



H.R.H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab

THOUGHTS ON A CENTENARY

by

A. B. Griswold

I.

His late Royal Highness, Prince Damrong Rajanubhab (1862-1943), was a man of many accomplishments. The brilliance of his long career in the public service is well known, not only in his capacity as Minister of the Interior, but also in his performance of the numerous special tasks entrusted to him by his half-brother King Rāma V. Here I wish to pay a tribute to him for his work of another kind—his studies of Siamese history and the impetus he gave to the pursuit of archeology in this country.

In these things he occupies so outstanding a position that the moment we try to write about them we become conscious of our indebtedness to him. We owe to him the creation of the Archeological Service, the organization of the National Museums and Libraries and the Royal Institute on an effective basis, and the preservation of innumerable documents and works of art of the first importance. As a scholar he set an example of open-mindedness, rationalism and thoroughness which today's authors would do well to imitate. He was not a chauvinist, but a patriot. At a time when the science of archeology was not understood in this country, he encouraged research and exploration by foreign archeologists. To fill the post of Secretary of the Royal Institute he chose first a learned German, Professor Frankfurter, and later one of the most brilliant Orientalists of our time, Professor George Coedès.

We owe to Prince Damrong's hand a greater number of studies on Siamese history than to any other writer. He was uniquely well qualified. From his father, King Rāma IV, he inherited a most incisive mind, a strong critical sense, and a forceful literary style. His love for his country and its traditions was great, but he was no blind admirer of the past; in making use of the old chronicles he

constantly exerted himself to rid them of the mistakes and legendary matter that had crept into them; and in his interpretations he was always guided more by common sense than by a wish to glorify. He had a horror of sloppy scholarship; he was not content with fanciful reconstructions; he wanted the true facts, and took pains to get them. His prose is a model of clear and simple Siamese. As Minister of the Interior, he travelled everywhere in the kingdom, and acquainted himself with all the most important monuments, many of which have since been pulled down, or suffered inexpert restorations that make them unrecognizable, so that their earlier form is known to us only from his descriptions. Many old traditions, which are now all but forgotten, were still vigorous when he was young; and his knowledge of them often enabled him to illuminate some obscure point of history.

For the earlier periods of history, written material preserved in Siam is somewhat meagre, and the archeological documents are difficult to date with precision, so Prince Damrong sought additional evidence from neighboring countries, where European scholarship had brought research to a high standard of excellence. As one draws closer and closer to modern times, the written documentation naturally becomes more plentiful and more reliable. But we might easily forget how much of that documentation, available in the Prince's youth, would be lost today if he had not taken measures to preserve it. He was assiduous in recording the recollections of elderly people, both those who had been associated in great events, and those who had some knowledge of particular antiquities. He rescued many old manuscripts from oblivion, and made them permanently available to a wider public by having them printed in the *พระสมุดพจนานุกรม* and other collections.

Our cultural debt to him may be summed up under two heads; first, the discovery and preservation of all sorts of antiquities and documents; second, their interpretation. Had he not undertaken the work he did, a great number of our most important links with the past would today be irretrievably lost; and our studies would not only rest on a less broad base of evidence, but would also lack the solid support of intelligent interpretation which was the hallmark of his work.

Only a little of Prince Damrong's work has been translated into European languages. English versions of some of his articles have appeared in the *Journal of the Siam Society*; paraphrases of a few others have been given us by Monsieur Lingat in his histories of various monasteries in the same journal; Phra Phraison Salarak's English version of his book on the wars between Siam and Burma has been printed in the *Journal of the Burma Research Society*; two chapters of his *ตำนานพระพุทธเจดีย์* appeared in a French translation by R. Nicolas in the magazine *Extrême-Asie* (July 1927). Translations of a few short pieces were included in *Siam, General and Medical Features* (Bangkok, 1930), in the periodical *Thought and Word* (Bangkok, 1955 and 1956), and elsewhere; and an introduction by him appears in the *Historical Sketch of Protestant Missions in Siam, 1828-1928*, edited by G.B. McFarland (Bangkok, 1928). Until recently that was all.

It was therefore a happy thought when it was decided to celebrate the centenary of his birth by publishing two volumes of his work in English. One of them, entitled *Miscellaneous Articles Written for the Journal of the Siam Society*, is published 'by permission of the Society for the Prince's Centenary,' (Bangkok, 1962). The other is a translation, by S. Sivaraksa, of Chapters 8 and 9 of the Prince's *ตำนานพระพุทธเจดีย์* under the title *A History of Buddhist Monuments in Siam*. This translation, which previously appeared in the magazine of the Thai Students Association in England (1961) and in *Viskha Puja* of the Buddhist Association of Thailand (1962), now reappears as the second volume of the Siam Society's *Monograph Series* (Bangkok, 1962).

As these two books will doubtless be widely read, I propose to examine them with some care so as to show how they may be put to the best use. The haste with which they had to be produced prevented the editing and annotation that would have been desirable. As a result the general reader is liable to get the wrong idea of the author's meaning in some places, and in others to accept as definitive certain opinions that the author later revised; while nowhere is there any reference to later discoveries that would surely have modified

his opinions on certain matters. It has therefore occurred to me that the most fitting tribute I can offer to the Prince's memory, and the one that would have been the most to his own taste, is to supply in these pages the material that the editors would doubtless have supplied if they had had more time at their disposal.

2

The *Miscellaneous Articles* are reprints of nine pieces that first appeared in the *Journal of the Siam Society* between 1904 and 1928.

This is a rich collection which will attract all those who are interested in Siamese history. The fact that the articles are reprinted without amendment has the advantage of showing how Prince Damrong's thinking on historiography developed over a period of 24 years; yet it must be confessed that a certain amount of editing would have improved the text. The old translations are not uniformly good; the English is sometimes awkward, conveying very little idea of the elegant clarity of the Prince's Siamese style; and a revision by someone with a good ear for English would have helped. Again, some footnotes calling attention to pertinent new discoveries would have been welcome: I have in mind the sort of annotation provided by Prince Damrong's son, Prince Subhadradis Diskul, in the new Siamese editions of two of his father's books, the *ตำนานพระพุทธรูป* (Bangkok, B.E. 2503) and the *นิราศนครวัด* (Bangkok, B.E. 2505), whose value for today's readers is thereby much enhanced.

In any case the anonymous persons who caused the *Miscellaneous Articles* to be printed deserve our gratitude. I should like to participate, though belatedly, in their act of merit; and this I can best do, it seems to me, by imitating the example of Prince Subhadradis and providing a commentary that will take cognizance of more recent progress in research.

The *Miscellaneous Articles* are arranged chronologically, in the sequence in which they appeared in the *Journal of the Siam Society*. I shall follow a different order in discussing them, but give in parenthesis following the title of each the date of its original publication in the *Journal*.

'The Introduction of Western Culture in Siam' (1926) is a little masterpiece, very well translated by an anonymous hand. Here, in a mere eight pages, we have a complex subject reduced to simple terms, and treated with admirable fairness.

'The Golden Pavilion at Wat Sai' (1921) deals with a delightful relic of secular architecture of the Ayudhyā period, now in a monastery in Dhanapurī, and contains some penetrating sidelights on Ayudhyā history. The translation, by the late B.O. Cartwright, is on the whole acceptable, though there are a few mistakes. For 'pavilion divided into three rooms, one of which has walls and the other two are open,' (p. 93), a better rendering would be: 'pavilion divided into three sections (ห้อง). one of which is a room with walls and the other two form an open porch'. Certain terms betray the translator's misunderstanding of Theravāda Buddhism. 'Temple' is a mistake for monastery; 'temple proper' a mistake for preaching-hall or *nihāra*; 'priest' a mistake for monk; 'head-priest' a mistake for Lord Abbot; and of course in the Theravāda there is no such thing as a 'house of prayer' (p. 94).

'Wat Benchamabopit and its Collection of Images of the Buddha' (1928) gives a valuable history of the Monastery of the Fifth King (Peñcamapabitra, vulgarly called the 'Marble Temple'), followed by an account of its statuary. King Rāma V entrusted to Prince Damrong the task of collecting fifty suitable images, all of approximately life size, to be placed in the gallery. They were to be 'selected from among numerous old and beautiful images made in various countries and at different periods,' and to be 'displayed in such a way that the public might acquire a knowledge of Buddhist iconography.'

Any visitor to the gallery today can see the skill and taste with which the Prince discharged the task, for the monastery is the repository of some of the greatest masterpieces in the kingdom. (For certain periods nothing larger than statuettes were available, so bronze 'copies' of these were made in the proper size.) I should like to call particular attention to the beauty of the antique images illustrated in the following Plates of the article: II, VII, XIII, XV,

XIX, XXIII, and XXV. The bronzes in most monasteries are so thickly gilded that it is difficult to appreciate their sculptural quality; but here, at Prince Damrong's instigation, they were not regilded when they were installed, but left as they were, with faint traces of the old gilding softened by patination. The surfaces are darkened by rubbing with cocoanut oil mixed with soot, which shows up their beauty to great advantage.

There are a few imperfections in the inventory of the images. No. 13 (pl. XIII) should be attributed to the early Ayudhyā period (‘*Ū Tòng Group C*’, 15th century); no. 10 (pl. XII) and no. 16 (pl. XVI) should both be attributed to the ordinary Ayudhyā style. The attribution of no. 51 (pl. XXXIII) to the ‘style of Haripuñjaya’ might suggest that it is to be dated before the Tai conquest of Lam-pûn; but the real date would be about the same as that of image no. 25 (pl. XXII), which bears an inscription with a date equivalent to 1500 A.D.

Several images are classified as ‘Chieng Sèn’ because they have the so-called Chieng Sèn iconography. But we now know that Sukhodaya produced a certain number of images with the same iconography. Judging by their style, the following should be attributed to the school of Sukhodaya: no. 3 (pl. VII); no. 15 (pl. XV); no. 42 (pl. XXIX); no. 44 (pl. XXX). The attribution is more or less confirmed by their provenance; one from Uttaratisā, one from Ayudhyā, two from Dhanapurī. At the first two places Chieng Sèn images are rare, but those of the Sukhodaya school are more frequent. The two pieces from Dhanapurī were presumably brought there in the reign of Rāma I by the Wang Nā Prince, who collected hundreds of images from Ayudhyā and the Sukhodaya region, but none from northern Siam.

The image from Jaiyā, listed as no. 2 in the middle of page 120, is no longer in the *śālā* of the Monastery, but has been transferred to the National Museum. It is generally known as ‘the Buddha of Grahi.’

3.

'Angkor from a Siamese Point of View' (*Misc. Art.*, p. 97), originally delivered as an address to the Siam Society in 1925, is a charming paper, containing not a few illuminating interpretations of the past that came instinctively to the learned author because of his familiarity with old traditions. But it stands badly in need of the sort of footnotes that are provided in the new edition of the *นิราศนครวัด*. Prince Damrong naturally used the chronology that had been worked out by the leading European authorities on Khmer art, according to which the Bayon was built in the 11th century, and Banteay Srei around 1300. Only a few years after he wrote, it was proved that almost exactly the opposite was true: Banteay Srei was built in the 10th century and the Bayon around 1200. The overturn in the dates of these two important monuments made it necessary to revise the whole chronology of Khmer art, and as a consequence a good deal of Khmer history had to be revised too. We may easily guess that Prince Damrong would not have sanctioned the reprinting of 'Angkor from a Siamese Point of View' without correcting the dates; and the reader should bear this in mind.

Works on archeology and the more obscure reaches of history, no matter who the author may be, are notoriously subject to obsolescence. The first two papers in the *Miscellaneous Articles*, one on the founding of Ayudhyā and one on Lopburī, date from 1904 and 1908. They were in fact obsolete long before the author's death, for they contain surmises that he himself later rejected. For instance the identification of King Dharmatraipitaka proposed on p. 7 is superseded by a more plausible one in Prince Damrong's *ตำนานพระพุทธรูปสำคัญ*. Everything of value in these two papers reappears elsewhere in the *Miscellaneous Articles*, and it would surely have been better not to resuscitate the papers themselves.

4.

The first volume of the 'Royal Autograph Version' of the *History of Ayudhyā* was printed in 1914, with a long introduction by Prince Damrong. The first part of this introduction was translated into English by O. Frankfurter, and printed in JSS XI/2 in 1914

under the title 'The Story of the Records of Siamese History.' Five years later the second part, translated by Mr. (later Sir) Josiah Crosby, was printed in JSS XIII/2 under the title 'Siamese History prior to the Founding of Ayudhyā.' Both papers are now reprinted in the *Miscellaneous Articles* (pp. 29-88).

In a prefatory note, the eminent historian sets the tone.

'The work of collating ancient documents is a laborious one, [he writes] since it is necessary to search for, to copy out and to make selection among narratives and authorities which are to be found in so many different places that it is difficult to examine them all. Moreover, the compositions of the old writers sometimes set forth occurrences of such an extraordinary nature as to be unworthy of credence at the present day; at other times, different accounts of the same events are so contradictory that the student must decide for himself as to which of them is correct. For this reason, the ensuing compilation contains much that is conjecture on my part, and, as conjecture is a process which may lead to error, the reader should exercise his own powers of discrimination when perusing the pages which follow.' (*Miscellaneous Articles*, p. 48.)

The prudence of these remarks should be a standing reproach to those historians of our own day who come to conclusions first and look for proofs afterward, accepting any evidence, no matter how dubious, that seems to support them, and rejecting any, no matter how weighty, that goes against.

Here, on the contrary, we see unprejudiced common sense at work. The Prince, as usual, sees the problems clearly and attacks them methodically.

Frankfurter's English is not very good, and his transcription of proper names is agonizing. Instead of choosing a method that would show how they are spelt in Siamese, or how they are pronounced, he tries to do both at once and succeeds in doing neither. We therefore have such monsters as 'Dhanaburi' for Dhanapuri, 'Cham-

madevivongs' for Cammadevivaṇsa, 'Sattana Kanahut' for Sata-nāga-nahuta, and so on. It is hardly fair to blame him, since most people who write on Siamese culture in English do the same thing; but it would surely be helpful if a little order could be brought into the business.

Crosby's translation is better than Frankfurter's, and it certainly reads more smoothly. His transliteration of Sanskrit and Pali words in the standard graphic system is for the most part correct, though not always. For Tai words he confesses defeat; in the preface to which I have alluded, he sighs: 'I have adopted no recognised method in the transliteration of purely Siamese words, for the sufficient reason that no such method exists' (JSS XIII/2, p. ii).

That was some years before the Royal Institute gave its blessing to the 'General System'. Even today it may be questioned how far the General System is 'recognised'; I have elsewhere (JSS XLVIII/1) tried to discover why, and proposed certain amendments to it which might make it a more acceptable means of transliterating Tai words. But in any sort of scholarly paper words of Sanskrit and Pali origin may much better be transcribed by the standard graphic system, as King Rāma VI so strongly advocated.*

* * * * *

'The Story of the Record of Siamese History' (1914) is Prince Damrong's descriptive and critical inventory of all the documents for the study of Siamese history that he had at his disposal.

For the Sukhodaya period, as he shows, by all odds the most important documents are the stone inscriptions. At the time he wrote, they had only begun to be systematically studied; since then they have been carefully edited, and more inscriptions have been

* It would be regarded as a vulgarism for a writer of English to put *Seizer* for *Caesar* and *Sham-pain* for *Champagne*. Though some arguments might be adduced in favor of such homely phonetics, it would be hard to defend 'Ceiser' or 'Champain'; yet nearly everyone in this country is addicted to similar monsters. How often, for example, do we not see 'Silpakorn' and 'Bho'? The proper way to write these words is *Śilpākara* and *Bodhi*, though there may occasionally be some justification for writing them phonetically, *Silpagòn* and *Pò*. In the present article, by the way, I have spelt the names of authors in the way they themselves do, though I do not always like it.

discovered. The Prince himself gave active support and assistance to the work of editing, which culminated in the publication of the *ประชุมศิลาจารึกสยาม* (Coedès, *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam*, Vol. I) in 1924. What he said about the inscriptions in 1913, therefore, must be regarded as preliminary observations only.

Having been written for the introduction to the *History of Ayudhyā*, 'The Story of the Records of Siamese History' is chiefly devoted to a description of the different versions of the Annals. These are submitted to a searching scrutiny, which everyone who has to deal with them will do well to read.

In 1907, when the manuscript now known as the Luang Prasrōth Version of the Annals was discovered, Prince Damrong was quick to recognize its importance, and the superiority of its chronology to that of all the other versions. The manuscript itself was considered to date from the very end of the Ayudhyā period or the beginning of the Bangkok period, and to be a faithful copy of a text compiled in the 17th century at the command of King Nārāyana. Prince Damrong caused it to be printed, giving orders that no alterations should be made in it; where a word or passage could not be read, it was left blank; where there was indistinct writing, the words were put in brackets (*Misc. Art.*, p. 11). In so doing he set an example of scientific scholarship that is all too rare in Siam, where the time honored custom has been for editors to make whatever 'corrections' and changes they thought fit, including modernizing, the spelling, without warning the reader: such amendments, accumulating through the course of four or five successive copyings, run the risk of producing a final result that is very different from the original.

Prince Damrong's preface to the printed edition of the Luang Prasrōth Version now reappears in the *Miscellaneous Articles*; for good measure we are given Frankfurter's complete translation of the text itself (pp. 13-25). The dates printed in the margin may puzzle the reader: Frankfurter's introduction (JSS VI/3), which is here omitted, explains that they are the dates 'under which events

are seemingly recorded in the Phra Raj Phongsavadan: in some instances, however, there are discrepancies in fact, such as in the record of the elephant fight of Queen Suriyothai' (loc. cit. p. 5).

I now return to the 'Story of the Records of Siamese History.' In addition to his long discussion of the different versions of the Annals of Ayudhyā, Prince Damrong gives briefer notices to a number of other chronicles. He shows a refreshing awareness of the fact that they were composed by human beings, individuals of widely varying capacity who wrote in varying circumstances. If some of the chronicles are official records to which entries were added each year, or at the end of each reign, others are compilations in which a variety of information from numerous different sources has been pieced together, sometimes with skill, sometimes without any regard for common sense or accuracy. In judging their value it is always well to bear these things in mind.

One of the most baffling documents is the *History of the North Country*, พงศาวดารเมืองเหนือ.* The 'North Country' referred to is not northern Siam, but the provinces constituting the old kingdom of Sukhodaya. The history was composed in 1807 by a royal pandit, Brah Vijjar Prijā, at the command of King Rāma I.

'It appears [says Prince Damrong] that the method Brah Vijjar adopted was to collect all the old manuscripts he could find that he believed to concern events that occurred before the founding of Ayudhyā [in 1350], and also to interview elderly people in the North Country and note down whatever they could remember from the old traditions. All this material he arranged in order just as he thought it would fit in, in the hope of making it into a consecutive whole like the history of Ayudhyā. As a result the composition is a patchwork of stories of quite different kinds, and sometimes one story is repeated twice. The chronology is entirely unreliable, and breaks down if any attempt is made to compare one date with another. Nevertheless there is a solid substratum of

* There is a French translation of this work: C. Notton, *Légendes sur le Siam et le Cambodge*, Bangkok, 1939.

fact in the accounts of various incidents given in this history; but we cannot rely on their sequence as set down by Brah Vijar Prijā. (*Misc. Art.*, p. 32; I have somewhat amended the English).

It is a great misfortune that the manuscripts were destroyed after Brah Vijar used them; conceivably modern scholarship might extract something more coherent from them than he did. As it is, the 'solid substratum of fact' is extremely elusive. Since no one can put the *History of the North Country* to any use at all without making large assumptions as to where this or that incident should be fitted in, it is all too easy to come to almost any conclusion one wishes. Prince Damrong's assessment is rigorously exact.

As to the chronicles in general, we are in a far better position to exploit them today than was possible a half century ago. A fair number of them which then existed only in manuscript have been made accessible in print; several have been translated into French or English. We possess beautifully edited versions of the Pali recension of the Annals of Ayudhyā and the historical portions of the Pali chronicles *Jinakālamālī* and *Cāmadevivamsa*, as well as Siamese and French translations. Yet much still remains to be done. A great many old chronicles dealing with the towns, monasteries and images of northern Siam exist only in manuscript (see, for example, the list of historical MSS in the Vajirañāna Library, BEFEO XXV, p. 172). We badly need printed editions of them. English translations of these, as well as translations of the ones that have already been printed in the พระพุทธศาสนา and elsewhere, would help make them accessible to the historians of neighboring countries, and permit an exchange of ideas on various points of history.

My own rather superficial studies have shown me that while some of the chronicles are quite hopeless, a good many are very trustworthy for the period from the 13th or 14th century on. Among the best are *Jinakālamālī*, *Mūlasāsanā*, the chronicles of Chieng Mai, Chieng Sèn and Nân, and of course the Luang Prsrōth Version of

the Ayudhyā Annals.* *Jinakālamālī* is unusual in that it is also to some extent trustworthy for the earlier period. These are preliminary judgments only; before a final judgment is possible, it will be necessary to collect, examine and compare all the chronicles, and wherever possible to compare them with the data available from inscriptions.

The *Yonaka History* (พงศาวดารโยนก), published in 1906, was a first attempt at this task. Prince Damrong gives it high praise, which indeed it deserves as a laudable pioneering effort. But as an authoritative document we cannot today give it so high a rating. Its author, whose critical sense was by no means as sharp as Prince Damrong's, did not realize that nearly all our chronicles, though they may be quite trustworthy in their later portions, are (with the partial exception of *Jinakālamālī*, *Cāmadevivāṃsa*, and one or two other) badly garbled in the portions dealing with events before the 13th century, if they are not pure fiction; he put too much faith in the *History of the North Country*; and a great many of the dates he proposed are hopeless. Besides, a careful comparison with the chronicles he used as source material shows that he sometimes misunderstood their meaning; historians will do well to consult the sources before drawing any final conclusions from the *Yonaka History*.

Prince Damrong enumerates several chronicles of neighboring countries that might shed light on the history of Siam, but he refrains from giving any assessment of their reliability. A generation or two ago, European historians put a good deal of trust in the chronicles of Cambodia and Lân Châng, Burma and Pegu; but as they began to compare them with one another, and with the inscriptions, doubts arose. These chronicles, at least in their earlier portions, are no longer taken quite so seriously. For instance the chapters of the *Glass Palace Chronicle* that deal with Pagán give a picture of events which the inscriptions show to be false. The Burma chronicles all praise King Aniruddha (11th century) as a zealous upholder of Theravāda Buddhism, and the historians Phayre

* For a French translation of the Chieng Mai Chronicle, see Notton, *Annales du Siam*, III, Paris, 1932.

and Harvey follow them; but it now seems probable that he was a devotee of the Mahāyāna, for the votive tablets bearing inscriptions to the effect that they were made by Aniruddha 'with his own hands' have figures of Avalokiteśvara or some other Bodhisattva on the obverse.

* * *

In historical and archeological research it is necessary to piece scattered and uncertain evidences together. One has to make certain surmises, or 'working hypotheses,' as one goes along—not mere guesses, but reasonable formulations that fit all the facts as they are known at the time. When new facts are discovered the hypothesis may have to be altered, or even abandoned altogether. Prince Damrong was perfectly aware of this necessity, and never hesitated to drop an old hypothesis when new evidence required.

Here is an example of his readiness to acknowledge error:

(I would here beg for an opportunity of correcting a mistake which I have made elsewhere, and more especially in my preface to the *Traibhumi of Phra Ruang*. I have stated that the King of Sukhodaya name Phya Li Thai is a different personage from King Cṛī Suryavaṃṣa Rāma. As a matter of fact, these two names designated the same monarch. My error was due to an incorrect reading of the dates appearing on the stone inscription of Nagor Jum. I have but recently ascertained that both names without doubt belonged to the same king (*Miscellaneous Articles*, p. 84).

It is this process of progressive rectification that makes historical research a science instead of a daydream. No one can ever know the whole truth; the better the scholar, the more he will inspire others to pursue the investigations he has started; ideas will be exchanged and debated; and the earlier studies will be superseded by more mature ones that interpret the data more perfectly.

Thus it often happens that an article embodying the most important original research into some difficult phase of history will itself become obsolete as soon as it has instigated this process. It

is like the scaffolding required to build a more permanent structure; and anyone who, mistaking it for that structure, ventures to climb on a scaffolding raised almost 50 years ago, is liable to come to grief.

These considerations apply in some degree to the paper on 'Siamese History prior to the Founding of Ayuddhya' (*Misc. Art.*, pp. 49-88). Prince Damrong dealt skilfully with the material at his disposal, but that material was meagre in comparison to what we have today. He tried to place it in the general framework of South-east Asian history—for it would have been meaningless otherwise—but that framework was only known in a very fragmentary way at the time he wrote. It is all too easy for us to forget the immense advantage we now enjoy in this respect: we have only to open Mr. Coedès's *Histoire ancienne des États hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie* (Paris, 1948), and there is our framework, erected on the solid base of epigraphy and references in Chinese history. So indispensable has this book become that one wonders how it was ever possible for historians to deal with Southeast Asia at all without it.

Prince Damrong's pages concerning Siam before the arrival of the Tai (*Misc. Art.*, pp. 49-59) are based on the best European scholarship of the time; but as much of it has since succumbed to the usual law of obsolescence these pages have inevitably succumbed to the same law. In 1914 when they were written, the kingdom of Dvāravatī had not yet been heard of; the great cultural complex around the northern coast of the Gulf of Siam and in the Jao Payā Valley, whose importance Prince Damrong was one of the first to appreciate, was not yet recognized as being Môn, but was attributed to the Lawā (လား, sometimes written Lawā လာ). The Lawā, who belonged to a less advanced branch of the Môn-Khmer people, were then identified with the Lāo (လော), who are of course a branch of the Tai. Many points of Khmer history, which are now well known, were still unsuspected. Notions of chronology were extremely vague, with a general tendency to place everything too early.

The modern reader would be well advised to skip these pages, which can only confuse him. They nevertheless contain much shrewd analysis that aided later historians in their researches. Though they should not be mistaken for permanent structure, we should remember that they were once a most serviceable scaffolding.

The next section (*Misc. Art.* pp. 60-65) concerns the origin of the Tai. Here the author was misled by the European Sinologists who, on evidence that is now known to be defective, identified certain peoples discussed in early Chinese accounts as Tai. In particular the identification of the state of Nan-chao, in Yünnan, as a Tai kingdom, can no longer be accepted: the ruling classes of Nan-chao, it now appears, were a people who spoke a Tibeto-Burman language, perhaps Lolo. (See the various articles by Mr. G.H. Luce in JSS and in the *Journal of the Burma Research Society*.) The pages that Prince Damrong devotes to the history of Nan-chao are therefore irrelevant to the history of the Tai.

But if the Tai did not come from Nan-chao, where did they come from? Prince Damrong, relying on a European scholar whom he does not name, says (p. 60) that by the second century B.C. or earlier the Tai had established several independent states in the four provinces of Kwangtung, Kwanghsi, Kweichow and Yünnan. The geographical distribution is doubtless right, with the possible exception of Yünnan. It may well be that their main movement was from east to west, into Tongking and Laos, and it was probably so gradual that there would be no use trying to give it a date. There are some reasons to believe that the great expansion of the Tai into Yünnan, the Shan States, Assam, and Siam, beginning around the 11th century A.D., had its main point of departure in the highlands of Thongking and Laos. Incidentally, that would fit in with the story, for what it may be worth, of Khun Parama (ขุนพรม), the legendary ancestor of the Tai of Laos and Siam, who is said to have been the ruler of Müang Tèng (Dien-bien-phu). (Cf. Rispaud, JSS XXIX/2, p. 98 f.)

All this is extremely speculative, and the time is not ripe to propose it or any other hypothesis seriously. I mention it only as a possible alternative to the now discredited Nan-chao theory.

'The Burmese and Peguan annals, like our own Northern annals,' says Prince Damrong (p. 66), 'give to events a date earlier than the actual facts warrant.' His critical sense pointed in the right direction; but he had no means of knowing what drastic revisions were needed. Some of his statements in the section on the Burmese therefore need to be reconsidered.

'At about the beginning of the Buddhist era, a body of Indian emigrants descended the upper waters of the Irawaddy valley and established the independent state of Thaton. Later on, when the Thai who had settled in the valley of the Salwin grew more powerful, they pushed their frontiers into the Irawaddy valley and took possession of Thatôn. The people of the latter country fled southwards from the Thai and founded the state of Sārakhetr near the district in which the city of Prae or Prome was afterwards built.' (*Misc. Art.*, pp. 66-67.)

I have not the Siamese text before me, but it is evident that a good deal has gone wrong in the English one. 'Sarakhetr' is a misprint for Sirikhetra (Śrīkṣetra), a Pyu city founded around the 5th century A.D. at the present site of Prome; Prome is northwest of Thaton, not south; the date for the founding of Thaton is at least a thousand years too early; and there is no evidence that any Tai were ever in possession of Thaton before the late 13th century.

Prince Damrong believed that King Aniruddha of Pagán conquered a large part of Siam. 'The period,' he writes, 'was one in which the might of the Khmers was declining; King Aniruddha accordingly brought them into subjection under him and extended his territory as far as the valley of the River Chao Phya.' He then quotes the *History of the North Country* to the effect that Aniruddha's dominions reached the city of Lopburī; and he adds that the circulation of the Pali Canon in Siam dates from the time when King Aniruddha procured copies from Ceylon.

These surmises need to be examined, because a great many writers on Siam have followed the learned author and accepted them.

They are in fact not tenable. The Prince was deceived by the old chronology into believing that the Khmer were losing their grip in the 11th century; true, they had some temporary internal troubles, but there is good evidence to show that Lopburī was firmly in Khmer hands from the beginning of the 11th century until some time in the 13th. Nothing could be more unreliable than the *History of the North Country*, and I fancy that the Prince advanced it only as supporting evidence for what it might be worth. We now know with virtual certainty that neither Aniruddha nor any other ruler of the Pagán dynasty ever conquered any territory east of the Salween; for though they have left us hundreds of inscriptions, many of which make somewhat extravagant territorial claims, not one makes the slightest claim to anything beyond that river. Nor is it likely that Aniruddha, even if he had gone to Siam, would introduce the Ceylon scriptures there if he was a devotee of the Mahāyāna. Besides, the Pali Canon was already well known in Siam, having been introduced into the kingdom of Dvāravati long before it was introduced into upper Burma; we have epigraphic proof that it was known in the region of Nagara Pathama around the 9th century (see *Artibus Asiae*, XIX, 3/4, p. 221 ff.).

Prince Damrong (p. 68) quotes the *Yonaka History* to the effect that the Tai Prince Brahma (พรหม) founded the city of Jayaprākāra in northern Siam around the 9th century A.D. But we know that the dates in the chronicles that form the basis for this section of the *Yonaka History* are very bad; and the identification of Jayaprākāra is uncertain (one of the Lāo chronicles places it in Annam). Apart from the bas-reliefs at Angkor Wat showing Tai contingents in the Khmer armies (12th century), our first sure evidence of the presence of the Tai in Siam dates from the 13th century, both in the Sukhodaya region and in Lān Nā. It seems likely that they were there before; but how long before, and exactly where, we have no means of knowing.

'We do not know what was originally the religion of the Thai,' Prince Damrong observes. He goes on to say that those in China were probably Mahāyāna Buddhists. The inference rests on

the mistaken notion that the rulers of Nan-chao, who were indeed Mahāyāna Buddhists, were Tai. In fact all the evidence we have suggests that the Tai were animists, but that they adopted Theravāda Buddhism from the Mòn after arriving in Siam. The Prince concludes—and everyone will agree—that ‘the Thai on their arrival must have adopted the religious beliefs and the customs of the original population’ (p. 69).

After some interesting speculations about the origins of the [^]Ū Tòng dynasty (pp. 69-73), he proceeds to the history of Sukhodaya (pp. 73-84). Here he is on more solid ground, relying as far as possible on the inscriptions and Chinese accounts, filling the gaps with information from such chronicles as he considers to be trustworthy. This section shows his true stature as an historian; and when we consider that it was written a half-century ago it is little short of remarkable. Still, a good deal of information has come to light since, and it would be a mistake to regard his account as definitive. Prudent readers will want to compare it with more recent studies of Sukhodaya, such as those in JSS XII/1, XIII/3, XIV/1, XVII/3, XXVIII/2).

His account of Lân Nâ (pp. 84-87) begins with an admirable note of skepticism regarding the chronicles when they deal with a period that has bequeathed us no inscriptions. At the time he wrote, the Mòn and Pali inscriptions of Haripuñjaya had not yet been read, and it was believed that Haripuñjaya and Khelānga (Lampâng) had been founded by the Khmer. He surmised that they were conquered by Aniruddha in the 11th century, and by the Tai soon afterwards; but as we have seen, neither Aniruddha nor any of his dynasty conquered any part of Siam. Researches published a dozen years after Prince Damrong's paper show that Haripuñjaya and Khelānga had been founded by the Mòns around the 8th century, and that a Mòn dynasty—after passing through a good many vicissitudes—was still ruling them at the time of the Tai conquest in 1292 (See Coedès in BEFEO, XXV).

The paper closes with a brief account of the founding of Ayudh-yā by the Prince of Ū Tòng. The region of Subarnapurī and Ū Tòng in heart of the Mòn country, had been ruled by vassals of Sukhodaya; the region of Lōpburī and Ayodhyā, which had been the main axis of Khmer power in Siam, seems never to have been subject to the Sukhodayan kings. The circumstances in which the Prince of Ū Thòng broke away are obscure. In his efforts to reconstruct them Prince Damrong uses his intimate knowledge of the geography and economy of central Siam to supplement the meagre records available, and arrives at a thoroughly plausible explanation.

5

Histories of art, like histories in general, succumb to the law of obsolescence with varying speed. Normally those dealing with the earliest periods succumb the quickest, for in them the proportion of hypothesis to established fact is the highest, so that any new discovery may change our views, and some will change them drastically. On the other hand those dealing with the more recent past have a much higher life-expectancy, for they are based on evidences that are both more abundant and easier to interpret with certainty; the documentation at the time of writing is already so large that any additions it receives from further research will be small in proportion; so conclusions intelligently reached will not be much changed by new discoveries.

This principle is strikingly illustrated in Chapters 8 and 9 of Prince Damrong's *ตำนานพระพุทธรูป*, first published in 1926. If they were being written today, the pages dealing with the earlier periods would have to be substantially changed, whereas the later portions would scarcely need retouching. If the reader has any doubt about the truth of this statement, all he has to do is to look at the footnotes in Prince Subhadradis's 1960 edition of the book. Those constituting *corrigenda* cluster around the earlier portions; those on later pages are mere *addenda*, which are always interesting, but could be omitted without seriously misinforming the reader.

When this text was written, the sections dealing with Dvāravatī and Srīvijaya, Lopburi and Chieng Sèn, constituted an important step forward. Yet very little is to be gained from re-reading them today: the specialist will find nothing in them that he does not already know, while the non-specialist will be misled by them.

The later sections, in contrast, are as fresh as if they had been written yesterday. The learned author writes of the Ayudhyā and Bangkok periods with a sure hand and irresistible *brio*. Everything he has to say about them is luminous, from his account of the early monarchs of Ayudhyā, with their strong Khmerizing tendencies, up to his estimate of King Rāma VII's great work of causing the Pali Canon to be printed in Siamese characters. He is at his best, I think, when he carries us into a past which is now already far removed, but whose traditions were still a living thing when he was young.

Monograph No. 2 of the Siam Society's series, entitled *A History of Buddhist Monuments in Siam*, is Mr S. Sivaraksa's translation. It is attractively presented, with good clear illustrations selected from those appearing in the Siamese edition of 1960. One might therefore suppose the translation to be based on that edition; but if it is, Prince Subhadradis's footnotes have disappeared (and so, for that matter, have Prince Damrong's).

No hint is given that anything in the text might require the slightest revision. One might suppose that in the last 36 years not a single pertinent fact had been discovered; that the Archeological Service had accomplished nothing; and that no writer, Siamese or foreign, had made the slightest new contribution to the subjects under discussion. Those of us, both inside and outside the Archeological Service, who have devoted many years of work to these very subjects may be excused for feeling a trifle crestfallen.

I do not think the translator meant to imply that we have all worked to no purpose; more likely it did not occur to him that our research might be relevant. He does not claim any knowledge of archeology. 'Despite the fact that it is published by a learned so-

ciety,' he writes, his book 'is meant for the general public rather than scholars' (Monograph, p. 3).

Here lies the danger: scholars can decide for themselves what is valuable and what is not; the general public, poor innocents, have no means of doing so. A writer who accepts the hospitality of publication in the journal of a learned society has certain duties to the public.

Although the *Monograph* is far from authoritative, a person who can read neither Siamese nor French may be glad to buy it; and if he removes, by excision or blocking-out, the first four and a half pages, and also pages 10 to 18, he will have a very nice book. The pages remaining after the operation are on the whole translated well enough for a reader who is not very sensitive to style; and very little of this portion of Prince Damrong's text has been overtaken by obsolescence.

The title of the Monograph, *A History of Buddhist Monuments in Siam*, requires a word of explanation, as it may give the impression that it is mainly devoted to architecture, whereas it also deals at length with Buddha images, and it includes some discussion of relics, footprints, bodhi trees, and the Pali Canon. All these things of course come under the heading *Buddhacetiya*, พุทธเจดีย์, the term that is here translated as 'Buddhist Monument.' Now although in common usage the word *cetiya* means an architectural monument, it has another and broader sense, meaning any sort of 'reminder.' Curiously enough the English word *monument* (from Latin '*monere*, 'to advise,' 'to remind') has a similar double meaning; and if we bear that in mind, 'Buddhist Monuments' is a perfectly acceptable translation of *Buddhacetiya* *

* The Pali word *cetiya* (Sanskrit: *caitya*) comes from the root *ci*, 'to heap up,' 'to construct,' connected in pre-Buddhist times with Vedic sacrificial altars, commemorative stupas, and the like. It also has connotations of *cit*, 'to aim at,' 'to resolve,' 'to remind,' etc. In Buddhism *cetiya* means any sort of reminder, symbol, memorial, or substitute; and *Buddhacetiya* is not only a reminder and a symbol of the Buddha who has passed into Total Extinction, but also a memorial to him and a substitute for him.

As Prince Damrong explains in a chapter which is not included in the *Monograph*, there are four categories of *cetiya*: *dhātucetiya*, *paribhogacetiya*, *dharmacetiya* and *uddesikacetiya*. The English equivalents for these terms given us by the translator are: Relic, Memorial, Teaching, and Votive (*Monograph*, p. 10 *et passim*). He would have done better to consult the late Professor Coomaraswamy's illuminating discussion of the terms in *The Nature of Buddhist Art* (New York, 1938). *Dhātucetiya* are indeed bodily relics; and by extension they include reliquaries, which may be of any size from a tiny capsule to a huge stupa. *Paribhogacetiya* (from *pari-*, 'around,' and the root *bhuj*, 'to make use of') are 'reminders by association'; they include the almsbowl the Buddha used, the seats he sat on, the trees that sheltered him, the footprints he stamped on mountain-top or river-bank, and so on. *Dharmacetiya*, 'reminders of the Doctrine,' are passages from the Pali Canon, or any objects on which they are written; and by extension they include buildings containing such objects. *Uddesikacetiya* (from *ud-*, 'upward,' 'apart', and the root *dis*, 'to point') are 'indicative reminders,' objects which the general opinion rightly or wrongly accepts as suitable reminders; they include replicas of *paribhogacetiya*, and of course replicas of other *uddesikacetiya*. By far the most numerous *uddesikacetiya* in Siam are, in architecture, the *stūpa* and monuments derived from it; in sculpture, images of the Buddha.

The matter of architectural terms is troublesome, as they have rather shifting values in Siamese usage, and of course there is nothing like a standardized system of English equivalents. The translator, as we can see from his Glossary (*Monograph*, p. 45), has struggled hard with the problem, but not very successfully. It is far from easy. The following remarks may help.

In the Glossary (p. 45) *Dagoba* is defined as:

'A word of Singhalese origin, used for a Buddhist monument in Theravada Buddhism. Monuments of the Northern School of Buddhism are called *pagodas*. Both words come from the Indian word *stupa*. The word *cetiya* is also used.'

I need hardly say that neither *dagoba* nor *pagoda* has any etymological connection with *stūpa*. *Dagoba* is indeed Sinhalese, but it derives from Pali *dhātugabbha* (*dhātu*, 'relic'; *gabbha*, 'an inner chamber,' 'womb'); and it is indeed used for monuments in the Theravāda, but hardly outside of Ceylon. The word *pagoda* (popularly but mistakenly believed to be a Spoonerism for *dagoba*) is a Portuguese corruption of either Persian *butkadah*, 'a house of idols', or of Tamil *pagavadi*, 'temple' (cf. Sanskrit *bhagavatī*); the Chinese *pei-ku-t'a*, 'white bone tower' (i.e. reliquary) is perhaps a coincidence. In any case the term *pagoda* is not confined to the Mahāyāna, but is also rather indiscriminately used by English speakers in several Theravādin countries (e.g. Burma). One can never be sure whether a tower or a monastery is intended; and in some of the older books on India it means an idol. In my opinion it is safer to avoid words like *dagoba* and *pagoda* altogether.

In architecture the terms 'stupa' (Sanskrit *stūpa*, Pali *thūpa*) and 'cetiya' are to some extent interchangeable.* But it is convenient to use the first in a restricted sense, referring to a more or less hemispherical solid structure, and the second more loosely. Among the different sorts of *cetiya*, in this sense of the word, the following may be mentioned: (1) any sort of monument consisting of a base supporting one or more stupas, which are usually but not necessarily surmounted by spires (e.g. *Monograph*, Figs. 7, 16); (2) the Khmer *prāsāda* and similar sanctuary towers (*Monograph*, Fig. 5); (3) the Siamese *prāṅg* (*Monograph*, Fig. 14), a beehive-shaped or bullet-shaped derivative of the *prāsāda*; (4) various combinations and modifications of these forms (*Monograph*, Figs. 2, 4, 11, 17).**

When Prince Damrong refers to a *prāsāda*, he usually calls it just that, ปราสาท. In the *Monograph* (pp. 18, 22, 26, 27, 29, 36) this word is regularly rendered as 'castle,' which gives the wrong

* By a singular confusion, some writers on Indian architecture use *cetiya* as an abbreviation of *cetiyaḥara*, a building such as a *vihāra* containing either a stupa or a large image as its principal object of worship.

** In Siamese popular usage ปราสาท generally means something like the *cetiya*s illustrated in *Monograph*, Figs. 16, 17.

impression altogether. It would be better either to leave the word untranslated, or else to render it as 'sanctuary' or 'sanctuary-towers.'*

The infelicities in the *Monograph* are not confined to architecture; I shall call attention only to those that are most likely to cause confusion. Most of them are in the pages I have advised the reader to get rid of; so if he has taken my advice he will not need to read my 'Supplementary Comments' (pp. 46), but only the following remarks.

Monograph, p. 5, paragraph 1. — 'After the reign of Anurudh, Pagan declined in power, and the Thais became more and more powerful in Siam. By this time, in the south of Siam, the Laos had intermarried with the Khmers for generations. The Laos civilization was inferior to that of the Khmers, and they more or less became Khmers. The original Laos only existed far from towns and on the mountains. And when the Thais increased their number in the northern part of Siam, the Laos civilisation, being inferior to that of the Thais, likewise became Thais. The original people only existed in small groups in the jungles, and are known to the Northern Thais as Luo and to the Southern Thais as Lawa. Nowadays they are still to be found in nearly every province in Siam.' The reader may find it easier to follow R. Nicolas's rendering of the same passage: 'Après le règne d'Anuruddha, la puissance du royaume de Pagan s'affaiblit et celle des Tai au Siam s'accrut petit à petit. A cette époque, dans le Siam du Sud, les populations Khmers s'étaient mêlées aux populations Lawa. Les Lawa avaient une culture inférieure à celle des Khmers et, pour la plupart, ils se laissèrent assimiler. Seules, parmi les Lawa, restèrent fidèles à leur vieille culture les populations de la jungle et de la montagne. A mesure que les Tai descendaient du Nord et se fixaient au Siam, une autre partie des populations Lawa, qui leur étaient à eux aussi inférieures en culture, se laissa assimiler par les nouveaux venus, si bien que peu à peu

* In Siamese popular usage, which should not be carried over into English, the word *prāṅ* (ปราสาท) includes the Khmer *prāsāda* as well as the beehive-shaped or bullet-shaped monuments to which it is more specifically applicable. In one instance, for a particular reason, Prince Damrong follows the popular usage; see below (p. 48), my remarks on *Monograph*, p. 13, par. 1.

elles diminuèrent et qu'il n'en subsista plus que quelques groupes sauvages et disséminés, que les Tai du North appellent Lawa et les Tai du Sud Lawa et que l'on rencontre encore aujourd'hui dans presque toutes les provinces du Siam' (*Extrême-Asie*, loc. cit., p. 22). These statements require a word of qualification. The decline in the power of Pagán after Aniruddha's death was brief; his second successor, Kyanzittha, was the real consolidator of the kingdom. I take it that the 'Lawa' (not Laos) that Prince Damrong says were partly assimilated by the Khmer were the same people as he calls 'Lawa' at p. 1, par. 2, that is, in reality, the Môn.* whether or not the Dvāravatī civilization was inferior to that of the Khmer is a matter of opinion: the progress of research in the last 30 years makes us set a higher and higher value on it.

Monograph, p. 6. paragraph 2. — The translation of the passage from Râm Kambhèng's inscription should read: 'West of this city of Sukhodaya is the monastery of the *Araññikas* [Forest-Dwelling Monks]. King Râm Kambhèng founded it and presented it to the Patriarch, the sage who has studied the Canon in its entirety, who is more learned than all the other monks of the land, and who came here from Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja.'

P. 6, par. 3; *et passim*; cf. p. 46, s.v. *Mon*. — The word Môn cannot properly be used as the name of a country or a city-state; it is the name of a people and a language. When a territorial designation is needed, the proper one is 'Rāmaññadesa' or 'the country.'

P. 19, par. 2. — The *prāṅg* of the Great Relic at Chalieng was probably built in the late 14th or early 15th century. Wat Culaṃaṇi at Bisṇuloka was built in 1464 (see *Misc. Art.*, p. 26). Both monuments, we now know, are of Khmerizing, not Khmer style.

P. 21, par. 2. — The quotation from the inscription should read as follows: 'When he . . . had been invested with the title

* Prince Subhadradiś draws attention to the distinction in a footnote see *ตำนานพระพุทธเจดีย์*, Bangkok, B.E. 2503 [1960], p. 85; though one may question his classification of the Lawa as Indonesian: their language is generally considered to belong to the Môn-Khmer family.

Srisuryavamsa Mahādharmarādhirāja [Great Righteous King of Kings, of illustrious Solar Dynasty], he was able to bring this holy Relic and deposit it here at Nagara Jun in the same year. This Great Relic is not an ordinary relic, it is a real and authentic relic [of the Buddha], which has in all truth been brought from far-away Ceylon.'

P. 21, par. 4. — If the reader has difficulty in following the description of the characteristic type of Sukhodaya *cetiya*, he will do well to consult the photograph. Fig. 11. Mr Boisselier has suggested that the form may derive from a miniature reliquary brought from Ceylon (cf. the Negapatam reliquaries), transposed to a monumental scale.

P. 23, next to last par. — The Canon brought from Ceylon was written in the Sinhalese script, but of course in the Pali language. From the Sukhodaya to the Bangkok period, the Khmer script was used, but — again of course — the Pali language.

P. 24, last par. — 'All these Sukhothai images were made with long robes . . .' The meaning is that the flap of the robe over the left shoulder reaches down nearly to the waist in front.

P. 26, par. 3. — The Buddha images that are usually classified under the heading 'Ū Tòng, groups B and C' (e.g. fig. 15) date mainly from this sub-period; see "The Arts of Thailand," p. 141 f.

P. 38, par. 4. — The second part of this paragraph might be better rendered as follows: 'The sculptors of the second and third reigns liked to emphasize ornament [i.e. the details of the Royal Attire], as may be observed in the Buddha images commemorating Kings Rāma I and II in the *uposatha* hall of the Chapel Royal of the Emerald Buddha. These statues are beautiful, but their beauty is doll-like: the artists of that period had no wish to reproduce the appearance of real human beings, but deemed the characteristics of the Buddha's Person (*Buddhalakṣaṇa*) to be entirely exceptional, and unlike the human anatomy.'

P. 43, par. 2.— Prince Mongkut, the future King Rāma IV, did not hold that 'Buddha had no hair.' Being a rationalist, he believed that the Buddha had a normal head, i.e. without the *uṣṇīṣa* or protuberance of skull that tradition assigned him. The image cast in conformity with this principle, shown at Fig. 20, has the usual curls but no *uṣṇīṣa*; the flame (equivalent to a halo) is attached directly to the top of the head.

P. 48, 49.— The Appendix contains a number of mistakes.

6

Mr. Tri Amatyakul has given us a complete bibliography of Prince Damrong (รายชื่อหนังสือพระนิพนธ์พระเจ้าบรมวงศ์เธอสมเด็จกรมพระยาดำรงราชานุภาพ, Bangkok, B.E. 2505). It is sure to whet the appetite of anyone who cares for Siamese culture. Persons who know enough Siamese to read the titles, but not enough to read the books and papers themselves without great labor, will indeed be grateful to any competent translator who comes to their rescue in this rich field.

A great many of these works are just as valuable today as when they first appeared, and require little or no annotation. But others—like some of those we have been discussing—are in part obsolete. That does not mean that they do not merit translation; but it would be unfair to Prince Damrong's memory if some mention of the results of later researches were not added. That is the more true because the later researches I refer to were in large measure instigated by Prince Damrong himself, and in nearly every case stem directly or indirectly from investigations that engaged his attention. To overlook them would therefore be tantamount to omitting a highly relevant part of his own work.

For this purpose it is essential for the translators to have some acquaintance with the subject they are dealing with, and indeed they should consult with someone who is an expert in it. Besides, when technical terms are involved, expert advice is the only sure way to avoid confusion.

The time is long since past when shabby translations need be accepted. The translators need to know both Siamese and English perfectly, and for that reason it might be better for them to work in pairs. Fractured English may lend a certain savor to the advertisements for boxing, but it will not do for translations of scholarly papers which are themselves written in pure and elegant Siamese.

I should like to suggest that our translators begin by mastering at least one of the numerous systems of Romanization, or preferably two. There are excellent Pali and Sanskrit scholars in this country; but we might never guess it from the Romanizations of Pali and Sanskrit names that are given general currency. Again our translators need to know something of Theravāda Buddhism, and the appropriate English terms associated with it. And they should remember that although we have no systematic English equivalents of the *Rājāsabha*, we have a considerable wealth of terms ranging from dignity to vulgarity, and it is well to choose the suitable one.

Siamese culture is an honorable subject, which deserves to be treated with respect and discussed with dignity. It ought to be more perfectly known, not only to Europeans and Americans, but also among the neighboring countries of Asia. English is the best vehicle; and nothing could be more valuable than further translations from the distinguished historian whose centenary was celebrated in 1962.

SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

Monograph, page 1, paragraph 2. — Nagara Pathama may or may not have been the capital of Dvāravatī. It has yielded a much greater quantity of antiquities of Dvāravatī style than any other site, but that might be due to a deficiency of excavations elsewhere. As I have already noted (p. 31), the ruling classes of Dvāravatī were Mōn, not Lawă.

Monograph, page 1, paragraph 3. — The argument that Buddhism was introduced into Siam in the first century B.C. needs to be qualified. None of the stone 'Wheels of the Law' or other

aniconic symbols that have actually been discovered in Siam date from any earlier than the 6th century A.D., as we know from the style of their floral and other patterns, and many of them are a good deal later. (One of the Wheels dates from the 9th century). Nevertheless it is possible that they are copies, at one or more removes, of much older objects that no longer survive; and if so they may be evidence, though not very conclusive evidence, that Buddhism was first brought to Siam in very early times. The late Pierre Dupont showed that there is not a single known example of Dvāravatī art that can be dated earlier than the 6th century A.D. (*Archeologie mône de Dvaravati*, Paris, 1959).

Monograph, p. 1, par. 4.— The type of image here referred to as 'the Buddha sitting in a chair' is the Buddha in *pralambanāsana*, commonly called 'seated in the European fashion.' The Dvāravatī images of this type derive not from Magadha but from the late Gupta cave-temples of western India (Ajanta, etc.), and should be dated in the 7th century A.D. and later.

Monograph, p. 3, par. 3.— I have already dealt with the argument that Aniruddha conquered northern Siam and introduced the Theravāda there (see above, p. 34). It is easily disproved, and I wonder why our patriotic Siamese historians have allowed it to go so long unchallenged.

Ibid.— To refer to the people of Pagán as 'Pagans' is a solecism, and a particularly unfortunate one in view of the meaning of the English word 'pagan.'

P. 4, par. 2.— 'Originally the Thai people had their own country ... situated between China and Tibet.' The reference is to Nan-chao, and rests on a false identification by European scholars (see above, p. 32).

Middle of p. 10.— The kingdom of Dvāravatī, first attested in the 6th century A.D., was conquered by the Khmer around 1,000. The dates assignable to Dvāravatī art, based on the latest researches, are 6th-13th century. 'Circa 500 of the Buddhist Era' (first century B.C.) is therefore from 700 to 1,400 years too early.

P. 11, par. 1.— ‘Big images were made either of stone or of brick; small ones were sometimes made of clay. They were also painted for decorative purposes.’ The original text has nothing about painting. The three categories referred to are (1) the main image in a monastery, made either of stone or else of masonry coated with plaster; (2) votive tablets; (3) bas-reliefs of incidents in the Buddha’s life, carved in stone.

Ibid — ‘The episode of the Buddha’s Double Miracle, or the Great Miracle as the Indians called it, was also invariably depicted, but was usually engraved on flat stones (like the one fixed at the back of the high altar at Wat Sutat in Bangkok.)’ A better rendering would be: ‘The Buddha was also represented in the attitude of performing the “Double Miracle,” or, to use the Indian terminology, the Great Miracle of Śrāvastī. Figures of the Buddha in this attitude occur in several scenes carved in bas-relief, such as the one at present installed in the Sudarśana Monastery in Bangkok, behind the pedestal of the image called Braḥ Śrī Sākya-muni.’ (This relief is illustrated in ‘The Arts of Thailand,’ Bloomington, 1960, Fig. 17.)

P. 12, par. 3. — The reader will get a clearer idea of the shrine at the Great Relic Monastery at Jaiyā from the photograph (*Monograph*, Fig. 4).

P. 13, par. 1. — ‘Sometimes these *Prang* Dagobas known as the Three Spires were built on the same line. (The Buddha image was housed in the middle spire, Bodhisattva images in the other two.)’ The original has: บางแห่งทำเป็นปรางค์เรียงกัน ๓ องค์ เรียกว่า ปรางค์ ๓ ยอด (ตั้งพระพุทธรูปไว้ตรงยอดกลางตั้งรูปพระโพธิสัตว์ ไว้ตรงยอด ๒ ข้าง). The reason why Prince Damrong here follows the Siamese popular usage, in which the Khmer *prāsāda* is called ปรางค์ is that he has in mind a particular edifice, the *Prāṅg Sām Yôt* ปรางค์สามยอด or ‘Triple Tower’ at Lopburī (*Monograph*, Fig. 5.). The word ยอด, which commonly means ‘spire,’ is here a classifier for ปรางค์ and as such is equivalent to องค์. The images were not ‘housed in spires.’ The meaning is as follows: ‘Sometimes sanctuaries of *prāsāda* form were built in groups of three in a row (called in Siamese *Prāṅg*

Sâm Yôt or "Triple Tower"), with an image of the Buddha in the central sanctuary and images of Bodhisattvas in the other two.'

Ibid. — 'Buildings were usually made of stone. Only the smaller kinds were cast in bronze.' The real meaning is that full-scale sanctuaries were made of laterite, whereas miniature shrines might be made of bronze.

P. 13, par. 2. — 'Buddha images during the Lopburî period were cast as well as made of stone and clay. There was also an innovation of royal insignias cast on the images.' The real meaning is: 'In the Lopburî period Buddha images were sometimes made of stone, sometimes of bronze, and sometimes in the form of votive tablets. During this period the type known as "the Buddha Wearing the Royal Attire" (พระทรงเครื่อง) appears for the first time.'

P. 14, par. 1. — 'The popular position was that of the Buddha seated under a serpent known as Pra Nag Prok.' This passage should read: 'The most popular type, known as *Brah Nāga Prak*, "the Lord sheltered by the Nāga," represents the Buddha seated in meditation with the serpent's hood spread protectively above his head.'

P. 15, par. 1. — The statement that 'Buddhist monuments of the Lopburî period are more numerous in Siam than those of any other single period' is of course untrue, as those of the Bangkok period are far more numerous. I think Prince Damrong meant that they are geographically more widely distributed than those of any other ancient style in Siam.

Ibid. — 'People claim that Lopburî images were also discovered at Lampoon. They were probably not made there, but were brought from Lopburî itself.' The reference is not to images in the plural, but to the famous image called *Brah Lvo*, 'the Buddha of Lawò', which can still be seen in the little museum of the Great Relic Monastery at Lampûn. Judging by the style, I take it to be a copy, made in northern Siam in the late 15th century, of some image of Û Tòng 'C' type which was made earlier in the century at Lopburî or Ayudhyā.

P. 15, par. 2. — The argument that northern Siam received Buddhism directly from India rests on faulty premises. It received Buddhism from Dvāravatī, with the founding of Lampūn around the 8th century. The Seven Spires Monument is indeed a copy of the Mahābodhi at Bodhgayā, but it was built in the second half of the 15th century.

P. 16, par. 2. — Northern Siam is full of monuments of Burmese style, mostly built in the late 19th and early 20th century. Not a single one can by any stretch of the imagination be attributed to Aniruddha or to his (imaginary) conquest of northern Siam.

P. 15, par. 2. is headed: CHIENGSAEN PERIOD FROM CIRCA 1600 OF THE BUDDHIST ERA. I have shown elsewhere that the term 'Chieng Sèn' is a misnomer; 'Lân Nā' or 'Northern Siam' would be more appropriate. The date is too early. Depending on precisely what is to be included, we could place the beginning date anywhere between the late 13th and the mid-15th century. Cf. below, my comments regarding page 17 par. 4, and p. 18 par. 1.

P. 16, par. 4. — The Cetiya Luang (here called 'Royal Dago-ba') dates from the 15th century; the original cetiya of the Flower-Garden Monastery dates from the 14th, but is now restored beyond recognition. The cetiya of the Standing Buddha at Lampūn was built in the early years of the present century, and is one of the monuments of Burmese style referred to above.

P. 17, par. 4. — 'Images of the Buddha on the whole represented the Votive Monument.' Read instead: 'The most important kind of *uddesikacetiya* were Buddha images.' For 'the robe was short' (last two lines of page), read 'the flap of the robe over the left shoulder was short' [i.e. stopping above the nipple]. The images of the sort described in this paragraph, which are here attributed to the 'early Chieng Saen period,' were, in my opinion, made at Chieng Mai and the other cities of northern Siam, mainly between 1455 and 1565. The example illustrated in Fig. 10 was cast in 1486, as we know from the inscription on its base; the one in Fig. 8 I believe to be a little later. See my remarks in 'The Arts of Thai-

Bloomington, 1960, p. 123; also my *Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam*, Ascona, 1957, *passim*. Most of my colleagues in Bangkok disagree with my views on this subject, maintaining that only the ugly examples date from the 15th and 16th century, whereas the beautiful ones are much earlier.

P. 18, par. 1. — For 'his robe was longer,' read 'the flap of the robe over the left shoulder was longer' [i.e. reaching down nearly to the waist in front]. — The images here described were made from the mid-15th century up to modern times. The image in Fig. 9 was cast in 1482. For a further discussion of these types, see 'The Arts of Thailand,' p. 123 f., and *Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam*, *passim*.

P. 18, par. 2. — For 'decorated with ornaments' read 'wearing the Attire of Royalty.'

P. 18, par. 5. — For 'Relic Dagoba at Nakonpanom' read 'the monument of Dhātu Bnam'. Recent unpublished researches by Mr. Boisselier indicate that it was built around the 9th century.

Ibid. — For 'Buddist or Hindu stone castles' (ปราสาทหิน) read: 'sanctuaries of the *prāsāda* type.' These are the same type as was called ปราสาท at p. 13, par. 1, though not in groups of three.

POSTSCRIPT

Since writing *Thoughts on a Centenary*, I have received further information about the two volumes under review, and learn that many of the imperfections in them were due to hasty preparation in order to meet a deadline. Deadlines, as my own experience has taught me, can be painful; and I should be sorry if my reproaches were to add to anyone's discomfort. Nothing could be further from my intentions than to offend anyone connected with the enterprise. If I have inadvertently done so, I hasten to offer my apologies.

A.B. Griswold

Bangkok, February, 1964

NOTE

(One of the most useful ideas initiated by Prince Damrong in his capacity of head of the National Library and later President of Royal Institute was the series known in our pages as *A Compendium of Historical Material* ("Prajum Pongsāwadār", as we prefer to write it,). The series served to present to the public historical material which already existed in print as well as in manuscript thereby preserving them from further decay. New translations of good historical work were encouraged and published. The scheme commenced as far back as 1914. By the time of the Revolution of 1932 when the Prince was relieved of his connection with those institutions sixty volumes had already come into existence. Then came a period of cessation of the good work which was fortunately resumed about 1936 from which there have been added some 17 volumes of the series, making the whole 77 in number. The range of subjects are within the range of historical materials.

Although the JSS. has since 1944 been publishing reviews and notices of recent Siamese publications which invariably include the series of historical material, no summary of the whole series had been so far available to foreigners in the more generally understood languages.

It is therefore to the credit of Dr. Klaus Wenk of Hamburg that he has made such a summary with a preface descriptive of the work in *Oriens Extremus*, year 9, part 2, December 1962, pp. 232-257, under the title of *Prachum Pongsāwadān, ein Beitrag zur Bibliographie der Thailandischen historischen Quellen*.

Dr. Wenk's summary carries us down to vol. 76. Another volume has been since published, containing a translation from the French of the *Histoire des princes du Yun-nan et leurs relations avec la Chine*. It is sponsored by His Excellency M. Thanat Khoman, Minister of Foreign Affairs in dedication to his farther-in-law, Mr. Pao Virānkūra on the occasion of the latter's cremation. The work is thought, as stated in the preface by the Fine Arts Department to be an authority on the subject. The translation has been done by Mme Jūsri Sāthorn of that Department and annotated by Prayā Anumān its President. The material runs to some 131 pages.

Bangkok, 11 November 1963.

D.

CORRIGENDA

- P. 23, line 24: for Viskha read Visakha.
P. 25, line 10: for devided read divided.
Pl. 25, line 12: after (၁၈၁), add a comma.
Ibid.: for af read of.
P. 27, line 25: for Dhamatraipitaka read Dharmatripiṭaka.
P. 29, line 21: for Record read Records.
P. 30, line 11-12: for Pras-röth read Prasröth.
P. 30, line 23: for time honored read time-honored.
P. 30, line 32: for next read text.
P. 31, line 20, 21: for Brah read Brah.
P. 32, line 2, 6: for Brah read Brah.
P. 32, line 19: for Cammadevivamsa read Cammadevivamsa.
P. 32, line 15: omit the parenthesis at the beginning.
P. 32, line 18: for name read named.
P. 36, line 29: for Thonking read Tongking.
P. 40, line 3: for in heart read in the heart.
P. 43, line 43: for the stamped read he stamped.
P. 44, line 28: for refer, read refers.
P. 44, second footnote: for catiyas read cetiyas.
P. 45, line 2: for towers read tower.
P. 46, line 2: for North read Nord.
P. 46, line 10: for whether read Whether.
P. 46, line 24: for the country read the Môn country.
P. 47, line 2: for of illustrious read of the illustrious.

