

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO "A SIAMESE ACCOUNT OF THE CONSTRUCTION
OF THE TEMPLE ON KHAO PHANOM RUNG".

Referring to my commentaries to the translation of "A Siamese account of the construction of the temple on Khao Phanom Rung", published in January 1932 in the *J. S. S.* vol. XXV, part I, Professor Georges Cœdès, Director of the *Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient* in Hanoi, nearly a year ago wrote to me and kindly drew my attention to several points in my commentaries which, according to his opinion, ought to be corrected. I regret very much that owing to lack of spare time I am only now able to make known and to comment on Prof. Cœdès' points of view, most of which I gratefully accept.

With regard to the age of the Dharmāçalas, mentioned in my paper p. 90, Professor Cœdès opines that these are contemporaneous with the Bayon temple in Angkor Thom, the construction of which has now been proved to have taken place during the reign of King Jayavarman VII, the date for their construction should therefore also be fixed at the end of the XIIth century A. D. and not during the reign of Yaçovarman (889-910 A.D.) as first fixed by Prof. L. Finot in his "Dharmāçalas au Cambodge" (*B. E. F. E. O.* vol. XXV 1927 p. 417) and accepted by me.

After having carefully gone through Professor Cœdès' learned article "Etudes Cambodgiennes" (*B. E. F. E. O.* vol. XVIII p. 81), I accept this correction as I am now convinced that Prof. Cœdès has conclusively proved through the inscriptions and the forms of art predominating at the end of the XIIth century as well as the religious conceptions of that period that the erection of the grand enceinte of Angkor Thom; its majestic gate towers adorned with the faces of the all merciful Boddhisattva, Lokeçvara, as well as the intricate labyrinthic Bayon and the Dharmāçalas (dedicated to Lokeçvara too) were all due to the enthusiastic Buddhist king Jayavarman VII (1182-1201), during whose reign the cult of the Boddhisattvas and of deified personages flourished exceedingly.

The inscription found at Khao Phanom Rung is stated by me to date back to about A. D. 1100, this should be corrected to A. D.

1113, according to Prof. Cœdès in his "Etudes Cambodgiennes" (B. F. E. O. vol. XVIII). The inscription thus belongs to the reign of King Suriyavarman who reigned from 1112-1152.

With regard to the temple itself which represents no mean work, I take it that the construction of it was already begun by Suriyavarman II's predecessor, Dharanindravarman I, reigning from 1108-1112.

Next we come to the age of the temple of Phimai. According to Monsieur H. Parmentier, Chief of the Archæological Service of French Indochina, this temple dates, at the earliest, back to the reign of King Jayavarman V (968-1001) but Professor Cœdès thinks that it is not much anterior to Angkor Wat, which, he assumes, was either built during the reign of King Suriyavarman Paramavisnuloka (1112-1153) or by his successor King Dharanindravarman II (1152-1182).

In this connection it may be noted that according to an inscription, in Cambodian, discovered by me in 1918, in the Southern Gopura of the galleries, which enclose the three towers of the Phimai temple, it is stated that in the year 1108 A. D. a certain Khmer nobleman, presumably a viceroy of what now constitutes the circle of Nakhon Rajasima, erected a statue of a god, called Senapati Trailokyavijaya, (a Bodhisattava). (See my paper "An excursion to Phimai". J. S. S. vol. XVII part 1 p. 10). This proves that the temple of Phimai existed prior to the construction of the mighty Angkor Wat and on the whole I am inclined to accept Monsieur Parmentier's estimate according to which the construction of the temple took place in the last quarter of the Xth century.

On pages 102-103 of my paper on the Phnom Rung temple I have tried to explain the significance of the sculpture on the lintel of the interior northern door of the great central tower in Phimai by identifying the central figure with the god Vajrasattva and the personages in the lowest row below this god as representing the five Dhyanabuddhas over which, according to Mahayanistic belief, Vajrasattva presides. Professor Cœdès is of the opinion that I am wrong in my interpretation but as my learned friend so far (for lack

of time) has not been able to offer any other interpretation I shall adhere to my own until otherwise convinced that the explanation of this sculpture is a different one.

Finally I come to the inscriptions of Wat Phanom Wan. On page 105 of my paper I mention an edict by King Jayavarman VII, dating back to A. D. 1171. As this king reigned from 1181-1201 this is evidently a lapsus on my part. Prof. Cédès furthermore informs me that the above date has been wrongly read by Aymonier; as a matter of fact it should be 1004 Mahasakharaj or A. D. 1182 and the king mentioned in the edict is probably Jayavarman VI.

I would also like to point out that due to a regrettable mistake made by the clerk who copied the map of Southern Khorat the name for the temple on Khao Phanom Rung appears wrongly as Pum Rung instead of Phanom Rung.

ERIK SEIDENFADEN,

15th January, 1933.

