

**THE PROBLEM OF CEYLONESE-BURMESE
RELATIONS IN THE 12TH CENTURY AND THE
QUESTION OF AN INTERREGNUM IN PAGAN:
1165-1174 A.D.**

by
M-Aung-Thwin*

The history of ancient Burma and particularly the civilization of Pagan has been reconstructed mainly by the labors of Professor G.H. Luce and his colleagues, including the late Prof. Pe Maung Tin, the late Colonel Ba Shin, and Dr. Than Tun among others. These pioneers had provided us with a (largely) chronological and artistic, and (partly) socio-economic framework with which to tackle the task of reconstructing the early history of Burma. Still, there are problems within the pioneering work that must be settled before we push on further. This paper is a discussion concerning one of those problems, which Prof. Luce has called "the second greatest crisis in the history of Pagan".¹ When I had the privilege of visiting Prof. Luce in Jersey in 1974. I brought up the problem and we had a very short discussion about it, Prof. Luce then suggested I write a paper on the subject and this is the result.

His article, "Aspects of Pagan History—Later Period" in, *In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon* (The Siam Society, 1970), summarized the problem in the following manner.²

* At present, the author is writing a dissertation at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, on "The Nature of State and Society in Pagan: 1100-1300 A.D." He spent 1974 doing research in England, India, and somewhat in Thailand. Originally from Burma, he grew up in India, and went to the U.S. in 1965. He received his M.A. from the University of Illinois.

- 1) G.H. Luce, *Old Burma-Early Pagan*, I (New York, 1970), p. 124.
- 2) G.H. Luce, "Aspects of Pagan History—Later Period", Tej Bunnag and Michael Smithies, eds., *In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, The Siam Society, Bangkok, 1970, 135-137.

Īm-taw-syañ, (the 'Narathu Kulākya' of the Chronicles), a fanatical Burma nationalist, had quarrelled violently with Parākrama Bāhu, the great king of Ceylon (fl. 1153-1186). It started with a trade dispute over the price and export of elephants; Ceylon had plenty of them, but the proportion of tuskers among them (useful in war) was much smaller than it was in Burma.

Many provocations are listed in the 13th century *Cūlavamsa*. But I suspect that one great reason was that the Ceylon king, in alliance with Camboja, wanted to break the Burmese/Coḷa hold over the narrows of the Isthmus of Kra. Īm-taw-syañ abruptly severed relations, and even intercepted a Singhalese princess on her way to Angkor. Parākrama Bāhu was furious: 'The King of Arimaddana (Pagan) must either be captured or killed'. In 1165 a huge armada was sent, under two commanders, with apparently two destinations. Ādicca, the senior, attacked Papphālama, the port near the Isthmus. Perhaps he died on campaign, for we hear no more of him. *Nagaragiri Kittī* (or Kit Nuvaragal), the junior commander, captured *Kusumi* (Bassein), took *Ukkama* (i.e. Pagan) by storm, and slew the king. He apparently held the city for some considerable time. He received a reward of land on his return to Ceylon; and his rock-inscription at *Devanagala*, not far from Candy, confirms much of the story in the *Cūlavamsa*.

Nine years of interregnum passed before the quarrel was settled by the intercession of the monks on both sides. And what were the results? Kyanzittha's line of Burmese-Mon kings was dethroned. Aniruddha's line was restored in the person of Jeyyasura, Cañsū II (Narapatisithu), who reigned from 1174 to 1211 A.D. He was given a princess, Vatamsika (U-chok-pan), in marriage—probably Singhalese, apparently on terms precluding her children from the succession. All this led to a gradual withdrawal of Mon influence and culture from Central to Lower Burma, and the apparent death of Mon literature for three centuries. It also led to the steady growth, triumph and efflorescence of Old Burmese art, literature and culture, during the last hundred years of the dynasty.

From the single *assumption* that Ukkama was Pagan, a number of important conclusions were made regarding the political and cultural history of Pagan. These may be itemized as follows: 1) the existence of an interregnum in Pagan history from 1165-1174 A.D., 2) the length of Alaungsithu's reign, 3) the regnal dates of ĩm-taw-syañ, 4) the identities of Kulākya and Mañ Yañ Narasiñkha, 5) the genealogy of Cañsū II (Narapatisithu), and 6) the nature of Singhalese influence in the Pagan court as well as in art and architecture in the late 12th century. All of these factors are dependent upon the one assumption mentioned above.

If we begin from fact, then proceed towards interpretation, rather than *vice-versa*, there emerges a completely different picture, namely that 1) Pagan was not attacked by the Singhalese at all, only Lower Burma, hence there was no interregnum between 1165-1174 A.D., 2) Alaungsithu's reign therefore continued past 1165 A.D., 3) ĩm-taw-syañ ruled for a longer period of time, 4) his successor, Mañ Yañ Narasiñkha was a historical figure, 5) the genealogy of Cañsū II (Narapatisithu) remains obscure, and 6) Singhalese influence in court and in art and architecture was the result of normal religious contacts, not military conquest.

What *are* the facts? There exist several sources that dealt with the problem, but the main one used to document the story has been the Devanagala Rock Inscription in Sinhalese; along with this there are several Old Burmese inscriptions, and three versions of the 13th century *Cūlavamsa*. I quote from the Devanagala Inscription which commemorated the event, as translated by the late S. Paranavitana.³

On the tenth day of the waxing moon in Poson [May/June] in the twelfth year when His Majesty was enjoying the royal splendour. Whereas, a person named Bhuvanāditta, Lord of Aramña, when reigning, said 'We shall not contract a treaty with the island of Lanka, and whereas, when His Majesty had commanded 'Put men board thousands of vessels, send and attack Aramña, and Kīt Nuvaragal, had taken by storm a town called Kusumiya and when... for five

3) S. Paranavitana, tr., "The Devanagala Rock Inscription", *Epigraphia Zelanica*, III, no. 34, p. 312-325.

months, the Aramaṇas sent envoys saying 'We shall contract a treaty...'

Proceeding from fact to interpretation, one should notice that the contemporary inscription made no mention at all of any place called *Ukkama*, however interpreted, neither was there any mention made of Pagan in any form, nor a King of Pagan. The attack, moreover, was made on Aramāña, in the 12th year of Parākrama Bāhu's reign* during the Southwest Monsoons (Poson). Finally, Kit Nuvaragal stormed a town called Kusumiya, and that particular fact need not necessarily be directly connected to the person called Bhuvanāditta, Lord of Aramāña. That is, there is no evidence that when Kit Nuvaragal stormed Kusumiya, Bhuvanāditta lived in that port city, or that he was killed, if any king was killed at all.

About one and a half centuries later, the *Cūlavamsa* had not only added drama to the event, but additional material as well. The relevant section as translated by Wijesinha is as follows: (the Rāmañña king) ... "violently seized a princess that the Lord of Lanká had sent to the country of Kámbója." Parākrama Bāhu then said: "It seemeth necessary that we should now compass *the king Arimaddana* [underscore mine] to take him captive or to kill him." After many preparations, ships were sent, but "because of the stormy weather certain of these ships were wrecked, and certain others were driven on strange lands..., one of the ships landed at Kákadipa [Crow Island]... But five of the ships... landed at the port Kusumi, in the country of Rāmañña... [The] soldiers [then] *advanced from the port where they had landed* [underscore mine] and fought many fierce battles, and slew many thousands of the forces of the Rāmañña country. Like furious elephants they destroyed a great number of coconut and other trees... and destroyed half of the Kingdom."

* There is argument even here. W. Geiger is of the opinion that the date of the inscription refers to the date of the raid, while S. Paranavitana felt that it was the date of the actual land grant to Kit Nuvaragal, *after* his services, as was typical of these inscriptions. (See *Cūlavamsa*, II, p. 69, note 3 and *Epiq. Zeylanica*, III, no. 34, p. 318. For our purposes, we must assume that the date referred to the raid, or else there would not be a problem left to discuss since the date of the attack would be unknown,

“And the ships which the Tamil general Ādicca commanded *cast anchor* at the port Papphāla in that country. All these men also led by the Tamil commander, began straightway a fierce and bloody war, and took many of the inhabitants captive, and shook the kingdom of Rāmañña greatly. And after this, the mighty and terrible Sinhalese entered *the city* [not Ukkama], and spared not their weapons, and slew the king of Rāmañña who had disregarded the laws of nations.”⁴ (So far, only one fact from the inscription remains confirmed, i.e. that Kusumi was attacked)

The Geiger version, however, is as follows. King Parākrama Bāhu said :

Either the capture or the slaying of *the king of Arimaddana* must be effected, [then] the ships on which the Damilādhikarin Ādicca commanded *landed* in the Rāmañña territory at the port of Papphālama, and while at once the people with the Damilādhikarin at the head, fought a gruesome, fearful, foe destroying battle... [all underscore mine] [The Sinhalese then] plunged the Rāmañña kingdom into sore confusion. Thereupon [they] with terrible courage, fearful with their swords, burst into the town of Ukkama and slew the Monarch of the Ramaṇas.⁵

Lastly, the Rhys Davids translation differs from both these, not only in terms of meaning, but in that he felt the raid occurred in South India, not Southeast Asia. Nevertheless, his translation of the *Narendracaritāvalokana Pradipikāwa*, apparently a shorter account but relating basically the same story, is as follows: Parākrama Bāhu said, “...that

king who will be our enemy [should be reprimanded]. [Then] two ships arrived at the harbour Kusuma in Aramuna, and took in battle and laid waste the country from the port Sapattota over which Kurttipurapam was Governor, Damilādhikāri himself arrived at the port Papphāta, and there having fought a great battle and taken

4) *Mahāvamsa*, pt. II, LXXVI, tr. by L.W. Wijesinha (Mudaliyar, Ceylon, 1909), p. 192.

5) *Cūlavamsa* : Being the recent part of, the *Mahāvamsa*, pt. II, tr. by Wilhelm Geiger (1953), chapter 76, verse 10-75, p. 69.

the inhabitants alive and seized the whole land of Rāmānya, went to the city of *Ukkāka*, and took prisoner the lord of Rāmānya, and overcame the land.⁶

All three versions corroborate relatively well those events concerning the *causus belli*, the Lanka-Rāmañña relations, and (two of them) the locality of Rāmañña. Both Geiger's and Wijésinha's versions, for example, suggest Rāmañña to be Lower Burma (as expected) then they recounted the story of the Singhalese princess being seized *on her way to Kamboja*, which would place this kingdom around the Isthmus of Kra. Furthermore, the King of Rāmañña had allegedly robbed the messengers sent by Lanka and had "imprisoned them... in a fortress in Malaya."⁷

Both Geiger and Wijésinha agreed that a large part of the armada was destroyed by storm with only five ships reaching Rāmañña. All three versions agreed that it was Ādicca, not Kit Nuvaragal that reached Papphāla and either killed or capture a king or monarch of Rāmañña. All three versions followed a story that dealt with the 16th year of Parākrama Bāhu's reign, which preceded a story of a raid on South India, which normally would lead us to conclude that the Rāmañña raid occurred either in or after the 16th year of Parākrama Bāhu's reign.

As one may recall, the Devanagala Inscription stated that the events transpired on the 12th year of the King's reign. There is then, a discrepancy of four years to be accounted for. Apparently, the chronicles had confused an event in South India with one in Rāmañña or had simply made an error in chronology. We shall not pursue this for it detracts from our main problem; suffice to say that there remain questions still unanswered with regard to the locality and date of these events.

Assuming that the raid was on Rāmañña, there are still very important discrepancies among the three translations. Wijésinha, for

6) Rhys Davids, "The Conquest of South India in the Twelfth Century by Parākrama Bāhu", *JAS of Bengal*, XLI (1872), p. 197-201.

7) *Ibid.* Geiger also has Malaya, but Wijésinha has "the hill country", apparently since *malay* or *mālai* means *hill* or *mountain* in Tamil.

example, translates *King Arimaddana* as a proper name, Geiger as *the King of Arimaddana* and Rhys Davids as *the king who will be our enemy*, using the word *Arimaddana* as a verb, not a proper noun. The Pali version itself has *Arimaddanarājino* which can be translated as either the *King of Arimaddana* or *King Arimaddana*.⁸ Since throughout the narrative, this king was referred to as the *King of Rāmañña*, it seems out of context to conclude that the writers suddenly changed to *King of Arimaddana*, then later (line 67) resumed to call him the *King of Rāmañña* once more.⁹ It seems more consistent and logical to accept Wijésinha's translation here of *Arimaddanarājino* as King Arimaddana, who was the King of Rāmañña.

The inscription, of course, neither mentioned the word *Arimaddana* as a proper name nor used it as the chronicles did. In this context, Rhys Davids' version is the best, for it described *the king who will be our enemy*, i.e. the inscriptional Bhuvanāditta, lord of Aramña. The chroniclers may have used the local account *Narendra-caritāvalokana Pradipikāwa* and changed the meaning of the word or the discrepancy may lie in the two translations.

Notwithstanding the inevitable exaggeration of victory by the chroniclers, Rāmañña could be stretched to refer to the whole of Burma; but one wonders whether calling a kingdom by the name of its tributary is not somewhat begging the point. Moreover, the argument proceeds from interpretation to fact (i.e. Ukkama was *first* assumed to be Pagan, then Rāmañña would mean the whole of Burma), rather than from fact to interpretation (i.e. Rāmañña as already accepted by most scholars of Southeast Asia to be the Mon area of Lower Burma, therefore Ukkama must be in Lower Burma).^{*} It is only on this particular occasion when the raid took place, did Prof. Luce write " 'Aramna' (= Rāmañña, here = Pagan)." (p. 121)

8) *Cūlavāṁsa* II, Pali text by Mahānāma, ed. by W. Geiger (PTS, London, 1927), p. 383, line 38.

9) Geiger, *op. cit.*, lines 11b, 14, and 67.

* Prof. Luce's map of Rāmaññadesa in *Old Burma-Early Pagan* represents Lower Burma.

A.P. Buddhadatta, in a highly detailed account, has corrected many of the verses in the translation of W. Geiger's *Cūlavamsa*. Concerned not only with accurate translation, he cross-referenced and corroborated his changes with other available *ms*s whenever possible and necessary. Among many, one of the changes he made concerned the word *Rāmañña* which Geiger had stated referred to Burma. Buddhadatta wrote that "the whole of Burma was never included in that name. Only... Lower Burma, which was formerly a separate kingdom, was known by that name. Upper Burma or Burma proper was known as Marammarattha, whose capital was Pagan..."¹⁰ And this argument was written outside the context of the raid.

Using Geiger's version, Prof. Luce wrote, with no historical, linguistic, or even legendary explanation, "Ukkama (i.e. Pagan)." On this single assumption, everything else mentioned on page 54 rests.

The identification of *Ukkama*, *Ukkaka* or *the city* (depending upon the translations) crucial to the above theory, may have a variety of possibilities, all of them in Lower Burma. If the *Cūlavamsa* authors had not confused the raid on South India (which followed the account on *Rāmañña*) and had not added a name by mistake from South India, *Ukkama* or *Ukkaka* may be the *Ukkala* or *Ukkaladesa*, once the name for the Delta area around Dala and Pegu. If so, overwhelming opinion places *Ukkala* in the area east of Kusumiya the traditional port of entry to Burma from the west, and in the natural path of sea-borne attack from west to east, around the Delta. The name *Ukkala* is not unknown, according to Emil Forchhammer, to Pali works such as the *Mahāvagga* and its commentaries, nor to the Shwedagon Inscription of the 15th century.¹¹

10) A.P. Buddhadatta, "Some Corrections of Geiger's *Culavamsa* Translation", *University of Ceylon Review*, VIII, 1950, p. 109.

11) *Epig. Zelanica*, "Pillar-Inscription of Mahinda V", IV, no. 8 p. 65, showed that the *Mahāvagga*, the *Nidūnakathā* and the *Lalitavistara* mention two merchants came from a country called Ukkala (Skt. Utkala) in North India. Lower Burma took up this name, as well as other names, such as Hamsavatī (Pegu), Iravatī (Irrawaddy). Forchhammer's statement is found in U.E. Maung's "Some place names in Burma", *JBR*, XXXIX, pt. II (1956), 182-192. Ukkala as Lower Burma has been identified by the following scholars :

According to D.B. Jayatilaka, a thera by the name of Vinayalamkara had stated that the modern name of Ukkama was Okkam, 50 miles from the sea in Lower Burma.¹² Or, it could be a garbled version of

Chas. Duroiselle, *Report of the Supt. Arch. Survey Burma*, "Place Names in Burma", 1923, p. 22; also same author, *ASB*, 1915, p. 32; Halliday's tr. of "Slapat Rajawan Datow Smin Ron", *JBRs*, XII (1923), p. 40; G.H. Hough, *Asiatic Researches*, XVI (1878), 273-283; Arthur Phayre, *History of Burma*, p. 50-51; J.A. Stewart, *Burma Arch. Report*, 1915, p. 31-2; Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 182; Emil Forchhammer, *Jardine Prize Essay*, p. 22; and *Notes on the Early Geography of Burma*, no. I, p. 6; Prof. Luce himself thinks the Talaing kingdom of "Ussala" or "Ussā-Peku" is found in three inscriptions: 1. Sakhalampa Pagoda Inscription of 1056 A.D., 2. the Htihlaing Shin Pagoda Inscription of 1107 A.D. and 3. the Monk Matima Inscription of 1086 A.D. in Luce, "A Cambodian Invasion? of Burma", *JBRs*, XII (1922), p. 42 and "Mons of Pagan Dynasty", *JBRs*, XXXVI, pt. 1 (Aug. 1953), p. 7. According to the Director of the *Arch. Survey Burma*, 1915, p. 32, *Ussala* was the old name for Orissa, taken from its variants *Utkala* and *Ussa*. The forms *Ukkala* and *Ukkalapa* results from the assimilation of the *i* in the first syllable *ut*. The word *Ussa*, he says, is merely the Burmese way, according to the genus of the language. He continued to write that "it is noteworthy that the same country (*Utkala*) was known to . . . Hiuen-tsiang . . . by a name very similar to the Burmese form, that is, *Utcha* . . . pronounced according to Chinese phonetics. See also Than Tun in *The Guardian* (Rangoon, Oct. 1964), XI, no. 10, p. 18, where he wrote that *Ukkala* was *Ukkalapa* in Lower Burma, old Rangoon. Codrington's *History of Ceylon* stated that the raid was on Pegu. Lastly, the Shwedagon Inscription and the Shwesandaw thamaing ties in that Rangoon area with the history of *Ukkalapa Min*. The assumption, of course, is that *Ukkama* may have been a mistake for *Ukkala*.

The word *Okkaka* (Rhys Davids' version) is a very commonly used family name from which Sri Lanka kings traced their genealogy, a name with Kalingan origins. See, for example, all the volumes of *Epiq. Zelanica*, I-V, in the index for the word *Okkūka* (Skt. *Ishvaku*). According to two Sinhalese texts on poetics, ed. by Jayatilaka, called *Siyabasalakara* and *Butsarana* by Namananda Thera, Aramana was a place in South India where there were many elephants, where they spoke Tamil, Yona and Barbara, etc . . . thus, the *Cūlavāṃsa* authors may have confused the raid on South India with the one on Lower Burma. They may have been in fact one battle, made into two separate ones, and this may explain why the Devanagala Inscription failed to mention *Ukkama*.

- 12) Godakumbara, C.E. "Relations Between Burma and Ceylon", *JBRs*, XLIX (Dec., 1966), pt. II, p. 145-162. However, this Okkam may have been in Sri

Muttuma (Martaban), a port very likely to have controlled trade around the Kra Isthmus.¹³ Perhaps Ukkama was Uttara, south of Muttuma, a favorable place from which to intercept a princess on her way from Sri Lanka to Kamboja, and to "imprison its envoys in a fortress in Malaya." One can go on indefinitely in this manner, unless one first accepts the facts as stated in the Devanagala Rock Inscription (in which no Ukkama is mentioned), *then* proceed to interpret.

Internal evidence from the *Cūlavamsa* suggests *Ukkama* or *Ukkaka* to be a town close to Papphālama, the port near the Isthmus, because the description of the battle is continuous, starting from Kākādīpa, Kusumi (Bassein), Papphālama, then Ukkama or Ukkaka.¹⁴

In Geiger's version, the troops arrived at the port called *Kusumi*, then "slew *from their landing place* the troops belonging to the Rāmañña country... But the ships which the Damilādhikarin Adicca commanded, *landed* in the territory (of Rāmañña) at the port of Papphālama" and fought a "gruesome" battle. They then "burst into the town of Ukkama and slew the Monarch of the Ramaṇas." (p. 69) Wijésinba's version is likewise similar. "They advanced from the port where they *landed* (Kusumi) and fought many fierce battles... And the ship which the Tamil general Ādicca commanded *cast anchor* at the port Papphāla in

Lanka itself, the village called Okkampitiya in Buttala Korate of the Uva Province, and the "raid" being part of Parākrama Bāhu's unification. For the possibility of place names in Sri Lanka being confused with those in South-east Asia, see S. Paranavitana's *Ceylon and Malaya*. For Okkam, see the "Pillar-Inscription of Mahinda V", IV, no. 8, p. 65.

13) U E. Maung, *loc. cit.*, p. 191.

14) *Cūlavamsa* (above), all three versions. For the port of Papphalama, see the near contemporary inscription of Rajendra Cola I, who raided Sri Vijaya in 1025 A.D. See also N.K. Sastri's *A History of South India* with regard to this raid and George Spencer's thesis, "Royal Leadership and Imperial Conquest in Medieval South India: the Naval Expedition of Rajendra Cola I, 1025 A.D.", Berkeley, Ph.D. thesis, 1967. Paul Wheatley's *Golden Khersonese* has many of these place names in Southeast Asia and so does O.W. Wolters' *Early Indonesian Commerce*. G. Coedès' *Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, p. 143 mentions Papphalama, but he footnotes the *Cūlavamsa* passage that we are dealing with.

that country..." They then entered *the city* and "slew the King of Rāmañña." (p. 192) Rhys Davids' version also shows that *Ukkaka* was stormed after having *landed* at Papphāta [sic] (p. 198) Thus the narrative of all three versions strongly suggest an attack along the coasts, west to east, Kit Nuvaragal stopping at Kusumi and Ādicca going on and casting anchor at Papphālama, *from where* they burst into Ukkama or Ukkaka and slew the monarch.

The story does not say or even suggest that after they landed at Papphālama, they walked (or rode) 300 miles up the Irrawaddy river, against a vigorous monsoon current (Poson is May/June), undetected, to launch a "lightning capture of the capital", as suggested by Prof. Luce.¹⁵ The narrative as presented by the *Cūlavamsa* and for geographical reasons, such an attack to have occurred anywhere in Upper Burma goes against the evidence.¹⁶ In other words, *Ukkama*, the word on which the whole

15) Luce, *Old Burma-Early Pagan*, p. 124.

16) Symes, Michael, *An Account of an Embassy to the Kingdom of Ava, sent by the Governor-General of India in the year 1795*, (London, reprint, 1969), chapter VIII. For the trip up-river Michael Symes' account is the best available because of the season in which he travelled (Poson) and the detail that he gave concerning the time of travel, etc . . . Admittedly, it was centuries later, but it did confirm those trips to Upper Burma made in preceding centuries whose journeys lack the information we need; journeys of Chapada in the 12-13th century, as well as other travellers of the 15-16th centuries. Symes' trip, in other words, epitomizes the typical journey before the steam boat.

It took Symes four hard months against a vigorous current to reach "Kiapatalaun", 19 miles south of Ava, near enough to Pagan. He did this under the most favorable political conditions, being escorted by a Burmese governor, and in the absence of war. He started approximately on the 15th of May (Poson) and reached the latter place on the 25th of September, hardly the time that could favor a "lightning capture of the capital." For this idea, Prof. Luce footnotes as partial support, the old familiar Arab tale, found in many versions ranging from Southeast Asia to South India, of the Mahārāja of Java capturing and beheading the ruler of Camboja in the 8th century, itself a subject of controversy.

Closer to the event in 1165 A.D. was the mission of Chapada in the 13th century. The *Sasanavamsa* (p. 46), supported by the Kalyani Inscription, recalled Chapada's return from Ceylon during the monsoons in the 13th century. Because of the rains, all the Theras stayed at Kusumi (Bassein), their

theory rests, must certainly have better documentation than a simple "i.e. Pagan" after it.

All three translations agreed that a king or monarch of Rāmañña or of the Rāmaṇas was killed or captured. The Pali text for the word king, however, was *Ramañādhīpaṃ*, which can be *lord, master* or *ruler* of Rāmañña, according to Buddhadatta's translation of the word *adhipati*, a term as ambiguous as the Burmese word *mañ*. Moreover, the Pali text in the *Cūlavamsa*, when using the word *ruler* varied, according to whether or not it fit the meter of the verse. For example, earlier in the narrative (line 14) *Rāmañña-bhūmipo* was used instead of *Ramañādhīpaṃ* to fit the particular meter in that verse. In short, there is nothing specific about the word *king* or *ruler* in the *Cūlavamsa* and may in fact have been referring to any Governor of a provincial town. It certainly is not a word on which to base the chronology of a king in Pagan.

In the *Cūlavamsa*, C.W. Nicholas warns us, "much of the... account of Parākkamabāhu is pure panegyric: there is a great deal of adulation and exaggeration, and successful skirmishes are made to appear as major victories." Then in the context of the Rāmañña raid wrote: "it is not improbable that the *Cūlavamsa* story of the subjugation of a foreign kingdom by six of Parākkamabāhu's ships is just another laudatory exaggeration of the marvellous power of its heroes' arms."¹⁷ Similarly, Prof. K.A. Nilakanta Sastri wrote that the *Cūlavamsa* "is an incredible record of uniform successes for the Sinhalese forces..."¹⁸ And that is precisely what the authors of the *Cūlavamsa* had done with the few facts found in the Devanagala inscription: it had added drama to the event and had gone well beyond the original story.

port of entry to Burma. "When they had reached the town of Kusima, the time for spending the rainy season was drawing near, and being unable to come to their teacher in the town of Arimaddana, they spent the rainy season in the town of Kusima itself." If this most welcomed group of monks could not reach Pagan during the Monsoons, one seriously wonders if an armed band of warriors being offered resistance all the way could have accomplished it.

- 17) C.W. Nicholas, "Sinhalese Naval Power", *University of Ceylon Review*, XVI, 1958, p. 84, 86.
- 18) K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, "Parakramabahu and South India", *The Polonnaruwa Period*, ed. by S.D. Saparamadu (Tissara Prakasakayo, Sri Lanka, 1973), p. 41.

Admittedly, the task of carving on stone might demand conciseness, but such an important event as the slaying of a king and subjugating of a foreign power certainly would deserve a place in an inscription which was erected solely to recognize that deed.

More important than exaggeration, however, were the mistakes made by the later accounts. The land grant acknowledged Kit Nuvaragal's services, yet the *Cūlavamsa* gave Ādicca the credit for killing the monarch of Rāmañña. The chronicles stated, moreover, that Ukkama or Ukkaka was taken by storm, whereas the inscription clearly declared that Kusumiya was taken by storm. In the inscription, no mention was made of the King of Arimaddana or Monarch of Rāmañña being killed or captured, only one Bhuvanāditta, "lord of Aramñña", whose existence and the storming of Kusumiya had no necessary connection.

The story has gone from Kit Nuvaragal taking by storm the town of Kusumiya (inscriptional version), to Ādicca landing at Papphālama and killing or capturing the ruler of Ukkama or Ukkaka (chronicle version), to Kit Nuvaragal capturing Kusumi and taking by storm "Ukkama (i.e. Pagan)" resulting in nine years of interregnum, the elimination of a king, the regnal dates of several kings and the impact of outside influence upon internal culture (Luce version). In short, there is no evidence that Pagan was raided and its king killed: hence, the existence of an interregnum (and all the other related implications mentioned above) between 1165 and 1174 A.D. in the history of Pagan remains highly conjectural.

A king by the name of Kulākya, not found in the inscriptions but added in the Burmese chronicles, was apparently killed by Kulās or foreigners, usually referring to people of South Asia. The chronicles tell us a story of how soldiers from the Kingdom of Patteikara, with whose royal house Pagan kings had marriage ties, came over and assassinated Narathū for killing one of his queens, a descendant of the Patteikara royal family who had been given as part of the alliance. Thus he was dubbed Kulākya, "felled by the Kulās."

Prof. Luce has used this term "felled by the Kulās" as part of the evidence for the Sinhalese raid. He argued that unless we accept the hypothesis that Kulākya was killed by the Sinhalese, we are left with

the improbable alternative of two kings of Burma being killed at approximately the same time by two foreign invaders. "We must choose between them", he wrote.¹⁹ The choices are not that limited, nor is the alternative logical. The choice is whether Kulākya was killed by the soldiers from Patteikara or by the Sinhalese; there is no question of two kings being killed at approximately the same time by two foreign invaders, for the word *king* as we have shown, is too ambiguous to assume that it referred to the king of Pagan.

Put another way, Prof. Luce's argument is highly circular; that is, Ukkama was assumed to be Pagan, the "monarch of the Rāmaṇas" was then made into the king of Pagan, Kulākya's regnal dates were changed to 1165 A.D. which made him the then ruling king, hence he must be the "monarch of the Rāmaṇas" because Ukkama was Pagan. If we argue that the Sinhalese did not kill Kulākya, we are told there are then the deaths of two kings to explain, namely Kulākya and the "monarch of the Rāmaṇas"; whereas the "monarch of the Rāmaṇas" would be a different person from Kulākya *only* if Ukkama were *not* Pagan.

Thus one half of his argument assumes that Ukkama was Pagan while the other half assumes that it was not. In effect, we are obliged to continue assuming that Ukkama is Pagan while we argue to the contrary. The root of the problem, as I see it, was the reluctance to part with the belief that Ukkama was Pagan.

That Ukkama was Pagan was explained to me in the following manner: Ukkama was probably a mistake for *Pukkama* or *Pukam̃*. Even if true, there remains several important questions. Since when have the Sinhalese sources ever used the word *Pukam̃* or *Pagan* to refer to this Kingdom? It has always been the Pali Arimaddanapura or as Buddhaddatta has suggested above, Marammarattha. Indeed the first time the word *Pukam̃* was found in original inscriptions in Burma itself was in 1196 A.D. in Narapatisithu's Dhammarajika Inscription, as argued by Prof. Luce himself.²⁰

19) Luce, *op. cit.*, 121.

20) G.H. Luce, "Geography of Burma Under the Pagan Dynasty", *JBR*, XLII, i (June, 1959), p. 37.

This brings us to the second part of our discussion, namely, the political and cultural implications of the alleged raid on Pagan's history. Since all these are dependent on the assumption that Ukkama was Pagan, we must reconsider all of them.

First, was there an interregnum at all between 1165 A.D. and 1174 A.D.? Several sources confirm the fact that a king or kings with his or their preceptor or preceptors were ruling Pagan during the so-called period of interregnum. One is an original inscription, carefully reproduced by the Archaeological Department of Burma in their most recent publication of inscriptions. It is called the "Cañsū Mañ Krī Inscription", which showed a Cañsū (a title taken by both Alaungsithu and Narapatisithu) still reigning and making royal donations in 1168 A.D.²¹ The reverse of the inscription has an epithet associated with Cañsū I, that is Alaungsithu, namely *sak rhe* (long lived) while the obverse has another, *morñ iū* (canal digger). Another inscription dated 1169 A.D. records a donation by the preceptor of the ruling king (lines 1b and 2) to the *sañgha* and again by the same person in 1171 A.D.²²

Moreover, Jeyyasura, a name claimed by both Alaungsithu and Narapatisithu, was performing the water ceremony on a religious gift made by a headman in 1171 A.D.²³ In the next year, there was a Cañsū Mañ Krī (Great King Cañsū) who, with his wife, offered a pagoda.²⁴ Then there exists another inscription, though inscribed later (1324 A.D.), which showed Alaungsithu in 1165 A.D.²⁵ In 1169 A.D., an inscription showed one Mittara Simcañ, a minister of Alaungsithu, building a mo-

21) Burma, Archaeological Department, *She Haung Myanma Kyauksa Mya* (Ancient Burmese Inscriptions), Vol. I, 1972, p. 33, hereafter known as *SMK*.

22) *Ibid.*, 35-37.

23) *Ibid.*, 342. The "kha" or "b" section of this volume contains inscriptions that are original, that not copied by Bodawpaya in the 18th century, but also not necessarily contemporary to the event, but considered for orthographic and other reasons, to be reliable.

24) *Ibid.*, 342-4.

25) Burma, Home Department. *Original Inscriptions collected by King Bodawpaya in Upper Burma and now placed near the Patodawgyi Pagoda*, Amarapura, Rangoon, Office of the Supt., 1913, p. 37.

nastery.²⁶ The famous Ajawlat inscription, recorded in 1165 A.D., showed generous endowments being made to the *saṅgha* as if everything were normal.²⁷

Thus daily affairs of state and society, such as religious dedications, water consecration ceremonies by the King and his ministers, the building of monumental architecture (whose economic function of bringing land under cultivation, employing people, providing social welfare, and in general bringing about and carrying on the economic *development* of the kingdom) continued rather vigorously during the so-called interregnum when presumably no king reigned. Moreover, Narapatisithu's achievements in empire building and expansion, consolidation of the military, and all those elements that implies secure foundations, could not have come about with an interregnum that would have been the basis for that growth. Rather, Narapatisithu's long and secure reign of 37 years were based upon the progressive developments of those years that preceded him, years in which effective administration governed the country, not the chaos of an interregnum.

If there were no interregnum, who ruled during the period, and is there evidence for it? If we depend entirely on the inscriptions, and for a moment, reject the theory that Kulākya alias Im-taw-syañ was killed in 1166, the problem could be solved. An original inscription has a short list of kings in which Im-taw-syañ was placed after Sak tau rhe or Alaungsithu,²⁸ while the chronicles placed Kulākya after Alaungsithu; therefore historians had agreed that Kulākya was most likely Im-taw-syañ. The questions arise only *after* Kulākya; who followed him? The Jatabon Chronicle, a highly reliable 15-16th century history placed one

26) *Ibid.*, p. 30.

27) *Selections From the Inscriptions of Pagan*, ed. by G.H. Luce and Pe Maung Tin, Rangoon, 1928, p. 13-16.

28) U E. Maung, *Pagan Kyauksa Let-Ywe Sin* (Selected Inscriptions of Pagan), Rangoon, 1958?, no. 24, p. 46. See the Thetsotaung Paya Inscription, where Aloncansu is shown as *sak tau rhe* (King long life). See also *Arch. Survey of Burma*, "A List of Inscriptions Found In Burma" (List), pt. I, Rangoon, Supt. Govt. Print, 1921, no. 263, p. 31, which noted that the inscription was original.

Min Yin Naratheinkha after Kulākya, who ruled till Narapatisithu ascended the throne in 1174 A.D., for which an inscription exists and for which there is general agreement. Thus the problem is one of chronology between Alaungsithu and Narapatisithu. When did Alaungsithu die, when did Kulākya come on the throne, and when did Min Yin Naratheinkha succeed him?

The Thetsotaung inscription, which lists these kings, were read differently by different persons. Prof. Luce has considered Min Yin Naratheinkha a fictitious person, the result of the chroniclers combining a later Min Yin and a later Narasiñha-Ujjanā, as argued by him. The idea was originally published in an article by Ma Mya Than in the *JBRs*, who though admitting doubtful reading of the above inscription, suggested that Narapati, not Narasiñkha, followed Īm-taw-syañ.²⁹

An inscription of 1267 A.D. mentioned one Mañ Yañ (Min Yin).³⁰ This Mañ Yañ had died, followed by one Cañsū, who was king while the donor who erected the inscription was still a child. The donation was made in the year 1267 A.D. Thus the Cañsū mentioned here preceded the donor and followed Mañ Yañ. The only Cañsū available at this time, i.e. when the donor was a child, had to be Narapatisithu, who ruled till 1211 A.D. Thus there did exist a Mañ Yañ *before* Narapatisithu.

The name Narasiñkha (Naratheinkha) is associated with Mañ Yañ. This Mañ Yañ Narasiñkha has become the recent controversy in the history of Pagan. According to U Lu Pe Win's reading of the Thetsotaung inscription, Narasiñkha, not Narapati, followed Īm-taw-syañ (unlike Professor Luce's reading).³¹ Thus Prof. Luce has read the list as follows: Mañ Lulañ, Thiluin Mañ, Sak Tau Rhañ (Alaungsithu), Īm-taw-syañ, and Narapati. U Lu Pe Win has read the same inscription in this manner: Mañ Lulañ, Thiluin Mañ, Sak Tau Rhañ, Īm-taw-Narasū,

29) Ma Mya Than, "Some of the Earlier Kings of the Pagan Dynasty", *JBRs*, XXII, pt. 11 (1932), 98-102.

30) *Selections From the Inscriptions of Pagan*, ed. by G.H. Luce and Pe Maung Tin, Rangoon University, 1928, no. 34, p. 83-85.

31) U Lu Pe Win, (review of) "Old Burma-Early Pagan", *JBRs*, LIV, i and ii (Dec. 1971), 20-21.

Naras(i)ñkha. The crucial distinctions are these: is the word *syañ* in Īm-taw-syañ as read by Luce actually *narasū* in Īm-taw-narasū as read by Lu Pe Win? And is *Narapati* as read by Luce actually *Naras(i)ñkha* as read by Lu Pe Win?

With Professor Okell, the author has carefully scrutinized the photographs of the inscription. There are twenty-two marks to account for between the word *taw* (of Īm-taw-syañ) and the next word; thus Īm-taw-narasū as suggested by Lu Pe Win has one too many letters. However, *Naras(i)ñkha* as read by Lu Pe Win fits better than the *Narapati* of Prof. Luce's reading. There is not much possibility for the last word to have been *ti* (in *Narapati*). (See *Inscriptions of Burma*, plate LX a) it seems then, that Prof. Luce is correct in reading Īm-taw-syañ and wrong in reading *Narapati*, while U Lu Pe Win is correct in reading *Naras(i)-ñkha* and wrong in reading *Im-taw-Narasū*. To this, add the fact above concerning Mañ Yañ that precedes *Narapatisithu*, and we have a list which has Īm-taw-syañ followed by a *Naras(i)ñkha*, not *Narapati*. The root of the problem was in assuming that Īm-taw-syañ was killed by the Sinhalese and therefore an interregnum followed, in which there could be no kings. Since according to this assumption the raid occurred in 1165 A.D., the date for *Alaungsithu's* death was cut short and *Kulākya's* accession and fall placed in 1165 A.D. And because *Min Yin Nara-theinkha* was considered fictitious, and *Narapatisithu* was known to have ascended in 1174 A.D. the period 1165-1174 A.D. was made into an interregnum.

The epithet *Kulākya* for Īm-taw-syañ still remains a mystery. Professor Luce documents two inscriptions as evidence, *List* 96 and 398. The first one, copied in 1788 A.D. states that there was a "Kulākya Min tha Min Sithu"³², which can be translated as either 1) "Prince *Kulakya* (who was *Sithu Min*" or 2) "*Sithu Min* (who was) the son of King *Kulakya*." The other inscription merely mentions boundaries of a dedication, which was bounded on the east by a "Kulākya stream", without any reference to a king.³³

32) Burma, Home Department, *Inscriptions Collected in Upper Burma*, Vol. I (Rangoon, 1900), 165-166. (hereafter cited as *UB I* or *II*).

33) *UB*, II, 810-811; *UB*, I, 302.

By the time these inscriptions were copied, the epithet "Kulākya" was already known in the histories, the *Jatatawbon* and U Kala's *Mahayazawingyi*.³⁴ In the absence of original inscriptions ever using the epithet Kulākya, we may find that the name could well be a late one. There really is no contemporary or near contemporary evidence that Īm-taw-syañ was Kulākya.

The case for Kyanzittha may serve as example. The Old Burmese form of *kya* in Kulākya, should have been *kla*, with the constricted tone ("creaky tone" at SOAS) and the subscript 1. The chronicles ran across similar problems with Kyanzittha's name and consequently with the stories that emerged later, trying to explain the legendary origins for the name. Because the modern Burmese spelling for the Old Burmese *kla* was *kya*, Kyanzittha's Old Burmese/Mon name Kalancaksa, became Kyanzittha; and since *kyan* meant "left over" a story evolved about his being a "left over soldier" i.e. Aniruddha's attempts to find the future king while still a babe were unsuccessful, providing Kyanzittha with *kammic* legitimacy which otherwise birth did not. The same consonants are here represented, in the word *kya*, and until we find in original Old Burmese inscriptions the epithet *Kulākya* spelt in Old Burmese the *bona fides* of the association between Īm-taw-syañ and Kulākya remains a mystery.

Provisionally, there are several possibilities for a revised chronology for this period 1165-1174 A.D. based entirely on the inscriptions mentioned above, since the death of Īm-taw-syañ, the regnal years of Alaungsithu, and the interregnum, were all based on the assumption that Ukkama was Pagan.

The Thetsotaung Inscription states that Alaunsithu succeeded Kyanzittha and was in turn followed by Īm-taw syañ, through the date is obscure. The latter was succeeded by Naras(i)ūkha who was later followed by Narapatisithu in 1174 (Min Saw Hla and Thetsotaung Inscription). Alaungsithu was alive and well in 1165, 1168, and 1169 A.D. as shown by his original epithets, *sak rhe* and *mron tū* (note 21) Īm-taw-syañ then must have succeeded Alaungsithu in 1169/1170 A.D. However, there is a Cañsū-Jeyyasura reigning in 1171 and 1172 A.D.

34) Mahāshin Tilawuntha, *Jatatawbon Yazawin* (15th century), ed. by U Hla Tin, Rangoon?, 1961, p. 40-41; and U Kala, *Mahayazawin*, Rangoon? n.d.

the assumption of one word (Ukkama to mean Pagan) had created all these wide ramifications so important to the history of Pagan. The absence of linguistic, historical, or even legendary evidence to support the interpretation that Ukkama was Pagan; the physical-geographical improbability of a lightning raid on Pagan during the height of the monsoons as well as during the reign of a powerful king; the highly dramatized narrative of events in the later *Cūlavamsa*, even if true, arguing against such a raid up river; the confusion of the chronicles over the names, places, and actions with regard to the raid; the absence of any facts in the contemporary Sinhalese inscription that might point to Pagan, the king of Pagan, and the destruction of either of these; and lastly, numerous Old Burmese inscriptions that testified to the presence of a king or kings during the period 1165-1174 A.D., all demand re-evaluation of the chronology and consequent implications to the political and cultural history of Pagan.