to help him to expel the Shans of Kyauksê. But it is not at all improbable that the Shan brothers borrowed troops from Chieng Mai, either to overawe the proud Burmese aristocracy of Kyauksê, or to meet the expected Mongol attack. And it is possible that they tried to bluff Kuan-chu-ssû-chia into believing that Klawcwā had done it; it is possible, also, that Saw Nit weakly lent his word to the deception. There may be other explanations. I am inclined to accept as a fact that Chieng Mai helped in the occupation of Kyauksê by the Buddhist Shans. In the autumn of 1299, in Rainun kharuin to the west of Kyauksê, a dedication was made by the family of the “queen of the king called Sirirāja, who has conquered all his enemies.”210 The king is mentioned nowhere else.211 I suspect he may have been a member of the old Burmese aristocracy who, after Klawcwā’s dethronement, made a stand against the Shan occupation of Kyauksê, with some temporary success on the west side of the river Panlaung.

The Mongols were the first to capture Pagan, in 1287-8. Its ruin was completed by the Shans and the Mons. When Klawcwā, the headman of Tala, moved back to Pagan in 1289, the Mons of the Delta took the opportunity to revolt. Before 1293, Rājasaṅkraśaṇ and his follower Anantajayapakram led a campaign which recovered Tala for a while.213 But by 1298, when Kuan-chu-ssû-chia was sent by Yünnan to open relations with the Mon kingdom, and returned to China up the Irrawaddy, the Mons must have been masters of most of the Delta.

At Pagan, the three Shan brothers, usually called sambyañ, the Old Mon title for a senior minister, are commonly mentioned together in Pagan inscriptions, from 1289 to 1291,214 endorsing Klawcwā’s decisions. In 1292 Rājasaṅkraśaṇ alone appears.215 Early in 1293, as we have seen in Asaṅkhayā’s inscription at Pagan,216 their policy begins to show itself. The three brothers are the generals, but also the equals, of the Pagan king, and they have defeated a Taruk army.
One obstacle to their plans was probably the prestige of Tarukpliy’s grand old queen, the great Queen Saw of the Chronicles. These say, “Queen Saw had no son nor daughter”; but this is in plain contradiction of her own inscriptions in the Sawhlawun temple, Minnanthu: “my two beloved sons” and “my husband the king, father of my two beloved sons.” She and her favourite, perhaps the elder son, Rājasū, were busy making dedications in 1290. In the spring of 1291 he was dead, and her heart was broken. The other son was probably Klaewā, who always takes precedence of the three Shan brothers in her inscriptions. He (or his brother) may be called “the king’s son Dhammmnarac”; if so, it suggests the possibility of his having been declared Crown Prince. We hear no more of Prince Klaewā till the autumn of 1293, when we find him married to Puthuiv-nī Maṅ 223 (the only female maṅ, I think, in Old Burmese, perhaps a courtesy title), ‘queen of Pahto-ni’, a small village in East Kyauksè, near Myinzaing. We do not know exactly when Queen Saw died; but it was well before 1300, when her younger sister, who took her place as chief queen at Pagan, set up her first inscription at Pwazaw. I cannot but suspect that the Shan brothers played some part in these events.

The cat-and-mouse tactics of the Shan brothers continued. Early in 1294, Sīṅgasū, the youngest, was present at a Pagan audience. At the turn of the year 1294/5, “the sāmpyaṅ Asaṅkhayā” also attends. In 1295, Sihasū is first styled Chaṅ phlu syaṅ, “Lord of the White Elephant”, in a Kyauksè inscription. Near the end of the following year, 1296, he sets up his first inscription at Myinzaing with true royal protocol: “The king called Sīṅhasūra, fulfilled with virtue, might and splendour”; he has built a “golden monastery east of Mraɪnuĩ” (Myinzaing), at the foot of the hills east of Kyauksè town, and dedicates a lot of small pieces of land in the eastern half of the district, and a large area in the hills behind Myinzaing.

Chinese texts, though based sometimes on contradictory reports, are our fullest informants about the last days of Pagan,
The following seems to me to be the probable course of events. Klawcwā, well nigh desperate, one imagines, turning to the only source from which effective help could be obtained, early in 1297 sent an important embassy to Peking, headed by his eldest son, Prince Singhapati. He promised to pay a yearly tribute of 2,500 tacls of silver, 1,000 pieces of silk, 20 tame elephants and 10,000 piculs of grain. On March 20th, 1297, in an edict given at length in the pên-chi, the Emperor granted official appointment to Klawcwā as king of Mien with a silver seal, and to Singhapati as Crown Prince with a Tiger Tally; a Pearl Tiger Tally was also conferred on “Sa-pang-pa, younger brother of the king of Mien,” and three on “the leader of the chieftains, Asan,” i.e., Asankhayā, including, no doubt, his two brothers. “Border generals of Yùnnan, etc.,” the edict concludes, “are not to raise armies without my authority.”

According to Na-su-la’s report, Singhapati, on his return, was accompanied by the minister Chiao Hua-ti as deputy of the Mongol Court. On their arrival at Pagan, Klawcwā convoked a big assembly to hear the reading of the Emperor’s edict. Rājasāṅkram and Sīhasū absent themselves. This was probably the occasion when Ch’ieh-lich, late Chief Secretary of Mien-chung province, “was made bearer of the imperial edict to publish abroad the majesty and virtue (of the Emperor) at Mien. The king of Mien bowed down his forehead to the ground and pronounced his thanks for the favour shown him. He sent his son and heir, Singhapati, to Court with tribute.”

In the autumn of 1297, things still seem normal at Pagan. “Śiṅkasū, sampyan in the royal presence,” recommends to the king a largish grant of land in Panan kharuin (the centre of Kyauksē) to “his servant and follower, Anantaśayapakram.” The trouble comes to a head, as mentioned above, in March-April 1298, when Kuan-chu-ssū-chia and the Mon envoys try to pass through Pagan. Klawcwā’s arrest of the latter gives the two younger brothers an excuse to revolt. There were other
reasons also. The A-pa tribe had rebelled, apparently, in the north; perhaps they were norther Shans, west of the Irrawaddy, on the border of Chêng-mien province. Klawcwâ asked the Mongols for troops to deal with them. The rebels were indignant: "He calls in an army from China to kill, plunder and enslave us." They fortified their town and mustered troops to retaliate. Śihasū and Rājasaṅkram made common cause with the rebels. They ravaged the land of Mi-li-tu (Mliylū, Myedu, in the north of Shwebo district) and Pang-chia-lang. Āsaṅkhayā was sent to stop them, but failed, and was put under arrest. The rebels fortified themselves in the land of Pu-kan-yū-su-chi-lao-i, and advanced by water and land to besiege Pagan. Na-su-la leads a sortie, but is captured. The monks of the capital persuade both sides to stop fighting and swear oaths of loyalty, whereupon prisoners on both sides are released. But in the 5th month (June 10th - July 9th, 1298), the three brothers return with a large army, force an entrance into Pagan, arrest the king, his eldest son Singhapati, and younger son (sons?) Chao Chi-li (and) Chao P'u, and imprison them all "for 11 months" in Myinzaing. "Ever since you submitted to China," they told Klawcwâ "you have not ceased to load us with shames."

Such is the version given in Huber's text, supported by a wealth of detail. It places the dethronement of Klawcwâ and his removal to Myinzaing in June - July 1298. This date, however, clashes with a Myinzaing inscription dated six months earlier, when "the dethroned king" (Nan kla maṅ) "appeared in full audience" in Myinzaing, listening to a request seconded by "the great minister Āsaṅkhyā," and pouring water of dedication. He still retains in captivity, it seems, his religious functions. If this inscription is trusted (I cannot question it), one is led to believe that the arrest of the Mon embassy at Pagan was not by order of Klawcwâ, who was in captivity 100 miles away, but by that of the brothers who afterwards bluffed Kuan-chu-ssū-chia into believing that he, not they, was responsible.
On the Pagan throne they left a puppet-king, Tsou Nieh \(^{244}\) (Caw Nac, Saw Nit), "a bastard son of the king, 16 years old," telling him, it seems, to do his best to propitiate the Mongols. In the 6th month (July 10th to August 7th, 1298), he sent an envoy, A-chih-pu-ch'ieh-lan, \(^{245}\) to Tagaung to report their version of what had happened, apologize to Kuan-chu-ssü-chia, and invite him to come to Pagan for discussions. When he arrived, Tsou Nieh put the blame on Klawcwā, and said he was preparing to send tribute to Peking by the hand of three high officials. \(^{246}\) He also sent a letter to the Yünنان government, praising Asaṅkhayā, and giving the reasons why the three brothers (here named in full) \(^{247}\) have dethroned Klawcwā and placed Asaṅkhayā on the throne.

To lend colour to their protestations, it appears that the three brothers allowed the captive Crown Prince, Singhapati, to head one further embassy to Peking. On April 13th, 1299 \(^{248}\) "the Crown Prince of Mien kingdom, Hsin-ho-pa-ti, submitted a memorial and came to thank the Emperor, who bestowed clothing on him and sent him back." The account in the section on Mien \(^{249}\) is fuller: "In the 3rd year (1299 A.D.), 3rd month, Mien again sent its heir apparent to submit a memorial of thanks. He himself reported that his tribespeople were being killed and plundered by the Gold Teeth", i.e., the Shans, "and that this had caused widespread poverty and want, and thus prevented him from being able to pay the tribute-offering of gold and silks at the appointed time. The Emperor took pity on him, and ordered him only every other year to offer elephants. Once more he bestowed clothing on him, and sent him back." Why did he not blurt out the whole truth, and beg the Emperor (as his brother did a few months later) to vindicate his father's right and punish the usurpers? I imagine they had sent spies to accompany him, and warned him that his father's life depended on his secrecy and quick return to Myinzaing. And so their poor victim duly
told his tale, and in a vain attempt to save his father, returned to his captivity and death.

But the truth was now beginning to leak out. The captive father and son having now served their purpose, on May 10th, 1299 (according to Na-su-la’s report),250 “Asaṅkhayā ordered his brother to kill the king and his two sons. K’ang-chilung Ku-ma-la-ch’ieh-shih-pa,251 another son of the king, managed to escape.” Conflicting accounts of the murders now poured in, which the murderer sought in vain to counteract.

Maṅ Lulaṅ, “the young king” (Tsou Nieh), was now with great publicity anointed king of Pagan. In the summer of 1299, “when the king appeared in full audience, in the glorious Presence of the Future Buddha Siri Tribhavanādityāpavara-dhammarājā Maṅ Lulaṅ,” a request was made, and the chief witnesses were “the great saṃpyaṅ Asaṅkhayā, the saṃpyaṅ Rājāsankram, the saṃpyaṅ Sinkasū,” etc.252 After the death of her sister, Tarukpliy’s queen, the youngest Phwā Cau, grandmother Saw, became the chief queen of Maṅ Lulaṅ. Horrified, one imagines, at the happenings around her, she left Pagan and settled in the little village of Pwazaw, still called after her, four miles inland from the city. Here she and her daughter and nephew found some comfort in a feverish burst of architectural activity, the last masterwork of Old Pagan – the Hsutaungbyi group with their great brick monasteries,253 the Thitmati brick monastery,254 the Adhittān temple,255 and the last and almost loveliest of the greater temples, the Thitsawadi.256

During the autumn of 1299, if my views about King Sirirāja are correct (supra, p. 153), the Shan brothers must have been busy crushing a Burmese rebellion in the west of Kyauksē. Meanwhile, in the 8th month257 (August 27th-September 25th) Kumārakassapa had made good his escape to Yünنان.
Here, Mängü Türümish, the imperial commissary, warmly espoused his cause. The latter's report was approved by the Emperor who, in the 9th month (September 26th-October 24th) ordered the Council of State to prepare a plan of campaign. This meant a year's delay; for Burma could only be invaded during the cold season, which had had already well begun. In the 12th month (December 24th, 1299-January 22nd, 1300), as soon as he knew that no invasion was imminent, Asan-khayā invaded Chêng-mien province, captured Nga Singu and Malê, and only turned back a few miles short of Tagaung. In the 1st month of the 4th year (January 23rd-February 20th, 1300), Mängü Türümish was summoned to Peking to help in the planning. On May 27th, "fifteen post-stages were added, from Yünan to Mien kingdom." On June 22nd, the Emperor issued a decree declaring Kumārakassapa king and rightful heir to the throne of Mien.

Past masters in deception, the three brothers tried every sleight to avert, or at least delay, the coming invasion. On May 1st, 1300 "Mien kingdom sent envoys to submit a white elephant." Impersonation, even, was attempted. On July 28th, 1300, "Che-su, (i.e., Sihasū), younger brother of A-san-ko-ye of Mien kingdom, and others, 91 persons, each submitted local products and were coming to Court. The Emperor gave orders that the rest be detained at An-ch'ing" (read Chung-ch'ing), "and only Che-su sent to Shang-tu." On September 1st, 1300 (four days later), "A-san-ch'i-ya of Mien kingdom and others, elder and younger brothers, came to the Gate of the Palace, and confessed in person their crime in killing their lord. The Emperor cancelled the expeditionary force to Mien." It was only for a moment, until the fraud was discovered. In the intercalary 8th month (September 14th-October 13th) the Mongol army started from Yünan Fu.

The Shan brothers, even in their graves, could deceive brilliant scholars. Huber does an injustice, I believe, to the Yüan-shih. "It is regarded," he says (p. 662—I translate from
the French), "as the worst-edited of the 24 dynastic histories of China.\(^{269}\) .... Its editorial committee, under the Ming, has shewn great incapacity to use the documents at its disposal. Thus, according to the Yüan-shih, no Chinese army ever besieged Myinzaing. Better still, the Shan usurper Asaómkhaya becomes own brother of King Kyozwa of Pagan, and in 1300 there was no change of capital nor of dynasty. The Yüan-shih chapter on the geography of the Burma frontier is equally worthless ...." On p. 679 he adds: "The official annals of the Yüan" (\emph{i.e.}, the \textit{pên-chi}) "state that in 1300... Kyozwa was killed by his brother Asaómkhaya, who shortly afterwards came to Peking to excuse himself, was pardoned and received investiture. If... the authors had seen the work I have just translated, we should be entitled to conclude that they have knowingly falsified history. But it is fairer to accuse them only of carelessness and ignorance."

In general the \textit{pên-chi} of the Yüan-shih are very full and admirably dated, fuller and better dated, \emph{e.g.}, than those of the Ming-shih. In working out over 150 dates, I have found, if I remember aright, only one mistake. So far as Burma is concerned, omissions there certainly are, but there is little sign of carelessness. The geographical section (\textit{ti-li-chih}, ch. 61) is incomplete; and in writing of Lu-ch'uan (see n. 41) it once says 'east' for 'west'; but my frequent references to it here prove that I have found it very useful. The section on \textit{Mien} (ch. 210) is almost the same as Huber's text, except that it entirely omits the last campaign. Everything that is not in Huber follows exactly the facts and dates as stated in the \textit{pên-chi}. I cannot say, but it is quite possible, that the authors knew the story of the last campaign (as given in Huber), and deliberately rejected it as inconsistent with the evidence of the \textit{pên-chi}, \emph{e.g.}, the Emperor on September 1st cancelling the expedition on the one hand, and the expedition starting a few weeks later on the other. Huber, facing the same dilemma, rejects the \textit{pên-chi}, while the brothers (if they but knew it) rejected Huber's text. I have tried to show that
both sources are valid, and can be reconciled, once we realize that
the Shan brothers were out to deceive and delude, and often
for a while succeeded in doing so.

Huber embroils his case by confusing Che-su with
Klawcwā. This is impossible. Che-su, the name used every-
where, I think, in the Yüan-shih, corresponds to Huber’s
Sēng-ko-su (see n.247). The latter is derived from the San-
skritic Singhasūra, “the Lion Hero”; Chē-su is from the Pali
Sīhasūra. In Old Burmese, forms like Singhasū and Sīhasū
are interchangeable. The Yüan-shih does not deny the siege of
Myinzaing, nor the change of capital or dynasty; it merely
does not mention them, because, presumably, it found the
evidence conflicting. And it nowhere says that Asaṅkhayā was
pardon or received investiture.

The Mongol army was quite a small one, not “the
200,000 soldiers of the Khan mañkerū” whom Asaṅkhayā claims,
three years later, that his younger brother Sīhasūra has
defeated.270 Māngū Tūrūmish had asked for 6,000 men. On
June 2nd, 1300271 the Council of State, “considering that
Burma was strong and could rely on help from Pa-pai-hsi-fu,”
thought he needed “at least 10,000.” The Emperor sanctioned
up to 12,000. Māngū Tūrūmish had asked for two generals to
join him, Hsieh-ch’ao-wu-ērh (Sāchāru?), the Grand Secretary
of Yūnnan, and General Liu Tē-Lu. He asked also for the
State Counsellor, Kao A-k’ang, native chieftain of Yūnnan, The
Prince of the Blood, K’uo-k’uo (“the Blue Prince”) was placed
in nominal command.272 In the 10th month,273 November
13th-December 11th, they entered Burma. On January 15th,
1301,274 they reached Malè, and held a general review.

While the army marched straight on Kyauksè, Kumāra-
kassapa diverged towards Pagan. He is not mentioned in
Burmese Chronicles, but a two-faced inscription275 dated 1302,
at the Shwenan-u pagoda, Paunglaung, mentions him under the
name, Tak tau mu māṅkrī, Taruk praṇī la so Tak tau mū māṅkrī, "the king who came from the land of the Turks and ascended the throne," "King Ascend-the-throne." Some 40 miles above Pagan, on the west bank of the river, he halted to hear a sermon on the way to Nirvāṇa, the Rathavinīta Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya, and to make a dedication of land (afterwards confirmed by the three brothers) "at the royal monastery of the mahāthera Tipitakavilāsa, spiritual preceptor of our lord Sīkapīcañ." Having thus created a favourable impression, he entered Pagan without difficulty. Later he told the Mongols, 276 "Those who through fear are still on the side of the rebels, are few. Everyone is on my side." But when the Mongols retreated, he went with them.

On January 25th, 1301, 277 the army reached Myinzaing, 278 with its three walled enclosures interlocking. The Shan brothers came out to fight, but were driven back within the walls, where they maintained a stout defence. Māngū Tūrūmish and Liu Tē-lu undertook the east and north sides, Hsieh-ch’ao-wu-ĕrh and Kao A-k’ang, the more open west side. They could spare no troops to besiege the south until later, when they mustered 2000 Pai-i (Northern Shans), who were on the lines of communication. The fighting was severe. The defenders mounted mechanical catapults on the walls. To protect themselves, the Taruk had to heap an earth-rampart all round the city. Between February 10th and March 10th, 279 the fortified outpost called "the Stone Mountain" was captured. The grand assault on February 28th 280 was a failure, the Taruk losing over 500 men, killed by arrowshot or crushed beneath the blocks of stone and timber that rained down from the walls. There was little more fighting, but, for the defence there was a real danger of starvation.

The Shan brothers fell back on their old incomparable expedient. On March 12th 281 Asaṅkhayā sent out men who shouted from afar, "We are not rebels. We are loyal
subjects of your Emperor.... We never killed the king. He committed suicide by poison. We are innocent men. We are Mongols. Please accept our submission.” Negotiations and secret corruption followed and the hot weather helped to complete the rout. Between April 6th and 8th,²⁸² the Taruk began their retreat. On April 14th²⁸³ Nga Singu was reached, and a vain attempt was made to rally the routed forces and return. The same day, by elephant, Kumārakassapa’s mother arrived and said, “The rebels held me captive in Myinzaing. I have only just managed to escape. If you had only waited five more days, the rebels would have been bound to surrender. What a pity you left so soon!” The Taruk returned to China by the Mêng Lai Road.²⁸⁴ They had to fight their way through ‘the Gold Teeth’, i.e., the Pai-i, during the following autumn. Under the date of September 10th, 1301,²⁸⁵ we read, “The Emperor sent Hsieh-ch’ao-wu-èrh, etc., to take troops and invade Gold Teeth and other kingdoms. At the time when the army of the Mien expedition was returning, they were intercepted by the Gold Teeth, and many of the soldiers killed fighting.”

On the same day, September 10th,²⁸⁶ the Court of Enquiry appointed by the Emperor reported that every single person of importance, from Prince K’uo-K’uo downwards, had been bribed, “Having let themselves be corrupted, the Commanders-in-Chief had no longer any authority over their subordinates....”

Their triumph accomplished, Burma and the Shan brothers were tactful and assiduous in softening the blow. On July 27th, 1301,²⁸⁷ “The king of Mien sent envoys to offer as tribute nine tame elephants.” On September 16th,²⁸⁸ “I-la-fu-shan, wan-hu of Chêng-mien, and others submitted six tame elephants.” On November 4th,²⁸⁹ “The king of Mien sent envoys to Court with tribute.” The final triumph, after the failure of the Pa-pai-hsi-fu expedition (see infra), came eighteen months later. On April 4th, 1303,²⁹⁰ “the Emperor abolished
Chêng-mien Province split off from Yünnan.” On May 25th,291 “the 14,000 men of the army returned from Chêng-mien were sent back, each man to his post.”

Tribute continued to be submitted. On October 6th, 1303,292 “the king of Mien sent envoys to offer as tribute four tame elephants.” Friendly relations were even established under the new Emperor, Wu Tsung. On February, 1st, 1308,293 “Mien kingdom submitted six tame elephants.” On May 31st,294 again, “Mien kingdom submitted six tame elephants.” On August 3rd,295 “the Emperor appointed Kuan-chu-ssū-chien,” probably a Tibetan, “as Vice-President of the Board of Rites, and To-êrh-chih as Vice-President of the Board of War, and sent them to Mien kingdom.” At this time, Sīhasū, the youngest of the Shan brothers, was busy choosing a site for his new capital near the junction of the rivers. Relations continued to be good under the next Emperor, Jen Tsung. On December 27th, 1312,296 “the lord of Mien kingdom sent his son-in-law, together with Ts'en-fu, chieftain of the Pu-nung Man of Yünnan, to come to Court.” On July 31st, 1315,297 “the lord of Mien kingdom sent his son, T'o-la-ho, and others to come and offer tribute of local products.” On July 20th, 1319,298 “Chao Ch'in-sa of Mien kingdom brought local products and entered the Presence.”

The resistance of the Northern Thai to Mongol aggression appears to have been just as brave, and just as victorious, as that of the Shan brothers. But the harvest was not reaped so neatly, and theirs continued for long to be a troubled border. Not having the Chao-pu-tsung-lu text (see supra, n. 190), the most I can do for the present is to translate seriatim relevant extracts from the pên-chi of the Yüan-shih, from 1300 A.D. onwards:
(i) February 1st, 1301.299 — "The Emperor sent Liu Shên, Ho-la-tai and Chêng Yu, at the head of an army of 20,000 men, to invade Pa-pai-hsi-fu. As usual, he sent orders to Yünnan province to give 5 horses per 10 men of each army, and more, if this was not enough."

(ii) February 18th, 1301.300 — "For the expedition against Pa-pai-hsi-fu, the Emperor gave paper money reckoned altogether at over 92,000 'shoes' (ting)."

(iii) March 27th, 1301.301 — "For the expedition against Pa-pai-hsi-fu, the Emperor set up two wan-hu-fu" (lit. offices controlling ten thousand households), "and four posts of wan-hu. He despatched criminals of Ssūch'uan and Yünnan to follow the army."

(iv) May 21st, 1301.302 — "The Emperor moved the Yünnan army to invade Pa-pai-hsi-fu."

(v) July 4th, 1301.303 — "The Emperor ordered that persons of Yünnan province who volunteered to go on expedition against Pa-pai-hsi-fu, should be given, each man, 60 strings of cowries."

(vi) August 20th, 1301.304 — "The Emperor commanded Yünnan province to divide up the Mongol archers to go on expedition against Pa-pai-hsi-fu."

(vii) September 10th, 1301.305 — "... again, the various southern barbarians on the borders of Pa-pai-hsi-fu have agreed among themselves not to pay taxes and imposts; and they have robbed and killed the government officials. Therefore all are to be attacked."

(viii) March 21st, 1302.306 — "The Emperor dismissed from office the yu-chêng for the expedition against Pa-pai-hsi-fu, Liu Shên, and other officials, and took from them their tallies, seals and post-station coupons."
(ix) April 4th, 1303.307 — "On account of the ruin of the army invading Pa-pai-hsi-fu, the Emperor put to death Liu Shên, and sentenced to flogging Ho-la-tai and Chêng Yu."

(x) December 3rd, 1309.308 — "Yün-nan province stated that Pa-pai-hsi-fu, Great Chê-ľi and Little Chê-ľi were making a disturbance at Ku-pao of Wei-yüan chou, and had snatched and occupied Mu-lo tien; the Emperor had given orders to send the yu-chêng of the province, Suan-chih-êrh-wei, to go and summon and notify them, and, as usual, had ordered 1500 men of the army of Wei-ch’u tao to guard and escort him within their frontier; but Suan-chih-êrh-wei had accepted bribes from Ku-pao (amounting to) 3 'shoes' each of gold and silver; after which, he advanced his force and raided and attacked Ku-pao; but bows and cross-bows were improperly used, and so he was defeated and returned. Not only had he lost the day, but also he had injured our men. 'Let Your Majesty decide!' The Emperor replied 'It is a big matter. We must be quick and select envoys once more to bear a letter with the imperial seal, and go and summon and notify them. As for Suan-chih-êrh-wei, (his life) is pardoned, but he must be rigorously tried.'"

(xi) February 22nd, 1310.309 — "The Emperor sent down orders to summon and notify Great Chê-ľi and Little Chê-ľi."

(xii) February 23rd, 1310.310 — "The Emperor gave orders to notify Pa-pai-hsi-fu, and sent the yu-chêng of Yün-nan province, Suan-chih-êrh-wei, to summon and comfort them."

(xiii) December 6th, 1310.311 — "The ministers of the Central Government reported ..., 'Moreover we are just moving troops to punish Pa-pai-hsi-fu. Our military strength is dispersed and exhausted. Now we propose that the Mongol troops be given one horse each, and the Chinese troops two
horses per ten men. We suggest giving these directly. We request the Emperor to bestow 30,000 'shoes' of paper-money for the purpose.'”

(xiv) May 20th, 1311.312 — “The southern barbarians of Pa-pai-hsi-fu, together with those of Great and Little Ch'è-li, raided the frontier. The Emperor ordered the Prince of Yünnan and the yu-ch'êng A-hu-t'ai to take troops and punish them.”

(xv) March 21st, 1312.313 — “Pa-pai-hsi-fu came and offered as tribute two tame elephants.”

(xvi) September 29th, 1312.314 — “The Emperor sent orders that the yu-ch'êng of Yünnan province, A-hu-t'ai, etc., should lead Mongol troops and follow the Prince of Yünnan and punish the southern barbarians of Pa-pai-hsi-fu.”

(xvii) October 6th, 1312.315 — “The Emperor cancelled the expedition against the southern barbarians of Pa-pai-hsi-fu, and those of Great and Little Ch'è-li. He sent a letter with the imperial seal to summon and notify them.”

(xviii) October 9th, 1312.316 — “The southern barbarians of Pa-pai-hsi-fu and Great and Little Ch'è-li offered as tribute tame elephants and local products.

(xix) November 1st, 1312.317 — “The yu-ch'êng of Yün-nan province, Suan-chih-êrh-wei, was found guilty. The spiritual teacher of the realm (kuo-shih), Shuo-ssû-chi-wa-chieh-êrh, memorialized requesting the Emperor to pardon him. The Emperor reproached him saying, ‘A Buddhist monk should study the writings of the Buddha. Is it proper for him to interfere in state affairs?’”

(xx) November 25th, 1315.318 — “The southern barbarians of Pa-pai-hsi-fu sent envoys to offer as tribute two tame elephants. The Emperor bestowed silks on them.”
(xxi) January 24th, 1320.319 — “The Emperor economized 124 ranks of officials, including sub-prefects and subordinate officials of Ta-li of Yünnan, Great and Little Ch’è-li, and other places, and various officials employed as Confucianist teachers and Mongol instructors.”

(xxii) January 24th, 1324.320 — “Yü Mêng of Ch’è-li of Yünnan made a raid. The Emperor gave orders to summon and notify him.”

(xxiii) January 26th, 1324.321 — “The Hua-chiao (‘Flowery Leg’) southern barbarians of Yünnan made a raid. The Emperor gave orders to summon and notify them.”

(xxiv) September 18th, 1324.322 — “The Emperor sent envoys to notify Great Ch’è-li and Little Ch’è-li of Yünnan.”

(xxv) November 3rd, 1324.323 — “The Ch’è-li southern barbarians of Yünnan made raids. The Emperor sent Wa-érh-to bearing an imperial decree to summon and notify them. Ni-érh, son of their chief Sai-sai, and Tiao Ling, son of Ying-kou-mu, came out and submitted.”

(xxvi) June 14th, 1325.324 — “T’ao La-mêng of Ch’è-li and the Great A-ai southern barbarians, 10,000 soldiers riding on elephants, attacked and captured 14 stockades including To-la....”

(xxvii) August 9th, 1325.325 — “The southern barbarians of Great and Little Ch’è-li came and offered tame elephants.”

(xxviii) August 15th, 1325.326 — “The Emperor sent envoys bearing imperial orders separately to...; to the native official of Chên-k’ang Road, Ni Nang; and to the native official of Mou-chan (or nien) Road, Sai Ch’iu-lo, ordering them to come out and submit....”

(xxix) August 20th, 1325.327 — “The Emperor set up Ch’è-li military and civil tsung-kuan-fu, and appointed the native
Han Sai as tsung-kuan (Governor), wearing at the waist a gold Tiger Tally."

( xxx ) June 11th, 1326.328 — "Chao Nan-tao, southern barbarian of Pa-pai-hsi-fu, sent his son, Chao Zan-t'ing, to offer local products and come to Court."

( xxxi ) August 15th, 1326.329 — "Chao Nan-t'ung, southern barbarian of Pa-pai-hsi-fu, sent envoys to come and offer as tribute tame elephants and local products."

( xxxii ) October 18th, 1326.330 — "The Emperor bestowed on the southern barbarian officials of Great Ch'ê-li who had recently submitted, 75 persons, fur garments, caps, boots and clothes."

( xxxiii ) October 23rd, 1326.331 — "Ai P'ei, chieftain of T'u-la stockade of Wei-ch'u Road of Yünan province; A-wu, son of A-chih-lung, chief of Ching-tung stockade; Ni Tao, younger brother of the lord of Great A-ai stockade; Ai Pu-li, chief of Mu-lo stockade; A-li, native official of Mang-shih Road; T'o-chink'o, younger brother of Ni Nang, native official of Chên-chiang Road; Ch'iu-lo, native official of Mu-t'ieh Road; Ai Yung, nephew of Chao Ai of Great Ch'ê-li; and Wu Chung, native official of Mêng Lung tien — all together submitted local products and came to offer tribute. The Emperor took Chao Ai's land and set up one Mu-to Road, with one Mu-lai chou and three tien (native districts). He took Wu Chung's land and set up one Mêng Lung Road with one tien. He took Ai P'ei's land and set up one tien there. At the same time he conferred on them gold tallies and copper seals, and bestowed the usual silks, saddles and bridles according to their rank."

( xxxiv ) March 14th, 1327.332 — "Chao Nan-t'ung, chief of the southern barbarians of Pa-pai-hsi-fu, came and offered as tribute local products."
(xxxv) August 9th, 1327. — "Sai Ch’iu-lo, native official of Mou-chan (or - nien) Road, summoned and notified the southern barbarian of Pa-pai-hsi-fu, Chao San-chin, to come and submit. San-ch’ieh-chè, native official of Yin-sha-lo (‘Perimeter of Silver Sand’), killed Sai Ch’iu-lo. The Emperor ordered the Prince of Yünnan to send persons to notify them."

( xxxvi ) November 13th, 1327. — "The southern barbarians of Pa-pai-hsi-fu requested the officials to garrison and set up Meng Ch’ing (as a) hsüan-fu-ssū and tu-yüan-hsuan-fu (Comfortership and office of General Commander), with two fu, Mu-an and Mèng Chieh, in their land. The Emperor appointed the sub-prefect and acting comforter of Wu-sa, Ni-Ch’u-kung, and the native official Chao Nan-t’ung as Joint Comforters and General Commanders; and the chao yü jên (‘summoner’), Mi-tê, as sub-prefect and acting Comforter; and Chao San-chin, son of the Assistant General Commander (Chao) Nan-t’ung, as prefect of Mu-an fu; and his nephew, Hun P’ên, as prefect of Mèng Chieh fu. The Emperor made the normal bestowals paper-money and silks, on each according to his rank."

( xxxvii) June 15th, 1328. — "The southern barbarian of Pa-pai-hsi-fu sent his son, Ai Chao, to offer as tribute tame elephants."

( xxxviii) October 15th, 1328. — "The native official of Mèng Ting Road of Yünnan came and offered as tribute local products."

( xxxix) November 20th, 1328. — "The native official of Yin-lo tien of Yünnan, Ai Tsan etc., came and offered tribute of local products."

( xI ) November 24th, 1328. — "The native official of Ch’è-li Road of Yünnan, Tiao Sai, etc., came and offered tribute of local products."
(xli) December 16th, 1328.339 — "Chao Ai, envoy of Pa-pai-hsi-fu kingdom; Ni Fang, etc., native official of Wei-ch'u Road of Yünnan; and Pi-yeh-ku etc., native official of 'the Ninety-Nine Stockades'; each brought local products and came to offer tribute."

(xlii) March 14th, 1329.340 — "A-san-mu, native official of Mêng T'ung (and) Mêng Suan tien (districts) of Yünnan province; Ai Fang, native official of K'ai-nan; Pa-pai-hsi-fu, Gold Teeth, 'the Ninety Nine Caves', and Yin-sha-lo tien; all came and offered as tribute local products."

(xliii) March 28th, 1329.341 — "The Emperor set up the hsüan-wei ssū (Comf ortership) and tu-yüan-shuai-fu (Office of General Commander) of Yin-sha-lo tien and other places."

(xliv) December 15th, 1329.342 — "The Emperor once again set up the military and civil tsung-kuan-fu (office of Governor) of Mêng Ting Road."

(xlv) June 20th, 1331.343 — "Mêng Ting Road and Mêng Yüan Road were both made military and civil tsung-kuan-fu, their rank being 3rd grade. Chê-hsien, Mêng Ch'ing tien, Yin-sha-lo and other tien, were all made into military and civil fu. their rank being 4th grade. Mêng Ping, Mêng Kuang, Chê-yang and other tien were all created military and civil chang-kuan-ssū, their rank being 5th grade."

(xlvii) January 26th, 1342.344 — "Han Sai-tao etc., of Ch'ê-li of Yünnan revolted. The Emperor gave orders to the p'ing-chang-chêng-shih (Grand Secretary) of Yünnan province, T'o-t'o-mu-êrh, to punish and pacify them."

(xlvii) May 13th, 1342.345 — "The Emperor abolished Mêng Ch'ing hsüan-wei-ssū of Yünnan."

(xlviii) February 1st, 1347.346 — "The Emperor set up again the hsüan-wei-ssū of Pa-pai, and appointed the native official Han Pu to inherit his father's rank."
(xlix) February 27th, 1347,347—“Lao Ya and other southern barbarians of Yünnan came to submit. The Emperor set up the military and civil tsung-kuan-fu (Governor's Office) of Keng-tung Road.”

These are all of the extracts I have found in the pên-chi of the Yüan-shih that are concerned with the border of Siam. There is more about the Pai-i of the north, and also about Mien and Mu-pang. But they relate rather the story of the rise of ‘the Maw Shans’, who sacked the two capitals of Central Burma, Sagaing (Cackvin) and Pinya (Panyā) in 1364, and remained a menace to the Chinese of the Ming dynasty for nearly a century. This story must necessarily be made the subject of separate study. Further searches throughout the whole of the Yüan-shih will very probably yield additional fruits. I hope, I shall be able to present them in the pages of a future issue of this Journal.
NOTES

THE EARLY SYĀM IN BURMA’S HISTORY

1. For Northern Thailand (Yonaka), excluding Eastern, Professor Coedès has listed 57 inscriptions (94 faces) on pp. 25-33 of his Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam, Part I, Inscriptions de Sukhodaya (Bangkok 1924), dating from the 14th to the 16th centuries. In East Burma about 10 faces in Old Thai have been found at various sites in the Kengtung plain. And recently, Professor Sören Egerod of Copenhagen, on a brief visit to Möngh Lwe and Möngh yang (50-60 miles north of Kengtung), discovered 14 faces in Old Thai, and heard of others which he had no time or materials to stamp. I cannot estimate the number of Old Thai inscriptions in Laos (Luang Phrabang, Vieng Chan, etc.); but those collected by the Mission Pavie, Fourmeneau, Lunet de Lajonquière, etc., suggest that it may be considerable. I would humbly suggest that it would be a good thing if a small joint committee of scholars of all three countries could visit the sites of these inscriptions, collect and share information, and arrange for their scientific editing under the auspices, if possible, of the three Governments.

2. In this paper I use Thai for the Siamese proper, and Dai for the larger unit, linguistic if not racial, stretching from Ssūch’uan southwards and Assam eastwards. For a note on the word, see Henri Maspero, BEFOE t. XI, 1911, p. 153, n. 1.

3. États hindouisés, p. 320.

4. Pl. II 1126, dated 482 s. Note that the modern Burmese spelling of ‘Shan’ is ṭham:

5. Pl. II 13818, 603 s. (sambyāñ syām).

6. Pl. II 11314, 507 s. (nīḥ syām panyāh).

7. Pl. IV 39122, 661 s. (yan sañī iñā syām).
8. Pl.IV 392\textsuperscript{19}, 662 s. (yanqwat īnā syām).
9. Pl.I\textsuperscript{13}, 65b\textsuperscript{3}, 8710, 9217; II 143a\textsuperscript{9,21}, 143b7,17, 144\textsuperscript{9}, 148b\textsuperscript{3}, (Khantī Poṅiloņ), 153b10, 183a\textsuperscript{2}, 186\textsuperscript{3}; III 2392,8,10, 282\textsuperscript{3}, 283\textsuperscript{14}. These references to Khantī range in date from 554 to 655 s. (1192-1293 A.D.).

10. The Khantī mentioned after Muiwkoīn (Mogaung) and Muiīn Cai (Maing Zin) in the Kyaukse Hill inscription (List 1084a\textsuperscript{5}, 955 s.), is doubtless Singkaling Khantī. The recently discovered Yan-aung-myin pagoda inscription at Thēmaunggan, south of Pinya (Obverse, line 8, 762 s.), claims that in 1400 A.D. the rule of the king extended beyond the Kandu (Kadu) and the Poṅiloņ amrī yok (“Palaungs who grow tails”), to the “heretic kingdoms of the Naked Nagas on the borders of Khantī Khun kyuiw (?)”, as far as the heretic kingdom called Timnasāla where they kill people and turn into spirits,” i.e., the Dimasa Kacharis of Upper Assam.

11. 白衣 Pai\textsuperscript{2}\textsuperscript{-i}. See Y.S. ch. 10 (15th year of chih-yüan, 4th month, ting ch’ou day). According to the Hsin-t’ang-shu ch. 222 B (f. 1 v\textsuperscript{0}), when the Nan-chao invasion of Tongking began (in 854 according to the Man-shu), the invaders styled themselves 白衣沒命軍 Pai-i Mo-ming-chüin “the White Clothes Death-devoted Army.” The invaders were probably, in part, Hsi-yüan or Nung troops (see n.137 infra), speaking a Dai language on the Kuangsi-Tongking border. One wonders if the fame of these heroes, who captured Hanoi in 863, may have led to the adoption of the name by the Dai (Shans) of the Burma frontier. The name 'White Clothes' occurs again on the Yünنان-Tongking border in the Y.S. ch. 15, under date 25th year of chih-yüan, 4th month, kuei wei day. That is, May 30th, 1288 A.D., when 愛魯 Ai-lu reports: “Since we left 中慶 Chung-Ch’ing (Yünنان Fu), on our way through the 羅羅 Lo-lo and 白衣 Pai-i to enter 交趾 Chiao-Chih (Tongking), we have fought, coming and going, 38 battles, and cut off innumerable heads.” But at Y.S. ch. 61, at 蒙自 Mêng-tzŭ in the S.E. of
The Early Syām in Burma's History

Yünnan, on the hill which gives it its name, "there is an old city built by the 白夷 Pai-i ('White Barbarians')."

12. 白夷 Pai²-i¹. See Y.S. ch. 14 (24th year of chih yüan, 8th month, i-ch'ou day). So also at ch. 61 ('Gold Teeth') under date 1254 A.D. (4th year of Hsien Tsung), etc.

13. 白夷傳 Pai³-i²-chuan⁴, of 李思聰 Li Su-t's'ung and/or 錢古訓 Ch'ien Ku-hsün (1 ch. Published by Liu I-chêng, Kuo-hsüeh-t'u-shu-kuan, 1929). See Ming-shih ch. 97, f. 29v⁰ (Pai-na ed.).

14. 雲龍州 Yün-lung chou. Lat. 25° 54', Long. 99° 36' (Playfair 7810). See Y.S. ch. 29 (2nd year of t'ai-ting, 8th Month, hsin-mao day). "Yün-lung 司 tien military and civil fu" is barely mentioned in Y.S. ch. 61.

15. 孟乃甸 Meng Nai tien. See Y.S. ch. 210, section on mien, and the anonymous text translated by Huber, and his note (P. 669, n. 1). Old Meng Nai was north of Meng Mi (Mông Mit): see TSFYCY ch. 119, P. 4752; Tien-hsi 1, 2, f. 59v⁰.


17. 尹良合台 Wu-liang-ho-t'ai. See the biography of him and his father, 遂不台 Su-pu-t'ai, in Y.S. ch. 121.

18. États hindouisés, p. 318: "On parle parfois de 'l'invasion des T'ais' conséquence de 'la poussée mongole' du XIIIe siècle. En réalité, il s'est agi plutôt d'une infiltration lente, et sans doute fort ancienne...."

19. Pl.III 231b¹, 590s.

20. Pl.III 231b⁶ (607s.), where Manorājā is judging a suit at Amyint on the Chindwin. He may well be the Samanta Koncań who was witness to a Pagan dedication in 1237 (Pl. I 100b²⁴, 599s.). See also Pl. II 158²⁰ (607s.); III 248¹¹ (598s.).

21. Pl.I 19⁹ Takoń, a ǸChoń Khyam, Uchotika (?).- 55⁸s.) In
1292 the corresponding northern boundary claimed was Na Chon-tiwâ (Pl.III 276a², 654a).

22. 信苴日 Hsin-chü-jih. See his biography in Y.S. ch. 166.

23. 金齒 Chin-ch’ih. Called by Huber (after Persian and Marco Polo) Zardandan (BEFEO IV, p. 430) or Zerdandan (ibid., IX, p. 665), i.e., ‘Gold Teeth’.

24. 禿書 Man-shu of 永昌 Fan Ch’o ch. 4, f. 9r⁰. 永昌 Yung-ch’ang. 開南 K’ai-nan.

25. Ibid. ch. 4, f. 6 r⁰-v⁰, 7v⁰-8v⁰, 9v⁰-10v⁰, etc.

26. Ch. 61. See especially the final pages, from “Gold Teeth Comfortership” (宣撫司 hsüan-fu-sî) onwards.

27. 罵 P’o. — Hsin-chü-jih and the Tuan ruling family of Nan-chao were of the P’o tribe. Another name for them was 黑爨 Hei Ts’uan, “Black Ts’uan”. 罵夷 P’o-i is said to be a variant of Pai-i, i.e., Shans. See J. Siguret, Territoires et Populations des Confsins du Yunnan, Vol. I, p. 137.

28. 嵐昌 O-ch’ang. Called 阿昌 A-ch’ang today, and in Huber’s text: see his note on p. 667. Linguistically, they are members of the Burma Group, stragglers of the proto-Burman migration, still mostly on the China side of the frontier, south of the Ta-p’ing. They are now Buddhist, and much influenced by the Shans who live around them.

29. 房 P’iao. — The later P’iao or Pyü capital, probably Halingyi south of Shwebo, was sacked by Nan-chao in 832 A.D., and 3000 of its people transported to colonize 拓束 Ché-tung (Yünnan Fu): see Man-shu ch. 10, f. 2r⁰. — Possibly some escaped en route, and settled either on the north bank of the Ta-p’ing in China (thenceforth known to the Chinese as 驤甸 P’iao-tien, “Pyu district”), or on the south bank (thenceforth called 驤嶺 P’iao-shan, in P’ing-mien Road). See Huber’s note on p. 666. “P’iao-tien military and civil fu” is barely mentioned in Y.S. ch. 61.

30. 鴹 Hsieh. — Possibly for 鴹鸛 P’u Hsieh, the original inhabitants of 三蹏 San-t’an (-lan), the old name for 麓江

31. 梁羅 Ch'ü-lo.—Possibly the 曲蠻 (Huber's text 曲蠻) Ch'ü-la, whose submission Nāsir ed-Dīn received in Nov. 1277 on his expedition to 江頴 Chiang-t'ou (Kaungzin). See Y.S. ch. 10 (16th year of chih-yüan, 6th month, kuei-ssü day = July 27th, 1279).

32. 比蘇 Pi-su.—According to the Hsü-han-chih, Pi-su was one of the six districts of the west region of 益州 I-chou (E. Yünnan) which were taken over by Yung-ch'ang, when that commandery was formed in 69 A.D. See *JBR*, Vol. XIV, Part II (Aug. 1924), p. 114. According to J.F. Rock (op. cit., p. 52, n. 13) Pi-su was in modern 雲龍 Yün-lung district.

33. Cf. Y.S. ch. 4 (2nd year of chung-t'ung, 8th month, mou-hsü day i.e., Sept. 4th, 1261): "The Emperor appointed 賀天爵 Ho T'ien-chio as 安撫使 an-fu-shih of Gold Teeth and other kingdoms, with 忽林伯 Hu-lin-po to assist him." Ho T'ienchio was probably Chinese. In 1275 he was still an-fu-shih of Chien-ning Road on the Burma border. His important report of that year is translated infra.

34. A different date is given in ch. 8—April 8th, 1273 (10th year of chih-yüan, 3rd month, jen-shên day): "The Emperor divided Gold Teeth kingdom into two Roads (路 lù)."

35. 建寧路 Chien-ning Road (No description given). 鎮康路 Chên-k'ang Road. "South of 束邏 Jon-yüan Road, and west of the 澜江 Lan-chiang", i.e. Lan-t's'ang chiang, the Mekong. "The land is called 石晝 Shih-shan." 腕 shan, written 腕 t'an in my text of the *Man-shu* (863 A.D.), was the Nan-chao word for river-valley (see *Man-shu* ch. 8, f. 3v).

36. 束邏路 Jon-yüan Road. "West of 大理 Ta-li, and south of 永昌 Yung-ch'ang. The land is called 澜江 Lu-chiang, or 普坪臉 P'u-p'ing chien, or 申臘熈寨 the P'o stockade of Shên-
chien, or 鳥學坪 Wu-mo-p'ing. The P'o barbarians are what the 通典 T'ung-tien calls the 黑霧 Hei (Black) Ts'uan. At the beginning of the chung-t'ung period (1260-3 A.D.), the chieftain of the P'o, 阿八思 A-pa-ssu, came to Court” (Y.S. ch. 61). P'ing=plain. As for 臘 chien—"When the 蒙 (Meng family) (the rulers of Nan-chao) "founded their realm, there were ten chien. In the barbarian language, chien is the same as 州 chou", i.e., prefecture (Y.S. ch. 61). The 臘 chien of Y.S. is probably the same as the 臘 t'an of my text of the Man-shu, (see ch. 6, "the Six t'an"). According to TSFYCY ch. 118, pp. 4723-4, "in the 23rd year of hung-wu (1390 A.D.), Jou-yüan fu was changed into 滬江 Lu-chiang chang-kuan-ssu". In 1411 it was raised to be an an-fu-ssu (Comfortership). Lu-chiang is a corruption of the old 怒江 Nu-chiang, i.e., the Salween. The T'ung-tien, first of the Nine T'ung or encyclo, paedias, was the work of 杜佑 Tu Yu, in 201 chüan, c. 800 A.D.

37. 黑霧 Hei P'o ("Black P'o"). For the P'o, see n. 27 supra


39. 茫施路 Mang-shih Road. "South of Jou-yüan Road, and west of the 滬江 Lu-chiang. The land is called 怒築 Nu-mou, or 大枯碽 Great Ku-shan, or 小 Small Ku-shan. It is what the T'ung histories call the 茫施蠻 Mang-shih Southern barbarians.” (Y.S. ch. 61). Written 芒市 Mang-shih in Ming texts. Both the Ming-shih (ch. 46) and TSFYCY (ch. 119, pp. 4753-4) give"the river of 麓川 Lu-ch'uan" as its western boundary.

40. 鎮西路 Chên-hsi Road. "Due west of Jou-yüan Road. To the east, it is parted from it by Lu-ch'uan. The land is called 千頤瞭 Yü-lai shan or 樂源瞭 Chü-lan shan. The 白夷蠻 Pai-i Man (‘White Barbarians’) inhabit it” (Y.S. ch. 61). According to the Ming-shih (ch. 46) and TSFYCY (ch. 119, p. 4743), it is the 千崖 Kan-yai hsüan-fu-ssu (Comfortership) of the Ming dynasty, i.e., the Kan-ai of modern maps.
41. 麓川路 *Lu-ch’uan Road.* “It is to the east of Mang-shih Road” (I believe ‘east’ is here a mistake for ‘west’). “The land is called 大布茫 Great Pu-mang, or 峨頭附塞 Fu-sai at the head of the shan, or 督中碑吉 Tan-chi at the middle of the shan, or 峨尾福隄培 Fu-lu-p’ei at the tail of the shan. All are inhabited by Pai-i” (*Y.S.* ch. 61).

42. 平缅路 *P’ing-mien Road.* “To the north it is near Jou-yüan Road. The land is called 箘誼 P’iao-shan, or 羅必四庄 Lo-pi-ssü-chuang (‘the Four Farms of Lo-pi’), or 小沙摩弄 Small Sha-mo-lung, or 峨頭 P’iao-shan Head. The Pai-i inhabit it” (*Y.S.* ch. 61). In the *Ming-shih* (ch. 314, section on Lu-ch’uan, 1442 campaign of 王騫 Wang Chi), one finds 番卜思莊 Lo-pu-ssü-chuang and 木亂 Mu-lung. In 1441, according to the *Ming-shih* (ch. 46), Lu-ch’uan and P’ing-mien were cancelled, and in 1444 they merged in 麓川 Lung-ch’uan hsüan. *fu-ssü* headquarters 龍把 Lung-pa: “the P’ing-mien Road of the Yüan was north-east of Lung-pa. The Lu-ch’uan Road of the Yüan was south of Lung-pa.”


44. The source of confusion probably lies in the name 麓川 “the Lu river-valley”. The name for the Salween in T’ang times, 怒江 Nu-chiang, got mispronounced as Lu chiang, variously written in Yüan texts. In the very passage we are considering, it is written 避 Lu chiang (under Jou-Yüan) and 淮 Lu chiang (under Mang-shih). Perhaps it was thought that 麓 Lu was yet another alternative. Note that 淮 Lu in the *Man-shu* (ch. 2, f. 3r⁰) meant the Upper Yang-tzú.

45. 南畑 *Nan-shan*. Described after the Six Roads (*Y.S.* ch.61): “North-west of Chén-hsi Road. The land includes 阿賽畑
A-sia shan and 午真睦 Wu-chên shan. It is inhabited by Pai-i and 峨昌 O-ch'ang.” For the latter, see n. 28 supra.

46. (乞駿 Haber 台) 脫因 Ch'i-t'ai (t'ai)-t'o-yin. See Y.S. ch. 210 Section on Mien (8th year of chih-yüan). Huber’s text, p. 665.

47. Ibid. (10th year), The exact date is given in Y.S. ch. 8 (2nd month, ping-shên day = March 3rd, 1273): “The Emperor appointed 勒馬剃失里 K'an-ma-la-shih-li (Kamala Śrī), 乞帶脱因 Ch'i-t'ai-t'o-yin, and 劉源 Liu Yüan as ambassadors to Mien kingdom, to summon (the king) to send a son or younger brother and minister near the throne, to come to Court.” The section on Mien, ch. 210, gives the text of the imperial letter.

48. Y.S. ch. 210, Section on mien (12th year, 4th month, or April 28th - May 26th, 1275). Huber’s text (pp. 665-6) dates the report 2nd month (Feb. 27th - March 28th, 1275), and only gives the latter part, about the three routes into Burma. For these, see Huber’s full note on pp.665-6.

49. 阿耶 A-kuo.

50. 阿必 A-pi.

51. 阿的八 A-ti-pa.

52. 天都馬 T'ien-up-ma (the Nam Hkam route).

53. 阿提犯 A-t‘i-fan.

54. Y.S. ch. 7 (7th year of chih-yüan, 12th month, ting-wei day). 阿匿福勒丁阿匿爪 A-ni Fu-lo-ting (and) A-ni Chao.

55. Y.S. ch. 210, Section on Mien; Huber’s text, p. 666. 金齒千頜總管阿禾 “A-ho, sung-kuan of Kan-ê of Gold Teeth.” Kan-ê, in Ming texts 千崖 Kan-yai, is modern Kan-ai. The first character is often miswritten 千 Ch’ien.

56. 浦 P’u.-See Mr. 張笏 Chang Hu’s interesting remarks translated into French by J. Siguret, op. cit., t. II, P. 69. J. R. Rock (op. cit., Vol. I, p.5 n.2), probably quoting the Yünnan-t’ung-
chih (ch. 189), identifies the 蓼 P'u with the 撲 P'u (or 滷), whom Tsin and perhaps Later Han texts place on the Burma border S.W. of Yung-ch'ang. This is phonetically impossible. The latter character-group had a final -ē; the former an open vowel (see B. Karlsgen, Grammata Serica, 102 n. 1211). The latter Buok tribes, if they were akin to the 撲 P'u of the Man-shu (ch. 4, f. 6r0-v0), were probably Tibeto-Burman, if not proto-Burmese. On Jan. 9th 1328 (4th year of 孴 t'u, 11th month, hsin-mao day), when the 蓼 P'u submitted, the Emperor set up 順寧 Shun-ning fu (S.of Ta-li W. of the Mekong); see Y.S. ch 30

57. Y.S. ch. 210, Section on Mien; Huber's text, p. 667. 忽都 Hu-tu (Quo? ?) was Mongol Commander of Ta-li Road. Hsin-chü-jih (supra, n. 22) was governor (tsung-kuan) of Ta-li Road. 脫羅脫孩 T'o-lo-t'o-hai, like Hu-tu, was a 千戶 ch'ienhu (Commander of a Thousand Households).

58. Y.S. ch. 210, Section on Mien. Huber's text (pp.666-8) closely corresponds.

59. 南甸 Nan-tien. Old name 南宋甸 Nan-sung-tien. 南宋 Nang-sung is also mentioned (TSFYCY, ch. 119, p. 4742). Nan-tien fu (military and civil) is barely mentioned in Y.S. ch. 61.

60. Pl. III 277, lines 1-6: "In 640s. (1278 A.D.), Vaiśākha year, the great minister called Íntapacrā, since there was no teras, monastery at the site of the Venerable Mahākassapa, made plans that should be one. Before building the monastery, he built the enclosure-wall; and the enclosure-wall was not yet complete when Íntapacrā was stationed at Nā Choḥ Khyam mruiw (fortress), and the government of the country fell into ruin."

61. Y.S. ch. 210, section on Mien; Huber's text, p. 668. I have not had access to the Chinese of this text, apart from the list of place-names (here fuller than in Y.S.) which Huber gives. His characters, too, sometimes differ from those of Y.S. My translation, therefore, is an amalgam, with variants added where possible.
62. 纳速剌丁 Na-su-la-ting, son of the great Muslim minister of Shih Tsu, 禽典赤聮思丁 Sai-tien-ch’ih Shan-ssū-ting (Sayyid Ajall), who organized and pacified Yünnan. See their biographies in Y.S. ch. 125.

63. 猞 Ts’u-an. A general name, dating from the T’ang, for the tribes, largely Lo-lo, mostly of Eastern Yünnan. See Pelliot BEFEO t.VI, pp. 136 follg.

64. 江頭深蹂 Chiang-t’ou Shén-jou. Chiang-t’ou “Head of the River”, was the Chinese name for the city Kaungzin (Ming texts 貢章 Kung-chang), below Bhamo. See Huber’s note on p. 652. It is possible to translate this sentence (much as Huber does): “He reached Chiang-t’ou and deeply trampled on the site where Hsi-an had set up his stockade.” But the expression is odd. I suspect that the original reading was 蹣深 Jou-shèn, old pronunciation न्यू-श्यॅम (see B. Karlgren, Analytic Dictionary of Chinese, 942, 970); i.e., Na Chon Khyam, and that since this was not recognized as a proper name, the characters were inverted to make them intelligible.

65. Stockades named: 木乃 Mu Nai. 木娄 Mu Yao. 蒙帖 Méng T’ieh. 木巨 Mu Chü. 木秃 Mu T’u. 磨欲 Mo Yü. 当蛾 (H. 蝈) 蒲折 Ch’ü-la P’u-chê. 孟磨爱吕 Méng Mo Ai lü. 磨条 Mo Nai. 蒙匡 Méng K’uang. 里答 (H. 里答) 八刺 Li-ta (H. Hei-ta)-Pa-la. 蒙忙 (H. 古) 向甫隄堡 (H. 保) Méng Mang (H. Ku) tien Fu-lu-pao. 木都鈹秃 Mu Tu Tan T’u.

66. Y.S. ch. 10 (16th year, 6th month, kuei-ssù day). The first stockade mentioned, 忙 Mang, should be the Méng Mang of n. 65. Huber’s ‘Méng Ku’ (usually = Mongol) is probably a mistake.

67. Supra, n. 15; infra, 104.

68. 蛮莫 Man-mo, at the foot of 蛮哈 Man-ha Mt. Split off from 孟密 Méng Mi (Möng Mit) in the 13th year of wan-li, 1585 A.D. (see TSFYCY ch. 119, pp. 4752-3). Here is still