

NOTES AND COMMENTS

by

A.B. Griswold

The editor of the Journal of the Siam Society has asked me to reply to an article by Prince Chand Chirayu Rajni (JSS 60/2, pp. 257-284), in which he reviews my book *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*¹.

Prince Chand says he counts himself among 'the most sympathetic of Griswold's readers' (p. 267), and considers this book 'probably the best work' I have done (p. 284). He also finds it disappointing (p. 257), says it is a pity that it should contain so many inaccuracies, and thinks it would have been better if, instead of writing it, I had translated 'Thai writing of the last ten years', without doing any interpretation myself (p. 284).

He says I have left out a number of matters I ought to have discussed. While he thinks I may have omitted one of them because I failed to read 'the results of the latest Thai researches' (p. 259), and he is 'prepared to believe' that I omitted two others by mistake, he is 'not prepared to accept that' a fourth one was omitted by accident because, if I had mentioned it, it would have played havoc with a theory which, so far as he knows, is accepted by no one in the world except myself. He adds that if his supposition is correct it indicates behavior improper in a genuine scholar, so he can only hope he is wrong (p. 284).

Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art—a title which I shall abbreviate as *HSA*—is certainly not flawless²; but Prince Chand seems to have been too busy condemning imaginary mistakes to notice the real ones. I hope

- 1) Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, Bangkok (Department of Fine Arts), 1967; revised edition, 1968. (Both editions bear the date 1967 on the title-page; but the date of printing, as given on the last page of the book, is B.E. 2510 for the first edition, and B.E. 2511 for the second.)
- 2) For example the date in line 6 of p. 29 should be 1347, not 1357; the date at the end of paragraph 4 on p. 38, given correctly as 1369 in the first edition, has gone wrong in the second; some mistakes in the text are corrected in the postscript to the second edition; and some are corrected in the various Epigraphic and Historical Studies contributed by Dr Prasert na Nagara and myself to the JSS.

he will not think me presumptuous if, in the course of trying to answer his questions, I mention some of the mistakes in his review.

In the passages cited below, preceded by the page numbers in JSS 60/2, I have taken the liberty of amending his spelling of Sanskrit and Pali loanwords, and Siamese names, so as to make for easier comparison with *HSA*. The citations are followed by my comments.

P. 257: 'An old theory, which Griswold accepts, regards Sukhodaya as a vassal of Cambodia in the reigns of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII.'

As this 'theory' is not the one that would have been endangered if I had not suppressed the evidence, I have no objection to stating some of the grounds it is based on. These include: a Khmer temple at Sukhodaya built in the reign of Sūryavarman II; five Khmer statues of Hindu divinities dating from the same reign; two Khmer temples at Sukhodaya founded in the reign of Jayavarman VII; the *dharmaśālā* at Chalieng, which is typical of the temples built by Jayavarman VII along the main routes of his empire; sculpture dating from his reign, including a stone statue which scholars acquainted with Khmer art consider to be a Jayabuddhamahānātha, though Prince Chand does not (p. 274); the Khmer title *Kamrateñ Añ* which Phā Mōañ received from the King of Cambodia, together with the sacred sword *Jayaśrī*, and a Khmer princess in marriage, all of which fit in with what is known about Jayavarman VII's presentations to his highest-ranking vassals³; the well-known Khmer title *Khloñ* borne by the 'valiant Khòm' who was defeated by Phā Mōañ and his ally Pāñ Klāñ Hāv; the name *Braḥ Khbañ* or *Braḥ Khbuñ* borne by the chief tutelary spirit of Sukhodaya, as well as the hill on which he resided (Khmer *braḥ khbañ*, 'holy and exalted'⁴); the lasting heritage of Khmer style in certain of the arts, including a fair amount of Khmerizing architecture and sculpture created after Sukhodaya became independent; the general use of a Siamese script derived from a Khmer cursive; the use of the Khmer script itself for inscriptions in Pali, for at least one

3) For the honors bestowed on Phā Mōañ by the King of Cambodia, as well as a discussion of the Khmer titles in Inscription 2, see JSS 60/1, pp. 86, 87, 110 and note 37, 111 and note 40.

4) See JSS 59/2, p. 214, note 95.

long inscription in Siamese, and of course for Līdaiya's Khmer inscription of 1361; and the frequent occurrence of Khmer loan-words in Sukhodayan Siamese.

P. 257: 'Many Thai scholars do not accept this theory. They say that Sukhodaya was never under the hegemony of Cambodia; and that the presence of Khôm buildings at Sukhodaya does not necessarily mean that the Sukhodaya country was a Khmer vassal state. They also point to some art objects at Biṣṇuloka and Tāk which are certainly not Cambodian and which are earlier than Sukhodaya, and thus earlier than Indrāditya. Both sides have good cases; but I accept neither.'

The non-Cambodian art objects pointed to, unless they can be proved contemporary with the reigns of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII, cannot count as evidence that Sukhodaya was not a vassal of Cambodia in those reigns. In any case I doubt if vassals were compelled to produce works of art exclusively in the style of the suzerain.

P. 258: 'Over ten years ago, some Thai scholars suggested that Rāmādhīpati did not come from Ū Tòng to found Ayudhyā, but from Ayodhyā a few miles downstream, that is, there was an older city at the site of Ayudhyā before Ayudhyā itself was founded A seminar was held at the Faculty of Archaeology, Śilpākara University, to discuss whether Ayodhyā had ever really existed Relying on the written sources, it was agreed unanimously that Ayodhyā had in fact existed. On the basis of air photographs, it was then agreed that there were two cities, of about equal size, in the Ayudhyā area Of the two cities in the air photographs, it seems more than reasonable to suppose that one is older than the other; that if the younger city was Ayudhyā, the older must have been Ayodhyā because there are no other large cities within miles; and that Rāmādhīpati came from there to found the younger city in 1350 A.D. This is basic logic and if it is accepted then Sukhodaya was not a vassal of Cambodia in Jayavarman VII's reign because the Kingdom of Ayodhyā laid in between.'

Whether or not Ayodhyā lay in between is irrelevant. Lavo (Lopburī) was part of the Khmer empire in the reigns of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII, which gave them access to Sukhodaya.

P. 259: As I cannot read Chinese, I will not venture to express an opinion about Prince Chand's identification of 'Hsien' with Nagara Paṭhama. In Professor Flood's article on relations between Sukhodaya and the Mongol Court, JSS 57/2 (p. 241, note 82), the reader will find a short discussion, with references, regarding the equation Hsien=Sukhodaya. For my views on Rāmādhīpati, see JSS 60/1, p. 29-39.

P. 260-261: Prince Chand's suggested location of Pān Khlañ (which he writes 'Bang Kloong') is plausible, though he gives no evidence for it⁵. That of Lambañ ('Lampong') seems less so.

P. 262: 'Griswold suggests that Müang Rāt was at what is now Uttarattittha, again without supporting evidence.'

Evidently note 8 on p. 3 of *HSA* escaped Prince Chand's attention. For some further information, see JSS 60/1, p. 85 and note 16.

P. 263: 'Griswold however thinks Rām Kambhèng died in 1299. He does not give any reason, but probably one of the dates is based on a Chinese record which states that Hsien (Siam) attacked Cambodia in that year. I am not prepared to accept that Hsien was Sukhodaya, but even if it was, there is no reason to think that it was Rām Kambhèng who attacked Cambodia. On the whole this Chinese notice is not generally accepted today.'

Prince Chand has confused two different accounts. The one from which the date of Rām Kambhèng's death can be inferred is the *Yüan-shih*⁶. The other is an account by Chou Ta-kuan, who accompanied the Mongol envoy to Cambodia and spent about a year there in 1296-7; and as he speaks of a 'recent' war with Siam (Hsien) in which a lot of Cambodian villages were devastated and the whole population had to fight, it is reasonable to conclude that Rām Kambhèng invaded Cambodia in 1296 or a little before⁷. It would be interesting to know which of the two Chinese accounts is not generally accepted today, and why.

5) cf. JSS 60/1, p. 110, note 35.

6) See JSS 60/1, p. 21 and note 2. I now think the right date was 1298 rather than 1299.

7) *HSA*, p. 7; Pelliot (tr.), *Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge de Tcheou Ta-kouan*, Paris, 1951, pp. 32, 34; and J.G.D. Paul (tr.), *Notes on the Customs of Cambodia by Chou Ta-kuan*, Bangkok, 1967, pp. 38-40.

P. 263: '1285 A.D. Râm Kanhêng dug up a relic of the Lord and buried it in the middle of Sajjanālaya (at Wat Châng Lôm). Griswold thinks he dug it up from the Mahādhātu at Chalieng, but the text is clear enough that he dug it up from where he buried it.'

It seems to me that the text pretty clearly implies the opposite⁸. Suppose someone says: 'I dug up a tree and showed it to all my friends; then I planted it in my garden and built a fence around it.' Does he mean that he dug up the tree in his garden or somewhere else? I believe it was Prince Damrong who first suggested that Râm Kanhêng dug up the relics at the Mahādhātu; and while that is conjectural, there are some collateral evidences that it is right.

P. 264: 'But the point is there were four "Râm Kanhêng inscriptions." Did he then set up four stone seats?'

Certainly not; see JSS 59/2, p. 215, notes 108, 109.

P. 264-5: 'The Manañsilāpatra is today a polished piece of stone with line decorations along the edges Some archeologists think the decorations are Sukhodaya. Such is not the case King Vajirāvudh turned the stone into a throne along the line of the Scone Stone [He] had the stone polished and the line decorations cut. I have been told that there is a record of this in the Royal Household Bureau, but I personally have not seen it.'

The 'line decorations' along the edges are motifs carved in bas-relief⁹. When King Vajirāvudh turned the stone into a throne by adding carved wooden fittings¹⁰ he may well have had it polished, but it is hard to believe that the bas-reliefs were not already there. Prince Chand would be doing a service to archeology if he could find the record.

P. 265: 'Griswold deserves credit, which I am glad to offer him, for his admirably coherent story of the monks of the period. But one important point has been left out, namely two of the monks, Anomadassi and Sumana, went to Ayodhyā to be educated. This was before Ayudhyā was founded and is good evidence that there was an Ayodhyā

8) See JSS 59/2, pp. 201, 217.

9) JSS 59/2, Fig. 2-b following p. 228.

10) *ibid.*, Fig. 2-a.

previous to Ayudhyā. Also of course he has put the whole story into the wrong reign.'

In case anyone might think I was suppressing evidence that would have been damaging to some cherished theory of my own, I should like to state publicly that I too believe Ayodhyā existed before 1351. When Mūlasāsanā and Jinakālamālī say these two monks had gone to Ayodhyā to study I see no reason to disbelieve them¹¹. I might add that Inscription 11 provides even better evidence for the existence of Ayodhyā before 1351¹². For its existence at an earlier period we have Jinakālamālī's story of the five statues carved from the black stone near Ayojjhā¹³.

I do not know which reign Prince Chand would like me to put the 'whole story' in. If we accept a chronology based on Mūlasāsanā and Jinakālamālī, which provide the only evidence I know of regarding the two monks' sojourn at Ayodhyā, they must have gone there some time in the 1320's; Udumbara arrived at Martaban in 1331, and the two monks were re-ordained in his sect soon after¹⁴. Prince Chand proposes 1322-1340 as Lōdaiya's regnal dates (p. 265); I think it more likely that Lōdaiya acceded in 1298, which is irrelevant to the present discussion; what is more to the point, I think it pretty certain that he reigned at least until 1345 (see my comments regarding p. 268).

P. 266: 'When Līdaiya became ordained in 1362 his Upajjhāya was the Saṅgharāja, Udumbara; Anomadassī was his Kammavācācariya, and Sumanathera was his Anusāsanācariya.'

Līdaiya was ordained in 1361, not 1362¹⁵. It is possible that the Saṅgharāja who performed the ordination was the same person as Udumbara, but I know of no specific evidence to that effect, and there is some chronicular evidence to the contrary¹⁶. Nor do I know of any evidence that Anomadassī and Sumana performed the functions Prince

11) JSS 60/1, pp. 51, 56, 57.

12) JSL 60/1, pp. 137 and 143, notes 33-34; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 30-39.

13) Coedès in BEFEO XXV/1, p. 123 f.

14) JSS 60/1, p. 55 and note 3, pp. 56-59, 69-74.

15) See below (comments to p. 275).

16) JSS 61/2, p.

Chand allots to them, though in view of their seniority in the order of Sīhaḷabhikkhus at Sukhodaya I think it a plausible surmise.

P. 267: 'Griswold says that Bān Mūang built Wat Pra Pāi Luang.'

I did not say who built Wat Pra Pāi Luang. I said that the three laterite sanctuary towers (two now in ruin) at the west end of the precinct were built in Jayavarman VII's reign, and that the tall pyramidal cetiya with niches containing stucco images of the Buddha, near the opposite end of the precinct, was probably built in Bān Mūang's reign. See *HSA*, pp. 2, 4, and 64.

P. 267: 'Griswold says that Lōdaiya added the four corner cetiyas in brick and made alterations to the main edifice [of the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya]. This final statement is completely wrong and contrary to the written evidence. We know that the corner cetiyas were put up after Līdaiya's time. We know who put them up. We know the date. They were erected in 1384 by the Saṅgharāja who was "Mahādharmarājā's teacher." Our source of knowledge is a gold plate which came from one of the four corner cetiyas (Inscription 94). It happened that thieves broke into the Mahādhātu complex and amongst the loot from one of the brick cetiyas was this gold plate.'

The date in Inscription 94 corresponds to Friday, March 1, 1385 (Julian). The cetiya it commemorates was made of 'stone' (sc. laterite), not brick, and the dimensions given would be much too big for the corner towers of the Mahādhātu. They correspond pretty well to the stupa of Wat Sraḷ Śrī where, according to other reports, Inscription 94 was discovered¹⁷.

P. 268: 'Griswold says Lōdaiya made his son [Līdaiya] Uparāja at Śrī Sajjanālaya in 1340... Then Ngua Nam Tom usurped the throne, and when Līdaiya's axemen struck down his enemies in 1347, Ngua Nam Tom was amongst the slain. There is no evidence that Lōdaiya made his son Uparāja in 1340. The chances are that Lōdaiya died in that year. Then there is no evidence that Ngua Nam Tom usurped the throne and was struck down in 1347. The chances are that he was Uparāja or Second King at Śrī Sajjanālaya in Lōdaiya's reign,

17) *JSS* 61/2, p.

and when Lōdaiya died in 1340 he became First King of the combined Śrī Sajjanālaya Sukhodaya kingdom, while Līdaiya became Second King in his place at Śrī Sajjanālaya. Then Ngua Nam Tom died in 1347, and Līdaiya became First King.'

According to Jinakālamālī, 'Dhammarāja's son Lideyyarāja' was ruler of Sajjanālaya while Dhammarāja was still reigning at Sukhodaya¹⁸. As 'Lideyyarāja' is certainly Līdaiya, it follows that Dhammarāja in this context is Lōdaiya, and it is hard to see who else could have appointed Līdaiya as Uparāja at Sajjanālaya. In M.S. 1283 (1361 A.D.), according to Inscription 4 (II/10 ff.)¹⁹, Līdaiya was in the 22nd year of his reign; in other words he had acceded as Uparāja at Sajjanālaya in M.S. 1262 (1340 A.D.). (In the traditional arithmetic, any part of a year counts as a whole one.) The Traibhūmikathā, according to the exordium, was composed by Ledaiya (sc. Līdaiya) in a year of the cock, when he had been reigning at Sajjanālaya for 6 years. If he became Uparāja at Sajjanālaya in M.S. 1262, it follows that the 6th year of his reign, when he composed the Traibhūmikathā, was M.S. 1267 (1345 A.D.), which was indeed a year of the cock²⁰.

Līdaiya had to fight for his throne in 1347 (Inscription 4); and though we have no direct evidence to prove he fought against Ngua Nam Tom rather than someone else, Ngua Nam Tom seems the most likely. The evidence cited above appears to go against Prince Chand's reconstruction of the events of 1340 and 1347.

P. 269: 'A case could easily be put up that the Wang Nā system of First and Second Kings was operative in Sukhodaya times before Ayudhyā and Bangkok. The Wang Nā (Second King) might have been a younger brother or son of the Wang Luang (First King); or it could have been somebody else . . . When the Wang Luang died, the Wang Nā automatically succeeded to the throne.'

18) JSS 60/1, p. 68.

19) JSS 61/1, pp. 133, 139.

20) Coedès in BEFEO XVII/1 (1917), p. 8-9; Prasert na Nagara, การชำระประวัติ-ศาสตร์สุโขทัย, Social Science Review, Special Issue, June 1966, p. 45 f.; and JSS 61/1, pp. 71, 72 and note 4.

I do not know whether or not Prince Chand means to imply that this was a specifically Tai custom. If so, it might be well to investigate the type of succession that normally prevailed in Lân Nâ Tai, in the Shan States, in Laos, and among the Tai groups in Tongking and China. As the Royal Family of Sukhodaya seem to have belonged to the Solar Dynasty (*Sūryavaṃśa*), we might think it likely that the normal succession was from father to son²¹. I do not feel competent to express an opinion one way or the other.

P. 269: 'If he [Nguā Nam Tom] had really usurped the throne as Griswold suggests, the inscription [No. 45] would probably have left him out altogether.'

The passage in question is a list of ancestral spirits who are being called on as witnesses to a treaty. It may or may not be exactly the same thing as a list of the legitimate kings of the dynasty. At the time Inscription 45 was written, a number of Nguā Nam Tom's descendants were probably still alive. If some of them occupied important positions, it would be useful to call on their forebear as one of the witnesses.

P. 270: Commenting on a passage in which I allude to studies made by Prince Subhadradis Diskul, Professor Jean Boisselier, and others, Prince Chand says: 'Boisselier takes only the aesthetic approach.'

Prince Chand can hardly have got this impression of Mr Boisselier's work from reading it.

P. 270: 'The reign of Rām Kamhèng was the Classic Period of Sukhodaya art ...' *P. 271*: 'Griswold has coined a very apt phrase for the Classic Period. He calls it Sukhodaya High Classic, only unfortunately he has placed this High Classic in the wrong reign (L̄idaiya's). Actually L̄idaiya was the dividing line between the Classic and Post-Classic Periods. This period (circa 1350, or covering 1325-1375) was the end of the Classic Period and the *beginning* of the Post-Classic Period. All this we know for certain because at least half a dozen monumental pieces from L̄idaiya's reign that can be identified in the inscriptions have come down to us.'

21) cf. JSS 60/1, p. 35.

Two statues from his reign can indeed be identified in the manner stated (*HSA*, Figs. 25 and 26). They are the epitome of the high classic; and since I coined the phrase I know what I meant by it. It would save confusion if people would coin their own phrases when they mean something else.

P. 272: 'The images in the niches of Wat Pra Pâi Luang outside the city walls of Sukhodaya show strong Chieng Sèn characteristics. But when they were pointed out to Griswold, he denied they were Chieng Sèn at all, and thought they were Śrīvijaya. Then he remembered that Śrīvijaya and Early Chieng Sèn were essentially the same art, so in his book he calls them idealized portraits of Bân Mūang.'

This is not at all what I said, and far from what I thought. I have never thought for a moment that the Pra Pâi Luang stuccoes 'were Śrīvijaya' or that 'Śrīvijaya and Early Chieng Sèn were essentially the same art.' In discussing the Pra Pâi Luang stuccoes in *HSA* (pp. 4-6) I said nothing about Chieng Sèn; and when I said they have pointed ear-tops like the bronze Lokeśvara from Chaiyá, I was calling attention to the rarity of this feature in any Southeast Asian art before the 13th century.

The bronze Lokeśvara was made some 500 years before the Pra Pâi Luang stuccoes, and is of an entirely different character. But similar anatomical peculiarities appear in a few bronze images of the Buddha produced by the school of Haripuñjaya in the 13th century²². As this school was much nearer in time and place, I think it possible that Haripuñjayan sculptors had a hand in training those who made the Pra Pâi Luang images.

Sculptors trained in the tradition of Haripuñjaya or pre-classic Sukhodaya may also have helped make some of the stucco statues at Wat Pâ Sak, Chieng Sèn, which was founded by Sèn Pû in the early 14th century. These statues, which have the same anatomical peculiarities, can properly be attributed to Early Chieng Sèn art, though none of them, so far as I know, has the Lion type iconography which Prince Chand calls 'Early Chieng Sèn'.

22) See *Śilpākara*, X/3, p. 93.

I wrote (*HSA*, p. 4): 'I am inclined to think—but with a large question-mark—that [the Pra Pâi Luang images] are idealized portraits of Bân Müang.' This is very different from the flat statement Prince Chand attributes to me; and if he reads the reasons I give (pp. 4-6) he will find they are not at all what he says. I should like to invite his attention to the last paragraph of p. 5, and to the reference in note 13 in which I acknowledge my indebtedness to one of his own works.

P. 272-3: 'Griswold is inclined to allot all the stupas of one type to one particular reign—for instance, all the Tai prāṅgs in the north (at Chalieng, Biṣṅuloka, etc.) were built by King Trailokanātha in the Ayudhyā period; all the Lotus-bud type cetiyas in the reign of Ḷḍaiya. In this way he shackles his own hands and cannot take into consideration thing like repairs, evolution and such.'

By 'the north' I assume Prince Chand means the Sukhodayan region. I do not know whether he is using the term 'prāṅg' to include prāsādas, which it often does in Siamese usage; if so, he might re-read pp. 2, 3, 11 and 57 of *HSA*, with its references to repairs and rebuilding which he may have forgotten about. If on the other hand he uses the term prāṅg in a stricter sense, excluding prāsādas, there are only three of them in the Sukhodayan region. According to sources which historians generally consider trustworthy, Trailokanātha built the Cuḷāmaṇī at Biṣṅuloka in 1464 and the Mahādhātu at Biṣṅuloka in 1482²³. The Mahādhātu at Chalieng is certainly, and the Mahādhātu at Biṣṅuloka probably, built on the ruins of an earlier monument. Apart from later repairs and alterations, they are very similar, both being typical Ayudhyan prāṅgs in the direct line of descent from the prāṅg of Rājapūraṇaḥ (c. 1424). Trailokanātha had to fight to regain Biṣṅuloka and Chieng Chün (Chalieng) from Tilokarāja; and nothing would be more likely than for him to build Ayudhyan prāṅgs to set the seal of his authority on both places. I think it likely that he built the prāṅg at Chalieng not long after his victory at Chieng Chün in 1475.

23) See the Luang Prasert Recension of the Annals of Ayudhyā, *sub annis* 826 (CS) and 844; also the inscription *in situ* at the Cuḷāmaṇī Monastery, printed in the annex to the Luang Prasert Recension, *Prajum Baṅśāvatāra*, I, Bangkok, B.E. 2457, p. 140 f.; cf. *JSS* VI/3, p. 20 f.

P. 273: 'The prototype of the lotus-bud cetiyas of Ḷīdaiya's reign was Cetiya Tòng at Biṣṇuloka (and one other I think at Tāk, or possibly Gampèng Pet). The [Cetiya Tòng] is illustrated as figure 27 in Griswold's work. To judge from the Chieng Sèn images that have fallen down from the niches (now in the Fine Arts University), the Cetiya Tòng is probably Pre-Sukhodaya. The Lotus-bud is a true "bud" and is structural, whereas the buds in the cetiyas of the later or Ḷīdaiya type have degenerated and become decorative. So the Cetiya Tòng at Biṣṇuloka was certainly pre-Ḷīdaiya, while the cetiya at Wat Asokārāma, Sukhodaya—another lotus-bud type—was even more certainly post-Ḷīdaiya. It was built in 1399. So to say that all the lotus-bud cetiyas were built in the reign of King Ḷīdaiya . . . is rather inaccurate.'

I said most of them were built in his reign, not all. I said nothing about the cetiya at the Asokārāma, which was indeed built in 1399; but as I have not seen it since the Department of Fine Arts cleared and restored it I cannot express an opinion about its architecture.

My grounds for believing that the prototype of all the lotus-bud towers was the one built on the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya (c. 1345) are given in *HSA* at pp. 20-21, 33-34. I see no reason to modify my opinion. The 'Chieng Sèn images' that fell down from the niches of the Cetiya Tòng may not be as old as Prince Chand thinks.

P. 275: 'We now come to the six bronzes cast by Ḷīdaiya. In 1362, the year of the ordination, Ḷīdaiya cast two Hindu images which he placed in the Devālayamahākṣetra at Wat Pā Muang.'

The two images are almost certainly those of Maheśvara [Śiva] and Viṣṇu which, according to Inscription 4 (I/51 ff.), Ḷīdaiya erected in the Devālayamahākṣetra at the Mango Grove on Friday, the 11th or 13th day of the waxing moon of āṣādha, in a year of the ox the designation of which is illegible²⁴. Prince Chand evidently has this passage in Inscription 4 in mind, but his dates are wrong.

Ḷīdaiya was not ordained in 1362. He was ordained as a sāmaṇera in M.S. 1283, a year of the ox, on a day that corresponds to Wednesday, September 22, 1361 (Julian), and he was ordained as a monk probably

24) *JSS* 61/1, pp. 132 and 137.

the next day²⁵. As the context shows that the 'year of the ox' in which he erected the statues was before the year of the ox in which he was ordained, it has to be twelve years earlier. The date would correspond to June or July, 1349.

P. 276-7: As Prince Chand says, Prince Subhadradis Diskul has used Professor Stern's method to study the Sukhodayan bronze figures of Hindu divinities. This method, as applied by Mr Stern and his colleagues, has proved effective in straightening out the chronology in several fields of Asian art. To use it well requires skill and experience, which Prince Subhadradis possesses in abundance. He has applied it to a restricted group of images, which is the only way to begin; he has established a relative chronology for them; and he has created a base for further studies. To say that he 'starts from nowhere and ends nowhere' (p. 276) is not true: while he leaves the date for the beginning of the series uncertain because the evidence is insufficient, he places the last statues in the series in the reign of Ļīdaiya. The 'aesthetic' method that Prince Chand prefers is defective for a number of reasons, the most obvious being that critics disagree among themselves as to the aesthetic superiority of one image over another, and that some artists in every period do better work than others.

P. 277: 'Ļīdaiya probably cast the "Jinarāja trio" sometime during the seven years he spent at Biṣṇuloka between 1347-1359 A.D., when he led a host from several townships to Mount Sumanakūṭa and recorded the fact in Inscription 8 By the Jinarāja trio, I mean the Buddha Jinarāja at Biṣṇuloka (fig. 56), the Buddha Jinasīha (fig. 63), and the Śrī Śāstā (fig. 64), now respectively in the uposatha hall and vihāra of Vāt Pavaranivesa The three images were put in separate buildings at three cardinal points to surround the prāṅg [of the Mahādhātu at Biṣṇuloka], which obviously was already in existence when the images were cast, or at least was built by Ļīdaiya at the same time, though the chronicles do not record the fact. The figures have one unusual feature, namely the fingers of the hands are of equal length. This was a Ļīdaiya

25) *AtHSA*, p. 37 I gave the wrong month for his ordination; cf. *JSS* 61/1, pp. 121-2.

innovation, and one that would appear not to have caught on.' *P.* 278: 'Griswold thinks the Jinarāja was cast by Mahādharmarājā IV in the late 1420's; while the Jinasīha and the Śāstā were later still . . . He says: "Probably Mahādharmarājā IV transferred his capital from Sukhodaya to Biṣṇuloka in the late 1420's and cast the Jinarāja at the same time as protector of the city.' *P.* 279: 'It would help if he could produce some evidence that Mahādharmarājā IV was ever at Biṣṇuloka in the 1420's when he cast the Jinarāja—or at any other period in his reign for that matter.'

Prince Chand says the Jinarāja, the Jinasīha, and the Śāstā are among 'the monumental pieces from Līdaiya's reign that can be identified in the inscriptions'; but the nearest he comes to identifying them in this manner is to point to the well-known statement in Inscription 8 that Līdaiya spent seven years at Sōñ Gvè (Biṣṇuloka)²⁶. I know of no Sukhodayan inscription that says a word about any of these three statues.

The 'Luang Prasert Recension' of the Annals of Ayudhyā, and the Chieng Mai Chronicle, show that Biṣṇuloka was the administrative capital of the Sukhodayan provinces after Mahādharmarājā IV's death in 1438, when they were incorporated into the kingdom of Ayudhyā. If Mahādharmarājā IV had reigned at the city of Sukhodaya until his death, we should expect the King of Ayudhyā to have chosen it as the administrative capital.

Trailokanātha's prāṅg at Biṣṇuloka may be built over an earlier monument, of a different sort, which had been erected by Mahādharmarājā IV or one of his predecessors. This is only a guess, but it is more plausible than the notion that Līdaiya would build an Ayudhyan prāṅg there or anywhere else. Mahādharmarājā IV, when he cast the Jinarāja statue in the late 1420's, may have installed it west of the earlier monument. When Trailokanātha built his prāṅg there in 1482, he very likely placed the Jinasīha and the Śāstā north and south of it, leaving the Jinarāja where it was (and still is).

26) The dates Prince Chand proposes for Līdaiya's seven-year residence at Biṣṇuloka are probably wrong; see *JSS* 61/2, p.

I do not believe the feature of 'equal fingers' was introduced by Īḍaiya; I believe it was introduced by the New Ceylon Order when they returned to Siam in 1425 (cf. *HSA*, p. 54-55). As we know from Inscription 12, Mahādharmarājā IV favored this order.

P. 278: 'The Royal Autograph Recension of the Annals states that in 1384, when King Rāmeśvara of Ayudhyā was returning from an expedition against Chieng Mai, he visited Biṣṇuloka and paid homage to the Lord [Jinarāja].' *P. 279-280*: 'Griswold does not mention [Rāmeśvara's visit].'

I did not mention it because I do not believe Rāmeśvara conducted an expedition against Chieng Mai or visited Biṣṇuloka on his way home. The late W.A.R. Wood, after noting that the Luang Prasert Recension mentions no such expedition, says: 'The literary style in which this alleged invasion of Chieng Mai is related [in the Royal Autograph Recension] is quite out of keeping with that used in describing other events of the period. The story is an interpolation. It is probably a description of some quite different war at a much later date'²⁷. Prince Chand, who is a noted critic of Siamese literary style, might wish to take the matter under advisement.

P. 279: 'I do not understand what Griswold is really trying to say about the Jinarāja trio.'

I do not regard the three statues as a 'trio' in the sense of having been cast at the same time. If the Jinaśiḥa, which I believe dates from the 1430's or 1440's, and the Śāstā which I believe dates from the last quarter of the 15th century, were later placed in buildings north and south of the central monument, while the Jinarāja was in a building west of it (cf. Prince Chand, p. 278-9), succeeding generations might easily take them to be a 'trio'.

P. 280-282: 'The sixth and last image cast by Īḍaiya that can be identified with certainty in the inscriptions is the immense Śrī Sākya-muni, a bronze five times natural size, now in the vihāra of Wat Sudarśana in Bangkok. In Inscription 4, Īḍaiya says that in 1362, the year of his ordination [really 1361], he invited . . . the Mahāsāmī Saṅg-

27) Wood, *History of Siam*, Bangkok, 1933, p. 76, note 2.

harāja to pass the three months rainy season retreat (*vassa*) at Wat Si Tol [*sic*]. When the *vassa* was passed he went to the wat to make great gifts (*mahā dāna*), and then he carried out celebrations for the bronze image that he had cast in the size of the Lord, which was placed in the center of Sukhodaya to the east of the Mahādhātu (Stupa). The ancients thought that the Lord was about five times natural size Their standing images were (figuratively) eighteen 'elbows' high (aṭṭhārasa). Sitting images of this size [*sc.* about 8.50 m. if the statue were standing] were cast in all periods except Lopburi . . . The Śrī Sākyamuni was squeezed in between the vihāra and main stupa at Wat Mahādhātu, Sukhodaya. Part of the building had to be dismantled and the Lord sat almost on the stupa itself. The roof of the vihāra was extended, and the ancients left about three feet of two of the old pillars standing to show what alterations had been made The Śrī Sākyamuni Vihāra is called Vihāra Luang, and . . . it was placed in front of the stupa facing east. When the gigantic image was added to the back of the original vihāra, but in front of the stupa, the image was *east* of the stupa. The reader will remember that Inscription 4 says that Ḷidaiya arranged festivities for the bronze image that he had cast of the size of the Lord and placed in the center of the city to the east of the stupa.'

Prince Chand and I agree that the Śiva and Viṣṇu (*HSA*, Figs. 25, 26) should be ascribed to the reign of Ḷidaiya²⁸. If that is right, I think it impossible, on stylistic grounds, for the Sākyamuni, at least in the form in which we now see it (*HSA*, Fig. 65), to have been cast in the same reign; and indeed I cannot place it any earlier than c. 1475. If it was at the west end of the Vihāra Luang before being taken to Bangkok, I assume that Ḷidaiya's colossal statue of the Buddha had been destroyed in the wars of the 15th century and that the Sākyamuni was a substitute for it, or else that Ḷidaiya's colossal statue had been so badly damaged that it required radical repairs, including a new head and new hands. It may have been further altered after reaching Bangkok.

28) Prince Chand dates them in 1362; I date them in 1349 (see my comments regarding p. 275).

P. 282: 'If the Sākyamuni was really cast in the last quarter of the 15th century (as Griswold thinks), who made the image? Was it some governor sent by Ayudhyā or Sukhodaya, or a district officer that we would today call a Nāi Ampö?'

I think it more likely to have been Trailokanātha.

P. 282-3: 'A few more words are required concerning the Nān images shown in Figs. 55-a and 55-b, to keep the record straight. In 1426 Prayā Ngua Pā Sum cast five walking images, one of which is shown in Figure 55-b. They all bear inscriptions, and three are now in Nān, while two were moved to Lampāng in 1932. So when Griswold says of these five figures that one is a standing image, three are walking and the fifth is lost, he is not quite accurate.'

Four of Ngua Pā Sum's statues were still at Nān in 1955—two at Wat Prayā Pū and two at Wat Chāng Kam—when Mr Kraiśrī Nimmāna-heminda and I photographed them²⁹. All four are about 1.88 m. in height. The standing statue and two of the walking ones have identical inscriptions on their bases, while the base of the third walking statue is missing. The inscriptions³⁰ state that Cau Brañā Nvva Phā Sum (Ngua Pā Sum), who became Brañā in the year of the horse, C.S. 788 [i.e. 1426 A.D.], founded 'five [images of the] Lord.' Of course the postures are not specified; there is no reason to suppose that all five were walking statues; and the inscription on the base of the standing statue proves the contrary. I am told that the four statues are still in the monasteries where Mr Kraiśrī and I saw them, and that the fifth was discovered a few years ago inside a cetiya at Wat Chāng Kam, but I have not seen it.

The two walking images that were removed from Nān to Lampāng have nothing to do with Ngua Pā Sum. One of them is the colossal image at Wat Sadēt near Lampāng, over 4.50 m. in height, which is said to have been taken to Nān from a ruined monastery near Chieng Kam

29) As stated in *HSA* (p. 54, note 137), the photographs of the four statues are published in *Artibus Asiae*, XIX, 3/4. Even without bothering to look them up, Prince Chand might have suspected, from the two of them reproduced in *HSA* (Figs. 55-a, 55-b), that he was going astray.

30) See *JSS* 57/1, p. 105 and Fig. 8.

around 1880, and removed to its present location around 1934. The other, about 2.15 m. in height, is at Wat Chieng Rái, Lampâng, or at least was there when I photographed it several years ago. These two, neither of which bears an inscription, are so different in proportions and sculptural style from Ngua Pâ Sum's five that there is no reason for confusion.

Conclusion.— Prince Chand has evidently read *HSA* carelessly, overlooking a lot of footnotes, failing to consult references, and attributing statements to me that I did not make; I have cited several instances, and could easily cite others.

Even when he quotes my statements correctly, I can find little merit in what he has to say about them; but readers who already share his views are likely to find his arguments more compelling than I do.