

[論文]

The Third Nikāya-like Order in Thailand:
Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, an Unknown Ethnic Mon Order
throughout the 20th Century

Wada, Michihiro

タイ国における第三の宗派的僧団
——少数民族モンの僧団ラーマン・タンマユット (c. 1898～2003)
の宗派的特徴について——

和田 理 寛

ラーマン・タンマユット（ラーマンニャ・ダンマユッティカ）は、19世紀末、タイ国のバンコク周辺で生まれた少数民族モンの僧団である。規模は比較的小さく、2002年時点での所属僧院は27院である。この僧団の存在は、現地タイ社会においてさえほとんど知られておらず、タイ国内外の学界もこれまで関心を示してこなかった。本稿は、このラーマン・タンマユットの成立から廃止までの経緯を明らかにするとともに、タイ国公認宗派との関係に注目することで、同僧団が固有の宗派（ニカーヤ）としての特徴を1世紀もの間、維持してきたことを論じる。また同時に、この事例を通して、宗派の創始、所属変更、統合はどのように行われるのか、民族宗派とは何かという点から、上座部宗派の理解に貢献したい。

タイ国の上座部僧伽については、1902年の僧伽統治法発布を契機として、全ての出家者を余すところなく統治管理するための制度が整えられ、宗派もまたタンマユット派とマハー派（マハーニカーイ）の公認2派のみに限定されて今日に至ると理解されてきた。しかし、ラーマン・タンマユットは、ニカーヤを

自称しないものの、創始後から21世紀に入るまで、この2派とは独立した第3の宗派の特徴を示してきた。同僧団は、元々、モン僧の一部がタンマユットに転入することで生まれており、公認宗派別の管理が明確化した1950年代以降は、制度上、タンマユットに所属してきた。それにも関わらず、同僧団は、マハー派はもちろん、タンマユット派とも具足戒式（出家式）や布薩などの羯磨を共に行わない傾向が顕著であり、この点で固有の宗派としての特徴を持っていたといえる。とくに具足戒式では、白四羯磨をモン式とタンマユット式の2つの発音で唱える独特の実践を続けてきた。かつてモン僧は、誦経発音の違いや、共住しない傾向、あるいは共に羯磨を行わない傾向をおそらく理由として、タイ僧とは別の民族的なニカーヤとしてタイ国内で認識されていたが、ラーマン・タンマユットは、このうちモン式誦経の実践という点でも、タンマユット派内における民族的下位集団としての特徴を際立たせてきた。2003年、ラーマン・タンマユットは、還俗せずにもう一度具足戒式を受ける「ダルヒーカンマ」（重ね出家式）という儀礼を通して最終的にタンマユット派に統合されたが、ダルヒーカンマが必要とされたこともまた、ラーマン・タンマユットとタンマユットがそれまで別々の宗派であると認識されてきた証左といえよう。

Keywords: *nikāya*, ethnic *nikāya*, *dalhīkamma* (adding-ordination), Mon

In theory there is only one *saṅgha* across all Theravāda Buddhist societies, which follows the same Pāli canon. In practice, however, in addition to the “national *saṅgha*” formed by each country, Theravāda *saṅgha* are divided into several monastic orders called “*nikāya*,” such as the Dhammayuttika Nikāya, the Shwegyin Nikāya, and so on. What, then is a *nikāya*? Has it been sufficiently explained and understood? Two types of research deal with the *nikāya* or similar monastic orders—philological studies by using Pāli scripture and area studies by using local vernaculars. A great gap separates the two.

Philological studies on Buddhism explain how *nikāyas* are formed in principle. Heinz Bechert defines a *nikāya* simply as “a group of monks who mutually acknowledge the validity of their *upasampadā* [ordination

of monks], and consequently, if staying within the same *sīmā* [boundary or ordination hall], can commonly perform *vinayakarmas* [*vinayakamma* in Pāli]” (Bechert 1982: 67–68).⁽¹⁾ In other words, monks belonging to different *nikāyas* usually do not conduct *vinayakamma*, especially *upasampadā*, together (Bechert 1990: 4–5). This definition is very valid to comprehend today’s monastic communities, as discussed in this paper. Bechert’s research, however, does not provide sufficient detailed field information to verify whether each monastic order named *nikāya* really has such characteristics or not. It is also not clear whether any orders that have *nikāya*-like characteristics as Bechert describes them exist, but are not called *nikāya*. Based on field data, we will focus on whether groups of monks do or do not conduct *saṅghakamma* (that is, the above mentioned *vinayakamma*) together in order to distinguish their feature as *nikāya*.⁽²⁾

Area studies on Theravāda Buddhism, on the other hand, have historically and anthropologically revealed the detailed practices of various groups and networks of monks, with indifference to the principle of *nikāya* as described above. For instance, Mendelson’s great work on the relationship between the *saṅgha* and the state in Burma/Myanmar uncovered the histories of the King Mindon sects, which conformed to strict *vinaya* (monastic discipline), and of some other sects regarded as unorthodox by Burmese authorities (Mendelson 1975).⁽³⁾ His work, however, was criticized by Bechert for not sufficiently considering the legal procedures of monks (referred to as *saṅghakamma* in this paper) (Bechert 1990: 1). Anthropologist literature in Japanese (see for example Hayashi 2011: 48–49; Kuramoto 2014: 31) also focuses on the innumerable teacher-pupil networks that appear and disappear over time, without paying full attention to the term *nikāya* and the practice of *saṅghakamma* related to it.

Researchers focusing on principles based on Pāli scripture and those focusing on the social facts of particular field sites should be able to cooperate to reach a better understanding of monastic community, but their concerns seem to face different directions. How can the two

approaches help each other? It is hoped that the case study of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika presented in this paper will contribute to bridge Buddhism studies and area studies for a better understanding of *nikāya*, even though I entirely depend on Bechert's definition of *nikāya* because I, a researcher of area studies, cannot examine the sources in Pāli or Sanskrit.

The Rāmañña Dhammayuttika (T. Rāman Thammayut) is a small monastic group consisting of ethnic Mon monks.⁽⁴⁾ It was founded around 1898 and remained intact until 2003 as a “*nikāya*-like” order in Central Thailand. It is almost unknown, even in local Thai society, not to mention foreign academia; nearly no English study mentions this group.⁽⁵⁾ Monks belonging to the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika rarely display, if not make a secret of, the history of their order and its “*nikāya*-like” features. During my stay in Thailand of about 10 months during 2009–2010, I learned Mon language at a Mon monastery one to four times every month. Yet, it was not until three years later that I realized that the monastery where I learned Mon had belonged to the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, and the abbot who I had met various times was the de facto head of the order. Although it had already been integrated into the Dhammayuttika Nikāya in 2003, the network of monks and their monastic practice of “bilingual chanting,” which will be described later, were alive when I attended the class, and are still today.

The purpose of this paper is to reveal the short history of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, focusing on the following two points: (1) Why can we call it a “*nikāya*-like” order, and if we can do so, should we reconsider the accepted understanding that there have only been two *nikāyas* in Thailand throughout the 20th century, and (2) How has it existed for more than one hundred years and how did it come to an end as a “*nikāya*-like” order?

By unveiling the history of this ethnic monastic order's continuance and abolition, it is hoped that this study will contribute to discussions and understanding of what a *nikāya* or “*nikāya*-like” order is, as follows: why does it exist in accordance with ethnic boundaries, how is it integrated or abolished, and how do monks change the one they belong to?

1. What is an Ethnic Nikāya?

Thailand today officially has two *nikāyas*, namely, the Dhammayuttika Nikāya (T. Thammayut Nikāi) and the Mahā Nikāya (T. Mahā Nikāi). Each of the two *nikāya* governs its members separately within a state *saṅgha* organization. Since 1902 Thailand has controlled its monks by establishing an extremely centralized and bureaucratic *saṅgha* organization under state law. As a result, for example, even the selection and appointment of an abbot of an ordinary monastery in a village is now made by monks at higher administrative levels, not by the pupil-monks of the ex-abbot of the monastery or the villagers. This *saṅgha* administration today is divided according to the two *nikāyas* at sub-national levels (which includes subdistrict, district, province, region, and area levels); for example, a Mahā Nikāya abbot of an ordinary monastery is appointed by a Mahā Nikāya monk who is the governor of the province where the monastery is located. Unlike the sub-national levels, the *saṅgha* administrators at the national level (the Saṅgha Supreme Council or T. *Mahā Thēra Samākhom*) consists of monks from both *nikāyas*.⁽⁶⁾

The Dhammayuttika Nikāya was established by Mongkut (who later became King Rāma IV). It began as a reformation movement of the *saṅgha* in the first half of the 19th century, when Mongkut was a Buddhist monk. When the Dhammayuttika Nikāya was formed, all monks who were not in the Dhammayuttika Nikāya came to be regarded as Mahā Nikāya monks. It is significant to note that these two *nikāyas* have not conducted, nor conduct today, *upasampadā* and other *saṅghakamma* together, due to the refusal of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya to do so. This condition is precisely the primary feature of a *nikāya* as defined by Bechert.

The definition of *nikāya* by Bechert, however, does not consider local usage of the word *nikāya*. Craig Reynolds, a famous Thai historian, notes that the term *nikāya* in Thailand is used not only for monastic lineages legitimized by themselves, but also for groups of monks

having the same ethnic identity (Reynolds 1972: 7, 201). Indeed, Prince Wachirayān (Vajirañāṇavarorasa), a Saṅgharāja (a head of an official monastic hierarchy) of Siam (today's Thailand) recognized three *nikāyas* in his country until 1902: namely, the Dhammayuttika Nikāya, the Mahā Nikāya, and the Rāmañña Nikāya (T. Rāman Nikāi) (*Thaleangkān Khana Song*, vol. 2: 1–2). Among them, the Rāmañña Nikāya refers to ethnic Mon monks in Siam as a whole, even though they were not organized into one association.⁽⁷⁾

Why is it that the Rāmañña Nikāya monks, who share the same ethnicity, can be called a *nikāya*? Reynolds does not answer this question. In my opinion, the colloquial and written language used and studied daily in the monastery, and the pronunciation of Pāli chanting, which differs from ethnicity to ethnicity, are key reasons.⁽⁸⁾ The languages and chanting pronunciations used by Burmese, Central Thai, Mon, and Khmer monks are quite different from each other, which can create a tendency to live in separate monasteries (although this is by no means a rule). As a result, they tend not to conduct *upasampadā* or other *saṅghakamma* together, even though it is not prohibited. Different chant pronunciation does not determine whether monks can conduct *saṅghakamma* together or not, because *saṅghakamma* is usually recited by one monk only, not chanted by many. However, different languages and chant pronunciations can result in monks living in different monasteries and, accordingly, not conducting *saṅghakamma* together. If monks of different ethnic groups tend not to hold *saṅghakamma* and ordinations together, they consequently take on the primary feature of a *nikāya* by Bechert's definition.

To summarize, the term *nikāya* refers to at least two types of groups of monks: one is intentionally formed as a result of legitimatizing their monastic lineage and practice, and the other unintentionally emerges as a result of a tendency to live in separate monasteries due to differences in daily language use/learning and the pronunciation of Pāli chanting. We would like to call the latter “ethnic *nikāya*.”

2. Ethnic Mon Order in Thailand: A Century of Change

Mon language is a relative of Khmer, and they, together with other languages, compose the Mon-Khmer branch of the Austroasiatic language family. Today, people who speak Mon (and their living descendants, who may or may not speak Mon) mainly live in Burma/Myanmar, where Burmese speakers are the majority, and in Thailand, where Thai speakers are the majority. However, each of the three—Mon, Thai, and Burmese—belong to different language families.

Burma/Myanmar currently has about 1 to 1.2 million Mon speakers as an ethnic minority. In Thailand, a Mon cultural leader enumerated that the country had 94,229 Mon people during 1969–1972 (Sujaritlak et al. 1995: 13–15). Today the Mon in Thailand are in the process of linguistically assimilating and the young generation (those under 30–40 years old) have mostly become monolingual Thai speakers.

In mainland Southeast Asian history, the Mon are well known as early accepters of elements of Indian civilization, such as Buddhism. For instance, historians generally think that Mon was the dominant language of Dvāravatī, an ancient Indic civilization of the 6th–10th century, prior to Thai/Tai speakers prevailing and assuming hegemony over the Chao Phraya basin in approximately the 13th century. In today's lower Burma/Myanmar, the Kalyānī inscriptions erected by King Dhammacetī in both Mon and Pāli commemorate his purification of the *saṅgha* through the importation of the ordination lineage from Sri Lanka to the Kalyānī Sīma in Pegu in the late 15th century, which is well known as one of the monumental projects of Theravādin history in Southeast Asia.

As mentioned above, the monastic authority in Bangkok recognized the existence of a Mon order, the Rāmañña Nikāya, until at least 1902. In addition, Mon monks enjoyed two privileges in 19th century Siam/Thailand. First, an official division of the *saṅgha*, called the “Rāmañña Division” (T. Khana Rāman), was comprised of Mon monks.⁽⁹⁾ A senior Mon monk was

Governor of the Rāmañña Division (T. Chao Khana Rāman) and “nominally” governed the Mon *saṅgha* in the whole kingdom.⁽¹⁰⁾ His rank in the state *saṅgha* was quite high: the last Governor of the Rāmañña Division was conferred the Dhamma (T. Thammasa) grade of *Phrarāchākhana-phūyai* (the title for highest ranking monks); this was about the 15th highest-ranking monk in the whole kingdom in 1910 (Sommot and Damrong 2002 (1923): 21, 44–45). Second, an official Buddhist examination was held specifically for Mon monks and novices by orally translating between Pāli and Mon (T. Parian Rāman). No Theravāda monks from any other ethnic minority enjoyed either of these privileges in and around Bangkok during the 19th century.

In the early 20th century, Thai authorities abolished the two privileges enjoyed by Mon monks. The Rāmañña Division was dissolved and its members were integrated into the divisions of the Mahā Nikāya around 1902, when the Saṅgha Act, the first modern state law related to *saṅgha* administration, was enacted. The last Governor of the Rāmañña Division, whose position perhaps became only in name after 1902, died in 1912 and his deputy died in 1919 (Sommot and Damrong 2002 (1923): 180, 189–190). More seriously for the future of the Mon language in Thailand, the Parian Rāman was also abolished in 1912. Prince Wachirayān, a Saṅgharāja who reformed the official Buddhist examination during the 1910s, proposed the abolishment.⁽¹¹⁾ King Wachirāwut (Rāma VI) entirely approved of the proposal, believing that people all over the country should be educated in Thai language and Thai letters to build a sense of comradeship without dividing themselves as Thai, Mon, and Lao (NA. R.VI. file number between S.11/7 and S.11/8).

Traditionally, Mon monasteries have taught Mon literacy to children in the villages. However, when the Buddhist examination could no longer be taken in Mon, the language became worthless as a means to improve one’s social status in Thailand. In addition to the vernacular itself, chanting Pāli with Mon pronunciation also gradually declined. As part of this decline,

Mon monks first became “bilingual” in Pāli chanting, that is, they were able to chant either with Mon or Thai pronunciation depending on the situation.⁽¹²⁾ The case of a Mon monastery in a Mon village 60 km from Bangkok (in an area where Mon language is most spoken in Thailand today) illustrates this process. Until the late 1950s, the Mon monks there (who belonged to the Mahā Nikāya) chanted *pāṭimokkha* only with Mon pronunciation.⁽¹³⁾ From the late 1950s, they began chanting *pāṭimokkha* alternately in Thai and Mon pronunciation and thereafter the practice of chanting it with Mon pronunciation disappeared. Although one can still sometimes hear chanting with Mon pronunciation in this monastery today, for example when the five or eight precepts are administered to lay people, the *pāṭimokkha* and *upasampadā*, which are part of *saṅghakamma*, are now chanted only with Thai pronunciation.⁽¹⁴⁾ With the exception of only extremely rare cases, all the Mon monasteries belonging to the Mahā Nikāya in Thailand have put an end to chanting *upasampadā* with Mon pronunciation.⁽¹⁵⁾ This may be the reason why the Mon *saṅgha* is now not commonly called the Rāmañña Nikāya in Thailand, both officially and unofficially. The boundary between the Mon and Thai *saṅgha* has become more obscure than before, as Mon monks have come to speak in Thai and chant Pāli with Thai pronunciation more and more, and mostly conduct *saṅghakamma*, especially *upasampadā*, only in Pāli with Thai pronunciation.⁽¹⁶⁾

3. The birth of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika

Some Mon monks, however, were not integrated into the Mahā Nikāya Divisions around 1902. These monks formed the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, on which this paper will focus. It may be said that the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika was born accidentally, during the Thai authorities’ efforts to centralize the *saṅgha* before 1902.

As mentioned above, there had been an official Mon *saṅgha* division,

which was a self-governed body under the Thai *saṅgha* authority until about 1902. It was called the Rāmañña Division (T. Khana Rāman) and was headed by the governor Chao Khana Rāman. The control of the Rāmañña Division, however, did not reach all the Mon monasteries in Siam/Thailand. This was also true of the *saṅgha* in general in Siam/Thailand, which did not have complete control throughout the whole kingdom during the 19th century. *Saṅgha* administrators were appointed by the king only in the royal monasteries, which were mostly located in the areas around the capital, leaving numerous commoner monasteries completely unorganized by Bangkok (Ishii 1986: 71–72). Although the capital appointed *saṅgha* governors for distant provinces, their rule was merely symbolic (Reynolds 1972: 235).

In addition, serious conflicts between the Governor of the Rāmañña Division (Chao Khana Rāman) and his deputy (T. Rōng Chao Khana Rāman) in the late 19th century meant that the former could not rule the latter's faction.⁽¹⁷⁾ The Minister of Education and King Chulālongkōn (Rāma V) planned to integrate all the Mon monasteries in the entire Kingdom first under the Rāmañña Division, and then, in 1894, place it under the control of Dhammayuttika Division (before the enactment of the *Saṅgha* Act of 1902). This plan failed, however, owing to the feud between the Governor of Rāmañña Division and his deputy, as well as Prince Wachirayān's (the Governor of the Dhammayuttika) refusal to accept Mon monasteries into the Dhammayuttika Division. Eventually, the Rāmañña Division was integrated into the divisions of the Mahā Nikāya around 1902.

Factions in the Mon *saṅgha*, however, included not only those of the Governor of Rāmañña Division and his deputy. During the Minister and King Chulālongkōn's planning to integrate all Mon monks as mentioned above, a third group of Mon monks avoided the rule of the Governor of Rāmañña Division by voluntarily converting to the Dhammayuttika Division in 1898. The Governor of Ayutthaya Division at that time (Chao Khana Krung Kao) helped to convert these Mon monks into Dhammayuttika

monks in compliance with their request.⁽¹⁸⁾ This third group, led by the abbot of today's Sālādaeng Nua Monastery in Pathumthānī, was called "Mon Plaeng" or "Rāman Plaeng" (meaning "Changed Mon" or "Changed Rāman") by the Bangkok authorities. This third group is what we call the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika in this paper.⁽¹⁹⁾

The number of monasteries belonging to the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika during the first half of the 20th century is unclear, but it remained stable during the latter half of the 20th century, with 26 monasteries in 1974, and 27 in 2002.⁽²⁰⁾ These monasteries were scattered in 9 (in 1974) or 8 (in 2002) provinces around Bangkok,⁽²¹⁾ about half of which were concentrated in Pathumthānī Province.⁽²²⁾ It is still unclear how the network spread from Pathumthānī northward and southward of Bangkok.⁽²³⁾

The semi-independent character of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika is the most relevant for this paper: that is, its *nikāya*-like features. The order maintained these features continuously for more than one hundred years, since its beginnings until 2003. As such, can we regard it as the third *nikāya*-like order in 20th century Thailand? In the next section we will consider the *nikāya*-like features of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika in detail.

4. The Century-long Nikāya-like Features of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika

Mon Plaeng, Rāman Plaeng, or later, Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monks have never called themselves, nor have they been officially recognized as, a *nikāya*. In practice, however, they have conducted themselves as a *nikāya*-like order throughout the 20th century: that is, they tended not to conduct *saṅghakamma*, especially *upasampadā*, with other monks who belonged either to the Mahā Nikāya or the Dhammayuttika Nikāya.

For a long time, the Rāman Plaeng did not even conduct *saṅghakamma* with other Mon monks who belonged to the Mahā Nikāya (Bunchuai 1974: 126). The case of conflict between two neighboring Mon monasteries in

Phrapradaeng confirms this. According to contemporary sources, when Thai authorities as very high monk officers, that is, Chinnawōn and Saṅgharāja Prince Wachirayān, planned to consolidate the two monasteries in 1913 for ease of control, a dispute regarding *uposatha* arose, because each of the two Mon monasteries belonged to different orders: the Mahā Nikāya and the Rāman Plaeng.⁽²⁴⁾ As a general rule, if the two monasteries were consolidated into one, all the monks would be expected to hold *uposatha* observance together in one ordination hall. In this case, however, the abbot of the Rāman Plaeng monastery ordered the monks from the neighboring Mon monastery (which belonged to the Mahā Nikāya) to conduct *uposatha* in the ordination hall of his Rāman Plaeng monastery, not together with his monks, but rather at different times. Citing this demand as one of the reasons, the lay people who supported the Mahā Nikāya Mon monastery opposed the consolidation plan. Therefore, Chinnawōn, who had planned this consolidation, explained to the lay people that monks in the two concerned monasteries could perform the *uposatha* ceremony either separately in the ordination hall of their own monasteries or in the same ordination hall at different times, for the Rāman Plaeng monks and the other Mon monks were “like different *nikāyas*” (*Phramahā Samanasātsana lāiphrachat rawāng Somdet Phramahāsamanachao...* 1989: 28, 31–34).

The Rāman Plaeng, or the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, did not hold *saṅghakamma* together with the Dhammayuttika Nikāya, either. Bunchuai quoted the words of a monk who later became the abbot (1958–1961) of Wat Bōwōnniwēt (the main monastery of Dhammayuttika Nikāya) as follows: we Dhammayuttika Nikāya and Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monks “have kept a distance each other for a long time, have not held *saṅghakamma* together quite a while, and have not had mutual contact for some time past” (original source dated in 1953) (Bunchuai 1974: 126). My interview with an abbot of Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monastery confirms this. According to him, the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika and the Dhammayuttika Nikāya did not conduct *saṅghakamma* together until 2003.

For instance, he explained, a senior Dhammayuttika monk who is today a member of the Saṅgha Supreme Council (T. *Mahā Thērara Samākhom*) told him when the senior monk was still young and stayed at a Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monastery in Pathumthānī, the abbot there as his host said that, “you are Thammayut Yai [Big Dhammayuttika, meaning the Dhammayuttika Nikāya], so you cannot join our *pātimōk* [*pātimokkha* or *uposatha* observance in this context]” (Interview, February 2016). In short, the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika tended not to conduct *saṅghakamma* together with monks who belonged either to the Mahā Nikāya or the Dhammayuttika Nikāya.⁽²⁵⁾

Furthermore, Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monks performed ordinations in a distinct way, that is, they used “bilingual chanting” in *ñatticatutthakamma* (the most important part of the *upasampadā*, or higher ordination, asking participating monks permission for an applicant to become a member of the *saṅgha*). Bunchuai explains that Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monks first chant *ñatticatutthakamma* in Pāli with a Mon pronunciation, and then chant it again in Pāli with the Magadha pronunciation (the Dhammayuttika Nikāya’s pronunciation), or vice versa (Bunchuai 1974: 124).⁽²⁶⁾

Moreover, a “Committee of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika Division (T. *Khana kammakān Khana Rāman Thammayut*)” consisting of four Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monks was formed with the support of the Dhammayuttika.⁽²⁷⁾ The task of the Committee was to train and elect applicants to become *upajjhāyas* of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika.⁽²⁸⁾ It was necessary for the applicants to chant *ñatticatutthakamma* using both Mon and Dhammayuttika pronunciations; the Committee therefore trained their applicants before recommending them to the Dhammayuttika Nikāya to ask for their official appointment as *upajjhāyas* (Bunchuai 1974: 125).

According to my field research in 2017, six *upajjhāyas* from the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika remain in Thailand and continue to conduct “bilingual chanting” during the *ñatticatutthakamma* of an *upasampadā*.⁽²⁹⁾ I had the opportunity to observe such an ordination under one of the

six *upajjhāyas* in 2014. During the ritual, two teacher-monks chanted *ñatticatutthakamma* in turns, first in Pāli with a Mon pronunciation, and then in Pāli with the Dhammayuttika Nikāya's pronunciation, to ask permission from the *saṅgha* for an applicant to become a monk. Interestingly, the applicants for ordination are also supposed to do “bilingual chanting,” but not during the *ñatticatutthakamma*. In the case that I observed, the applicants chanted in Pāli with both the Dhammayuttika Nikāya and the Mon pronunciation in turn before the *ñatticatutthakamma*, when asking the *saṅgha* to ordain him.

In brief, the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika retained *nikāya*-like features, based not only on its exclusive *saṅghakamma*, but also on its unique “bilingual chanting” during *upasampadā*. How did the Dhammayuttika Nikāya regard such a *nikāya*-like order or sub-group under its control: negatively or positively? The negative reaction will be explained in the next section. There was also, however, a positive or semi-official recognition of the order, as follows. Let us focus on the letter of appointment to *upajjhāya* of a Mon monk who acted as the chairman of the Committee of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika Division. His name is Sanit (1927–2006), and he was the abbot of the Chankaphō monastery in Pathumthānī during 1959–2006. Not only was he a leading monk in the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, he was also appointed as a Governor of the Dhammayuttika Saṅgha in the Pathumthānī Province Division, (T. Chao Khana Changwat, Thammayut) in 1980. His appointment demonstrates that a Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monk governed all the Dhammayuttika monks at a provincial level, and that the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika and the Dhammayuttika acted as one *saṅgha* administrative body. However, in examining the letter of appointment of Ven. Sanit as a *upajjhāya*, which was issued by a Governor of the Dhammayuttika Division (T. Chao Khana Yai Khana Thammayut) in 1963, it is surprising to note that the letter appoints Ven. Sanit as a “*upajjhāya* of Rāmañña Dhammayuttika Division” (T. *tang hai...pen phra upatchāya nai Khana Rāman Thammayut*), not of the Dhammayuttika (*Somdet*

Phranāngchao sadet Phrarāṭchadamnoenpai nai kân phrarāṭchathân phloeng sop Phra Thammamēthāpôn (Sanit Suphāchārō) 2008). This indicates that the Dhammayuttika Nikāya formally recognized the existence of a *nikāya*-like order based on its independent ordination lineage under the same administration of the Dhammayuttika.

The book *Khana Song Rāman nai Prathēt Thai* (Rāmañña Saṅgha in Thailand) compiled by Bunchuai in 1974, provides another interesting example of the positive acknowledgement of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika by the Dhammayuttika. It is certainly the most valuable book on the history of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika due to its sourcing of various materials, including internal Dhammayuttika ones. This book was published as a cremation volume for a Mon monk, Ven. Khiaw, who was the abbot of the Phayāprāp monastery in Phrapradaeng, a Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monastery. In its introduction, it acknowledges the support of a Dhammayuttika monk to publish it. When Phayāprāp monastery consulted with Somdet Phra Yānasangwong (Ñāṇasaṅvara)—who was the abbot of the Bōwōnniwēt monastery (of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya) and a future Saṅgharāja (r. 1989–2013)—about the publication of a cremation volume for Ven. Kiao, Yānasangwong directed Phra Mahā Bunchuai, who was a monk in the Bōwōnniwēt monastery, to compile it. In other words, the best previous book on the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika was published with the strong support of the Dhammayuttika.

Such acceptance of ethnic diversity among Buddhist monks, which may be due to the historical contributions of Mon monks to the Dhammayuttika's origin, is a stark contrast to the image of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya described in previous studies as one which centralized monks and homogenized or weeded out various regional Buddhist practices (for an example of this in Northern Thailand, see Bowie 2017).⁽³⁰⁾

5. How the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika was Integrated into the Dhammayuttika

The Dhammayuttika recognized the Buddhist practices and individual ordination lineage of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika as mentioned above. However, the Dhammayuttika sometimes prevented the Rāman Plaeng or the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika from expanding its influence and sometimes suggested that it integrate into the Dhammayuttika. Ultimately, the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika was integrated into the Dhammayuttika Nikāya in a two-step process, through re-ordination and adding-ordination. Before explaining the integration, let us first look briefly at the restraints placed on the Rāman Plaeng by Saṅgharāja Prince Wachirayān in the 1910s.

In the early 20th century, separate *saṅgha* administrations for the two official *nikāyas* (the Dhammayuttika and the Mahā Nikāya), as seen today, were not yet entirely implemented even after promulgation of the Saṅgha Act of 1902. For instance, in 1925, Governors of the Saṅgha in two Monthons (T. Chao Khana Monthon), whose jurisdictions covered all the monks in all of Northeast Thailand, were both Dhammayuttika monks (Prēm wit 1991: 117–118).⁽³¹⁾ This demonstrates that they governed not only Dhammayuttika, but also Mahā Nikāya monks in each of their Monthon.

In addition, during 1913–14, of all six provinces in Monthon Krungthep (the surrounding Bangkok area), not including Bangkok, the Governor of the Saṅgha in Nonthaburi Province was a Mon monk (probably belonging to the Mahā Nikāya) and the Governors of the Saṅgha in Pathumthānī and Nakhōn Khuankhan (present-day Phrapradaeng and the surrounding area) provinces were Rāman Plaeng monks (*Thaleangkān Khana Song*, vol. 1: 22). In other words, the Rāman Plaeng controlled all monks in their province, whether those monks belonged to the Dhammayuttika or the Mahā Nikāya. Therefore, it can be said that the Rāman Plaeng was a small but influential group at that time.

Nevertheless, Saṅgharāja Prince Wachirayān (who also served as

the Governor of the Dhammayuttika) seemed not to welcome Rāman Plaeng's growth. For example, he forbade Mon monasteries in Nakhōn Khuankhan (Phrapradaeng) to convert to the Rāman Plaeng in 1913. He also did not appoint Ven. Thammawisāratha, a Rāman Plaeng monk who was the Governor of the Saṅgha in Nakhōn Khuankhan Province, as the abbot of a principal Mon monastery in that province, which belonged to the Mahā Nikāya and was a royal monastery. Wachirayān felt that if the Rāman Plaeng monk became an abbot, the relationship among monks in the royal monastery possibly would not go well. He also complained when the Governor of Saṅgha in Phathamthānī Province, who was a Rāman Plaeng monk, appointed another Rāman Plaeng monk as the new abbot of a Mon monastery in the province by removing the former abbot (probably a Mon monk of the Mahā Nikāya) (*Phramahāsamanasāsana lāiphrahat rawāng Somdet Phramahāsamanachao...* 1989: 28, 31–37, 41, 47).⁽³²⁾

The unclear division of *saṅgha* control into two official *nikāyas* in the 1910s and 1920s perhaps continued until the 1950s, despite experiencing important changes caused by the new Saṅgha Act of 1941. By issuing the new act, the government at that time perhaps hoped to integrate the Dhammayuttika and the Mahā Nikāya into one, but it instead resulted in discord regarding the *saṅgha* administration between them. The Dhammayuttika was discontent with some Mahā Nikāya provincial governors who tried to rule even Dhammayuttika Nikāya monks in their provinces in 1949 (Ishii 1986: 104–113). Then, the Khana Sankhamonthorī (the *saṅgha* cabinet) decided to divide control of the *saṅgha* into two official *nikāyas* at the local level of *saṅgha* administration in 1951. Following this, 26 of the 31 monasteries of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika requested to belong clearly to the Division of Dhammayuttika in 1952 (Bunchuai 1974: 113–117). It can be considered that the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika came to be under the control of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya distinctly then, even though in practice the two continued to function as different *nikāyas* during the remainder of the 20th century.

At the same time, the remaining five monasteries of Rāmañña Dhammayuttika asked to convert to the Dhammayuttika Nikāya around 1952 (Bunchuai 1974: 116–117). In other words, 26 Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monasteries continued to be a *nikāya*-like order, but five withdrew from the order to become genuine Dhammayuttika Nikāya monks. Why did monks from those five monasteries not remain in the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika? How did they transfer to the Dhammayuttika Nikāya? As Bunchuai's book provides no explanation of this process, in 2018 I interviewed abbots of four of the five monasteries and the following explanations were obtained.

The abbot named Chit in Chachoengsao Province decided to change *nikāya*. The Ven. Chit was an influential *upajjhāya* among the Mon; he had ordained many disciples across many communities. Some, if not all, of the five monasteries that converted to the Dhammayuttika Nikāya (one was in Chachoengsao where Chit was the abbot, two were in Samut Sākhōn, and another two were in the western part of Bangkok) were either descendants of Chit's ordination line or under his influence. One day in the early 1950s, Chit, who was still a member of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, decided to convert to the Dhammayuttika Nikāya on the advice of one of his disciples. Other monasteries under his influence followed him. In order to change *nikāya*, Chit and his disciples had to leave the monkhood once, and then be ordained again as monks belonging to the Dhammayuttika Nikāya. Chit, not knowing the details of this procedure beforehand, deeply lamented the need to renounce the monkhood by disrobing once. In order to become an *upajjhāya*, a monk must continuously be in the monkhood without any break for at least for ten years. Since Chit had to renounce the monkhood once, this break made it impossible for him to attain the position of *upajjhāya* and he could not ordain anyone again. He passed away in 1958.

The requirement to hold re-ordination also demonstrates that the Dhammayuttika Nikāya did not recognize the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika as the same *nikāya*. Although Chit and his disciples had not committed

any serious sin, they still had to leave the monkhood once, the most severe treatment for a monk. This illustrates how exclusive the Dhammayuttika's ordination lineage is.

Whereas the word “re-ordination” in this paper refers to the procedure whereby a monk leaves the monkhood once before being ordained again, we would also like to use the word “adding-ordination” to refer to the procedure whereby a monk is ordained again without leaving the monkhood. In this case, a monk is able to maintain the number of years of keeping Buddhist Lents (*vassa* or T. *phansā*) that is accumulated from when he was ordained. This “adding-ordination” is called *daḥhikamma* in Pāli and *buat sam* (repeat or stack ordination) in Thai.⁽³³⁾

It was through the *daḥhikamma* that the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika was brought to an end as follows.⁽³⁴⁾ The Dhammayuttika had hoped to integrate the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, the latter refused integration efforts. Shortly before 2003, the Committee of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika eventually changed its stance and decided to integrate, citing anxieties over possible inconveniences for Rāmañña Dhammayuttika disciples of the next generation not being allowed to conduct *upasampadā* (ordination) and *uposatha* together with Dhammayuttika monks.⁽³⁵⁾ Based on the decision, in 2003 nine *upajjhāyas* from the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika gathered in the ordination hall of Bowōnniwēt monastery and received *daḥhikamma*, or an “adding-ordination,” from Dhammayuttika monks, including Somdet Phramahā Wīrawong (Mānit) from Samphanthawong monastery as an *upajjhāya*. They did not need to leave the monkhood once, so they could retain their accumulated *vassa*. Subsequently, those nine *upajjhāyas* returned to their respective monasteries and performed *daḥhikamma* for their disciples. As a result, 231 monks in the 27 monasteries of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika converted to the Dhammayuttika, marking the end of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika. However, the “bilingual chanting” of *ñatticatutthakamma* in both Mon and Dhammayuttika pronunciations continued to be allowed, and six *upajjhāyas* are continuing the practice as

described above.

In short, requiring either “re-ordination” or “adding-ordination” (*dalhikamma*) rituals indicates that the Dhammayuttika did not acknowledge Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monks as genuine members of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya, but rather as members of a distinct and different order. This strengthens the assertion that the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika had, in practice, been the third *nikāya*-like order in Thailand.

6. Re-emphasis of the Origins of the Dhammayuttika’s Monastic Lineage

The practice of the “adding-ordination,” or *dalhikamma*, calls our attention to why the Dhammayuttika Nikāya developed not only as a mere monastic group, but also as a *nikāya* order based on a strictly exclusive ordination lineage. I presume that the origin of its development as a *nikāya* can be traced back to the *dalhikamma* of Mongkut, who was a founder of the Dhammayuttika and became King Rama IV (r. 1851–1868).

Chulālongkōn, or Rama V, a son of Mongkut, explains the history of the beginning of the Dhammayuttika movement as follows. After Mongkut moved to Samōrāi monastery as a monk in 1929/1930, he noticed the size of boundary stones (T. *nimit simā* [sic]) was too small, which made him concerned about the validity of any ordination [in the kingdom]. Therefore, Mongkut asked 18 monks who were ordained at Kalyānī Sīmā in Pegu, Burma to give him a *dalhikamma* ordination on a raft in a river (Chulālongkōn 1956 (written in 1908): 31–39). Other sources describe this incident as twenty Rāman (Mon) monks (who had been ordained at Kalyānī Sīmā more than twenty years earlier) giving Mongkut the *dalhikamma* six times by switching *upajjhāyas* who chanted with both Mon and Magadha pronunciations (*Wat Bowōnmongkhon*: 21).⁽³⁶⁾ It was also said that nine main disciples of Mongkut were given the *dalhikamma* after him in the same way. Then, four of the ten monks who received *dalhikamma*, including

Mongkut, became the origin of the Dhammayuttika lineage (T. *ton wong Thammayut*): namely, (1) Mongkut, (2) Pawarēt, future Saṅgharāja (r. 1891–1892), (3) Sā, future Saṅgharāja (r. 1893–1900), and (4) Thap (Phicit 2006: 10, 18–19).⁽³⁷⁾ Even if Mongkut simply intended to correct, or purify, his and his disciples' ordination, it resulted in the creation of a new ordination lineage through the addition of the imported ordination lineage from the Mon of Kalyāṇī Sīmā to the Siamese ordination lineage.⁽³⁸⁾ This new monastic lineage subsequently became exclusive, bearing the feature of a *nikāya*.⁽³⁹⁾

In addition, Prince Wachirayān, who was a son of Mongkut, was given a *dalhikamma* to strengthen or expand his influence among the Dhammayuttika. In the late 19th century, the Dhammayuttika divided into two ordination lineages: monks who ordained on land (T. *phra bok*) and those who ordained on water (T. *phra nam*). Bōwōnniwēt monastery, representing the land ordination lineage, stopped performing *dalhikamma* on the water for some time, but descendants of the water ordination lineage in the other monasteries continued to perform it on rafts as an adding-ordination. Prince Wachirayān had already been ordained on land in 1879, but he also received a *dalhikamma* on a river raft with both Magadha (Dhammayuttika) and Rāman (Mon) chanting in 1880, in order to be related to both of the two ordination lineages (Wachirayān 1952 (1925): 34–36). In short, *dalhikamma* have been used as a tool to change, create, combine and stack ordination lineage(s).

It should be noted again that the *dalhikamma* for Prince Wachirayān mentioned above was chanted in both Magadha and Rāman pronunciations. This could help to explain at least in part why, although Wachirayān as a Saṅgharāja tried to stop the expansion of the Rāman Pleang during the modernization of the National Saṅgha in the 1910s, he and later Dhammayuttika leaders did not ban or abolish the existence of the Rāman Pleang or the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika throughout the 20th century. For the Dhammayuttika monks, the Mon *saṅgha* was a part of the origin of their

ordination lineage and the bilingual chanting (Magadha and Rāman) is their lost tradition.

7. Conclusion

Bechert's definition of *nikāya* as a group of monks who conduct *saṅghakamma*, especially *upasampadā*, together, helps us to understand one aspect of the reality of the social relationships among Theravāda monks. Ethnic *nikāyas*, which Bechert did not mention, can be understood according to their unique language use and study as well as pronunciations of Pāli chanting; due to these characteristics, ethnic monks tend to live in monasteries together with monks of the same ethnicity, and as a result tend not to conduct *saṅghakamma* with monks of a different ethnicity, thus taking on a *nikāya*-like feature. However, social boundaries among ethnic *nikāyas* are looser than *nikāyas* that are intentionally formed as strictly exclusive groups (based on ordination lineage). When a monk can chant in two or more pronunciations, he can, in theory, move from one ethnic *nikāya* to another by changing his pronunciation according to the situation. The Mon *saṅgha* is the representative example: it was called “the Rāmañña Nikāya” (the Mon Nikāya) in Thailand and it still calls itself so in present day Burma/Myanmar. As Mon monks in Thailand have become more Thai than before, speaking and learning in Thai and chanting in Pāli with Thai pronunciation more and more, the Mon *saṅgha* is no longer generally called the Rāmañña Nikāya. Importantly, no Mon monks in Thailand conduct *saṅghakamma*, especially *upasampadā*, in Pāli with Mon pronunciation (with exception of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika).

The Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, a sub-independent order of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya, existed in Thailand throughout the 20th century. This paper has tried to explain why it can be considered a *nikāya*-like order in Thailand. First, monks in the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika tended not to conduct *saṅghakamma* with monks of either the Dhammayuttika

or the Mahā Nikāya, even though the order has clearly been under the administration of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya since the 1950s. Second, the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika maintained the special practice in the *upasampadā* ritual of “bilingual chanting,” using both Mon and Maghada (Dhammayuttika) pronunciations. Third, monks from the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika wishing to convert to the Dhammayuttika Nikāya in the 1950s were required to re-ordain. Furthermore, when the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika decided to be integrated into the Dhammayuttika Nikāya in 2003, the monks underwent an adding-ordination (*daḥhikamma*). If the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika and the Dhammayuttika Nikāya were the same *nikāya*, such procedures would not be required to convert or integrate. As the result of the integration, the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika as a *nikāya*-like order came to an end in 2003. The practice of “bilingual chanting,” however, survives today and some of its former members continue to maintain close relations with each other.

In short, although Bechert’s definition of *nikāya* is very useful, further research is still needed to provide a fuller picture of *nikāya* in Theravāda societies. On the one hand, when regarding Bechert’s definition as an *etic* criterion, we may be able to discern some *nikāya*-like orders, such as the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, which intentionally avoid crossing exclusive boundaries of *saṅghakamma*, but do not identify themselves as *nikāyas*. On the other hand, based on an *emic* perspective, we can see that there are some groups of monks, such as the ethnic Mon *saṅgha*, which are identified or regarded as *nikāyas* by themselves, a state, or lay people, even if they do not intend to maintain their *saṅghakamma* boundary strictly, and consequently such boundaries are situationally penetrable, or are changeable over time. Therefore, several questions require further investigation: for example, does each of the nine official groups (B. *gains*) in Burma/Myanmar have the character of *nikāya* in accordance with Bechert’s definition? Are there any unofficial orders having the features of a *nikāya*? How many ethnic *nikāyas* based on distinct chanting pronunciations are there in Theravāda

countries?⁽⁴⁰⁾ Does the word *nikāya* have any local meaning other than Bechert's definition?⁽⁴¹⁾ The list goes on.

The practice of *dalhikamma* is also deserving of further research. Are there any other cases of receiving *dalhikamma* to change the *nikāya* to which a monk belongs? Burma/Myanmar also has an interesting practice of an adding-ordination (called *kan hta'* or *thein hta'* in Burmese, meaning to stack *kamma* or to stack *sīmā*/ordination hall), which also functions to fulfill the desire of lay people to practice merit making.⁽⁴²⁾ In this case, a layperson can sponsor the “adding-ordination” as a “parent” of the monk, thus gaining merit. Some famous monks have been “adding-ordained” several times, and even up to one hundred times, due to the number of lay people who want to sponsor the adding-ordination. It would be interesting to study the variations in the practice of “adding-ordinations” across several countries or areas.

Furthermore, if we regard the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika as a Mon Dhammayuttika, we should also acknowledge the other Mon Dhammayuttika in Myanmar, that is, the Mahā Yen order (or Mahā Yin in Burmese pronunciation), which is one of nine official *gains* in the country. It was founded by a Mon monk who belonged to the Dhammayuttika, but not to the Rāman Pleang, and came from Thailand in the latter half of the 19th century. Although these two Mon Dhammayuttika orders (Mahā Yen and Rāmañña Dhammayuttika) have different origins, they have had a long-standing relationship across the two countries. The Mahā Yen order calls itself a *nikāya* and is, based on my interviews, able to conduct *dalhikamma* for monks from other orders or *gains* who hope to convert to the Mahā Yen order. Therefore, the history and practice of the Mahā Yen order is also an interesting case when considering what is *nikāya*.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to Mon monks and people for help to conduct field research. This work was also supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant

Number 19K20545.

Notes

- (1) Square brackets in quotations denote additions by the author of this paper.
- (2) *Dhammakamma*, *saṅghakamma*, or *vinayakamma* are “the legal procedures of the monastic community” prescribed by Buddhist ecclesiastical law. They include the *uposatha* ceremony and *upasampadā* (Bechert 1982: 65; Bechert 1990: 3–5). In this paper, we choose the word *saṅghakamma* among them, because it is the most commonly used in Thailand. According to a Buddhist dictionary in Thai, *saṅghakamma*, some duties that an assembly of monks are supposed to perform, has four types: (1) *apalokanakamma*, to give punishment (*brahmadanda*) to a monk, (2) *ñattikamma* i.e., *uposatha* (mentioned later in this paper) and *pavāraṇā* (a rite at the termination of Buddhist Lent), (3) *ñattidutiyakamma* i.e., *sammatti sīmā* (*sīmāsammuti*, a rite to make a boundary) and to give *kāṭhina* cloth and (4) *ñatticatutthakamma* i.e., *upasampadā*, *parivāsa* and *mānatta* (kinds of penances for an offence of breaking any monastic disciplines) (Payuttō 2010: 415). For details about *sīmāsammuti*, see Carbine 2012.
- (3) “Sect” used by Mendelson here means *gain* in Burmese, which comes from the Pāli term *gaṇa*. The word *gain* can indicate various groups of monks, including *nikāya* (Mendelson 1975: 86 (footnote 40)).
- (4) “Rāmañña Dhammayuttika” is the spelling based on Pāli and “Rāman Thammayut” is based on Thai. To mark “T.” before words in this paper means they are based on Thai pronunciation. Likewise, “B.” is for Burmese.
- (5) Exceptionally, Brian Foster’s dissertation based on anthropological fieldwork of ethnic Mon communities in Pathumthānī and Nonthaburī provinces in Thailand, which includes many valuable data, briefly mentions the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika group as below, though he does not use this name: “What is beyond doubt, though, is that the Mon wats [Buddhist monasteries] have become Thammayut and Mahanikai. A smaller number became Thammayut (36 I was told by one knowledgeable monk), and these constitute a special division within the Thammayut sect called “Mon Thammayut” or “Changed Mon” (Raman plāäng)” (Foster 1972: 23). For previous literature in Thai, Bunchuai 1974 explains the history, network, and special practice in ordination of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, which we will quote many times in this paper. Suchao Ploychum published a revised version of Bunchuai (1974) in 2001, with same title. However, the contents, especially those regarding the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, are

almost the same as the 1974 version, with the only the exception being some useful pictures added by Suchao. Therefore, we should quote Bunchuai 1974, as he was the first to uncover the history of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika, not Suchao 2001.

- (6) A state law established the *saṅgha* administration in Thailand three times: in 1902, 1941, and 1962, each repealing the former one (the 1962 act was partly revised in 1992, 2017, and 2018). The separate administration according to the two *nikāyas* was prescribed in the 1902 act, but it was not strictly applied, as mentioned later in this paper. The 1941 act did not mention the two *nikāyas* (in accordance with the government's attempts to integrate the two *nikāyas*), and it thereby aroused conflict between the two *nikāyas*. The 1962 act does not specifically mention the division of the two *nikāyas*, but the separate control by the two *nikāyas* seems to be legally based on the Order of Mahā Thēra Samākhom in 1963 and its revisions, which provide for the establishment of five governors of highest regional level (T. Chao Khana Yai), including a Governor of the Dhammayuttika Division (T. Chao Khana Yai Khana Thammayut).
- (7) For the internal split among Mon monks at the end of 19th century Siam, see Reynolds (1972: 221–233).
- (8) The word ethnicity in this paper indicates simply the relatively large groups based on languages such as Thai, Burmese, Mon etc., not on psychological self-identities of individuals that can easily change depending on the situation.
- (9) *Khana* means a group of monks, which was translated as “chapter” by Reynolds (Reynolds 1972: 197). *Khana* comes from the Pāli term *gaṇa*, which has the same origin as *gain* in Burmese. In this paper, we use the word “division” for an official *khana* (*gaṇa*) in the *saṅgha* administration of Siam/Thailand.
- (10) What “nominally” means is mentioned later in this paper.
- (11) Bunchuai 1974 cites another source saying that Prince Wachirayān expressed dissatisfaction in 1912 that Parian Rāman did not support “a language for state” [i.e. Thai] among Mon monks (138–139).
- (12) Mon monks in Burma/Myanmar today mostly are “bilingual” in Pāli chanting. They chant with Mon pronunciation for their *saṅghakamma* and for Mon lay people. On the other hand, they chant with Burmese pronunciation with Burmese monks or for Burmese lay people.
- (13) *Pāṭimokkha* is supposed to be chanted by monks in Pāli on every *uposatha* day, which comes twice a month.
- (14) About the monastery used as an example here, *upasampadā* was conducted in Pāli by either Thai or Mon pronunciation, but mostly Thai, until the 1950s.

- (15) The Saṅgha Act of 1902 and the Buddhist examination reform in the 1910s did not ban chanting with Mon pronunciation, but clearly caused the subsequent decline gradually throughout the 20th century. This is similar to the case of the Yuan sect (or order) in Northern Thailand, which Keyes discussed in 1971, although he did not focus on their chanting pronunciation or whether they conducted *saṅghakamma* together or not. Namely, the Yuan tradition was taught in monasteries as Buddhism centers, but it was “increasingly assuming an antiquarian character,” especially for young monks at that time. Keyes continued that the Saṅgha Act of 1902 “did not lead to the death of the Yuan tradition. However, the impress of Thai structures upon the northern Sangha did succeed in reducing the potential of the Yuan tradition as a rallying point for communal or regional dissent” (Keyes 1971: 558–559). This is also true of Mon in Thailand, as they have been assimilating linguistically into Thai. Quite the opposite is true in Myanmar, however, where Mon monks have led Mon language nationalism. Thailand has created a national *saṅgha* that is easy to control, but in exchange lost some of its ethnic or regional diversities.
- (16) From my impression, Mon monks in Thailand now generally do not emphasize their identity as Rāmañña Nikāya. On the contrary, in Myanmar we can see nameplates today at some Mon monasteries including the words “Rāmañña Nikāya.”
- (17) The last Governor of the Rāmañña Division (Chao Khana Rāman) was the abbot of Chanasongkhrām Monastery in Bangkok. His last deputy (Rōng Chao Khana Rāman) was the abbot of Paramaiyikāwāt Monastery in Ko Kret, Nonthaburī. The complications occurred between them.
- (18) However, it is not known how the Mon monks changed their *nikāya* from Rāmañña to Dhammayuttika at that time.
- (19) It is not known when the name of the order changed from Rāman Plaeng to Rāmañña Dhammayuttika.
- (20) An official document in the National Archives of Thailand lists 162 Mon monasteries in the whole Kingdom in 1895 (for English translation, see Reynolds (1972: 276–280) (Appendix B)). Therefore, Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monasteries represented roughly 16 percent of the total number of Mon monasteries in Thailand.
- (21) In 2002 the 27 monasteries of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika were in Bangkok (1), Nonthaburī (1), Pathumthānī (13), Lopburī (4), Chachoensao (2), Nakhōn Phathom (1), Samut Prākān (3) and Samut Sākhōn (2).
- (22) The population census of Monthon Krungthēp (Bangkok and surrounding areas) in 1899 shows that about 42 percent of the total population in Pathumthānī province were Mon at that time (Grabowsky 1993: 12–13, 34).

- (23) Only four monasteries in a Mon community in Lopburī were a bit far from Bangkok.
- (24) Chinnawōn was a Dhammayuttika monk and at that time a Governor of the Central Division (Chao Khana Yai Khana Klang). Later, when Prince Wachirayān died in 1921, he became a Saṅgharāja (1921–1937).
- (25) It is not sure if the rule forbidding conduct of *saṅghakamma* together reached the rank and file of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika. Therefore, we call it a “tendency,” but the tendency was certainly widespread.
- (26) The chant pronunciations of the Dhammayuttika Nikāya and the Mahā Nikāya are slightly different: the former (called Magadha) was likely “corrected” in an attempt sound more like the Pāli language.
- (27) From Bunchuai’s book, it can be assumed that the Committee of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika Division was formed relatively soon after 1951, when the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika came to be clearly under the administration of the Dhammayuttika. The first members of the committee include Ven. Khiao (1891–1973) (Bunchuai 1974: k-c, 125). This paper discusses Ven. Khiao in section 4.
- (28) *Upajjhāya* is the main preceptor indispensable in *upasampadā*. Only they can reproduce Buddhist monks.
- (29) I directly interviewed three *upajjhāyas* of the six, and monks from each monastery or community where the other three *upajjhāyas* lived.
- (30) Hayashi 2003, however, interestingly discusses how local religious beliefs in Northeast Thailand and the establishment of state Buddhism led by the Dhammayuttika Niāya were combined and how this combination propagated *mo tham*, a ritual specialist who expels evils and spirits by using Buddhist dhamma, at the local level.
- (31) A monthon was an administrative division that included several provinces under it; they do not exist today.
- (32) The Mon books considered as the first publications in Mon letters in Thailand were printed by the Mon monk Candakanta (Bunkhan) at Phrapradeang. According to my interview with a Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monk, Ven. Bunkhan was also a Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monk. Later, he moved to a Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monastery in Chachoensao province. About the short history of printing by Bunkhan and 20 or 24 titles published by him, see Sujaritlak et al. (1995: 103–107) and Busaba and associates (1998: 6–8). For contemporary information on his publishing, see also Halliday (2000 (1917): 143–144). For study on *Rājādhirāj*, the famous classical literature about the history of the Mon kingdom printed by Bunkhan, see McCormick

- (2010), which reveals the linguistic influence of Thai upon Mon.
- (33) *Daḥhī* means strengthening, so *daḥhīkamma* indicates a strengthening ordination. About *daḥhīkamma*, see also Reynolds (1972: 82), Kitsudo (2002: 386 (footnote 13)) and Blackburn (2012: 283–284). In Thailand, *daḥhīkamma* is also called *yatti mai* (new *ñatti*), which is an abbreviation for “new *ñatticatutthakamma*”. However, *yatti mai* is a vague term, for it can indicate both “re-ordination” and “adding-ordination.”
- (34) The details of the “adding-ordination” or *daḥhīkamma* of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika in 2003 are based on interviews with former Rāmañña Dhammayuttika monks in 2014, 2016, and 2019, and a document of the Decisions by the Executive Committee of Dhammayuttika Division in 2002 (*mati kammakān borihān Khana Thammayut khrang thī* 1/2545 and 2/2545).
- (35) While it cannot be confirmed exactly why the Committee of the Rāmañña Dhammayuttika decided to integrate into the Dhammayuttika at this time and not before, the cumulative effects of linguistic assimilation to Thai among young Mon people was likely an important reason for their decision.
- (36) It perhaps means six Mon *upajjhāyas* conducted *daḥhīkamma* to Mongkut by turns.
- (37) For the name list of the ten monks written by Mongkut, see Wachirayān (1922/1923: 52–53). Among them, Sā left the monkhood later and was ordained again in 1851 under Pawarēt as an *upajjhāya*. Thereafter, Sā received *daḥhīkamma* to act as a teacher (*kammavācācariya*) in the ordination ceremony of King Chulālongkōn (Rāma V) in 1873. The reason was because the *upajjhāya* this time (Pawarēt) thought that all the monks attending this ordination should have received *daḥhīkamma*, but only Sā had not done it since he was ordained in 1851 (Wachirayān 1952 (1925): 34).
- (38) The reason why Mongkut’s adding-ordination was tolerated, even if it could be interpreted as severely criticizing the tradition of Siam monks, is possibly that he was a very high-ranking prince who had the right to succeed the throne. It is said that he was defeated in succession conflict by a faction supporting his brother (future King Rama III) and then he escaped to become a monk in 1824 (Reynolds 1972: 71–74).
- (39) Mongkut and his disciples lived with other monks before he was appointed abbot of Bōwōnniwēt monastery in 1836. Therefore, it is not sure if Mongkut and his group called Dhammayuttika held *saṅghakamma* with the other monks or not before 1836. (For a different comprehension, compare Ishii (1986: 155–156) and Yamada (1991: 59–62)). Further research is needed to understand how the Dhammayuttika group before 1836 kept their ordination lineage “purified” by *daḥhīkamma* under Mon monks.
- (40) For example, I have heard that ethnic Shan monks in Myanmar generally chant

in Pāli with Burmese pronunciation. If so, how should we understand the boundary between the Shan and Burmese *saṅgha*? Further research is needed to clarify and compare various ethnic boundaries among *saṅgha*.

- (41) There were 17 or 18 *nikāyas* in and around Chiang Mai city at the end of 19th century. However, monks of each different *nikāya* “had apparently performed the Uposatha ceremony together”, so “it is more likely that the term “sect” or “Nikaya” signifies a line of successive monks from particular teacher or preceptor in certain regions” (Sommai 1975: (1)–(3)). Or “the names of the various *nikai* [*nikāya*] rather indicate different ethnic and descent groups” (Aroonrut and Grabowsky 1996?: [7]). Thanks Akiko Iijima for providing information about *nikāya* in Lānnā or Northern Thailand.
- (42) Adding-ordination is called *thop sīm* in Mon language in Burma/Myanmar, which is the equivalent of *thein hta* in Burmese.

References

- Aroonrut Wichienkeeo and Grabowsky, Volker. [1996?]. “Ethnic Groups in Chiang Mai by the Turn of the Twentieth Century: A Study Based on Names of Old Monasteries,” n.p.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1982. “The Importance of Aśoka’s so-called Schism Edict,” In *Indological and Buddhist Studies, Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, L. A. Hercus, F. B. J. Kuiper, T. Rajapatirana and E. R. Skrzypczak (eds.), Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, Australian National University, pp. 61–68.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1990. “The *Nikāyas* of the Burmese *Saṅgha* in the Context of Contemporary Burmese Buddhism,” *Society for the Study of Pali and Buddhist Culture*, 3: pp. 1–13.
- Blackburn, Anne M. 2012. “Lineage, Inheritance, and Belonging: Expressions of Monastic Affiliation from Laṅkā,” In *How Theravāda is Theravāda? Exploring Buddhist Identities*, Peter Skilling, Jason A. Carbine, Claudio Cicuzza and Santi Pakdeekham (eds.), Chiang Mai: Silkworm, pp. 275–294.
- Bowie, Katherin A. 2017. “Khruba Siwichai: The Charismatic Saint and the Northern *Saṅgha*,” In *Charismatic Monks of Lanna Buddhism*, Paul T. Cohen (ed.), Copenhagen: NIAS press.
- Bunchuai Suchawanō, Phramahā (compiled). 1974. *Khana Song Rāman nai Prathēt Thai [Rāmañña Saṅgha in Thailand]*, cremation volume for Phrakhrū Pariyatsunthōn (Khiao), Samutprākān. [in Thai]

- Bussaba Prapasapong and associates. 1998. *A Survey of Mon Literature in Central Thailand*, n.p. [in Thai]
- Carbine, Jason A. 2012. “Sāsanasuddhi / Sīmāsammuti: Comments on a Spatial Basis of the Buddha’s Religion,” In *How Theravāda is Theravāda? Exploring Buddhist Identities*, Peter Skilling, Jason A. Carbine, Claudio Cicuzza and Santi Pakdeekham (eds.), Chiang Mai: Silkworm, pp. 241–273.
- Chulālongkōn, King. 1956. *Ruang Wat Samōrāi an mī nām wā Rāchāthiwāt*, [On Samōrāi Monastery, which is called Rāchāthiwāt], cremation volume, [Bangkok]. [in Thai]
- Foster, Brian L. 1972. “Ethnicity and Economy: The Case of the Mons in Thailand,” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Grabowsky, Volker. 1993. *An Early Thai Census: Translation and Analysis*, Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University, Institute of Population Studies.
- Halliday, Robert. 2000 (1917). *The Mons of Burma and Thailand: Volume 1. The Talaings*, Christian Bauer edited and with a Forward and Photographs, Bangkok: White Lotus.
- Hayashi, Yukio. 2003. *Practical Buddhism among the Thai-Lao: Religion in the Making of Region*. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press.
- Hayashi, Yukio. 2011. “Tonan ajia bukkyo no sekai,” [World of Buddhism in Southeast Asia] In *Sei to do no bukkyo (Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia: Serenity, Dynamism, and Multiplicity in Buddhism)*, A New History of Buddhism in Asia vol. 4, Nara Yasuaki and Shimoda Masahiro (eds.), Tokyo: Kosei shuppan, pp. 20–62. [in Japanese]
- Ishii, Yoneo. 1986. *Sangha, State, and Society: Thai Buddhism in History*, Peter Hawkes translated, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Keyes, Charles. 1971. “Buddhism and National Integration in Thailand,” *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 30(3): pp. 551–567.
- Kitsudo, Masahiro. 2002. *Contemporary Buddhist Orders in Sri Lanka: Study on the Modes of Existence of the Amarapura and Rāmañña Nikāyas*, Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin. [in Japanese]
- Kuramoto, Ryosuke. 2014. *Sezoku wo ikiru shukkesha-tachi: jyozabu bukkyo-to shakai Myanmar ni okeru shukke seikatu no minzokushi* [Renunciants Living Secularly: Ethnography of Monastic Life in Myanmar, a Theravāda Buddhist Society] Kyoto: Hozokan. [in Japanese]
- McCormick, Patrick. 2010. “Mon Histories: Between Translation and Retelling,” Ph.D. Thesis, University of Washington.
- Mendelson, E. Michael. 1975. *Sangha and State in Burma: Study of Monastic Sectarian-*

- ism and Leadership*, John P. Ferguson (ed.), Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Payuttō, Phō Ō. 2010. *Photchānānukrom Phutthasāt chabap pramuan sap* [Dictionary of Buddhism], 14th edition, Bangkok: Thanathat kānphim. [in Thai]
- Phicit Thittawannō, Phra Thanmawisutthikawī (compiled and edited). 2006. “Prawat phonngān khōng Somdet Phra Wannarat (Thap Phutthasirimahātēn),” [History and Achievement of Somdet Phra Wannarat (Thap)], In *Prawat phonngān lae ruam thanmōwāt niphon Somdet Phra Wannarat (Thap Phutthasirimahātēn)*, [Bangkok], cremation volume. [in Thai]
- Phramahā Samanasātsana lāiphrarat rawāng Somdet Phramahāsamanachao Kromphrayā Wachirayānawarōrot kap Somdet Phrasangkarāṭchao Krommaluang Chinnawōnsiriwat*, [Correspondence between Prince Wachirayān and Chinnawōn]. 1989. Bangkok: Mahamakut Buddhist University. [in Thai]
- Prēmmit Tawkaew. 1991. “The Establishment and Expansion of the Dhammayuttikanikaya in the Northeast (1851–1930),” M. A. Thesis, Chulalongkorn University. [in Thai]
- Reynolds, Craig James. 1972. “The Buddhist Monkhood in Nineteenth Century Thailand,” PhD Dissertation, Cornell University.
- Somdet Phranāngchao sadet Phrarāṭchadamnoenpai nai kān phrarāṭchathān phloeng sop Phra Thammamēthāpōn (Sanit Suphāchārō)*. 2008. [Pathumthānī], cremation volume. [in Thai]
- Sommai Premchit. 1975. “A List of Old Temples and Religious Sects in Chiangmai,” in collaboration with Puangkam Tuikheo, Chiangmai: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Chiangmai University. [in Thai]
- Sommot Amōraphan and Damrong Rāchānuphāp. 2002 (1923). *Ruang tang Phrarāṭchākhana Phūyai nai Krung Rattanakōsin*, lem 1 (vol. 1), [On Appointments of High Ranking Monks in the Rattanakōsin Dynasty] [Bangkok]. [in Thai]
- Sujarittak Deepadung, Vichitr Kerdvisit, Attajinda Deepadung, and Su-ed Gajaseni. 1995. *Mōn: Botbāt dān sangkhom watthanatham khwāmpenmā lae khwāmplienpleang nai rōp 200 pī khōng Krung Rattanakōshin*, [Mon: Their Social and Cultural Roles, Background and Changes during 200 years of the Rattanakōsin Dynasty] Nakhōn Pathom: Research Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development, Mahidol University. [in Thai]
- Thaleangkān Khana Song*, vol. 1. 1913/1914 [Announcements of Saṅgha Affairs] [Bangkok]. [in Thai]
- Thaleangkān Khana Song*, vol. 2. 1914/1915 [Announcements of Saṅgha Affairs]

[Bangkok]. [in Thai]

Wachirayān, Prince. 1922/1923. *Tamnān Wat Bōwōnniwētwhān*, [*History of Bōwōnniwēt Monastery*], [Bangkok]. [in Thai]

Wachirayān, Prince. 1952 (1925). *Phraprawat trat lao*, [*Autobiography*], [Bangkok], cremation volume. [in Thai]

Wat Bowōnmongkhon. 2007. [Bangkok?]. [in Thai]

Yamada, Hitoshi. 1991. “The Expansion of the Thammayut Movement,” In *Southeast Asia: History and Culture*, 20: 57–76. [in Japanese]

Unpublished Materials: National Archives of Thailand (NA.)

NA. R. VI. file number between S.11/7 and S.11/8, [Documents of the Reign of Rāma Sixth, Department of Education], “Somdet Krom Phrayā Wachirayānawarōrot song hen khwan loek kānsōplai phra pariyattitham kae phra phiksu sāmanēn Rāman nai phāsa Rāman” [Prince Wachirayān thinks that the Buddhist examination for Mon monks and novices in Mon language should be abolished]. [in Thai]