MAHĀKASSAPA AND HIS TRADITION*

by

Than Tun

AS A PRELIMINARY, I would like to acknowledge the help given to me by my colleagues in preparing this paper, to state why I write it, and to mention which period it belongs to. As source material I used only the lithic inscriptions and almost all the estampages of them are now kept at the Burma Historical Commission. Therefore my thanks are largely due to the Commission for allowing me to read them and to Dr Yi Yi and U Tin Hla Thaw in helping me to decipher and index some of them. The aim of the paper is to correct such statements as:

At Pinya under Tazishin Thihathu, there were very few moral, virtuous and modest monks. But there were plenty of Ari- the remnants of Pagan Ari, who went under the guise of monks. ¹

This means that early in Pagan these Arañ were suppressed only to revive again after the fall of Pagan. I disagree with this theory. Researches in the history of Pagan have shown that there were no such ascetics known as Arañ in the early period of the Pagan Dynasty. They appeared only in the latter half of the period and continued to thrive for quite a long time after the fall of Pagan. Their period of prosperity extended from A.D. 1200 to well over 1500. The name Arañ, I think, derives from arañaka ² meaning to live in the forest and therefore the other view of deriving it from ariya meaning noble, does not hold good any longer. ³ The contemporary writers, i.e. those who engraved their records on stones, however, very seldom used the name Arañ. ⁴ They used instead some pure Burmese names as monks of the taw kloñ ⁵ or forest monastery and taw mlatkõ ⁶ or the Reverend Lord of the Forest. Therefore it would be incorrect to define the Arañ as

* Read at the Ramakhrisna Mission Society Meeting on 29 VII 59 with Professor Pe Maung Tin in the Chair.

2. See JRBS, IX, iii, 155-6 and X, ii, 82-3.
4. Pl. 44 ⁵, Pl. 54 ³ (and its duplicate Pl. 371b³), Pl. 241 ⁵, Pl. 250 ², Pl. 264 ⁸. Anein Tawgyaung Shwegu Inscription 2 ⁴). (S. 748)
5. Pl. 44a ³, Pl. 68 ², Pl. 89 ¹, ³³, etc.
6. Pl. 208 ¹², Pl. 223a ⁸.
one who has the pretensions of a monk though he has never been either
disciplined or ordained. 7

The reasons why such a definition is objectionable would be given in detail
in this paper.

In A.D. 1216 A queen's mother built a *taw klon*—forest monastery, for
Skhîn Yintaw and left a record dedicating to it. 20 *pay* of land from *Tonîn* 8 It
is a good proof showing that this sect of “forest dwellers” received the recognition
of the royalty from the first quarter of the 13th century. In A.D. 1227, an
important government officer known as Jeyyapwat dedicated 750 *pay* of land
to a forest monastery he established at Pwazaw on the east of Pagan. 9 Many
Burmese slaves were also dedicated to it. 10 Another officer called Rājamaḥā-
manigalapati built a *kū* in A.D. 1233 at a forest monastery to the east of Prasat-
tū in Minnanthu, east of Pagan. 11 These evidences show that the sect of
“forest dwellers” had established their centre quite close to the eastern side
of the capital by the second quarter of the 13th century. The lands given
by Jeyyapwat to the forest monastery were confiscated by King Klaewā soon
after his accession but because of an objection raised by the monks, the king
thought it wise to *return them*. 12 Pwazaw and Minnanthu on the east of
Pagan were once known as Saćmatī or Thamahti as popularly mentioned in
the Chronicles. The birth-place of the “Forest-Dwellers” Movement was at
Amyin, Anin and Kyaukyit of Sagaing and Monywa districts. We shall go
into some details as to how they became the centre of the movement when
we discuss the biography of Mahākassapa. In some records such phrases as
“the forest monastery established by the Right Reverend Mahākassapa 13” or
“forest monastery of Mahākassapa” 14 often appear and it is suggestive that
those phrases refer to the leader and his sect. It is according to an inscription of
A.D. 1247 that the movement came down the Chindwin to Pagan. 15 To our
great amazement, among the “forest dwellers” we find the mention of bhik-
khuṇ in an inscription of A.D. 1281. 16 Her name was Li Chi. 17 This sect of the
“forest dwellers” 18 was found to be in popular existence far beyond the Pagan

7. Mahādhammaṇasākramaḥ: Śāsanālaṇkāra cātāma: 1831. Hanthawaddy Press,
Rangoon 1956, p. 128.
8. Pl. 44a 3
11. Pl. 68 2.
13. Pl. 140a 2.
14. Pl. 143a 7, Pl. 143b 5.
16. Pl. 268 16.
17. We have ample evidence to show that there were bhikkhuni in the Pagan
   Period (Pl. 29 7-19, Pl. 53 7, Pl. 89 27, Pl. 92 14, Pl. 101 29, Pl. 119a 2, Pl. 134b 5,
   Pl. 147b 20-24, Pl. 200 11-15, Pl. 214b 9, Pl. 220 9, Pl. 221 27, Pl. 268 16,
   Pl. 285 25-28, Pl. 329 15, Pl. 510 3, Pl. 559a 14, Pl. 562a 8, Pl. 576a 7) and that
   they were in existence at least until A.D. 1408 (Pl. 510 3, List 834 3, Rhwe kỵọn
   Saṅgharāja Uim Ton Ruī).
period. 18 But these monks of the Arahāwasi taw kloñ 19, with the exception of a few 20, never lived alone in the forest to observe the Āraññakañgañ as their name suggests. They lived in great monastic establishments, owned vast estate and allowed certain lapses in the observation of vinaya. Their mode of life will be discussed in detail later.

As monks, they also got certain gifts of land from their lay devotees but they wanted more. They enlarged their estates through purchase. In such business transactions they usually employed a layman to act on their behalf. 21 Once Sañkrammasā, the great grandfather of Mahākassapa dedicated to the Religion 89 pay of land at Surokkha of Sañtoñ Kharuin. After Sañkrammasā’s death, one of his grandsons called Na Rok Sañ took those lands as part of his inherited property. Being poor, he had to sell them to the Cakraw who guarded the outpost at Chiproñ. When Na Rok Sañ died it became evident that he had no right to sell them and therefore two judges viz. Caturāñkapul and Acalapharac were sent to investigate. In the athak cārañ—Royal Register, it was found that the lands in question were originally given to Sañkrammasā by the king and that Mahākassapa had a better claim to inherit Sañkrammasā than Na Rok Sañ. Thus Mahākassapa got legal sanction to get back the lands. Nevertheless, in order to safeguard his cousin from being roasted in hell, the inscription says, for selling what really was religious land, Mahākassapa decided to buy it back at the market price. So he sent lā sukhāmin—a wise layman, called Dhammahānḍa with sañgha (belonging to the Order) money to do the transaction. The price then was 15 ticals of silver for 1 pay. It was in A.D. 1244 22. In the same inscription that records the above incidents, lā sukhāmin Dhammahānḍa was mentioned to have been ordered five more times to buy land 23.

In such land transactions, there is one particular practice which according to a modern Burmese Buddhist conception, would be considered improper for a monk to indulge in. It was to give a grand feast to mark off the success of

---


21. Pl. 162 and Pl. 163.

22. Pl. 162.

23. The records reveal that the price of land was high in the kharuin area, (1 pay at 20 ticals of silver or 8 viss of copper) while it was cheap in the tuik area, (1 pay at 1 tical of silver or 1 viss of copper). The average price is from 8 to 10 ticals of silver or 2 to 3 viss of copper per 1 pay.
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the transaction and to gain the public recognition of the new ownership. Officials in connection with the land were given cloths of various kinds as gifts and both men and monks were invited to the feast where meat and liquor were served plentifully. The price of land, when put on record, usually included *siyphuiv sāphuiv* 24 — the price of liquor and the price of meat. When both parties were happy about the bargain, a *pri sły pri sā* 25 — finishing liquor and finishing meat, were consumed. Sometimes for the sake of brevity, all expenses of drinks, food and cloths given as gift came under the category of *cā phuiv* 26 — the price of food and the details would be omitted by simply stating *cā pe e,* or *cā ce so or cā ra e,* or *cā pe sate* 27. A little more careful statement would be to say *cā sok piy ruy* 28 — having eaten and drunk. Now one would certainly like to know what kind of meat and liquor they enjoyed most. Contemporary writers were careful not to leave out such details. Regarding food, there were some casual mention of *thamañ haiñ amai acā* 29 — the rice, curry, meat and salt. Sometimes the drinks were given pre-eminence by saying *set'sami* 30 — liquor rice. To denote a feast on a grand scale, the phrase *sekri sākri* 31 — great liquor and great meat, was used. Some took pleasure in mentioning the details as *sā mū 2 khu samai 3 khu se 30 32 — 2 calves 3 deer 30 liquor, or *cā*

24. Pl. 224 a10-11 (S. 630), Pl. 231 a5 (S. 632), Pl. 264 a-6 (S. 642), Pl. 268 a-9 (S. 643), Pl. 3806-7 (S. 611), Pl. 395 16-18 (S. 664), Pl. 4107 (S. 670), Pl. 423 a-4 (S. 679), Pl. 532 a (S. 722), sā nā, Pl. 543 a (S. 726), Aineñ Tanaung Laytha Kyaungdaik Inscription Reverse 4 (S. 740), Kyaukyit Shwepanluang Inscription Reverse 19-20 (S. 760), Yemyak Kelapuyok Inscription 25 (S. 785), List 922 b12 (S. 801), List 923 15 (S. 801), List 840 a-3 (S. 801), List 840 b2 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 17 (S. 803).
25. Pl. 519 a10 (S. 686), Pl. 543 a (S. 726), Mandalay Palace Shed Stone 106, Obverse 5 (S. 770), List 840 a-2 28, 42, 43, 45 (S. 801), List 923 15, 16 (S. 801), List 925 a/b2 (S. 802), List 840 b3 (S. 803), List 1371 3.
27. Pl. 418 a18 (S. 67), Pl. 474 a14 (S. 706), Pl. 516 a14 (S. 718), Pl. 520 a18 (S. 720), Pl. 536 a9 (S. 723), Aymint Tanaung Laytha Kyaungdaik Inscription Reverse 4 (S. 740), Mandalay Palace Shed Stone 106, Obverse 8 (S. 770), Yemyak Kelapuyok d (S. 785), Sagaing Zedibha Tilokagura Gyaung West face Reverse 2 (S. 785).
28. Mandalay Palace Shed Stone 74 Reverse 21, 22 (S. 545), Pl. 449 9, 21, 26 (S. 651), List 704 a16-17 (S. 701), Pl. 464 a9, 10, 13 (S. 703), Pl. 473 b5 (S. 706), Pl. 474 9 (S. 760), Pl. 488 a11, 13 (S. 712), Pl. 508 b3, 5, 7 (S. 713), Pl. 509 22, 23, 24 (S. 717), Pl. 515 a11, 12, 13 (S. 718), Pl. 516 9, 17 (S. 718), Pl. 519 b7 (S. 718), Pl. 528 20 (S. 712), Pl. 526, (S. 721), Pl. 536 23, 24, 25 (S. 723), Pl. 543 b6 (S. 726), Pakhangyi Kyaungdwin Dhammayan 4 faces inscription W. face 16, 17 (S. 729), E. face 18-19 (S. 729), List 636 a17 (S. 732), List 665 b2 (S. 734), List 671 a4 (S. 735) List 682 27 (S. 737), Aymint Tanaung Laytha Kyaungdaik Inscription Reverse 6, 14, 21 (S. 740), List 704 6, 8, 9 (S. 742), List 847 a25, 29, 31 (S. 745), Hsalingyi Hkuntha Myatelezu Inscription 12, 30, 31 (S. 745), List 723 13 (S. 747), List 726 b3 (S. 748), List 745 a9 '750), List 754 5 (S. 755), List 770 27 (S. 755), List 739 4 (S. 757), Kyaukyit Shwepanluang 2 faces inscription Obverse 23, 24-2 (S. 760), Reverse 7, 19, 20 (S. 760), Mandalay Palace Shed Stone 106 Obverse 13 (S. 770), Reverse 4 (S. 770), Sagaing Zedibha Lokaguruyaun Inscription Obverse 17 (S. 785), List 729 48 (S. 791), Aineñ Tawgyaya Taungmingaung Kyaung 4 faces inscription N. face 47-8 (S. 802), W. face 30 (S. 802), S. face 6, 10, 11, 23, 45 (S. 802), Myingyan Talumyo Thonluhla Inscription 13, 32 (S. 815), List 981 b5 (S. 830).
30. Pl. 536 a9 (S. 723), Aineñ Tawgyaya Taungmingaung Inscription S. face 6 (S. 802), Myingyan Wathaya Chantagyagi Pagoda Inscription Obverse 10 (np date).
32. Pakhangyi Kyaungdwin Dhammayan 4 faces inscription Obverse 18 (S. 729).
sok pe sakā nwā puik krī ta khu/ wak tọn ta khu se sụn chay mlat 33 — 1 big steer, 1 large pig 30 or more liquor were consumed. One could imagine how many people would come to a feast where one big bull, one big pig and over 30 pots of liquor were taken. Perhaps we could assume that the Burman of 500 years ago was unlike his modern counterpart, a great consumer of liquor and meat. While giving a list of dedications, they did not think it improper to include such simple statement like kywai sat ruy cā sok pe sate 34 — a buffalo was killed and eaten. A group of people who put up boundary pillars of a religious land admit that klok chok so le nwā ta khu lhañ ruy cā sok pe e 35 — when stone-pillars were put up an ox was slain and eaten. The monks would say saṅghika cit ta khu se thamañ nhañ may cā pe e 36 — one goat commonly owned by monks was eaten (as) meat with liquor rice. Such feasts became more elaborate and more common as time went on. By comparison, we find that a feast consuming nwā 1 khu/se khunhac huîm 37 — one ox and seven pots of liquor, was considered a big feast in A.D. 1249 while in A.D. 1429, i.e. about 200 years later, a feast of nwā 8 khu wak 5 khu chit 10 se 30 38 — 8 oxen, 5 pigs, 10 goats and 30 liquor, was fairly common.

Regarding amai achā 39 — meat and ? salt, the following details would illustrate the different varieties eaten. Beef seems to be the most popular of all the meat. One reference as nwā krī ta khu se nā huîn nhañ cā sok vo e’ pri e 40 — one big ox and five (pots) of liquor were taken and finished, indicates that one ox is usually eaten in one meal. There are also references when a total of 8 41, 10 42 and 15 43 oxen were eaten. The difference in tenderness of meat is perhaps indicated by the mentions of nwā nak 44 — black ox, nwā puik 45 — steer, mwāmā 46 — cow, mwālā 47 — bull, lhāy nwā 48 — old ox and sā nwā 49 — calf. In the scale of preference pork comes next to beef. A feast was mentioned when 10 pigs were eaten 50. The varieties were given as sā wak 51 — suckling pig, wak ma 52 — sow, waṅtoñ 53 — large pig and

33 Hsalingyi Hkuntha village Myatlezu Pagoda Inscription 12 (S. 745).
34 List 726 b 3 (S. 748). List 793 a 17 (S. 760) It also mentions kywai 2 khu sat ruy).
35 List 770 27 (S. 755).
36 Aein Tawgyaug Taungmingyaung Inscription S. fahe 6 (S. 802).
37 Pl. 380 6 (S. 611).
38 List 729 48 (S. 791).
39 Sagaing Htupayon Stone 12 Obverse 13 (S. 760).
40 Mandalay Palace Shed Stone 106 Obverse 13 (S. 770).
41 Pl. 538 b 16 (S. 723). List 729 48 (S. 791).
43 Mandalay Palace Shed Stone 106 Obverse 8 (S. 770).
44 List 132 44 6 (S. 857).
46 Pl. 432 a 10 (S. 683). Pl. 473 b 5 (S. 706).
48 Sagaing Zedilha Tilokagaru Gyaung Inscription W. face 8 /S. 785).
49 Pl. 433 b 8 (S. 683).
50 Æein Tawgyaug Taungmingyaung Inscription W. face 13 (S. 802).
51 Pl. 449 9 (S. 651).
52 Pl. 433 b 8 (S. 683).
53 Pl. 519 b 7 (S. 718).
wak toñ cway thwak$^{54}$—large pig with tusks. Next in the list was the goat. There were feasts when 10 goats $^{55}$ or 18 goats $^{56}$ were eaten. It seems that buffalo was seldom eaten$^{57}$. There is also the mention of samañ $^{58}$—deer, krak $^{59}$—fowl and nā$^{60}$—fish, being eaten.

With food comes the drinks. A record of A.D. 1376 says:

_Mahāthaṅ ca so skhiṅ takā tuiw takkhina than lhū ruy yaṁmakā aphyaw nhaṅ akwa chwanī klwe e$^{61}$

All the lords starting with the Mahāthera were given a donation of the Palmyra Toddy Palms and (also) given a feast together with yaṁmakā aphyaw.

Here yaṁmakā aphyaw is taken to be a sweet liquor made from the toddy juice. $^{62}$ Tryāphyā III (1376-1400) or Maṅkri:cvācoaukai’s inscription at Pokmruṅī Śamārwā Kūdwe: Kyoṅ; dated A.D. 1373 has:

_i suiw lhū tau mu ruy ra sa Cecim miy kuiv than cuik ruy Yakhaṅ twāṅ klōn plu ruy lhū kha e$^{63}$ // i than kuiv na klōn kā nhac cha // Yakhaṅ twāṅ skhiṅ apon kā tacha // sok pā ce sate //

After planting toddy palms at the Cecim land which is acquired through a royal dedication, (the land) in given to the monastery which is being established at Yakhaṅ. May all the lords of Yakhaṅ drinks one- fold and (those of) my monastery twofold of this toddy (juice).

It evidently means that the drinking of the toddy juice by the monks was allowed and it was the king who gave the toddy garden to the monastery. In another reference we find that a curse was put on the monks who drank even a single pot of liquor which was not their own $^{64}$. The following extract from the inscription dated A.D. 1373 at Pakhankri: Kyoṅtim Pagoda by Maṅrai Sāṅkhayā reveals another important fact that the monks drank liquor even on the religious premises. It says:

---

$^{54}$ Mandalay Palace Shed Stone 106, Obverse$^{5}$ (S. 770).
$^{55}$ List 729$^{48}$ (S. 791).
$^{56}$ Pl. 520a$^{16}$ (S. 720).
$^{57}$ Pl. 509$^{22}$ (S. 717). Sagaing Ywathit Phayangazu Inscription Obverse$^{25}$ (S.737), List 726b$^{1}$ (S. 748).
$^{58}$ Pakhangyi Kyaungdwin Dhammayon 4 faces inscription E. face$^{18}$ (S. 729).
$^{59}$ List 671a$^{4}$ (S. 735), Ainei Tawgyang Taungmingaung Inscription W. face$^{14}$ (S. 802).
$^{60}$ Pl. 532$^{9}$ (S. 722).
$^{61}$ Pl. 233$^{14}$ (S. 738).
$^{62}$ See G. H. Luce: \’Economic Life of the Early Burman\’. _JBRs_, XXX, i, p.296.
$^{63}$ See G. H. Luce: \’Economic Life of the Early Burman\’. _JBRs_, XXX, i, p.296.
$^{64}$ Myingyan Ywathaywa Chanthagy Pagoda Inscription Obverse$^{13}$.
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cā sok pe sañ kā || sā nwā ta khu | wak ta khu | chit ta khu | krak 8
ku se 25 luñ | i a kun Poñloñ Mahāthī kloñ thak lhyāñ cā sok pe
kun ruy pri e’65

As for the food and drinks taken, there were 1 calf, 1 pig, 1 goat,
8 fowls and 25? pots of liquor. All these were taken and finished
on the monastery of Poñloñ Mahāthera.

It is an unheard of thing to-day to have such a feast at the residence of the
chief monk. But in those days we have the following phrases in their records,
viz.

(1) kloñ tau ū nhuik sḫiñ myā tuïw le cā pe e’ tryā le nā e’66
at the foremost room of the royal monastery, the lords (of the Order)
also ate and a sermon was also heard.
(2) Kulā kloñ ū thak lhyāñ cā sok pe so sañghā thi67.
the Sañghāthera, i.e. the Elder of the Monks, who ate and drank at
the foremost room of the brick monastery.
(3) se sā cā pe ruy lhū e’68
after eating and drinking, a dedication was made.

All these show that a feast also accompanies a dedication ceremony when
both men and monks eat meat and drink liquor to their fill. Not excepting
the monasteries, such a feast would be held in any convenient place. In A.D.
1378 an inscription says that im thak sok cā piy ruy69—drinking and eating
was done at the house. In another instance mruïw lai lhyāñ kanākri chok ruy cā
sok pe e70 — a big pavilion was built right in the centre of the fortress to eat
and drink. Similarly ruñ lai lhyāñ kanā chok ruy ... cā sok piy e71 — a
pavilion was built right in the centre of the village to eat and drink. When a
field was bought and dedicated to a monastery, thuiw lai twañ nhuik tau thwañ
ruy kannākri chok ruy...cā sok pe ruy72 — a clearing was made in that very
field where a big pavilion was constructed to eat and drink. Thus we
understand that people in those days used to put up special and temporary
buildings for feasting. But an outstanding yet simple arrangement is
mentioned in the Kyokrac Rhwepoñloñ inscription as

/ mañkri chryiā | tau kloñ mahāthe ca so sañghā apoñ cañ we ruy cā sok
sa kā mañklañ pañ rañ nhuik te | prañcuīw ruwašukri asañ myā tuïw cā sok
sa kā kurkuuiw pañ te mañ ca so sami smak cañ we saka pok 2 pañ te /73

65. List 67la12 (S. 735).
66. Pl. 50416 (S. 715).
67. Pl. 53623 (S. 723).
68. Pl. 587b5 (S. 723).
69. Amyint Tanzaung Lethakyaungdaiq Inscription Reverse6 (S. 740).
70. Pakhangyi Kyaungdwin Dhammayon 4 faces inscription E. face19 (S. 729).
71. Pakhangyi Kyaungdwin Dhammayon 4 faces inscription W. face16 (S. 729.).
72. List 636b7 (S. 732).
73. Kyaukyit Shwepaunglaung Inscription Obverse21-4 (S. 760).
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It was at the foot of the *Tamarindus indica* that all the monks beginning with the Royal Preceptor, the *Mahāthera* of the forest monastery, gathered to eat and drink. Under the *Albizia Lebbeck* the rulers, headmen and owners ate and drank. Starting with the king (himself), his daughter, son-in-law, (etc.) gathered under the *Butea Frohdosa*.

At a time when the monks themselves indulged in drinking intoxicants, it is no wonder that a lady called *Im Ma Cañ* was found to be one of the guests of a feast where 7 pots of liquor, 1 ox and 5 pots of rice were consumed. It is also not unusual for one *Cakuiñ Pitu Saṅgharājā*, who in appreciation of a good drink, made a remark in A.D. 1441 as *se koñ e* — this liquor is good.

*Than rañ* — the fermented toddy palm juice, and *poñ rañ* — the distilled liquor, seem to be the most popular among the drinks but the drinking of *pe rañ* — the palmrya palm juice and *arak* the foreign liquor, was also quite considerable. Except in an inscription of A.D. 1248 which we do not think is an original one, the first mention of *arak* occurs in an inscription of A.D. 1379 when Queen *Cow* dedicated one *poñkan* of it.

Just as a feast was compulsory for the change of ownership in land either by purchase or by dedication, there was another custom that such a transfer was always accompanied by the gift of cloths to all important persons bearing witness to the transaction by the new owner. Minister *Lakwai* and wife built a monastery in A.D. 1337 and dedicated lands to it. The record in dealing with it says:

```
//i kloñ nhuik ratanā 3 pa so a paccañ 4 pā phlae cim nhā lhū so mliy kā //
Kansyā Tandhā U san lai 20 // ņa Cwai Sañ Mran san lai 8 pai // i mhyā
so lai kā kalaen saṁpyan 4 yok ca sa cakhī kun ān kuiv phu markri Tryā-
phyā hu Asoñkhyā ka 100 mlat huiv hu dhōn, so lhyā ron kun sate // piy
so aphāw kā // ivny 145 klāp te // awat kā Phummasaṅkram Phummapā
Phummaphattrā Phummasiṅkhā Rāṇu mpuiw Rāṇamasu // 6 yok so phyañ
mañ 6 thān // Sanmpet kā tuyāñ pucwanchi ta thān Anantasūra Caethe
Uim Koñ Sañ Na Wāñ Sañ Na Sok Krū Sañ Na Khyāñ ņa Camba
Na Pūñnai 8 yok so phyañ phlū 8 dhōn Kañkai phyañ ta dhāñ sā nwā 2 khu
samañ 3 khu se 30 mruiv lai lhyā kanākri chok ruy cā sok pe e // 79
```

74. List 847a (S. 745).
75. List 840b (S. 803).
76. List 952b (S. 852).
77. Kyaukyi Shwepaunglaung Inscription Reverse (S. 760).
78. List 27719 (S. 610), Wetlet Thitseinglyi Kyaung Inscription Obverse (S. 741).
79. List 718b (S. 743), Kyaukyi Shwepaunglaung Inscription Reverse (S. 760).
80. List 8915 (S. 791), List 902a (S. 795).
81a. List 27219 (S. 670).
81b. Wetlet Thitseinglyi Kyaung Inscription Obverse (S. 741).
82. Pakkoku Pakhangyi Myaukkyawng Twinywa Dhammayon 4 faces inscription E. face 11-19 (S. 729).
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The land dedicated to this monastery so that the Four Requisites for the three Gems might be acquired, viz. 20 rain land of Kansyā Tandhāū, 8 pai of rain land of Na Cwai Saṅ Mran, 5 pai of dry land to the west of the Two Banyan Trees, were sold to gain 100 profit by all cakhī starting with 4 kalan and sampyān in? the presence of the great king Tryāphyā. The price given was 145 ticals of silver. Phhumasaṅkrān, Phummapā, Phumnaphatrā, Phummasṅkhā, Raṅmapuiw and Raṅmasu: to them were given 6 black cloths. Sammrāi got one? golden tuyān. Aṇansūra, Cac the, Uim Koṅ Saṅ, Na Waṅ Sa Saṅ, Na Sok Krū Saṅ, Na Khyāi, Na Cama and Na Puṅ Nai.8 of them were given 8 white cloths. Kānpkhaj 1. A big pavilion was built right in the centre of the fortress and 2 oxen, 3 deer and 30 liquor were consumed.

In this record, people having phumma prefixes to their names seem to be some kind of land officers and it was to them in particular that these black and white cloths were given. Kaṅkasū Monastery Inscription of Kaṅmpwān village has a clearer statement:

// mre nai sakā Lakyāsaṅkrān ta yok / Praṅcuiv ta yok / Phumma-
khyatrā ta yok / Phummasaṅkrān ta yok cakhī le kun’ōn Mrancaṅ ca so Kukhan sanpyān klan akun pā e’// pe ap so’ cakhī sampyān kalan tuw kuwiw/ suiw/ santuṅ ni’/ phyaṅ ūwiw/ phyaṅ nhai/ phyaṅ maṅ/ phyaṅ phlū/ cā sok pe kun e’/ 80

Those who set foot on the land (to inspect) were Lakyāsaṅkrān, Praṅ cuiv, Phumnakhyyatrā, Phummasaṅkrān, all cakhī and all sampyān and klan of Kukhan, Mrancaṅ, etc. Given to cakhī, sampyān and kalan were full-sleeved gowns, red short-sleeved frocks, brown cloth, grey cloth, black cloth, and white cloth. (They then) ate and drank.

This practice of feasting and giving gifts began to appear by A.D. 1200 and it was continued beyond A.D. 1500.

The reason why these buying of lands, the eating of meat and ? salts, the drinking of liquor, the spreading of cloths by the monks are given in detail, is to make clear that these were the only practices where the tawmlat kṛī—the revered lords of the forest monastery, or Araṅ. differed from, say, the monks of to-day. They were not certainly as bad as the Chronicles make us believe. In addition to the above mentioned defections, there is one minor point to add, though the evidence is poor as it is found in the copy of a record dated A.D.1248 81. It was found near the Nandamaṅā in Aijaghow enclosure of Minnanthu, Pagan. It says that provisions were left to prepare rice and curry for the morning and evening meals of the monks. Thus with the exception of drinking liquor, eating evening meals, and encouraging the slaughter of cattle, etc. these monks were very much the same with other monks. The following extracts, mostly from the inscriptions found at Amyint

80. List 682 25-8 (S. 737).
81. List 27720-1 (S. 610). See also G. E. Harvey: History of Burma, p. 60.
and Aein, their stronghold in Monywa district, will show that they too had quite venerable persons among them.

bhurā mlat cwā sāsanā nhuik akyan sitañ sañkhan khañ nhuñ plañjuñcwā so alwan lokijan ra pri klauñjukri so phummat kri cwā Aññatukañḍañ so mahāthe sañ kā Krañkku mañ so prañ e' toñ myak nhuñ rwā nhuñ ma kap taw e' arap sacañ rau nhuik samakhan khañ ruy sañ sapit kuw rye te lyak bhawanā mū ruy ne can lyañ tau chan pok mañ ruy nhãnoñ muw lyak taw sañ rhyan ruy ple klup lat-te j mahāthe e' adhami rok so sat an mutta sat kham khuañ ruy rhi khuiw pujau pri so lakyā pat lañ ruy swā khañ i a kroñ kuw tānā tuw mañ ruy Lesoñ sukri Suwañnaprañi ā kāñ pa le e' amat kri le bhun mlat kri cwā athañ lā ruy mlat cwā sukñi atl rap suw swā an sanhe hu me ra kā e' bhunkri so amatkri i prañ nhuik mhi ruy chwañ khañ cam so hu pe ra kā sañkhan plu pe khaī. 82

In the Religion of the Exalted Lord, the Reverend Aññatukañḍañ, a Mahāthera replete with virtue, pious and restraint, possessor of the highest stage of the supernatural power, came to a place south of a city known as Krañkku, far away from human habitations in the forest and spread a seat under a tree. While he sat (on that seat), with his iron begging bowl set right in his front, in meditation, a young male elephant rumbling loud with a raised trunk dashed forward to strike. Approaching the Mahāthera, in the very moment to kill, it tore off a branch of a tree and bowed in the act of prayer and circled clockwise around the Lord and went away. Fishermen saw it and reported to Suwañnaprañi, the headman of Lesoñ. The great minister then came to the Reverend (Mahāthera) and asked where the Reverend Lord intended to go. When the Lord replied, “Oh Powerful Minister! I came to live on the food begged from this city” he built a shelter.

As a matter of fact, it was due to the personality of leaders like Aññatukañḍañ that this sect of ‘forest dwellers’ prospered.

These ‘forest dwellers’ headed a movement for which we owe them much gratitude though it was not particularly of a spiritual nature. We know of course that the ‘first home’ of the Burmans was known as kharuin and the ‘second home’ as tuik, and that even in the tuik area much of the land had been cleared for cultivation long ago. But after the fall of Pagan, perhaps due to the shortage of man power and the disturbances in the outlying districts, much of the cultivable land of the tuik areas naturally lapsed into jungle again. The following extract from the inscription of A.D. 1375 shows the situation of the country then:

ňa lañ (Toññu Man) ńat rwā lā pri Awa mañ kri cac 3 krim tak lac so rahan minñā lā takā tuw sañ mwañ so khā nhuík wat krak 37 pāa

82. Amyint Minyekyaung small 2 faces inscription Obverse5-13 (S. 733).
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After the death of my husband (King of Taungoo), when the great king of Awa marched thrice to do battle, all men, monks and Brahmans starved. Then I gave cooked food to 37 monks and uncooked food to 200. When men died of starvation, I had a compassion on them as I had on myself, (and therefore) I had 50 kwak of rice cooked twice—night and day, daily and gave them away. When the Lords (of the Religion) became uncomfortable due to the wars, I made them comfortable by giving them complete sets of the four requisites.

Again in an inscription of A.D. 1386, we find:

Mahāmatimā dhān ā | Uccanā maṅkri saṅ saṅsārā chaṅray kuw krok cwā so kroṅ Paṅkley tuik twaṅ cucāṅ lat ruy Sakarac 617 khu Cissa nhac Tapon l-chan 13 ryak 5 ne mle 1500 Cayyasatthiyu tuik twaṅ lhā taw mā e | akhā tapā Tarak phyak ruy taw ati phlac khai ruy | dhuiw mle tuiw twaṅ akhuw ka: taw phlac khai |

Great king Uccanā, being afraid of the miseries of the saṅsārā made enquiries in Paṅkley tuik and on 8 February 1256, gave 1500 (pay) of land from Cayyasatthiyu tuik to Mahāmatimā thera. Because the Taruk once plundered, (the said lands) became full of jungle. In these lands some relapsed into jungle.

Either in clearing new lands for cultivation or clearing again those lands which were once under cultivation, these ‘forest dwellers’ took the lead. This in fact was a distinct step towards rehabilitation and reconstruction after war years and therefore their contribution towards peace and order was quite considerable. Their work was thus in agreement with the policy of the then government. The extract below gives a very good illustration of the amount of work they had done at that time.

83. List 686b8-10 (S. 737).
84. Anein Tawgyang Shwegu Stone 2 Reverse7-11 (S. 748).
In A.B. 1973 (A.D. 1429), it was brought to the notice of Pitu Saṅgharājā popularly known as Śīrī Dharmamīnsēnāpati for his unrivalled knowledge of the three Piṭaka, who was commlacent, wise and diligent, who was the donor of nine Piṭaka and who (had the right to) use a white umbrella, and (who at the moment) was staying at the Samantarāc Monastery, that (a certain) jungle land was left unproductive for 30 years from the time it was (acquired and the boundary) pillars put up. In order that it might be of some use to the Three Gems, he caused his disciple Aṅgū Ummān Chryīā to clear away the jungle. When he failed, the Saṅgharājā himself went there and put his might to clear it. A long canal was dug. The Great King Satuw who was famous as being a just king, was(also)clearing ‘green jungle lands’for (increasing) the prosperity of his country. Saying that he would also plough the said land, (the king) with his North Queen came and stayed at (a place called) Taṅkli. There the Mahāsaṅgharājā went, and mentioning the extent of the land, asked permission (to work on it). The just king with his North Queen actually went about in the field and ordered the Minister Rājā to measure it. (It measured) 2951.5 pay. The Great and Just King said, “Saṅgharājā alone could not clear it.” The Saṅgharājā replied that (he alone is responsible to look after) a religious property and for (the trouble of) marching he gave (the King) 300 silver as the money for the soldiers. To the Minister Rājā together with cackhi Bodhi who measured the land were given 50 silver and 3 ticals of gold. To the person who carried about the tā measure was given 5 ticals. Out of this land where the jungle was cleared through hard work, the claim was (renewed) from the king through diplomacy, the cost of reclaiming was defrayed through faith (in the Religion).

85. List 891.9-24 (S. 791).
with the consent of all the monks, 10 (pay) was dedicated to the Ruby Pagoda of Tanhaṅkri at the beginning of the canal where the clearing of this land was started. 10 (pay) were also dedicated to the Pitu Cāṅkhum (Pagoda). 10 (pay) were also dedicated to the big pagoda of Pitu. 20 were given to the nine Piṭaka he made. As for the remaining land, may the ? chief monk enjoy onefold and the saṅghā twofold (of the yearly produce) for procuring (daily meals).

According to this inscription, through the effort of a leader of the ‘forest’ dwellers’, an area of over 5000 acres became cultivable and it is also very interesting to note that the then reigning king (Muṅña Satuṅw, 1426-39) took a personal interest in reclaiming waste lands. The prosperity of the 15th century was perhaps due to the efforts of such enterprising persons together with the king’s encouragement to grow more food.

It must be understood that these monks who worked hard on ‘green lands’ would work harder on older lands under crop for years and would spare no pains to keep these lands in their possession as long as possible. On the other hand, the king had no objection to having more land under crop but he did have a strong objection to the increase of religious lands from which he got no revenue. Thus the tendency during the Pagan times was to confiscate religious lands where the evidence was weak. We have mentioned above that Sanhaṅ Jeyyapwat dedicated 750 pay at Hairaṅ paak which he received from king Nātonnyā to the forest monastery on the east of Pagan in A.D. 1227. Soon after his accession to the throne in A.D. 1235, King Klaewā seized all the religious lands throughout the country including the lands of the above monastery.

86. Pl. 90 16-26 (S. 597).
The lord monks living at the Jeyyapwat forest monastery informed the great king: "Mahārāja, these mahādāna lands of Jeyyapwat had been dedicated to the Lord of the forest monastery": when thus told, the great king who was a king of great wisdom became mindful of all sins (said) "If it is true that (these lands) were given by my father (to Jeyyapwat) and that Jeyyapwat had dedicated (them) to the Lord, let the Lord get (them)". King’s uncles Rājasū, and Kankaśā, Ministers Mahāsiman, Amrukkalayā, Amantajayayakrāni, and Mūhāsakhāti; these 6 were ordered to investigate. As they had the royal command to investigate, all 6 of them investigated. (Then) they said: "It is true that (these lands) were given by the king’s father (to Jeyyapwat and) that Jeyyapwat had dedicated (them) to the Lord". This unanimous decision was conveyed to the royal ears. The great king said: "It is found correct that my father gave these mahādāna lands to Jeyyapwat and that Jeyyapwat had dedicated them to the Lord at the forest monastery. May the Lord get them". (So saying) the great king poured royal pure water in the presence of all ministers and dedicated them.

The objection raised by the monks made the king appoint a Commission of six to investigate and when that commission reported that the lands in question belonged to the Religion, the king had to return them. A similar case happened to the forest monastery at Aein in A.D. 1255. Skhiṇī Mahāmatmāhe was the chief there. Paccayā Phoṅcan, Na Plān Caih Sān and Nā Mraṅ Sān dedicated 1500 pay of land to it. When Uccanā later known as Talapyāṁ Maṅ confiscates the lands of Phoṅcan Panḵli in A.D. 1255, the above mentioned lands were included. In the same year Uccanā went to Tala and was killed there. Panwpat Saṅ mliy who later became known as Taruk phly became king and when he arrived back at Pagan Skhiṇī Mahāmati māhe reported it to the new king through his father-in-law Sariy. The king said:

Sariy na aloṁ lhyaṁ yu so te na ma saṅ nuw sim ran iaṅkā asuṅ hu yu an sanhe sikhaṁ tuw na ḫū e, atuṅ ra ciy e, ratanā suṁ pā so mily kā na mliy suw čhain khrāṅ to taṅ lhyaṅ avānj ciy na tuw mily kā ratanā sunpā so mily suw wan sakā na thiy plac skhiṅ tuw mily khrā naṅ amray amraṁ tuṅ chok pa liy ḫū so thuy taur ra lhyaṅ sateı 87

"Sariy, as I am a Bodhisattva (myself), I should never take them. How could I confiscate them? (If they were already seized), I dedicate them to the lords. Let them do what they like with them. Let not the land of the Three Gems enter our land: not even one width of a hair. There could be no sin if our land enters the land of the Three Gems. You put up permanent pillars to demarcate the land of the Lords". This was the royal order.

Again the monks were able to correct the mistake done by a king. Over a century later in A.D. 1386 these Panḵli Tuṅk lands became a problem again, 87. Pl. 296 11-16(S. 689).
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dhuw Mahāmatimātheñ ā | Uccanā mañ kṛ ṣaṇ saṃsara chañray kuśw krok cва so kroñ Paikley tuik twañ cūcañ lat ruy Sakarac 617 khu Cissa nhac Tapoi 1-chan 13 ryak 5 ne mle 1500 Cayyasatthiy tuik twañ lhū taw mū ē | akhā ta pā Taruk phyak ruy tā ati phlac khāi ruy | dhuw mle tuw twañ akhūw kā: twañ phlac khāi | akhūw kā: skhin tuw ā paceñ phlac ē akhā ta pā: so Siri Tittyaparadhammarājā hū so Tryāpyāya manķri ē sā caw phlac so apah rā khañ dhuw cwa ruy im rhuey arā mañ lhīyā dhā so Tryāpyāya Chañ Phū Skhiñ sañ mlok bhak prāñ kuśw ra lat so khā klau ok cakhi tuśw| ta khyūw sa mle kuśw sūrāi ap bhi ra kā| Sakarac 748 khu Tanchoınmum 1-chan 9 ryak 6 ne| bhun mlat kṛ Dhamma senāpati Mahādhañ sañ | Siri Dhammā Soka mañ kṛ myō miphūra Sandhamittā kośu| saddhā cwa ruy rahan saṅghā mhi rañ rā phlac so amiphūra ā ryap le ra kā | amat kṛ Pītarac kuśw | apahī kroñ, Chañ Phū Skhiñ Tryāpyāya kā | Uccanā mañ kṛ alḥū kuśw sū rai jā pe sa nhe | apac te lhū tuñ amī rāñ | wat hon kuśw atī pa lasse| bhun kṛ asak rāñ kroñ skhiñ tuśw wat lhū pe | amī anā achan lasse me khrā tuśw, klok chok pe lasse hu ruy thwe twañ khaḷ la tō so khā | saddhā cwa sa Chañ Phū Skhiñ Tryāpyāya le cit cañ sañ-so saṅghika amhat si lat rakā up mi sa sūrāy le ta pā ajā khaḷ le ē | wat hon kuśw le nā lhū ē’/ asac so le nā lhūpā ē’

Great king Uccanā, being afraid of the miseries of saṃsara made enquiries in Pañ kley tuik and on 8 February 1256, gave 1500 (pay) of land from Cayyasatthiy tuik to Mahāmatimā therī. Because the Taruk once plundered (the said lands) became full of jungle. Of these lands some relapsed into jungle and some remained in support of the lords. Once when Tryāpyāya Chañ Phū Skhiñ, Heir Apparent and worthy son to inherit the kingly rights from his father Tryāpyāya Maṅkrī titled Siri Tittyapawara dhammarājā, had subduced the North, the subordinate officers of the outlying districts gave away some of the lands to the Heroes of the War. So on 16 November 1386, the Reverend Dhamma senāpati Mahāthera approached the Queen who was steeped in the faith of the Religion and became the solace of the monks as Sandhamittā, Queen of Siri Dhammāsoka had been before. (Thereupon the Queen) said to the Great Minister Pītarac: “Why does Tryāpyāya, the Lord of the White Elephant, give the dedicated (land) of the Great King Uccanā to the Heroes to enjoy? Is sin to be expected from a good deed? An old donation should not be molested. For prosperity and long life, give land to the lords. Obey my orders. Put up stone pillars of demarcation”. When the royal order was given thus, the pious Tryāpyāya, the Lord of the White Elephant, became aware of the monks’ common property which ought to be given minute care, made changes in his rewards to the Heroes and said: “Old donations are returned and new donations are bestowed”.

88. Anein Tawgaung Shwegu Stone 2 Reverse 7-24 (S. 748).
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The story so far is like this: From Cayyasatthiy tuik of Paṅkli 10 tuik, 1500 pay of land was given by various donors to the forest monastery at Anein where Skhiṅ Mahāmatimā; who acted as an agent of Mahākassapa, was chief monk. Just before his death in A.D. 1255, King Uccanā confiscated these lands. Mahāmatimā informed this to the new king, i.e. Tarukpli, through the king’s father-in-law called Sarī. The king expressed regret and returned these lands. When the country was devastated by the Mongol invaders, most of these lands relapsed into jungle. After Tryāphyā III (1367-1400) or Maṅ: kri: cwā coau kai had subdued the Northern part of the country, he gave away some of these lands as reward for bravery to his soldiers. At this time the Reverend Dhammasenāpati was the chief monk of the forest monastery of Anein. Through the Queen in A.D. 1386, he informed the king that religious lands should not be given as fief to the soldiers. So the king returned them. Thus we find that these ‘forest dwellers’ had the ability to keep a good hold on their lands.

In this sect of ‘forest dwellers’, such leaders like Skhiṅ Mahāmatimā who were well versed in the Piṭaka came to be known as Saṅgharājā after the fall of Pagan. They had the power to control the monks and they exercised much influence over the kings of the Ava period. The king gave them authority to use the Kanakkatan White Umbrella. There were many of them according to localities. It seems that a Saṅgharājā who was also a royal preceptor was the most influential of them. From A.D. 1330 onwards we often find the mention of one royal preceptor called Sethadisāprāmokkha mahā therī saṅgharājā. His successor as the royal preceptor was Maḥāsaṅgharājā. In the Tanthā Ü Rakraṅ Kyōn: Inscription of Awa Maṅ khaṅ kri:, this Maḥāsaṅgharājā is described as:

Trya phyā maṅkri e chryāi taw mū laṅ phlac tha so / kute phanan san ma ka sa aryā saṅghāi apon kuïw acuïw ra sa Mahāsaṅkhārā khaṅ cā mū le phlac tha so / thi phlu amvaa Kanakkatan piman (rhwe) ruïw pittū muïw saw koï kuïw ci phwā tryā si pri phun taw krī saṉ alwan tryā rāttaṇā suṃpā kuïw yuṁ kraṅ cwā so //

being a preceptor of the Great King Tryāphyā, being the Maḥāsaṅgharājā, the Chief ruling millions of monks, being the glorious personage who could use the best of the white umbrellas, called Kanakkatan with golden rod and cottoncloth spread, being the meritorious monk who has great faith in the Three Gems.

This person became famous after A.D. 1370 and remained so for the next thirty years. He was succeeded by Piti Saṅgharājā who was described as:

89. Pl. 503,7,12,19 (S. 715).
90. List 8452-4 (S. 774).
91. List 69712 (S. 739), List 7385 (S. 749), List 8452 (S. 774), Htupayon Stone 2511 (S. 794), Sagaing Thawtapan Laykyunmanaung Thitsaya Inscription Reverse3 (S. 891).
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popularly known as *Siri Dhammasena*pati for his unrivalled knowledge of the Three *Piṭaka*, who was complacent, wise and diligent, who was the donor of the nine *Piṭaka*, and who (had the right to) use a white umbrella.

This is the very *Saṅgharāja* mentioned above, who dug a big canal and made an area of over 5000 acres which had been lying waste for 30 years cultivable again. He was a man of vast influence and according to his Sagaing Ruby Pagoda Inscription, he built 7 big monasteries, 5 hollow-pagodas, 4 solid-pagodas, and had 3 copies made of the Three *Piṭaka* 93. He died in A.D. we do not know who succeeded him. There were many *Saṅgharāja* mentioned 1450, and records. Among them, we find *rhe klōh Saṅgharāja Im Toṅ Ruiv* 94 who in various probably was a bhikkhuṇī. Another one called *Caṅkā Saṅgharāja* was described as *atu ma hi so*—being unrivalled 95. Perhaps he was the lord of the Seven Monasteries of *Cakā*: often quoted in the Chronicles dealing with the Pinya Period 96. Because in one inscription he was mentioned as *Caṅkā Saṅgharāja Weluwa Mahātheṅ* 97—the *Mahāthera* of *Weluwa* (called) *Caṅkā Saṅgharāja*. Other *Saṅgharāja* were:

*Arhe Saṅgharāja* 98—the East *Saṅgharāja*,
*Anok Saṅgharāja* 99—the West *Saṅgharāja*,
*Aphuiv Saṅgharāja* 100—the Grandfather *Saṅgharāja*,
*Tanthā Û Saṅgharāja* 101—the *Saṅgharāja* of *Tanthā Û*,
*Toṅ Saṅgharāja* 102—the South *Saṅgharāja*,
*Thūpārumm Saṅgharāja* 103—the *Saṅgharāja* of the *Thūpārumm*,
*Paniya Saṅgharāja* 104—the *Saṅgharāja* of *Paniya*,
*Raṅoṁlaṅ Saṅgharāja* 105—the *Saṅgharāja* of *Raṅoṁlaṅ* and
*Sinkhuiv Saṅgharāja* 106—the *Saṅgharāja* of Ceylon.
It seems that after A.D. 1500, these Saṅgharājā did not enjoy the power and prestige of their predecessors. Because there appeared some monks who challenged their authority. We find that in A.D. 1558 one Waraguṇakitti was ordered by the Tanthā Ü Saṅgharājā to quit a monastery at Tampak chwai. The reason given by the Saṅgharājā was that he was virtually the owner as he had to look after it when the country was disturbed by the Shans. Now he wanted to turn it into a Śīma. Waraguṇakitti refused to comply with the order and so the case was brought up to the Elders who after consulting the Vinaya decided in favour of Waraguṇakitti. It goes on record as:

asak khrōk chai khrōk nhac hi so Tanthā Ü Saṅgharājā phunkrī ewā kuīw | asak nā chai kuīw nhac hi so Tampak chwai Chañ Phīlū Shyaṅ Chriā Waraguṇakitti dhei Vinaṅ toau lá S utuṅ nhuin îe R

107 In accordance with the Vinaya, the Saṅgharājā of Tanthā Ü, aged 66 was won by Waraguṇakitti, aged 59 of Tampak chwai, the Preceptor of Chañ Phīlū Shyaṅ

The leader of this important sect of ‘forest dwellers’ which prospered for centuries, was Shyaṅ Mahākassapa. An inscription found at his native place dated A.D. 1388 has his Jātā engraved on top of the inscribed part and it mentions that his original name was Na Poṅ Loṅ Saṅ born A.D. 1169. His birth place was Parimma in Myaung township, Sagaing district. His educational qualification is mentioned as Na Poṅ, Loṅ, Saṅ Mahākassapa ka: Piṭakāt kuīw alwān tat ruy 110–Na Poṅ, Loṅ, Saṅ Mahākassapa was extremely well versed in the knowledge of the Piṭaka. As for his conduct he was considered an equal of the Great Mahākassapa of Gotama’s time. His legend is well kept in the Kyaukyit Shwepauanglaung inscription of A.D. 1388. It says:

purā mlāt lha Kotama e’ khré tāu rāṅ, nhuṅ kuīw se klūi nwan byātīt khaṅ 6 purā loṅ tā kip 6 twāṅ akhrwām wāṅ 6 Na Poṅ Loṅ Saṅ Mahākassapa kā Paḷalaṅ māṅ 6 chaṅ aphilac māṅ phluc phu khāi ruy // // || ... || arhaṅ tāu purā kriṅ kuīw phu mraṅ ra mrik kroṅ hit nhāṅ akwa rahan aphiṛc kōṅ sa khaṅjū nhāṅ plāṅcum tāṅ 6 Mahākassapa saṅ kā // // ... || mla ssa rahan aphiṛc rē rūy lyak tāw kri thwāk ruy // bhummalaksan kran lhyāṅ saṅ, 6 mle akhyāk 9 acn rāṅ ruy // sāsāṅ kōṅ mhu arap plu e’ // sabaṅnutaṅ nhāṅ purāṅ čhu 9 lūw khyāṅ ewa ruy arhaṅ tāu rupthu rhyu chaṅpū ati plu e’ // mwe sa miphwā ayā mhu ruy ahi taričan nｗāṅ aphiṛc 2 pā lāṅ 6 Krokcr wāṅ nhuṅ ā // arañwāśi tāu kloṅ sāmnuṅk purāṅ tāṅ 6 // ... || i nhuṅk ā lhyāṅ Caṅsū maṅ kri ā bhiṅā āṅn chaṅ ruy 3 kriṅ caṅ lhyāṅ paṅ, lat

108. Sagaing district, Myaung township, Kyaukyit village, Shwepauanglaung Pagoda 4 faces inscription E. face 9 (S. 750).
110. Anein Tawgyuang Shwegu Stone 23 (S. 748).
111. Anein Tawgyuang Shwegu Stone 52 (S. 740).
raka luik pu le e' // Mahākassapa Pukañ prañ rok-ka lhyañ Cañsū mānki kā bhilū bhe mha khyain sā-ra ruy // thī phlū Kanakkatan-hañ akwa mañ mlok tanchā 5 pā // Mahākassapa 9 pu cau bhi e' // bhumlat kri cwā Mahākassapa 4// mle alhū chwamī kham e' // 112

Na Pon Loñ Sañ Mahākassapa, who was one of the ten bodhisatta to receive respectfully the pāṭihāra (as to the time when they would become Buddha themeselves) at the foot of the most exalted Lord Gotama, was once an elephant king called Palalāñ... (This) Mahākassapa, who for being (fortunate) to see the living Lord Buddha, became a monk replete with many virtues... With a mind to seek solitude in the forest (he) went about to look for an auspicious land (? monastery) for the good of the Religion. Being desirous of attaining Buddha-hood he had an image of the Lord cast entirely of gold. At Krokrac where his mother for having a false belief became a cow, he established an araññavāsi forest monastery and built a pagoda... In A.D. 1215...the Great King Cañsū suffered an illness caused by a bhilū and sent (for him)three times. He went. On Mahākassapa's arrival at Pukañ, the Great King Cañsū was spared of the bhilū's disturbance. Mahākassapa was offered the 5 regalia together with the Kanakkatan White Umbrella. The Reverend Mahākassapa (then) asked for land.

According to this inscription Mahākassapa was born in A.D. 1169 at Parim and established a forest monastery at Krokrac. He was requested repeatedly to come to Pagan to cure the king's illness. He went there in A.D. 1215 and after having successfully cured the king's illness, he asked for land in support of his growing monastic establishments.

Checking with the contemporary records, we find that the above statement is possible. His name first appeared in a Pagan inscription in A.D. 1225 when Nātominyā and sister Man Lha made some dedications.113 He started his forest monasteries first at Krokrac, Parim, Amrañ and Anim. We have mentioned above that on the east of Pagan a forest monastery was established in A.D. 1236 at Phwazaw. Next Mahākassapa was mentioned together with other famous monks of the capital at a dedication ceremony in A.D. 1237 of the most important minister of the time known as Mahā Sman. 114 The other names mentioned together with him on that occasion were Dhammasiri and Subhūticanda who were most probably his rivals. They went on an educational mission to Ceylon between A.D. 1237 and 1248 with perhaps the chief object of soliciting Sinhalese help to stop the growth of this sect of 'forest dwellers'.115 Mahākassapa was found to be very active while his rivals were away at Ceylon. First he worked hard to get the royal patronage. When Na Blañ Sañ,

112. Kyaukyit Shwepaunglaung Obverse3-17(S. 750).
113. Pl. 1233.6,7,12(S. 587).
114. Pl. 1028(S. 596).
115. Pl. 302.
son of Ratanā Payyasu and Headman of Lesoñ dedicated 405$\frac{1}{16}$ pay of land in A.D. 1242 to the Reverend Lord of Kraññītū, who was one of his lieutenants, he went to see King Klaewā and got the royal consent of pouring water in recognition of that dedication. Then he put it on record as ī kā mañ piy mañ lhī te 116 this is verily the king’s gift. After having thus acquired the royal patronage, he tried to extend his influence east towards the rich rice lands Kyaukse. 117 At the capital he had the support of such influential person as Kāñkasū the King’s brother. When Kāñkasū died his widow put up many buildings in his memory at the Mahākāssapa establishment, Minnan-thu. 118 In Puir Sukri Sattyā’s inscription of A.D. 1244, Mahākāssapa’s monastery is located at a place close to arhiy prañ takhā 119—the Eastern Gate of the capital, i.e. Pagan. In this establishment, he used to reside at the building made for him by Princess Mañ Lhā. 120 While staying in that residence in A.D. 1244 he brought an action against the Cakraw Guards of Chip Toñ on the north west of Kyaukse district, for the ownership of land at Sañtoñ kharuin. 121 The land in question was originally the king’s gift to Sankrammasé who was Mahākāssapa’s grandfather. This incidentally shows that he came from a family of government officers. By A.D. 1248, he started buying big estates at the Shwebo Chindwin area 122. We do not exactly know when he died, but it ought to be between A.D. 1272 and 1278. Because inscriptions put up after 1272 mention only Mahākāssapa’s establishment 123 and by 1278 a new thera, name unknown, was residing at that establishment 124. If this inference is permissible we may assume that Mahākāssapa also known as Na Pon Lōñ Sañ, the leader of the sect of araññawāsi forest dwellers or in short the Arañ, died either at the age of 103 or 109. The sect he led lasted well over A.D. 1500.

There is a local legend that Mahākāssapa went to the Yaw area to propagate the Religion and in the course of his travels, he died where Pontaung, Ponnya and Mahu rangers meet, i.e. at a place about 60 miles to the north east of Monywa. His remains are believed to be buried at that place and pilgrims still wend their way there 125.

116. Pl. 2978 (S. 662). In this record mañ kri nhañ, Cow thuy le Mahābodhi twah ca riñ piy sa lhyañ mlat kri lak riñ cañ tawk khla ruy, thu satel! ī kā mañ piy mañ thū te //orneys is a mention of Mahābodhi. Perhaps king Klaíwā and Cowthuy were at a temporary residence called Mahābodhi when Mahākāssapa sought audience.
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