001 Halingyi

ASB 1913, 15 ***?***

Apart from mentioning the Halingyi inscription as part of a general summing up of Pyu epigraphy at the time, this citation has little worthwhile content.

ASB 1915, 21-3 ✔ (mentioned twice in the inventory entry)

This citation was already confirmed. It follows up the above report on the Halingyi inscription. Includes both Blagden’s and Sastri’s transliterations. Full record in my detailed notes.

ASI 1904-05, 126 ***?*** 

Mentions the Halingyi find (identifying the inscription as Sanskrit) in the course of summarizing discoveries in Burma. Little of value.

003 Surivikrama’s relative(s)

ASI 1911-12 p. 147 

Most likely only about 005 and 006, not about 003. Plate LXIX, fig. 1, opp. Page 149, shows an urn with relatively long lid flange and narrow diameter, Harivikrama visible in the inscription, i.e. 005.

ASI 1912-13, pt. I, 29 ***?***

Mentions the five urns and cites Blagden’s translation of four of them, including 003.

ASB 1912, 7, 11-2

Most likely refer to 005 and 006, not 003.

004 (Surivikrama)

ASI 1912-13, pt. 1, page 29: ***?***

Discusses the five urns with reference to Blagden’s dating. As for 003.

ASB 1912, 7, 11-12 

Most likely refer to 005 and 006.

ASB 1914, p. 20 ***?***

Like ASI 1912-13, pt. 1, page 29, only makes reference to Blagden’s paper “the Pyu inscriptions”. No specific details other than Blagden’s tentative translation.

005 (Harivikrama)

ASB 1914, p. 20 ***?***

Like ASI 1912-13, pt. 1, page 29, only makes reference to Blagden’s paper “the Pyu inscriptions”. No specific details other than Blagden’s tentative translation.

ASB 1912, 7, 11 ✔

P. 7: notes the discovery, 220 feet to the south of the pagoda – two stone reliquaries, side by side = 005 and 006. One is larger than the other - probably 005.

P. 11, long reference to 005 and 006, with mention of Harivikrama and Sihavikrama.

ASB 1913, 13-4 

Refers only to 004 and 002, though does cite ASB 1912 where Taw Sein Ko’s two urns (005 and 006) are mentioned in passing.

006 (Sihavikrama)

ASB 1913, 13-4 

As noted above, refers only to 004 and 002.

*On the urns, the dimensions given in ASB and ASI don’t correspond very closely to those in the inventory. E.g., ASB 1913, 13-4, talking about 004, gives dimensions of : 2’11” (h), 3’6” (dia). Inventory gives h. 95 (3’1”) - close, dia. 67 (2’2”) – not so close. Perhaps there’s confusion between internal and external diameter.*

011 Tharaba Gate

ASB 1907, 10 ✔

Brief reference to the inscription, no details.

ASB 1910, 21***?***

Mentions a bilingual inscription in Chinese and Mongol ... only a few characters legible … set up to demonstrate the tribute relationship.

ASB 1913, 15 ✔

Mentions the inscription in the course of listing the 12 Pyu inscriptions discovered by that time.

ASB 1916, 18 (with n. ‡) ✔, 20 ✔

The part on p. 18 with the note was confirmed earlier. The second part of this citation is on page 20 (paragraph 51). It makes reference to 011 and observes that Pyu rather than Bs was used at this late date.

ASB 1917, 24-25 ✔

Clear mention of the inscription “set up in 1284, in order to commemorate the invasion”.

ASB 1922, 17 ✔

Mentions 011 in longer discussion about the fall of Pagan.

012 Amarapura stele

Add this? ASB 1912, 12 §37 ✔

Makes reference to a Pyu inscription in Bodawpaya’s Amarapura collection. “In that collection an epigraph in the Pyu character was found…” “I [=Blagden] have studied the impression and the photograph … The inscription may belong to about the fourth century A. D.”

020 The Hpayahtaung urn

Rubbing in MHRJ 11 / unnumbered pages in MHRJ 11 ✔

Tun Aung Chain article provides, in an appendix, photographs of the inscription and a transliteration done (earlier) by Than Tun, Nyein Maung and San Win. The appendix is unnumbered. In MHRJ, the last page of TACh’s article before the appendix is 14, the first of San Win’s is 15.

San Win 1998, 2000-1 ✔

San Win 2000-1 is the same as the 2003 publication in MHJR, except for a few things, e.g., the 2000-1 version has the 4th king as Grimhtū Vikrama, while the 2003 version has a new and more correct reading - Brithu Vikrama (cf. our <briṁthu vi(k·)krama>; perhaps San Win realized that anusvara does not represent a nasal in Pyu).

Christian noted (and the German note at the beginning of the IAZ 2000-1 article confirms it if I understand it correctly), 2000-1 is an English version of 1998. I now have the 1998 article and while I can’t be sure that there aren’t some minor differences, it looks as though the 2000-1 article is indeed a translation of the 1998 one.

035 megalithic relief sculpture, very worn.

R. le May, Culture of SEA, fig. 3; also p. 47

Should be Fig. 2 captioned “Stone Stela. Group of Pyu”. (Also mis-cited by Luce PPPB I, 53, 58 n. 43, 149, which may be the source of the error.) Le May notes that the stele shows several dozen figures in three ranks beneath a lower torso. The inscription is almost completely worn away, except for a few aksharas in the top left of the frieze. See also p. 47, from the middle of the page.

Guy 2014, cat. 39

Rewrite as: Guy 2014, p. 90 (cat. 39)