

war and now themselves lie years in the past, it seems justified to do more than ask—as the authors do in a mere footnote—to what extent the ethnographic data presented here still coincide with actual reality. Indeed, there is a real fear that all of the information contained in this book might have passed into the realm of otherwise unretrievable historical documents, documents of a culture which today finds itself basically altered, or perhaps even substantially destroyed.

Rüdiger Schumacher
 Institut für Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft
 Freie Universität Berlin

SAO SÄIMÖNG MANGRÄI. *The Pādaeng Chronicle and the Jengtung State Chronicle Translated.* (Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 19). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, 1981. xxiv+304 pp. Illustrations, bibliography. Cloth US\$18.00, ISBN 0-89148-020-X; paper \$10.00, ISBN 0-89148-021-8.

In the volume under review we read of the following: "The (Ruler of Jengtung State Prince Konkaeu Intraeng's) fourth wife had two children: the eldest child was a boy Cau Saymong and a girl Cauang Canfong. These are the children of Nang Daeng, the fourth wife" (§ 325, p. 278). We are indeed very fortunate to have this Cau Saymong or Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi, as he appears here, translating the two chronicles of the Pādaeng Monastery and the Jengtung State. The rulers of the Shan States were feudal lords and these lords surrendered their rights and became ordinary citizens of the Union of Burma about ten years after Burma's independence. The last ruler of Jengtung was Sao Sailong, and Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi was his uncle.

In the summer of 1956 I took on loan a copy of the *Jengtung Chronicle* (written in Khun) from Cau Yodmong (son of Prince Konkaeu and Nang Bodipnoy, see § 327, p. 278), a step-brother of Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi. I had it translated into Burmese and published as part of my book *Naylhai, Rājawan*. In the copy that I used, the story of Jengtung does not end in 1935 when Prince Ratana Konkaeu Intraeng died. In my version he was succeeded by Prince Kongdaiy who was assassinated by Sao Siha, nephew of Cau Brohmlu, who was alleged to be the person who caused the crime. Sao Sailong, who was too young to succeed his father, was sent to Australia to study. During the Second World War the Transsalween Shan Areas formed part of Thailand and Cau Brohmlu became ruler of Jengtung. After the war Sao Sailong came back from Australia and he was made ruler until all feudal lords in Burma surrendered their rights in 1957. Perhaps the chronicle that I translated into Burmese is the same as the one now translated into English, though Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi stopped it at 1935, probably because he wanted to omit the sad part of the family quarrel.

Like the *Jātātaupum Rājawan* of Burma, the *Jengtung State Chronicle* gives the horoscope of each ruler. The good point in having these is that (if one knows how to interpret them) one can find out instantly how the person of the horoscope was born to be a ruler, what would be his weaknesses or virtues and when he would be unlucky again to lose his throne or die. Historians today would not like having history with astrology but astrology is also the record of past experience, saying what happened when such-and-such situation occurred in the constellations. This, however, cannot be taken as history because no tangible reason is given as to why such an event happened. Sao

Sāimōng Mangrāi also said that he did not include the horoscopes in his translation though he said he tried to give the meaning of everything that is written in the text that he translated. I am in full sympathy with him. When I did the Burmese translation I also omitted this horoscope part of the text.

In this translation I felt that dates should be given in the western calendar. Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi says: "What I intend to do on my return to Burma is to edit all the dates in the *Jengtung State Chronicle* and investigate certain textual discrepancies" (p. 201). He came back to Burma once but he left it again early in 1982 and I am afraid he did not have any chance to do what he had promised. Burmese chronicles too have quite a number of date mistakes which the scribes made through successive copying and it requires a special effort to check them and to convert them into Christian dates. In the Bibliography, he mentions Billard 1963. I have not had a chance to use this work of Billard's. For myself I use Irwin 1910. For dates after 1752 A.D., I would recommend the use of Yi Yi 1965 and of Htoon-Chan 1905. As local history should be studied on a broad base of its relations with the outside world, it is always helpful to have the dates in AD equivalents.

The translator has made various references to Burmese history in the Introduction and Notes. I would like to point out, with due respect to his hard work and scholarship, some of his statements with which I do not agree.

On page 11 he says, "The Burmese regard the (Saṅgāyanā) convened by King Mindon in 1867-1871 at Mandalay as the fifth, when the whole of the Tipiṭaka was inscribed on both faces of 729 marble slabs." However, the copying of the Piṭaka on stone slabs was started on 26 October 1859 and completed on 4 May 1868. The Saṅgāyanā was held during the period 15 April 1861-12 September 1871. Consequently these two did not belong to the same program as most people think.

On the same page he says, "After the Third Saṅgāyanā in the 3rd century BC . . . the mission to Suvaṇṇabhūmi, the Land of Gold, which the Burmese and some chronicles of northern Thailand identify as lower Burma, was undertaken by the theras Soṇa and Utra" (p. 11). We doubt very much the historicity of the Soṇa-Uttara Mission. Rock Edicts of Asoka mention various other missions but not this one. The earliest record of this mission on a stone inscription in Burma is the Pegu Kalyāṇī Inscription by King Ramādhipati in 1480 A.D. and as the event of the 3rd century B.C. was put on record in the 15th century A.D. we feel that we would better ignore it.

Later on we read, "The exact location of Suvaṇṇabhūmi is between the Sittang and the Bilin rivers, about twenty miles north-northeast of modern Thaton. This is where the excavations by the Archaeological Department of Burma are being carried out" (p. 18). Archaeological excavations made in 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978 at Araksama, Waṅka and Kaṅ:rwā in the Bhilaṅ township in the Bon State of the Union of Burma with the belief that Suvaṇṇabhūmi might be unearthed there failed all expectations. The site was of the 17th century A.D. And although he says: "The compass of the (Byu) city-wall is faced with glazed bricks" (p. 16), archaeological excavations at Śrīkṣetra and Hanlaṅ did not produce any glazed bricks. Pagan in the 11th century A.D. produced glazed plaques but there were nothing like them in Burma before Pagan.

Then we also read, "We are told . . . that King Manuha of Thaton was dedicated to the Shwedagon Pagoda of Pagan" (p. 33). Yet, I do not consider Manuha a historical figure and I also do not believe that the conquest of Sathurṃ by Aniruddha in 1057 A.D. was a true historical fact. He might have conquered lower Burma including the Tanessarim coastal strip, but that was not for religious reasons as alleged. The Shwedagon is of Rangoon; perhaps Shwezigon is meant here. When he says, "Tharekhittara (Śrīkṣetra) existed from the first century AD and Pagan since AD

849" (p. 37), it seems to me that we always want to make a place more old than it really is. Śrīkṣetra would not have been established as a capital city before the 6th century A.D. and Pagan before the 11th century A.D.

Let me finally quote from p. 199: "From the *Chronicle of Hsenwi* it was the Crown Prince of Mongmit who, by the order of 'Cau Vong' (Chinese Emperor), led the Chinese delegation to demand tribute from Narathihapate of Pagan, who put . . . members of the delegation to death." According to the Maṅgalā Cetī Inscription founded by Rhañ Disāpramuk (Pe Maung Tin and G. H. Luce, 1936, Pl. 277) we find that the Reverend Disāpramuk himself was asked by the king (who was later known as Tarukpily) to go and negotiate terms of peace with the Mongol Emperor Kublai Khan at Taytu in 1285. The king told the monk that he should not be afraid to go as it was not the way of kings to molest an ambassador. This gives a point to argue that if the king himself had executed the Chinese envoys recently, he would not have said these words nor would he have sent his own envoy to China.

At one place in the *Pāḍaeng Chronicle* it is mentioned as "we are but of Burmese-Mon origin" (§ 16, p. 102). It is no wonder that this chronicle of the Buddhist Religion at Jengtung is written very much like the Singhalese *Mahāvamsa* or the Burmese *Sāsanālaṅkāra* and *Sāsanāvamsa*. But there is one great difference. In Burma there was a schism between the Vinaya Sect and the Forest Sect and the Forest Sect was defeated. There at Jengtung it was the Forest Sect that won (§§ 154-191, pp. 134-141).

Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi says, "In the translation I have tried to be as close to the original and to be as literal as possible, consistent with meaning and sense in English" (p. 32). I congratulate him for doing this very well. I am looking forward to seeing his English translation of the *Hsenwi Chronicle* soon.

REFERENCES CITED

BILLARD, Roger

1963 Les cycles chronographiques Chinois dans les inscriptions Thaïes, *Bulletin de l'École Française de l'Extrême Orient* LI-2, pp. 403-431.

HTOON-CHAN

1905 *The Arakanese calendar with the corresponding dates in Burmese and English, 1820—(June) 1918*. Cactwe, Rakhuiṅ Satañ:cā.

IRWIN, Sir Alfred

1910 Elements of Burmese Calendar—AD 638 to 1752, *Indian Antiquary*, pp. 289-315.

DE MAUNG TIN and G. H. LUCE, selectors

1936 *Inscriptions of Burma*. Portfolio V. London: Oxford University Press.

THAN TUN

1968 *Naylhai, Rājawañ, I*. Rangoon: Namsa, Publishers.

YI YI

1965 *An English-Burmese calendar, AD 1701-1820*. Rangoon: Government Publications.

Than Tun

Mandalay University, Mandalay, Burma