. SMK 1:331–332.

21. That the Taungbyôn Hlièduak Inscription is dated to 1111 AD and written in King Alaungsithu’s voice raises some extremely important issues in Pagán studies: the dating of the Myazedi Inscriptions, the regnal years of Kyazittha, and the ascension of Alaungsithu. The most reliable and oldest extant portions of the *Zata-tawpon* chronicle (p. 40) also gives Kyazittha’s death as 1111 AD. So Alaungsithu’s accession that same year is quite possible, giving credence to the date and reliability of this inscription.


23. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:51. However, the compiler of SMK 1:332, states that he does not know if the base had any lines of text.


25. As noted in earlier chapters, the Myazedi Inscriptions did not say that the king mentioned on the stones, Śrī Tribhuvanāditya Dhammarāja, was Kyazittha; that is only an assumption.

26. Personal communication from Ken Breazeale, who figured these dates out using Eade’s computations.

27. Even this is disputed. U Tha Myat translates the Pyû face as saying “one thousand six hundred and twenty-eight years after Lord Buddha had attained Nibbana, this city was named Arimaddanapura,” not that Śrī Tribhuvanāditya Dhammarāja was king. In other words, we do not know if the 1,628 years brought us to the reign of the king or the date when Pagán was given its formal name (see *Pyû Phat Ca*, p. 76).


29. Luce, in his “The career,” p. 55, stated that Kyazittha, “though a Burman, loved the Mons.”

31. Kywan were people attached to either the crown or the sanūgha.


33. Tin Hla Thaw, “History of Burma,” p. 138, demonstrates that the entire corpus of Ava inscriptions did not once mention Rmeñ, but did refer to people known as Tanluin.

34. I am thinking of King Bayinnaung’s trilingual inscription on a small bell at the Shwêzigôn Pagoda at Pagân where he recorded his donation in Mon, Pali, and Burmese.

35. The issue of Mon loan words in Burmese is a major topic in itself and cannot be dealt with here in any thorough way, except to reiterate what has been said above. There is no proof that if such borrowing occurred, it happened during Kyanzitha’s reign, that it did not go from Burmese to Mon instead, that a third source was not responsible for the common words in both languages, or that any borrowing did not occur during the Ava/Pegu period of Burma’s history when Mon and Burman had experienced 700 years of continuous contact. That neither Old Mon nor Old Burmese saw much significant change between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries seems to confirm that most of the borrowing occurred later.

36. These numbers reflect only stone inscriptions. I have not included ink glosses on temple walls, captions under Jātaka plaques, and other such smaller items. Of the stones, the number also depends on how one counts. Shorto, in his *Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions*, xxviii–xxxiii, counts each stone separately, although he does not do the same with votive tablets and ink glosses. U Chit Thein, in *MKPC*, also counts each stone as a separate inscription (hence, his number of 106), even if the text continues to another stone. Thus, for example, the Kalyani Inscriptions comprise ten stones, but it is one continuous narrative that can be counted either as ten inscriptions or one.

37. I have had threatening emails from Mon exiles in Thailand or their advocates who claim to have read drafts of the paper I presented in Yangôn in 2001. They consider this study to be another case of Burman hegemonism and a threat to their political agenda.

38. Luce wrote that King Kyanzitha wrote Old Mon “like a master,” although there is no evidence that he personally wrote the inscriptions (“The career,” p. 55).


42. The Prome Inscription has been discussed at length. Kyanzitha also erected the Shwêzigôn, Myakan, and Alanpagān Inscriptions at Pagân, all in Old Mon (*EB* 1, 2:90–143).

43. *List*, pp. 4–7, has seven inscriptions in Burmese and Pali attributed to Kyanzitha.

44. For the 1107 inscription, see *SMK* 1:329–330.

45. The word used on the inscription was prañ, which can have different meanings—city, capital, country, region, abode, and so on—depending on the context. I chose “region” because there is no independent evidence of any city or capital at Pegu until 1266. See *SMK* 1:329. Some consider this inscription to be a late copy, but that does not vitiate the point.
46. *EB* 1, 2:117; Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:57, 72.

47. *EB* 1, 2:129, where it says that 1,628 years after the *parinirvāṇa* (1083/4 AD), Viṣṇu will become king in Pañag as Kyanzitha.

48. *EB* 1, 2:117.

49. I think the switch of the Tanluin wise man from Kyanzitha to Aniruddha has to do with the myth concerning Aniruddha’s conquest of Thatôn. It provides Aniruddha with a good reason to search for the holy scriptures. The motif of Shin Arahan and Aniruddha is, of course, taken from the story of Aśoka and Nigrodha in the *Mahāvamsa*, Chapter V, p. 31, and repeated in the *Glass Palace Chronicle*, p. 72–73, where the comparison is made explicit.

50. It may have been Duroiselle who began this convention as early as 1918, and is quoted in Taw Sein Ko’s *Burmese Sketches*, 2:379. Harvey, in *Burma*, p. 40, picked it up, with the assumption that Kyanzitha was either Indian or Arakanese, rather than Burman, simply from the way the statue looked to him. Luce continued the assertion (in *Old Burma*, 1:54, 57), stating that the statues did indeed represent Shin Arahan and Kyanzitha.


52. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:38.


55. Whether or not these “Aris” necessarily represent Tāntric Mahāyāna sects rather than simply a name given to forest monks is difficult to tell. I am not endorsing the view that they were Tāntric, but since Luce took the chronicle account of them as historically valid and saw them as Tāntric, I am compelled to address this issue within that context. In any case, Duroiselle preceded Luce in this thesis in his “The Ari of Burma.”


57. Aung Thaw, *Historical Sites*, pp. 41–98, especially p. 73. The issue here is not whether Viṣṇu can also be considered a Buddhist deity, as he was in Śrī Lanka; he may well have been. Rather, my objection is that Luce used his iconography as evidence to date the temple to Aniruddha’s reign so that it fit his thesis, whereas everything in Kyanzitha’s reign makes him a far more likely candidate to have used the

58. Luce, Old Burma, 1:268, 275–276; 288.
59. The Ḥpayathonzu and Nandamanya have had ample treatment in most of the works I have cited. The Visṇu temple is less well known, but its inscription can be found in Archaeological Survey of India, “A Vaishnava Inscription at Pagan,” Epigraphia Indica, 7, 27 (1902–1903): 197–198. In addition, I have personally observed a rather large stone lingam and yoni in one of the five shrines surrounding one of the most “orthodox” temples at Pagan: the Dhammayazika of King Narapatisithu built in 1196–1198. Although the lingam-yoni stone appears to be in situ, it is not certain, of course, whether it was part of the original dedication.

60. Luce, Old Burma, 1:262.

61. DPPN 1:951–952. The Dipavamsa, p. 141, does mention the Jātakas as comprising part of the canon but says nothing further.


67. EB 2, 1:iv. See also Luce, Old Burma, 1:262, and Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 84.

68. Luce, Old Burma, 1:262, note 33. Although Luce makes it appear that both temples had the 550 Jātakas, Aung Thaw, in Historical Sites, p. 84, states that only the West Hpetleik had evidence of it.

69. Luce, Old Burma, 1:262–263.

70. Luce, Old Burma, 1:264, note 45.


72. Taw Sein Ko, Burmese Sketches, 1:68–69. For the most recent data, see Pierre Pichard’s Inventory, 4:263–266.


74. Duroiselle, “Pictorial Representations,” p. 89. Aung Thaw, Historical Sites, p. 84.

75. Duroiselle, “Pictorial Representations,” pp. 89–90. There may, of course, be painted representations in the interior of other temples.

77. EB 2, lv.

78. Benjamin Rowland in *Art and architecture of India*, chapter 20 on Ceylon, mentions no such use of the *jātaka* plaques on temples, although they are found early in Bharhut (pp. 83–84) and the Borobudur (p. 453). Neither did S. Paranavitana in “The Art and Architecture of the Polonnaruwa Period,” in *The Polonnaruwa Period*, ed. S. D. Saparamadu, third edition, (Dehiwala: Sri Lanka, Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973). Duroiselle, “Pictorial Representations,” p. 89, is also of the opinion that Pagān is the only place where the complete collection of the *jātakas* were made on terracotta and placed on temples.


81. Rhys-Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 93, states that the commentaries of the *jātakas* were compiled in the fifth century AD in Śrī Lanka.

82. There is some evidence that the Pyū used *jātaka* plaques of the Sinhalese series. See Duroiselle’s “Excavations at Pagān,” p. 173.


85. For instance, see U Kala, *Mahāyazawingyi*, 1:190–195, and *Zatatawpon*, p. 89.

86. Duroiselle, “Pictorial Representations,” p. 89.

87. I am not addressing the issue of whether there were, in fact, two distinct recensions, but since Luce believed there were and based his argument on that belief, my analysis must also work within that framework.


89. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:273. That may have given some reprieve in his mind, although I am not certain how “both and neither” recensions can exist simultaneously.

90. According to Pichard’s *Inventory*, there are 420 plaques left *in situ* on the Shwēzigōn, with 597 pockets for them. This suggests that a different “recension” might have existed, an idea that has not been taken into account in Luce’s analysis (Pichard, *Inventory*, 1:66). Similarly, there were originally 601 *jātaka* plaques on the Dhammyazika Pagoda (Pichard, *Inventory*, 4:172), which suggests still another “recension.” If nothing else, these various numbers suggest duplication or redundancy, which would tend to alter the sequence, on which the Luce thesis depends.

91. Luce *Old Burma*, 1:269. This admission reveals that what he really meant by the term “muddle” was that the Shwēzigōn plaques were a “mixture” of the “two” recensions, not “both and neither.”


93. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:60.


97. *EB* 1, 2:93. As Duroiselle put it: “There is no evidence as to the date when the inscription itself was engraved . . . .”

98. King Bayinnaung in the sixteenth century erected a bell at the Shwézigón which he inscribed with three languages: Pali, Burmese, and Mon, symbolic of cultures of his kingdom.


100. Although Luce dates the Ânanda to 1105, which serves the modern Kyanzittha legend, Duroiselle however, dates it to 1090. See his “Talaing Plaques,” *EB*, 2, 1:iii; and “Stone Sculptures in the Ananda Temple at Pagán,” *Archaeological Survey of India: Annual Report, 1913–1914*, pp. 64–65. This, of course, could be used to argue that written Old Mon in the Pagán script might have been a bit earlier than I have contended in this book, but since the temple is not dated by an original epigraph, the 1093 Old Mon inscription of Kyanzittha is still the first dated evidence for written Old Mon in Burma.


102. Since the *Cûlavânsa* was not written before the second half of the thirteenth and continued to be written into the nineteenth century, this reference to the “Rāmañña country” is not evidence that it was contemporary to Vijayabāhu I. Rather, it reinforces my contention that Rāmañña desa did not appear until the late thirteenth century.


104. Luce, *Old Burma*, 1:40


106. I am aware that Kemper in *Presence of the Past* (p. 3) is reluctant to call the *Mahâvamsa* Ceylon’s “national” chronicle. I am saying only that no other text probably represented Ceylon as well as the *Mahâvamsa* did, particularly in the past, and in that important text, borrowing orthodox Buddhism and its texts from Burma is freely admitted.

107. SMK 1:325. The inscription is dated to 1082, prior to Kyanzittha’s ascension either in 1084 or 1086. In part it reads: “This is a good deed done for the benefit of the Three Gems.” One could argue, I suppose, that this was not a specific reference to the *Tipitakas*, but a general reference to the Buddha, *Sangha*, and *Dhamma*.

108. Luce, “The career,” p. 64.

109. To name but one, see Bode’s *Pali Literature*. As the citations above have shown, there is much recent scholarship that does not support Luce’s contentions.

110. There are ink inscriptions written in Mon in various temples, but to my knowledge, none has been securely dated to the Pagán period. Even if the temple in which such inscriptions appear is securely dated, there is still no guarantee that the ink writings were contemporary to the building of the temple.

**Chapter Eleven: The Mon Paradigm and the Myth of the “Downtrodden Talaing”**

1. Quoted in Dorothy Woodman, *The Making of Burma* (London: The Cresset Press, 1962), p. 75. This proclamation was made late in 1824, after the British had taken the maritime provinces in Lower Burma.


7. *Burney Papers*, 1, 1–4:125–126. Burney wrote and signed this letter, which was dated 27th December 1825, and delivered it personally.


12. Luce, “Note on the Peoples,” pp. 299–300, for the first three countries mentioned.


21. Neither Shorto, in his *Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions and Dictionary of Modern Spoken Mon*, nor Halliday in his *Mon-English Dictionary*, has an entry for it. It is only in the twentieth century that the Mon began to use it.


25. E. A. Stevens had compiled what appears to be the second *Judson’s Burmese-English Dictionary*, which was produced in 1852 after Judson died in 1850 without completing it.

26. By the time the 1952 Centenary edition of *Judson’s* was published belatedly in 1953, and although the editors had finally expunged Forchhammer’s note found in the 1893 edition about Alaungpaya and his alleged oppression of the *Talaing*, they had nevertheless retained his ethnic focus on the word *talaing* by defining it as “Peguan or Talaing, Mun.” The first edition of what became *Judson’s*, the 1826 version, had not linked the word *talaing* with the Mun ethnic group, but with the peoples of Pegu, so that it was more a geosocial term. Hence, it read: “[*talaing*], adj. pertaining to the Peguese. [Talaing-pyai], n. Pegu.” (*A Dictionary of the Burman Language*, p. 175.)


30. Said’s phrase means that whether subconsciously or deliberately a particular world view is shared by numerous people benefiting from, in this case, colonialism. Thus even Blagden, whose work is objective in many ways, succumbed to Forchhammer’s views of the oppressed Mon (see Blagden, “The Chronicles of Pegu,” p. 372).


35. In addition to the Pagán and Ava inscriptions in which the word is found as *tanluin* (to be documented below), U Kala’s chronicle preceded Alaungpaya, as did several other works written in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, all of which used the word *talaing*.


38. The manuscripts he was using, written by a Meerm Htaw Tu (in Burmese, Maung Shwe Tu), are dated to *Sakaraj* 1203 or 1841 AD (Cooper, “Origins,” p. 4).

39. It is interesting that a Mon monk would accept a Sinhalese manuscript about themselves as representative of the Mon of Lower Burma.


46. Blagden, “Etymological Notes: I. Talaing.” *JBRS* 4, 1 (1914), p. 58. This is
confirmed by modern linguists as well. F. K. Lehman wrote me that *ita term* “cannot . . . (even imaginably) have given rise to ‘talaing’ in Burmese or any other language” (personal communication, June 6, 2003). Christian Bauer’s “Notes to Mon Epigraphy,” p. 75, includes the word *ita*, but it is defined as a Middle Mon term of respect. Shorto’s *Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions*, p. 17, has two meanings for *ita*: one is a female personal name and the other, a title of respect.

47. SMK 4 and 5 approximately.
50. Halliday, *Mon-English Dictionary*, p. 23. Shorto’s *Dictionary of Modern Spoken Mon*, pp. 8–9, does not have it at all.
52. *Judson’s Dictionary*, p. 149. I do have one reservation about the word being derived from Pali. Six other words in Halliday’s *Mon-English Dictionary* beginning with the same letter are associated with females and all are kinship terms, hence unlikely to have been borrowed. They include “grandmother,” “younger sister,” “older aunt,” “midwife,” “an aunt younger than one’s parents,” and “elder sister” (p. 79). If these are indigenous Mon words current at the time of Halliday’s work, then probably *italem*, beginning with the same letter *i*, is neither related to “father” nor likely to be obsolete.

55. Blagden, “Etymological Notes: I. Talaing.” p. 58. I am not certain to what “chronicle” he was referring, but I presume it was the Mon manuscripts presented as evidence by Cooper.
58. Wheatley, p. 225, note 28, refers to this Chinese text in the narrative which mentions a T’an-laing island thought to be a dependency of Dvāravati. It is highly conjectural.
61. Both the 1082 and 1107 inscriptions are discussed in Chapter 10. For the 1204 evidence, see Luce, “Note on the Peoples.”
62. See also Tin Hla Thaw. “History of Burma,” p. 147.
63. *Zatatatwpon*, pp. 99–100. What is curious in this text is that while Talaing was listed as one of the “101 Races,” so is Rman, suggesting that they were two different ethnic groups.
64. U May Oung, “Origin of the Word ‘Talaing.’”
67. See *MKPC* cited earlier, which contains all the Old Mon inscriptions of Burma up to its publication.
68. Shorto’s *Dictionary of Mon Inscriptions* does not have it.
69. Kyuan were clients in a patron-client relationship. The term is wrongly translated as “slave,” which has a modern meaning not applicable to their situation at Pagan. See Aung-Thwin, “Athis, Kyun Tau, Hpaya Kyun.”

70. Luce, “Note on the Peoples,” p. 300.

71. Luce, Old Burma, 1:28.


73. Luce, Old Burma, 1:21.

74. This would explain why, in the 1826 edition of Judson’s, the entry for talaing reads (the brackets in the entry represent the Burmese text): “[talaing], adj. pertaining to the Peguese. [Talaing-pyay], n. Pegu” where there is no mention of Talaing being Mon (or Mun). (See, A Dictionary of the Burman Language, p. 175. In the next edition, in 1852, p. 335, the entry has added the word Mun (Mon) to the definition: “[talaing], n. a Peguan or Talaing, [mun].” That continues with the 1883 edition, p. 289, where the entry states: “[talaing], n. a Peguan or Talaing, [mun] [-kayin], n. a Pwo Karen . . . .” And as we have seen, only by the 1893 edition, revised and enlarged by Robert C Stevenson do we have Forchhammer’s “etymology” of the “enslavement” of the Talaing added because Stevenson found it “interesting.”

75. One can trace the beginnings of this sentiment to Forchhammer in his Notes on the Early History, 1883, p. 2. Even Blagden was swayed by it and appealed to the British Government to right the wrongs allegedly perpetrated by the Burmans against the Mons in his “Chronicles of Pegu,” (p. 374). Bode also sympathized, particularly in terms of the Mon being the preservers of the Sinhalese tradition of Theravada Buddhism in her Pali, p. 9. Most sympathetic about the loss of Mon civilization was Robert Halliday, who wrote in his Talaings that the “Talaings . . . [are] a people without a country . . . [and] as a separate people with laws and government of their own, no longer exist . . . [hence] one wishes that their own race characteristics could be preserved . . . .” (pp. 16–18). See also his “Mon Inscriptions of Siam.”


78. Phayre, History, p. 35.

79. Bode, Pali Literature, p. 9, n. 2.

Chapter Twelve: Colonial Officials and Colonial Scholars


3. Bigandet, Legend, p. x, p. 389

4. As shown in Chapter Eleven, the Rev. Francis Mason had implied such a link in 1860, but he did not explicitly tie it to Ramaññadesa.


7. Slapat, p. 34.
13. These colonial officials, scholars, and missionaries knew each other, read each other’s works, sometimes dedicated their publications to each other, in some cases worked in the same offices, and likely discussed many of these issues at length with each other. So precisely where information originated and to whom it was dispersed at what particular time, is difficult to determine.
14. Phayre, History, p. 24. However, Phayre cites the wrong page number (101) in Bigandet’s work, which has nothing to say about Suvanabhumi or Soṇa and Uttara, but discusses the Shwedagon Pagoda and the two other merchant brothers, Tapussa and Bhallika. Apparently Phayre had confused the two. Forbes, in Legendary History, p. 10, stated that “Talaing legends” mention the Soṇa and Uttara story, but he does not document any source and may have obtained his information from Phayre’s articles of 1873–1874. Phayre, similarly refers to “traditions current among the people of Pegu” as noted above, as well as “Talaing chronicles” (p. 26), in making his case. However, Blagden wrote in “The Chronicles of Pegu,” p. 372, that Phayre did not have access to Mon sources, a curious statement.
15. Forbes, Legendary History p. 23. He quotes an inscription of Arakan that allegedly records Aniruddha’s bringing back of monks well versed in the scriptures from Thaton, although without a conquest. Unfortunately, Forbes provides no documentation for the quote.
16. Phayre, History, p. 31. He had used the manuscript version of the Yazadarit and the Slapat, neither of which mentioned the alleged conquest (see Phayre, History, p. 58). Halliday also states that Phayre “evidently followed this work [Yazadarit] for that period of Talaing history, except that he has read it in a Burmese translation . . .” (see his Talaings, p. 130).
20. Cox, Journal; and John Crawfurd, Journal of an Embassy from the Governor General of India to the Court of Ava in the year 1827 (London: Henry Colburn, 1829).
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Chapter Thirteen: Without the Mon Paradigm
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44. Zambudipa Okhsaung Kyan, pp. 41–47.
45. The Anh Pass through the Arakan Yomas lay across the river from Prome (Prañ).
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