

by

Dr. Than Tun²

CHAI TA RWA (Pl. 423/12) of Kyaukse district and *Khrok Kharuin* (Pl. 117a/9) of Minbu District were the first homes of the Burmans in Burma. It seems that they took the eleven *kharuin* from the Mon and the six *kharuin* from *Ponloñ* and *Cakraw*. Outside the *kharuin* area, there are the *tuik* areas which include *Toñthwañ* (Pl. 12/9) and *Prāñtāwsā* (Pl. 51/10) island in the south, the Yaw area in the west, the *Pañklī Chai Tuik* (Pl. 162/24) up to Monywa in the north west and the area extending up to Tagaung in the north. The social life that we are about to discuss is confined to these *kharuin* and *tuik* areas which roughly form the dry zone of central Burma getting less than fifty inches of rainfall per year. These areas as a whole were known as *Tattadesa* (*Ep. Birm.* I, ii, I-F/34) or the Parched Land, with centre at *Arimaddanapura* (*Ep. Birm.* I, ii, I-A/18) or Pagan. Later the area was divided into two portions which were known as *Sunāparanta* on the north of the Irrawaddy and *Tambadipa* on the south of the Irrawaddy. Kyanzittha's Shwezigon Inscription (B/24)

1. Read at the Sixth Annual Research Conference on December 31, 1958, with U Chit Thoung in the Chair.

2. Lecturer in History, University of Rangoon.

mentions the men "of the four castes" but there is no reason to believe that caste was recognised in Burma even at that time. It only means "the people in general" (*Ep. Birm.* I, ii, p. 78). The ruling people were known as *mañ* (Pl. 3/24), *mañ krī* (Pl. 24/3), *mañ khyañ* (Pl. 257/6, 13), *mañ ce* (Pl. 215 b/6), *mañ nhama* (Pl. 73/3), *man phathuy* (Pl. 90/20), *mañ phwā* (Pl. 126 b/2), *mañ myā* (Pl. 31/21), *man sami* (Pl. 67/13), *mañ sā* (Pl. 31/20), *cuiw sā* (Pl. 68/23), *cuiw mañ* (Pl. 133/27), *amātya* (Pl. 10 a/1), and *buil pā* (Pl. 6/21). We shall, however, dwell more upon the common people here with special reference to the slave community because lithic inscriptions of the period tell us more about the slaves than about anybody else.

Of the common people, we propose to deal first with the different nationalities living within the Parched Land. The most important of them were the Burmese. A Mon inscription of A. D. 1101-2 mentions them as *mirma* (*Ep. Birm.* III, i, IX-B/42). The word *mranmā* (Pl. 10 a/20) occurred first in an inscription of A. D. 1190. The spelling changed to *mranmā* (Pl. 446 b & Pl. 469 a/2) in about A. D. 1332. *Mranmā prañ* (Pl. 87/1) which of course was the *Tattadesa* was first mentioned in A. D. 1235. Next we have *Pyu* (Pl. 31/7) who were probably the Chinese *P'iao* and the Mon *Tircul* (*Ep. Birm.* III, i, IX-B/42). They lived on the northern and southern tips of the Burmese area and it seems that they mixed so freely with the Burmans that they disappeared rapidly during the Pagan period. *Sak* (Pl. 361 a/30) also must have been absorbed by the Burmese though a few of them still remain in the Akyab district. A peak near Pagan was known as *Turañ Sak Cuiw* (Pl. 126 b/4) - a peak of *Turañ* from where *Sak* were controlled. *Saw* lived to the west of the Mu in the Tabayin area (Pl. 228 b/5 & Pl. 94 a/17) and *Kantu* in the upper Mu. *Sañthway Prañ* (Pl. 271/13) or Tagaung was the centre of *Kantu*. The final conquest of their lands by the Burmese seems to have taken place in A. D. 1228 (Pl. 231 b/1). *Khyañ* (Pl. 78 b/32) and *Yaw* (Pl. 31/12) occurred in the inscriptions of our period more in geographic than in ethnic sense. There must have been also people from Arakan among the Burmese because we find the mention of *Rakhuin* among both the slaves (Pl. 35/27) and the donors (Pl. 391/29, 37). The southern portion of the Burmese area must have been peopled first by *Cakraw* (Pl. 147 b/15), who were enlisted by the Burmans for military service (Pl. 162/5, 6, 7). *Toñsu* was also used in its ethnic sense in the inscriptions (Pl. 392/17, Pl. 393/13). *Rmeñ* (*Ep. Birm.* III, i, IX-B/14, 42. G

23; H/12) or *Tanluin* (Pl. 27/4) were able to exercise quite a considerable influence over the Burmans in the first half of the Pagan dynasty. *Kharimhu kharuin* including *Tanluin Rwā Ma* (Pl. 205/12.17) was located at the junction of the Samon and Myitngè. *Krwam* (Pl. 10a/24) or ? Cambodian population was also quite numerous, among whom *Nā Pu Tat* (Pl. 186/6, Pl. 239/12) was noted for bravery during the reign of *Nātoñmyā*. *Lawa* lived perhaps in *Sañoñ kharuin* to the east of the *Sañoñway* canal (Pl. 20a/2) in Kyaukse district. *Syam* (Pl. 110/6) were also found to be very much mixed up with the Burmese as the word is frequently mentioned among the slave names. *Cin* (Pl. 216/33) or ? Chinese slaves were mentioned in A. D. 1266. *Taruk* (Pl. 271/3) might mean the Mongols. *Kula* (Pl. 10a/19) or Indians were most frequently recorded in the inscriptions. They must have had a great cultural influence over the Burmese. One type of architecture was called after them as *Kulā kloñ* (Pl. 64/6) i. e. a brick monastery. Perhaps they were more numerous at *sañphaw chip* – shipping port, like *Yhanpuiw* (Pl. 76/1). Among the slaves, Indians formed the majority next to the Burmese. With this racial background, I think, we could now briefly examine their family life.

Family was very important in a society of that period: *Im thoñ* (Pl. 73 *passim*) is the Burmese word for it. Some of the terms for blood relations are *achuyamluwiw* (Pl. 13/20) or *achuyawā* (Pl. 3/17) or just *chuymluwiw* (Pl. 44a/14) or ? *pokpo* (Pl. 36/12). Ancestors are *ābep aphuiw* (Pl. 6/23). A father is sometimes called *khamañ* (Pl. 90/19) but usually the parents are *āmi āpha* (Pl. 6/23). A husband and wife with children are often referred to as *lan miyā sa curñ* (Pl. 417/14). The loving couple are known as *moñ nham* (Pl. 80/1) or *myok sā* (Pl. 42/30) or *khañ pwan* (Pl. 14/7). In-laws are *yokkhama* (Pl. 197/14) – parents-in-laws *yokpha* (Pl. 205/27) or *mat* (Pl. 144/7) – brother-in-law, *samak* (Pl. 12/12) – son-in-law, *khruyma* (Pl. 265/37) – daughter-in-law, Step mother is *nhoñ ami* (Pl. 56b/4). Mother's brother is either *ari* (Pl. 74/35) or *uri* (Pl. 597/11) and sister is *ataw* (Pl. 214b/6). But mother's elder sister is *mikrī* (Pl. 384/15) and younger sister *mithuy* (Pl. 181/2). Father's elder brother is *pha krī* (Pl. 386/31) while the younger one is *phathuy* (Pl. 594/11). Beloved wife is *pay myā* (Pl. 3/13) or *mayā pluwiw* (Pl. 134b/9). Since there are references to *miyā ñay* (lesser wife) (Pl. 7/12) and *kuiw lup* concubine (Pl. 140b/15) it would be quite safe to assume

that polygamy was recognised during that period. Though *sā* could mean son, the word *sā* (Pl. 180 / 8) is used as a generic term for children because daughter is invariably written as *sāmī* (Pl. 10 b / 5) or *smī* (Pl. 376 / 9). A suckling is *nuiw cuiw* (Pl. 22 / 9) and *nuiw khuiw* stealer of milk (Pl. 68/16) is perhaps an adopted child. Among the children, to a girl her elder sisters are *acma* (Pl. 199 / 8) and younger ones are *nīma* (Pl. 376 / 7) – and her elder brothers are *ackuiw* (Pl. 9 b / 7) and younger ones are *moñ* (Pl. 376 / 10); and to a boy his brothers are *noñ* whereas the elder brother is *ackuiw* and the younger one is *nī* (Pl. 376 / 5) or *noñ nai* (Pl. 67 / 2, 9) and his elder sisters are *acma* – and younger ones *nhama* (Pl. 376 / 10). *Kamay* (Pl. 4 / 7) is the word for widow. Thus they had well-knit family ties as the Burmans of to-day have. Their professions would enlighten us on the social conditions of these days.

Their professions roughly fall into five categories. Firstly there are the agriculturalists including cowherds; secondly the food suppliers including cooks; thirdly the craftsmen; fourthly the musicians and finally the miscellaneous.

Of the agriculturalists, *lay sañ* (Pl. 193 / 26) or *lay su* (Pl. 110 / 7) – farmers, topped the list. Then there were such people as *lay uyan coñ*, (Pl. 75 a / 33) – those who guarded the fields and gardens, *capā cuik* (Pl. 175 / 2) – planters of paddy, and *uyan sañ* (Pl. 76 / 2) – gardeners. Next come those who looked after cattle and poultry and for convenience sake we include here herders of other animals as well. They were *nwā thin* cowherds (Pl. 138 / 13), *klway thin* buffaloherds (Pl. 73 / 47), *chit thin* goat-herds (Pl. 153 a / 19), *chañ thin* elephant-keepers (Pl. 76 / 23) and *wampay thin* tenders of ducks (Pl. 183 a / 12). Queen Saw in A. D. 1299 proudly mentioned a *nwā kloñ cwañ* (Pl. 390/33) – expert cowherd called *Ñā Lyoñ* among the slaves dedicated to a pagoda. Burmans as indicated in an inscription were fond of *nuiw sac nuiw tham ryak tak thawpiy thawpat arasā nā pā* (Pl. 235/9) – five delicacies of fresh milk, sour milk, butter milk, unclarified butter and clarified butter. *Nuiw ñhat nwā ma* (Pl. 134a/4) – the milch cows, must have been specially reared for such delicacies.

The food suppliers comprised of workers such as cooks, butchers and milkmen. Old Burmans employed separate people for cooking rice

and curry and thus they had *thamzā sañ* (Pl. 36 / 16) – rice cooks and *hañ sañ* (Pl. 36 / 18) – curry cooks. Perhaps these were attached to big monastic establishments where preparing rice alone required an army of cooks. For the house-cook they had *im thamāñ khyak* (Pl. 110 / 6). To supply meat there were *away soñ* (Pl. 391 / 33) of *may sañ* (Pl. 153 a / 22) – butchers, *sācuiw* (Pl. 36 / 19) – keeper of game and *muchuiw* (Pl. 71 / 7) – hunters. *Puik sañ* (Pl. 7 / 9) or *kwan sañ* (Pl. 267 / 4) – net men, supplied fish. For sweetmeats, there were *nwā nuwi sañ* (Pl. 36 / 18) – the milkman, and *yana, pyā sañ* (Pl. 36 / 18) – the honey man. Chewing betel was a regular practice and perhaps demanded specialized service (See *JBRs*, XXX,i, p. 312, n, 64) They had *kwañ sañ* (Pl. 391 / 13), *kwañ tau sañ* (Pl. 476 / 13), *kwañ si tañ sañ* (Pl. 229 / 18) and *kwañmwan tāw sañ* (Pl. 74 / 28) as servers of *kwañ yā* (Pl. 139 / 11) – betel quids.

The third category includes craftsmen who were responsible for the beautiful Pagan architecture which we admire very much to-day, and who made articles of everyday use and weavers. They were *laksmā* (Pl. 81 / 12) – carpenters *tacañ sañ* (Pl. 102 / 14) – plane men, *puran* (Pl. 68 / 22 / 97) – masons, as builders; *panpu* (Pl. 81 / 8) – woodcarvers, *pankhi* (Pl. 144 / 5) – painters, *panpwat* (Pl. 392 / 19) wood turners, *tañkyat sañ* (Pl. 194 / 27) – ?canopy makers as decorators; *ut sañ* (Pl. 595 / 13) – brick makers to supply bricks; *panphay* (Pl. 68 / 22) – blacksmiths to supply things made of iron and *athu sañ* (Pl. 392 / 11) or *purpa sañ* (Pl. 391 / 3) – image makers to supply the images of the Lord. *Thī sañ* (Pl. 148 b / 3) – umbrella makers to manufacture golden umbrellas (Calcutta Museum BG 232 shows a Burmese umbrella cast in bronze in A.D. 1293) to spread over pagodas or images. These builders, suppliers of building materials and decorators must have had a very busy time during the period under survey which is often called the period of temple-builders. There were also *panthin* (Pl. 3 / 22) – goldsmith to make jewellery as well as the spires of temples and pagodas, where precious metal and stones were used. For pots and pans, there were *uiw thin* (Pl. 392 / 11) – potters, *kara sañ* (Pl. 216 / 30) – jug makers, and *laiñpān sañ* (Pl. 164 / 25) – tray makers. For making clothes, there are *khrañ sañ* (Pl. 391 / 36) and *khrañ ñay sañ* (Pl. 393 / 28) – spinners, *pukhrañ sañ* (Pl. 392 / 30) loincloth makers, and *yan sañ* (Pl. 164 / 21) – weavers.

In the fourth category were the musicians; these were players of various musical instruments among which the drum seemed to be the

most popular. Singing and dancing accompanied by the drum seemed to be one of the favourite diversions of the old Burmans since there were more people employed as *cañ soñ* (Pl. 9 / 8) – drummers and *pantyā* (Pl. 5 / 8) – nautes than any other musicians. For singing alone they had *sikhrañ sañ* (Pl. 3 / 18) – the singers and for dancing they had *kakhriy sañ* (Pl. 15 / 12) – the dancers. Other musicians were persons to blow *tapuiw* (Pl. 367 a / 5) – horns, *pasā sañ* (Pl. 10 a / 18) – side drummers *khwakkhwañ sañ* (Pl. 17 / 19) – cymbal players, *noñnañ sañ* (Pl. 367 a / 5) – bell players, *khara sañ* (Pl. 68 / 22) or *nhañ sañ* (Pl. 81 / 21) – trumpeters, *cañdra sañ* (Pl. 85 / 9) – ? dulcimer players, *narañcrā sañ* (Pl. 138 / 8) – ? trumpeters, *coñ sañ* (Pl. 265 / 36) – harpists and *saro sañ* (Pl. 387 a / 3) – ? violinists.

Lastly, there were professionals of various types. These were *lak sañ* (Pl. 79 b / 7) – midwife, *kuhā sañ* (Pl. 81 / 17) – launderers, *lhawkā sañ* (Pl. 376 / 4) – boat men, *sañryañ sañ* (Pl. 275 / 18) – palanquin carriers, *chañ chum sañ* (Pl. 417 / 12) oil producers, *riy sañ* (Pl. 392 / 2) – water carriers, *mloñ mliy sañ* (Pl. 423 / 30) – ? canal diggers. As has already been stated, we know more about the slaves than about anybody else. *Kywan* (Pl. 10 a / 28) is the Burmese word for slave and it implies nowadays menial service by a person to another. But to a Burman of the medieval times the connotation of the word must have been different. We have evidence to show that people in those days voluntarily turned themselves into slaves of religious establishments (Pl. 6 / 10 – 15). Even kings had their children dedicated as slaves (Pl. 34 / 10). If a king could turn his own children or children whom he regarded as his own into slaves, it is obvious that to become a pagoda slave in those days did not imply that the person would go down in the social scale: workers as *rakan soñ* (Pl. 216 / 33) and *alay sañ* (Pl. 422 a, iii / 5). The wide range of professions shows us that the town community or the village community was self-sufficient.

As has already been stated, we know more about the slaves than about anybody else. *Kywan* (Pl. 10 a / 28) is the Burmese word for slave and it implies nowadays menial service by a person to another. But to a Burman of the medieval times the connotation of the word must have been different. We have evidence to show that people in those days voluntarily turned themselves into slaves of religious establishments (Pl. 6 / 10 – 15). Even kings had their children dedicated as slaves (Pl. 34 / 10). If a king could turn his own children or children whom he regarded as his own into slaves, it is obvious that to become a pagoda slave in those days did not imply that the person would go down in the social scale:

The majority of the slaves were hereditary. Hence such phrases as *sā can mliy can* (Pl. 164 / 31) or *sā chak mliy chak* (Pl. 164 / 32) meaning from son to grandson in succession. A slave community would come into being and every child born thereafter into that community was considered to be a slave. Perhaps the word *sapok* (Pl. 182a / 21) was applied to a person born of slave parents. Eventually slave villages came into existence as *kyon rwālwin* (Pl. 51 / 8) – the whole village of slaves, (in an inscription dated A. D. 1223); *kloñ kywan rwā* (Pl. 127 a / 3, 4) – the village of monastery slaves, (in an inscription dated A. D. 1235); and *wat khlak rwā* (Pl. 215b / 18) – the rice cooking village, meaning that the villagers were all slaves to the nearby monastery and that they served it as cooks. The famous Gubyaukgyi inscription of Prince *Rājakumār* mentions the three slave villages of *Sakmunalon*, *Rcpāy* and *Henbuiw* (Pl. 364 / 30–2). Owners naturally regarded slaves as part of their estates that could be handed down from father to son, or could be bought or sold or used in settling debts (Pl. 303 / 15) which often led to disputes and law suits concerning their ownership (Pl. 74 / 8–20). Perhaps to avoid such disputes at a later date, judges were called upon in some cases to witness the transfer of ownership (Pl. 56b / 6–9) which was duly registered, signed and sealed (Pl. 77 / 6, 10). *Amuy kywan* (Pl. 75a / 3) – the inherited slave, is the term used by *Nā U Lyon* to describe eleven slaves whom he inherited from his aunt *Yaptaw Sañ Khyat Ma* a concubine of king *Cañsu I*. But there are also records which explicitly state that some slaves were not part of the inherited property (Pl. 70 / 6–8). In such cases it can be deduced that certain slaves were acquired through buying or settling a debt or winning a law suit. If buying or selling slaves was possible, it could be assumed that there was some form of a recognised slave trade.

There are instances where donors in making dedication of slaves to religious establishments, very often mentioned the prices they paid for the slaves (Pl. 75a / 3–6). A slave cost approximately thirty ticals of silver (Pl. 75a / 57–8) or twenty viss of copper (Pl. 392 / 11–12), or twenty baskets of paddy (Pl. 392 / 30), while fifty slaves were exchanged for an elephant (Pl. 156 / 3–4), forty for an exceptionally good horse (Pl. 94b / 13), one for a boat (Pl. 75a / 45–6) or ten areca-nut palms (Pl. 175 / 16–17). A slave could redeem himself for as little as five viss of copper (Pl. 182a / 18–19). On the other hand the price for redeeming an insolvent debtor who became a slave would be enormous. A *piysmā* (Pl. 79a / 1–13) who prepared palm leaves for writing,

called *Nā Tañ*, *Sañ* went bankrupt in A. D. 1227. He and his family became slaves of a minister called *Anantasu*. There are also probably instances of war captives and certain followers of a rebel prince being turned into slaves (Pl. 42 / 13-16). These slaves could become free again by either redemption or by simply running away.

Even though a modest sum of five viss of copper was the fee of liberty as mentioned above, some did run away (Pl. 75 b / 36, Pl. 76 / 10). But this did not happen frequently and we can find no evidence that they were even tracked down and given capital punishment. Most of the slaves were probably too contented with their lot and many of them were perhaps too attached to their native place to run away. Besides, the slave owners were merciful and benevolent. Slaves were never taken away from their native place but instead they were allowed to follow their own trade or profession with the added comfort that they had a master who would keep them for better or worse. Usually they were attached to a land in their locality (Pl. 216 *passim*) or in the case of professionals, people of the same vocation were grouped together (Pl. 144 / 22, 23). Cowherds stayed with their cows in their pasture lands (Pl. 138 / 13, 20). It was only the ownership which changed. Nevertheless there were some blacksheep amongst the slaves. Towards the end of the dynasty, in A. D. 1266, a whole group of Indian slaves at *Yhanpuiw* was recorded to have absconded (Pl. 216 / 33). *Yhanpuiw* was a port and was within easy reach of the sea. This proximity to the sea coupled with an uneasy political situation at that time might have tempted them to escape.

Benevolence as a characteristic of the slave owners is an outstanding feature of Pagan slavery. A donor (Pl. 19 b / 9-11) in A. D. 1198. dedicated to a pagoda 567½ *pay* of land and 228 slaves, the majority of whom were labourers who served the pagoda with the produce of the land, and the rest were slaves who were skilled artists. Among these were leader of the group who was the general supervisor; firewood cutter, a granary keeper, a dancer or singer and a drummer, all of these in their own skilled ways served the pagoda. For their service and for their welfare, the donor was meticulously careful to leave special special provisions for them. Out of 567½ *pay* of land, ten were allotted to the supervisor, five to the woodcutter, five to the granary keeper, five to the singer and three to the drummer.

Queen Saw, mother of *Singhapati* and *Tryaphyā* dedicated to a pagoda in A. D. 1241, 260 *pay* of land, 2 gardens and 178 slaves. So

bountiful was she that she left detailed instructions regarding the food supply for the slaves who were not even connected with the land (Pl. 138 / 30-6). Again the wife of Prince *Gaṅgasura*, in making a dedication of 511 $\frac{1}{2}$ *pay* of land in A. D. 1242 stated that 15 *pay* were for the slaves (Pl. 147 b / 21). Queen Saw, mother of *Rājasura*, dedicated slaves to a monastery in A. D. 1291 and said that when these slaves became sick or old, the monks must give them proper treatment and care (Pl. 275 / 28-9). This is the best security that a man could desire against old age and infirmity and many of the Pagan slaves had that security. Very often we find *rahan* (Pl. 7 / 9), *pancañ* (Pl. 146 / 3), and *bhikkunī* (Pl. 89 / 27, Pl. 92 / 14) among the lists of slaves. The only reason we could think of their presence in the lists of slaves is that they were born of slave parents. The Buddhist Order recognizes no class distinction nevertheless slaves must obtain the consent of their masters before they could become monks or nuns. These slaves must have had the permission of their masters before they joined the Order probably with the understanding that if and when they left the Order they should revert to slavery again. It is conceivable that their names were included in the lists of slaves so that should there be any disclaimer after he had left the Order, one of these lists might be used as an evidence against him. Apart from that the inclusion of their names in the lists seems to have no meaning at all. In one case it is specifically mentioned that a minister called *Gaṅgabijañ* allowed two adults and twenty children of his slaves to become monks and novices (Pl. 308 / 33).

There were also equally magnanimous slave owners who set their slaves free out of sheer kindness (Pl. 191 a / 15-16, Pl. 201 a / 9-14). Some owners not only set their slaves free but also gave them land so that they might not be in a paradoxical plight of gaining freedom yet being without work. When allowing their slaves to go free, the owners used this regular phrase *mrak nu riy krañ hi rā lā eiy* (Pl. 201 a / 9-10) meaning that the slaves could go wherever there is "tender grass and clear water". In one particular case the slaves of a pagoda were even given the right to decide for themselves when to leave the pagoda service (Pl. 280 a / 9-10). They could have sought freedom whenever they wanted. But with ample funds provided by the rich donor and only one image to look after, they decided perhaps to remain slaves for ever. They must have been either quite contented with their lot or devoted to their duties.

Their duties seem to be onerous. In A. D. 1197, *Jeyyaseṭhiy* dedicated 141 slaves to a pagoda and monastery, in order that *samput wat chīmī wat ma prat cim so nhā* (Pl. 16 / 4-5) - 'in order that rice food and oil lamps shall be served without intermission'. Slaves whose exclusive duty was to cook rice or food at a monastery were known as *samput khyak kyon* (Pl. 50 / 22) or *wat khyak kywan* (Pl. 186 / 28). Minister *Anantasura* in A. D. 1223 clearly defined their duties as follows:—

To go on forever doing the necessary repairs (at the establishment); to sweep the compound; to go on serving the Lord and the Law without intermission with rice food, oil lamps, betel and flowers; to go on serving the patient reverend monks with the flowers of rice food on behalf of the loving couple (Pl. 73 / 30-1).

Minister *Mahāsmān* in A. D. 1255 gave another definition:

These slaves are to fetch the water for the monks to wash their feet, hands and bodies, and water to drink. They are (also) to cook the rice food and to sweep and remove the refuse (Pl. 186 / 27-8).

In A. D. 1269 a donor dedicated a *laksmā* (Pl. 261 / 7-8) - carpenter and a *panphay* (Pl. 261 / 24) - blacksmith to a ruined monastery to carry out necessary repairs. Another donor dedicated eleven slaves in the same year to his religious establishment (Pl. 225 / 6-7) so that they would be useful when necessity for repairs arose. The nature of duties might vary slightly among the slaves who were attached to the pagoda (Pl. 9 / 5), to the Law (Pl. 42 / 28), to the Order (Pl. 114a / 7-9) and to the *sima* (Ordination Hall) (Pl. 212 / 15-16). Some of the slaves were personal attendants to the heads of monasteries (Pl. 229 / 20).

Beside the slaves of the religious establishments, there were domestic slaves who would be called variously as *īm kywan* (Pl. 156 / 3, 4), *im thoñ kywan* (Pl. 181 / 3), and *īm niy* (Pl. 228b / 9). Slaves at the court were known as either *kywan taw* (Pl. 228b / 5) or *mañ īm krī sañ* (Pl. 421a / 2).

Another interesting phenomenon about the slaves in the inscriptions is the terms used to describe them. In giving a list of slaves,

whenever it is necessary, short descriptive account accompanied their names e. g. *īm thoñ* for the head of the family, *kamay* for a widow, *Ya* (Pl. 4 / 7) as prefix for a woman of Mon extract, *pucu* (Pl. 7 / 9) for young people, *nuiw*, *cuiw*, (Pl. 22 / 9) for sucklings, *cātat* (Pl. 7 / 6) for literates and *samī apluiw ñay* (Pl. 270 / 11) for young unmarried daughter. There are certain terms used as prefixes to the names of both sexes but unfortunately we have not been able to identify them yet. These are *mhura* (Pl. 73 / 51), *mrakra* (Pl. 73 *passim*), *phut* (Pl. 73 *passim*) and *uiw*, *phu khi* (Pl. 73 *passim*).

With regard to literacy among slaves, three inscriptions dated A.D. 1227 (Pl. 73), A.D. 1235 (Pl. 181) and A.D. 1249 (Pl. 376) throw much light on this subject. They mention the expression *cātat* (literate) more than any other inscriptions. The first inscription enumerates seventy eight slaves, among whom nine were literate (five boys and four girls). In the second one there are 116 slaves, of whom eight were literate (only boys), In the third there were 140 slaves, of whom seventeen were literate (thirteen boys and four girls). Therefore according to the statistics, approximately 10 percent of the slaves were literate. Among the free people the percentage would still be higher. It is interesting to note that there were girls among the literate of which they formed a quarter. The slave community was considerable and there were slave villagers with their own administrative officers as *sukrī* (Pl. 89 / 22) – headman, to control the village; *kumtham* (Pl. 68 / 19) – to supervise cultivation; and *sañkrī* (Pl. 25 / 8) and *sañlyan* (Pl. 73 / 49) as village elders. The mentioning of a slave wife is conspicuous by its absence. Perhaps taking a slave wife was unpopular though the society, as has been stated, allowed polygamy. To sum up: slaves especially pagoda slaves, it seems, were not regarded as social outcast in that period as they are at the present time.

This then is a very brief survey of the social life in Burma, A. D. 1044 – 1287.