

## REVIEWS

Lucien M. Hanks, *Rice and Man: Agricultural Ecology in Southeast Asia* (Aldine-Atherton, Inc.; Chicago & New York, 1972), 163 pp., index.

Rice can be and, over the centuries, has been cultivated in numerous different ways. In this interesting book, Dr. Hanks first describes the principal ecological relationships man can share with rice. Then, shifting his focus from the general and theoretical to the specific and empirical, he sketches a history of the village of Bang Chan. Changes in mode of rice cultivation have been, Hanks argues, crucial to Bang Chan's development over the past century. He draws upon the extensive research carried out there since World War II by himself and others from Cornell University to make his case. Although *Rice and Man* is written with an undergraduate audience in mind, it should nonetheless attract wider attention because, first, it draws together diverse, though limited, data to support conclusions about differences in the requirements and yields of the alternate modes of cultivation, and, second, it presents probably the most thorough history of a rural Thai community yet published.

In Part I of the book, Dr. Hanks gives his rather general description of rice and its cultivation. A discussion of the characteristics and needs of the plant is followed by specific detail with regard to the three modes (shifting, broadcasting, and transplanting) of cultivation. To the standard view of the different requirements and yields of these diverse modes of cultivation, Hanks adds a helpful ecological perspective. The energy expended by a community in developing its ecological "holding" must, he emphasizes, be in harmony with the natural characteristics of that holding. The yield of a crop depends not solely on man's inputs but also on the natural givens of the crop's setting.

Beyond this descriptive level, Hanks has gathered data which support his conclusions. His findings are not surprising, but it is not clear to me that the data presented here prove them conclusively. The statistics are rather limited (between 8 and 17 cases are used to support different conclusions), and were gathered by numerous different researchers using different techniques in all parts of Asia over a period of some

thirty-five years. Surely there is much room here for unexplained variables to have influenced the results.

A second problem in Part I has to do with sequential relationships between the different modes of cultivation. The logic of Hanks' argument and the evidence he provides clearly suggest that, if geographical conditions are appropriate, increasing population and intensification of settlement in a given area will be paralleled by transitions, first, from shifting to broadcasting and, later, broadcasting to transplanting cultivation. This is so because increasing population density not only enables a community to perform the tasks necessary for the cultivation of the "next" mode, but also requires that it do so in order to obtain yields high enough to sustain itself. Yet, having clearly established these relationships and, seemingly, this sequence, Hanks is reluctant to draw the conclusion that as a population expands and its settlement becomes more permanent, it will, as a general rule, change from shifting to broadcasting and then from broadcasting to transplanting cultivation. To the contrary, Hanks writes, "Rather than stages in development or evolution, these modes of cultivation are manners of adapting to a changing environment. The increasing populations offer a greater work force to sustain a more demanding ecological holding, yet this is not a one-way road." (p. 66) This assertion is followed by a pair of isolated examples—exceptions, I would argue, which tend to prove the rule—describing those who have clung to traditional techniques while their societies as a whole have moved on to the "next" mode. This reluctance on Hanks' part can, I think, be related both to the village perspective of Part II and to his conservative approach to which I will return shortly.

Part II presents a periodization of Bang Chan's history in which mode of cultivation is the distinguishing characteristic: 1850-1890 are the years of shifting cultivation; 1890-1935, years of broadcasting; and 1935-1970, years of transplanting. The differing modes of production are related to the community's development in general, but not in a predictable, causal manner. Mode of cultivation is sometimes cause, sometimes effect, of other historical developments.

Interspersed in Part II are sections which, while not directly relevant to the development of rice cultivation as such, round out the picture presented of Bang Chan as a rural Thai village. Hanks combines his own insights with a heavy reliance on already published research of others in these descriptions of the monastic, commercial and governmental communities, as well as in the sections dealing with kinship systems and other institutions of rural life. Like the historical sections, they are well-written and entertaining. Obviously, Hanks has spent much time not only in rural Thailand, but also thinking about it. His descriptions of villagers, their houses, canal-bank scenes, and so forth are charming and, I think, accurate.

The history presented here draws heavily on the research of the Cornell Bang Chan project and it provides, as far as it goes, a valuable picture of change in rural Thailand over the past century. But, whereas the data used to buttress his arguments in Part I were not entirely convincing, in Part II Hanks' account is severely limited by the neglect of important historical resources. He may be justified in writing that, for the 1840's and 1850's, "There are no records, thanks to mildew, centipedes, and termites with their appetite for paper." (p. 72) But for the bulk of the years involved in this study, certainly from 1890 on, extensive written documentation does exist, most notably in the form of ministerial records in the National Archives. Whether documents relating specifically to Bang Chan exist or not I do not know, but I would estimate that those which provide information on all aspects of life in immediately neighboring areas number in the thousands, and that those pertaining to rural areas of central Thailand as a whole are many times more numerous. Hanks' relation of events in Bang Chan itself is probably quite accurate, but the wider context in which those events are placed is much less so. Had he supplemented his oral sources of history with either a closer reading of the published material or a perusal of archival materials he would have avoided numerous errors. A few examples will illustrate the point. For one, on p. 113, he gives an incorrect figure for the rice-land tax. For another, on the following

page he praises an Englishman (presumably W.A. Graham) for reforming the system of land registration in the early twentieth century, whereas in fact credit for this important reform should go to several Thai officials in the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Interior. A further example is his absurdly inaccurate, almost completely unfactual treatment of the development of the Rangsit area to the north of Bang Chan. (p. 114)

It may be that these and several other inaccuracies are not important because they are not vital to the history of Bang Chan itself, but I believe otherwise. First of all, if his oral sources provided inaccurate information on these matters which can be checked against written sources, how is one to judge the accuracy of their information not subject to such verification? This difficulty is aggravated by Hanks' failure to support his account with footnotes or specific references.

In addition, these inaccuracies point to the limitations Hanks has imposed on himself by confining his perspective to that of a single village. Because of this limited perspective, Hanks misses, I think, much of the larger picture of rural Thai history in the past century. For example, he describes those who came to settle in Bang Chan largely as refugees cast out from an expanding Bangkok. In Bang Chan, this may have been the case, but those who rushed eagerly into the areas between the Chao Phraya and Bang Pakong rivers all through the 1870's, 1880's, and 1890's, were, I think, less outcast refugees than peasant opportunists responding to the potentials of the expanding rice economy. Behind this boom were international demands for Thai rice which Hanks, from his village perspective, fails to mention even once.

Thus, while the particular facts gathered here about the history of an individual community are important data for any history of rural Thailand as a whole, such a broader history cannot be derived from that of Bang Chan alone. Its peculiarities must be matched and balanced against those of hundreds of other villages before some general picture will emerge.

The fact that Hanks' rural history emphasizes the particular at the expense of the general is related, I suspect, to his reluctance in Part I to view the different modes of cultivation sequentially. A particular case can be used to argue against any general trend—any universal development—and one may choose to emphasize either the particular case or the general trend. Emphasis on the general trend is consistent with the view that an understanding of history as a progressive, progressing phenomenon is possible, while emphasis on the particular case conforms to a more conservative estimate of our ability to achieve an orderly historical understanding of our past and future. To me, therefore, there is a conservative tone to the whole of this book, of which the reluctance to draw the general conclusion in Part I and the emphasis on the particular in Part II are two examples. A third example can be seen in the conservative approach to politics and social change implicit in the suggestion that social stability and order are necessarily the highest goals a society can strive for. (p. 117) And a final example consists of the numerous references to some ill-defined, mystical "Asian" approach to life and society. Because this approach stresses harmony with nature rather than development at its expense, Hanks implies, Westerners have much to learn from it.

Obviously, there *is* much that is worthy of consideration in each of these separate aspects of Hanks' approach. Because it is representative of much currently fashionable thought, however, it is important to point to its conservative nature.

*David B. Johnston*

*Yale University*

M. Rajaretnam and Lim So Jean, Eds., *Trends in Thailand : Proceedings and Background Paper* (Singapore University Press, 1973), 144 pp.

*Trends in Thailand* is the published paper of the Fifth Seminar arranged by the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, on May 5, 1973. The Institute has in fact been conducting a series of seminars under the overall title of "Trends in Southeast Asia" since November 1970, with the aim of "keeping abreast of the latest political, economic, social trends in the individual countries of Southeast Asia". (Preface)

But for the dramatic turn of events in October 1973, this noble objective in *Trends in Thailand* would have been amply rewarded. As it is, many of its analyses, observations, propositions, and predictions must be read with qualifications, i.e. the reader must bear in mind the significance of the overthrow of military rule in Thailand.

This little book is divided into four parts. The first part contains the background studies done by the Institute's research officers namely Messrs. Raja Segaran Arumugam, Patrick Low, and M. Rajaretnam; the second part brings into focus Thai society and economy, with Mr. Sulak Sivaraksa expounding on "The Role of the Intellectuals", while Dr. Boonsanong Punyodyana, and Dr. Amnuay Viravan presenting papers on "The Changing Status and Future Role of the Chinese" and "Trends in the Thai Economy" respectively; the third part concentrates on Thai politics and foreign relations : two speakers, Mr. Saneh Chamarik and Dr. Thanat Khoman, exploring (the former) "Questions of Stability and Security in Thailand", and (the latter) "Thailand in the Midst of Changes". The last part is the winding up of the seminar with "Proceedings of Forum".

The Background studies reflect an admirable effort on the part of the research officers in welding together numerous aspects of Thailand with great precision, constructive analysis and relevant comments in a concise and readable statement. For example, the main reason for the 1971 coup has been correctly pointed out as originating in "the domestic sphere" and not in "the realm of international politics" as claimed in the official version. But, as commonly happening to all works hindered by both time and space limitations, the sources become over-exhausted

when the writers attribute to Field Marshal Prapas Charusathien the role of the master-puppeteer of the majority of the elected members in the Lower House. Police Major-General Sanga Kittikachorn publicly declared not so long ago that the in-fighting of the UTPP with a result heavily in the Maj.-General's favour, who is well-known for his not-so-happy relationship with Field Marshal Prapas, was one of the first causes leading to the coup as a means to strengthen Prapas's rein. Subsequent events before October 1973 tend to support Sanga's claim, for example, the promotion of Prapas from the rank of a General to that of a Field Marshal, the big shuffling of top military personnel as late as September 1973 – all to enhance Prapas's power and prestige as the country's strong man.

The subsection on the Thai students up to the seminar period is a fair account of their role in society. Be that as it may, one cannot help suspecting that the factor overclouding deeper and more penetrating findings has been the writers' *a priori* vision of Thai students as "rarely (being) noted for a high degree of political activism and radicalism". It is true that, in comparison with radical and activist students in the West, the Thai counterparts present a somewhat diluted element of the fiery youth. But in the context of the Southeast Asian students, Thai students have much to commend themselves. It was the collective demand of students in 1957, heavily overshadowed by the military in the later stage, that set the political ball rolling, culminating in the overthrow of the much-despised Pibul-Phao clique, and paved the way for Sarit to seize political power. Even before the great showdown with the Thanom Government last October, the National Students Centre of Thailand had scored a weighty success in their demonstration on behalf of "academic freedom". The decision to take up the cause of constitutional rule, plus the gross miscalculation on the part of the Government as to the staying power of the unified students against violent measures, logically led to the historic events of October 1973.

Among the contributions from the Thai speakers, two papers stand out for their lucidity, realistic approach and coherent theme: "The Changing Status and Future Role of the Chinese" and "Questions of

Stability and Security in Thailand". Dr. Boonsanong has done tremendous work in bringing studies of the Chinese community in Thailand to date. Many sensitive questions have been tackled with great tact and understanding (pp. 61; 62-9). One only wishes that the dealing with the minority ethnic groups has been more thorough so as to present the true nature of Thai society as well as to keep a balanced account of the seminar proceedings. The Vietnamese ethnic group, for example, has also played not so insignificant a part of late, and therefore deserves to occupy at least no less attention than that accorded the Chinese ethnic minority.

The reviewer feels that the other Thai contributors could have rendered their statements more justice. The paper on "Trends in the Thai Economy" which is well-supplied with relevant indexes of statistics and useful informations (pp. 75-79), impresses one more as an annual report than an analytical paper. (Dr. Amnuay, nevertheless, proves himself very constructive in the discussions later, see pp. 136-7; 138-9). Mr. Sulak's account of "The Role of the Intellectuals", on the whole, leaves the reader much perturbed; for one thing, it is too much of a black-and-white painting of the nature of the Thai intellectuals, (it takes a great amount of courage and confidence of a man to divide arbitrarily, as Mr. Sulak has done, "the Thai intellectuals"), and for another, its objectives are vaguely, at times confusedly presented. The questions proffered in the discussion may be employed as indicators of the impression the reviewer wishes to convey (pp. 127-128). The statement on Thai foreign affairs by Dr. Thanat probably unjustly suffers more from the author's command of credibility than from the substance of the text. Nevertheless, it is hard for the reader, such as the reviewer, who has made a study of Dr. Thanat's role as Thai Foreign Minister for a period of 13 years, and who, it must not be forgotten, has witnessed his zeal as the greatest "hawk" ever in the cabinet, to have much faith in what he now advocates. After all, Dr. Thanat himself relates enough incidents in his presentation (pp. 98; 102-8) to prove that he had stayed on at the Foreign Office in spite of the fact that his better judgements and principles were time and again rebuffed. Any responsible politician with so strong a conviction, as Dr. Thanat now projects himself, would have gladly resigned under these distasteful circumstances and would not have waited to be

ignominiously dropped after the November coup of 1971. Perhaps it is unfair and unrealistic to raise this kind of objection as, though it is by no means an unheard of political etiquette in Thailand, such a moral code of conduct has so far failed to find favor among leading politicians in power.

*Trends in Thailand* contains numerous viewpoints of interest. The study of Thai society by Messrs. Sulak and Saneh, for instance, leaves no doubt that "Thai society is a society of government officials" (p. 57), and it is not surprising consequently to find that "when it comes to the issue of power and privilege within the social hierarchy in society, not only does the issue of power system become closed in terms of upward mobility for other Thais but it also somehow compels the upper class Thais to become introspective and . . . . . (cut off) from the real problems and needs of the public at large" (pp. 93-4). The NEC attitude, since the November 1971 coup when the Thai leaders most consistently turned a deaf ear to the growing demands of the people and stumbled from one mistake to another without bothering to learn from their past short-comings, has proved beyond measure how accurate their profound criticism is.

By the middle of 1973 it became self-evident that the Thai leadership cut no figure internally or internationally. The Thai speakers have not failed to comment on this unfortunate aspect of the country. Mr. Saneh's narrative of Col. Narong Kittikachorn, the heir-apparent to the Thanom-Prapas politico-military legacy, and Dr. Thanat's allusion to "the personality next in the line for political succession" serve to drive home effectively the irreparable harm done to the regime's credibility.

The muddled-headedness not only prevailed in the domestic sphere but also in the field of foreign affairs. Dr. Thanat's presentation has left no question about the inability on the part of the Foreign Office to initiate any far-sighted policy to safeguard national interests, even before the "militarisation" of the Office. It is true that Dr. Thanat had advocated for a considerable period a policy of forming a *modus vivendi* with the People's Republic of China which was taken up by the Thanom Government after 1971. Since then a long spell has elapsed and still the Sino-Thai negotiations have not got off the preliminary round of sports diplomacy, while others, Malaysia for example, have already signed one form or other of commercial agreements with the PRC. Dr. Thanat's

critical opinion of the cause of this seemingly inexplicable lack of progress must be given full credit (p. 108). It also reminds one of King Chulalongkorn's wise recommendation to his Minister of Metropolitan Affairs on the policy towards the Chinese as far back as 1910. "Perhaps, once making up our mind to go along with the Chinese, we must be firm and courageous. We must not let them see that we are in anyway shaken or hesitant at the prospect of such step. This, I think, is the most essential point to put across (to the Chinese) . . . ."

The Thanom-Prapas Government could have profited more from this royal directive than the one it favoured as referred to by Dr. Thanat (p. 108). Instead, as *Trends in Thailand* has made clear, it only managed to hold on to the policy of one step forward and two steps backward, which has, in turn, successfully discredited the whole regime.

Great hopes and promises have emerged with the departure of military dictatorship of the Sarit-Thanom-Prapas clique, which has with a brief interval between 1969-1971, dominated the political scene since 1958. Yet one only has to read various warnings in *Trends in Thailand*, such as, "Apart from the problem of lack of technical expertise, the main challenge for Thai policy makers is to work out a development strategy which will try to redress the social and regional imbalances existing in the society following a period of rapid growth . . . . . a development plan to harmonise the objectives of growth with social justice also requires some kind of political and institutional structure which has a clear sense of purpose and which will be innovative enough to bring about the necessary reforms . . . . unfortunately this is something that seems to be completely lacking in contemporary Thailand . . . .", (p. 89) to realise that "one cannot feel very optimistic for the future of the country". (p. 96)

To make effective and flowing reading, one is strongly advised to read part 1 of this book with its various subsections each together with the corresponding presentation in the two following parts.

*Kobkua Suwannathat-Pian*

*Faculty of Humanities,  
Chiangmai University*

Pongpen Sakuntapai, Ed., *Politics for the Citizen* (a series of booklets) (Department of Government, Faculty of Political Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, 1973).

พงศ์เพ็ญ ศกุนตาศัย บรรณาธิการ *วารสารชุดการเมืองสำหรับประชาชน* (แผนกวิชาการ  
ปกครอง คณะรัฐศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ๒๕๑๖)

- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1) Kamol Somvichian,      | <i>What is Democracy ?</i>                |
| ๑) กมล สมวิเชียร          | <i>ประชาธิปไตยคืออะไร</i>                 |
| 2) Sujit Boonbongkarn,    | <i>The Citizen and His Political Role</i> |
| ๒) สุจิต บุญบงการ         | <i>ประชาชนกับบทบาททางการเมือง</i>         |
| 3) Jaroon Subhab,         | <i>Parliamentary Democracy</i>            |
| ๓) จรูญ สุภาพ             | <i>ประชาธิปไตยแบบรัฐสภา</i>               |
| 4) Prapanpong Vejajiva,   | <i>Ombudsman</i>                          |
| ๔) ประพันธ์พงศ์ เวชชาชีวะ | <i>ผู้พิทักษ์ผลประโยชน์ของประชาชน</i>     |

This attempt by the Department of Government, Chulalongkorn University to make available to the public certain ideas about politics and government in an economical and readable form is praiseworthy in that it shows the authors' willingness to descend from their ivory towers to bridge the gap between the politically-oriented minority and the apparently as yet apathetic (for a variety of reasons) majority. The extent to which this series will encourage reasoned analysis and criticism of the Thai political scene depends first on its marketing efficiency, secondly and importantly on the books' understandability and thirdly on their academic quality. This review will pay attention to the last two issues.

The reviewer's suitability to the task may indeed be questioned on the ground that he is a member of staff in the same department as the authors. However, since I have only recently joined this department, it may be said that I am less socialised into its 'culture' than would have otherwise been assumed. Furthermore, my academic background, being in sociology, is at variance with that of most of the authors who are political scientists. Therefore, I might venture to suggest that, whilst sympathetic to their cause, I still retain a critical view of their products.

Dr. Kamol Somvichian, the author of *What is Democracy?*, begins by dispelling the myth that the existence of a constitution and an elected assembly are the hallmarks of a democratic polity. This is an important point to make considering the history of Thai politics since 1932. The book can then be seen to be divided into two interrelated parts. First, he deals with the meanings political philosophers and political scientists give to democracy and subsequently turns his attention to the level of society and more specifically to the problem of the relationship between individuals and groups in a democratic society. Throughout the book the author is concerned to point to the philosophical assumptions about human nature which underlie each of the approaches he mentions. Thus, in the second section, he also deals with the polemics between the Western democratic tradition and the Marxist (equating this with Communist) tradition.

Dr. Kamol, being conscious of current misunderstandings, delineates three basic tenets of democracy. First, the rulers must have received a mandate to rule from the ruled. Secondly, the ruled must have the right to change their rulers from time to time. Thirdly, basic human rights must be safeguarded. As a summary to the section on the political philosophers' notions of democracy, he points out two basic assumptions that, on the one hand, there is a belief in the ability of each ordinary person to know how to choose a leader and, on the other hand, that the individual might use the power given him in the wrong direction. Thus, in a democracy, both the individual's and the government's freedom of action need to be limited. The individual must be prevented from doing things against the public interest and the government has to be controlled by independent organisations which provide the means for the individual to complain about the government's encroachment on his freedom. This is then used to stress the author's disagreement with Saul Padover's idea of majority rule without regard to minority rights. At the same time, Dr. Kamol argues that although he himself does not make explicit his ideas about equality, it is already implicit in his notions about the people's mandate, occasional change of rulers (in that each has equal political right in "one man one vote") and the safeguarding of basic human rights.

The second section, dealing with the societal level of democracy, brings the topic closer to the life of the individual reader. The practice of democracy at this level is seen to involve three basic tenets. First, it involves respect for each other's rights. This in turn means respect for the rule of law without exception, each citizen having the duty to safeguard the law. The practice of democracy is also expected within the family and the educational institutions. In other words, the family is seen as an agent of socialization of the child into a democratic society. Obviously, this does demand that such a one exists at the national level. It is indeed the author's hope for Thailand, as is illustrated by his dedication of the book to his children: "with the hope that they will grow up in a democratic system."

The second tenet demands that there is in a democratic society the use of peaceful means of reaching a decision. The author skates over the problem of equating "peaceful" with "rational" and with "majority opinion", whilst at the same time he gives prime importance to "peaceful." It may be said that the belief in peaceful means may provide the necessary conditions for rationality to operate, but it is by no means sufficient; nor can it be said that "majority opinion" is always "rational". That the complexity of this problem is not gone into might be understandable in terms of the prevalent power of *minority* opinion in Thai political decision-making, but it cannot be justified on academic grounds. This issue perhaps shows up clearly the dilemma faced by an author trying to produce a book for the general reader from an academic standpoint.

The author turns finally to the issue of social justice in a democratic society. The arguments between the Western democratic and Communist traditions is here illustrated by the notion of "equality of opportunity". Though Dr. Kamol is not explicit on this distinction, "equality of opportunity" to democrats means "equality of provision", whilst communists as a matter of principle demand economic equality as a prerequisite to "equality of opportunity". Dr. Kamol puts it in terms of the communists preferring revolutionary means of changing the economic structure of society, whilst democrats prefer reforms through the political system. The equation of Marxist with Communist is

regrettable because it ultimately leads him to miss the point that both Marx and the democrats hold the common assumption that man is naturally "good", and thereby overstresses the incompatibility between Marxism and Democracy.

On the whole, this brief discussion rightly raises many questions in the reader's mind, but does not and cannot, within its framework, suggest ways of resolving them. The problems centre on the question of the relationship between the political system and the social system, one which was recognised by Marx and is an important concern of sociologists such as Parsons and is central to Political Sociology. It is not a simple matter of a particular kind of social structure giving rise to a particular kind of political system. Furthermore, it cannot be assumed that one can build a democratic political system out of the social and economic structures of present day underdeveloped countries, dependent as they are on the operations of the international market and aid from the Big Powers. It is not surprising therefore that Dr. Kamol, who can find no scientific support for the notion that man is a rational animal, turns to mere hope or belief in democracy and asks for the opportunity to learn about democracy by practising it in Thailand.

\* \* \*

The theme of the relationship between the individual and the state is continued in Dr. Sujit's *The Citizen and his Political Role*. It is, however, the author's explicit intention to draw attention to the need for group formation which will mediate between the individual and the state.

He devotes some time to laying out the arguments for and against political participation. Those who do not favour it argue that nowadays the process of government is too complex for the ordinary citizen, not having the knowledge and technical knowhow, to understand. The electoral process usually produces people who, though popular, are administratively incompetent. Their decision making is governed by self-interest, creating a difficulty for the government in reconciling conflicting interests. Finally the rise of political awareness is seen as a

double-edged sword, that is, participation by "legitimate" and "illegitimate" means; the latter is then seen as leading to political instability.

On the other hand, those who favour political participation argue that it would lead to real governmental responsibility to the public; which is certainly capable of reviewing broad policy aims. Greater political participation would make the citizen more willing to grant legitimacy to the government. Instead of leading to instability, the absorption of those who are politically aware serves to reduce disaffection. Most importantly, the allowance of political participation would encourage various groups to come together to solve important societal problems, whilst its restriction would tend to accentuate fragmentation within society.

Given that there is already some political awareness, the author believes that the advantages of allowing political participation outweigh the disadvantages. The level of demand for political participation would depend on cultural tradition and attendant socialization processes on the one hand and the availability of the means for political participation on the other. Importantly, real political mobilization only arises when political parties and elections can really affect the choice of political leaders, this providing the incentive to participate.

However, it is not always the case that the politically aware do become involved in politics. Involvement requires a belief that one could influence the government and bring about change in policy. This belief may arise through education creating self-confidence, encouragement by others such as intellectuals, mobilization by political parties and joining interest groups. The latter, though not specifically political, usually become involved in politics in order to safeguard their interests. Thus, it is usual that political parties and interest groups work in conjunction.

Turning his attention to the Thai situation, the author observes that neither the military nor the civilian governments have seriously tried to change the people's orientation to politics. It remains unclear as to what is the structure of the political system. It would seem that "the constitution or the permanent system of government is temporary, while temporary constitutions or temporary systems of government are

permanent" (p. 40). However, with the now increasing demand for political participation it seems clear that the Thai brand of democracy, whatever else it might be, must recognise the people's right to choose their leaders. In other words, widespread political participation is a necessary prerequisite of democracy. Given that political power in Thailand lies with the bureaucrats, both military and civilian, it cannot be expected that they will represent the people. Representative institutions still have to be built; and the author emphasises two of them, the political party and the interest group.

In the past, political parties were lacking in strength and in support from the people. Strength depends on having a viable structure, faithful members and responsible leadership. It would not be possible to snatch power abruptly from the bureaucrats. It is important to estimate one's resources in relation to what can be achieved and then act step by step. Strength and support are mutually dependent, and have to be built up together.

In talking about interest groups in Thailand, the author notes that there are a number of clubs and societies but they are not politically active. This is so because people seek to influence political leaders through personal channels rather than through the strength of interest groups. On both sides, personal gains are obtained through the bureaucratic-commercial complex, rendering interest groups to be no more than a nomenclature. Dr. Sujit finds this regrettable. He argues that from small beginnings, with clear ideology, endurance, practical assessment of resources, real cooperation and commitment, real interest groups with political influence can be formed. Intellectuals are clearly called upon to 'come down' to the people and help them to *begin* this task which has to be worked through step by step.

Dr. Sujit clearly believes that political development (with political participation as a necessary prerequisite) cannot come about without the building of political institutions involving not only the rules of the game but also the organization by which players can team up to play the game according to the rules. This contention rests on sound academic judgement; but I cannot help feeling that we in Thailand have hardly begun the academic work necessary for understanding the

characteristics of what we call "interest groups" as they exist in Thailand. We sometimes talk about patron-client relationships, but we confine our definition to two persons and do not develop a picture of the patronage system in specific contexts. If we do not know the exact nature of existing "interest groups", we can hardly hope to change them. In any case, some of them seem to be changing already in the direction of having real interest group features, particularly noteworthy are university students and some groups of industrial workers. Yet, we are still in the dark as to their organizational features, whether they have "intellectual" patrons or not, etc. The answers to these questions are surely relevant to our assessment as to whether it is realistic for us to hope for the formation of real interest groups and ideologically-oriented political parties.

On the whole, Dr. Sujit's prose is easy to understand. The book is clearly written with a conviction, showing his bias but giving a fair presentation of alternative ideas. The latter part of the book reveals his conviction that power is best kept with the people and his slight impatience with his colleagues who remain in their ivory towers or who seek personal gains through patronage, that is, with those who are concerned purely with individual rather than group advancement.

\* \* \*

Attention is turned to a particular method of achieving democratic government in Mr. Jaroorn's book *Parliamentary Democracy*. Its selection for exposition is an arbitrary one. This means that there is in this book virtually no attempt to show its advantages and disadvantages as compared with other methods.

The author emphasises the fact that, in Parliamentary Democracy, the electorate chooses members of Parliament and the latter in turn nominate the Executive or Government. The source of all power, therefore, lies with the people. Because of the non-comparative framework, the extent to which this is true is not made clear.

Looked at formally, there is a two-way process at work; one, the people's control over the Executive and the Legislature (Parliament) and

two, the responsibility Parliament and the Executive have towards the people. Through the electoral process the people both choose and control members of Parliament. The latter then has the duty to legislate according to the wishes of the people and to exert pressure on the government to act in order to satisfy the needs of the people. The Parliament being in theory supreme, the government cannot remain in power unless it is approved by Parliament.

This point about Parliamentary control over the government is particularly important in the case of Thailand where the opposite is usually true. The author points out that the degree of success in the execution of this duty by Parliament depends on a number of factors. First, the relationship between Parliament and the Government has to rest on reasoned arguments and the consideration of the needs of the country as the ultimate goal. Secondly, members of Parliament should obviously know the needs of the people and thus be able to safeguard their interests. Furthermore, they must be trustworthy, always thinking of public rather than private interests and must not use their positions for personal gains. Thirdly, the process of election itself should be clean. There should not be pressure, such as from bureaucrats, for the people to vote for a particular candidate, or the buying of votes either by promises or money.

Finally and importantly, Mr. Jaroon points out, the "quality" of Parliament depends on the "quality" of the people. "Quality" in this case means interest given to politics, to the safeguarding of rights, etc. If these qualities are lacking, then there is a high risk that Parliamentary Democracy would be in form only, but in content would be government by an elite oligarchy. The latter can then use the mere fact of form to say that there is democratic government whilst in fact there is concentration of power within a small ruling group. When the level of political consciousness is low, as is the case with most underdeveloped countries, then it is easy for those with intelligence and know-how to exploit the majority of the people who are much less knowledgeable.

Mr. Jaroon seems to put a greater percentage of the blame for the failure of Parliamentary Democracy on the people's apathy, to the extent that he says: "Underdevelopment is usually the factor which has such

influence as to change an originally well-intentioned politician into a person who later acts to the detriment of the country". One might well retort: given that in an underdeveloped country there is by tradition little political participation, is it not the duty of the well-intentioned and more knowledgeable to encourage the people's interest in politics and to show them how to play the democratic game? Is it not more plausible to say that these elites have always seen political apathy as a good thing in so far as it creates no challenge to their own positions.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Jaroon sees the development of political parties as serving the function of coordinating Parliament and the Government. It is argued that since the people elect members of Parliament and the rule being that the party with a majority in Parliament form the Government, it is therefore usual that the majority of members would agree with the Government. This method works well when there is a clear majority; but when there is not, there is usually a coalition government which usually has internal conflict and is much less stable.

Mr. Jaroon is of course writing from the point of view of theory and explicitly assumes that political parties have clear ideologies with little internal conflict. It is pertinent to point out here that this conception of the political party is only a model which may or may not correspond with reality in underdeveloped countries. If non-correspondence is discovered, it would be the duty of academics to fashion concepts which better describe political parties in particular situations. In writing about ideal states, we may indeed be forsaking our responsibility of describing and accounting for reality.

On the whole, however, Mr. Jaroon achieves a readable text-book description of the "ideal-type" Parliamentary Democracy.

\* \* \*

The safeguarding of public interest particularly in individual cases is the theme pursued in the exposition by Mr. Prapanpong on *The Ombudsman*. I am not entirely capable of reviewing this work and can therefore only make certain observations about the relevancy of this topic to the current Thai situation. The Swedish *ombudsman* is appointed by

the Legislature rather than by the Executive. The Thai 'equivalent' is obviously contrary to this model. The ideal would seem to be the independence of the *ombudsman* from the influences particularly of the Executive and the Administration, and in the case of the consumers' *ombudsman* from that of the industrialist. Only in this way can the *ombudsman* function to safeguard public interest. This book is of value in providing the information on the original model. In view of the increasing need in Thailand for the safeguarding of public interests, it deserves a far more competent and extensive review than I have the ability to do here.

\* \* \*

All in all, this series of booklets is providing relevant information for those who wish to think about political affairs. Some of the books stimulate much thought, others less so. After four issues, it is interesting to watch and see whether the standard can be kept up. There would also seem to be the problem of wider-scale marketing, one which may prove unresolvable by this department which is after all a part of the Thai bureaucracy. The marketing organisation is by nature amateurish and involves the misuse of manpower. Unless this problem is solved, however, the impact of these booklets on the reading public would remain minimal.\*

*Prudhisan Jumbala*

*Department of Government,  
Political Science Faculty,  
Chulalongkorn University*

---

\* This review was completed in October 1973 but before the events of October 14-15. *Ed.*

Jayanta Kumar Ray, *Portraits of Thai Politics* (Orient Longman, New Delhi, 1972), pp. 225.

Were the facts of Thai politics for the past four decades to be laid bare, romantic contemporary historians who thrive on the cloud of mystery surrounding Thai political processes would surely be thrown into despair. For such historians, the publication of *Portraits of Thai Politics* need cause no alarm.

It is a tantalizing book in its casual finales where curiosity longs for denouement, and it is an important book in its uneven but generous smattering of first class primary source material. One wonders if it will just add another set of myths to untangle. If that should be the case, it is no less welcome, for, as the author notes, there is a dearth of primary sources available in this field. In a political milieu so dominated by personalities, memoirs are of special interest.

The heart of the book is the "political memoirs" of the late Thawee Bunyaketu, Mom Rajawongse Seni Pramoj, and Lady La-iad Pibul Songgram. All three have been important personalities in contemporary Thai politics and close to the decisions as they were being made. While not thorough in a biographical sense, the memoirs aim at the highlights.

Thawee's memoirs are excellent. Making up the longest section of the book, they are relatively thorough and extremely candid. Beginning with his sojourn as a student in France, he describes the ideals of the 1932 coup group as they were forming, the preparations, how new members were screened, how finances were arranged, the secrecy of planning and timing, the events of the actual day of the coup, followed by the troubles with Phrya Mano, the Pibul guided resignations of Phahon, Phrya Song, Phra Prasert, the gesticulations of Pibul and Pridi, and the frustration with Pibul which led to Phahon's resignation. Thawee also spends time describing the events leading to the Japanese invasion of 1941: for instance, Pibul's delayed return to Bangkok before the crucial Cabinet meeting, the outline of the intra-Cabinet struggles over the correct stance to take *vis-à-vis* Japan, and the eventual dismissal of Pibul. Much of this account is discordant, however, with the later memoirs of Lady La-iad.

There is also a section devoted to recounting how Thawee several times outmanouvered Pibul on issues ranging from saving two office girls accused by Pibul of not wearing hats to thwarting Pibul's attempt to discredit him before Parliament in 1944.

Thawee's account of the Free Thai Movement also conflicts on several points with that of Lady La-lad. Police General Adul Adul-dejarat, for example, was, according to Thawee, acting under Pridi not Pibul. We also learn of the use of robbers to harass the Japanese and of the extent of connections with the Allies.

Post-war developments—the problem of the rice commitment, the overseas Chinese actions, the British interference, and the excesses committed by Thai soldiers which led to a struggle between civilian and military elements in the government—all these too receive special treatment. Finally, there are three sections: one, describing Thawee's short stay in jail shortly after the coup of 1947 and his subsequent stay in Penang; another describing his relations with Sarit; and lastly, one telling of his successful struggle to speed up the promulgation of the 1968 Constitution.

The account is packed with intriguing details. Even more for the insights into personalities, it all makes fascinating reading.

Seni's memoirs are curious. They are no less excellent for that, but one is nevertheless left a bit disconcerted. The four years during which Seni did "the hard, tedious job" (p. 148) of codifying Thailand's laws are dismissed in three sentences. Half of a paragraph later he has already accepted the assignment as ambassador to Washington. Any curiosity about early working relationships with Pridi and Pibul is left in a crippled heap as the narrative rushes on. And yet, a whole section near the end centers around the 1292 stone inscription of King Ram Khamhaeng of Sukhothai. The impression that this latter section is simply used to launch into his rambling discussion of the inadequacies of the 1968 Constitution leaves one still more perplexed over where it is all meant to take us. The finale is a highly rhetorical admonition not to despair, in spite of the apparent lack of democracy in Thailand. Instead he reassures us that "the people of Thailand have already attained democracy in their hearts." (p. 185) Coming from a constitutional lawyer, and a brilliant one, it is a curious statement.

Sandwiched in the middle are descriptions of Seni's experiences as the Free Thai Movement leader in the United States, as Prime Minister after the war, and the eleven years from the signing of the post-war treaty to the rise of Sarit in 1957. In the first section, Seni argues that at the time of Pearl Harbor he had to decide between keeping quiet (i.e. getting sent back to Thailand by the US and having no chance to organize a Free Thai Movement) and organizing a Free Thai Movement (i.e. taking a chance with the wrath of the Pibul government). The choice, albeit tempered by hindsight, seems a bit overly clear-cut, but why, after he had chosen the latter alternative and had his nationality "proscribed" by the Thai government, that same government would ask him to declare war on the US seems even more mystifying—especially when Seni admits that they had cut off financial support.

Having agreed to take the post-war Prime Ministership after a third telegram from Pridi had raised the spectre of British occupation, Seni tackled the problem of getting foreign troops out of Thailand. Many of these anecdotes—of the nullification of the first treaty with the British, the belligerence of the British at the subsequent negotiations, the stalling and eventual leak to the press required to get a suitable treaty—have been circulating for some time, but it is good to have them in print, and from Seni himself.

For the historian, anxious for new facts, Seni's description of the Kuang Aphaiwong government and the successful campaign to discredit Pridi in the wake of the regicide is frustrating. A number of people are praised with a flare (including Seni himself), but the dynamics of situations are summarized in sentences like: "That coup [Pibul, 1947], through a series of events, led to the exile of Pridi (and the banishment of the spectre of a Communist state) from Thailand." That is quite a packed sentence to leave without comment! Similar sentences follow in rapid succession.

It is an impressionistic picture which Seni paints. Flamboyant yet blurred, it reveals on close examination skillful strokes but few details. It is no less important for that.

Lady La-iaad Pibul Songgram, as she admits at the start, has set out with a specific purpose in mind: to defend her husband. She argues, first, that Pibul's disposition was that of a scholar, not a strongman—in

direct opposition to the impression Thawee conveys. She emphasizes the significance of the Boworadet rebellion in boosting Pibul to prominence. On the touchy issue of the Chinese minority, she is adamant about the laudable nature of Pibul's motives and the comparative moderation in the methods employed.

Defending Pibul's pre-war policies toward Japan, she informs us that he had made it clear to the Cabinet that he would accept their decision on whether to fight Japan. The Cabinet, she says, not wanting to appear opportunistic, rejected early on the Japanese proposal of reacquiring "the lost territory". Pibul was not the leader of some "fascist faction" which dominated the Cabinet. "This assertion," she writes, "is simply false." (p. 202) In fact, we are told that it was Pibul who initiated the first anti-Japanese underground movement during the war and that his close associate, Police Chief Adul Aduldejarat, was eventually assigned the task of providing "protection and assistance" for Pridi's Free Thai group.

Continuing, she recounts the refusal of Pibul to join the 8 November Group, what eventually changed his mind, and what transpired in the final phase of Pibul's career (particularly concerning his relations with Phao and Sarit). Throughout are sprinkled tantalizing quotes from Pibul's diary. The overall effect of Lady La-ia's memoirs is a portrayal of Pibul quite out of the ordinary. One wishes it was longer, and much more liberally sprinkled with diary quotes.

The lengthy introduction by Jayanta Ray is really a fourth section and deserves some comment. The bulk of Mr. Ray's introduction is concerned with reciting, occasionally at point blank range, what is found in the subsequent memoirs. The setting is a chronological survey of the modern period and intertwined is Ray's argument that Thailand exemplifies Lucian Pye's "transitional society" model, but rates low marks in the Almond-Verva "civic culture" scheme.

For those with a semi-careful knowledge of contemporary Thai history, the introduction is liable to have a slightly somniferous effect—particularly for those who follow G.B. Shaw's dictum and read the introduction last. In attempting to spotlight differences between other published interpretations and those found in these memoirs, Ray is occasionally over-enthusiastic. For instance, Wilson indeed argues that Pridi's Economic Plan created divisions in the People's Party but Wilson's

interpretation does not conflict so drastically with the testimony of Thawee and Lady La-iad as Ray suggests. In fact, Thawee's assertion that "the plan caused no split in the People's Party" and Lady La-iad's comment that "the infant ruling group was split in bitter dissent", are quite contradictory on the surface. Wilson's measured handling of the situation seems all the more appropriate. This may be a trivial point in itself but it reflects the inclination in the introduction to become enraptured with the glare off the wave rather than with the motions of the wave itself. What is really interesting, for example, is the description of the extent to which the plan as an ideological entity became entangled in the web of personal power struggles.

A second criticism concerns the application of the models of Pye and Almond-Verva. Professor Pye's model, though neatly built, must be handled with caution if it is to have much meaning. Politicians contending primarily on terms of personal prestige rather than on issues, for instance, is something which, without refinement of definition, is not only hard to measure but is frequently to be found in "sophisticated" societies as well as transitional ones. In spite of repeated statements by Thawee and Seni that they were motivated by certain principles rather than personal ambition, Ray calmly points out that, indeed, "Thai politicians exhibit this tendency [to compete] not primarily on issues of alternate policies but on those of personal influence and 'prestige.'" (p. 28); and, therefore, Thailand fits this part of the model. The assertion itself would have thrown us to the wolves of over-prediction, but the testimony seems to condemn it first. The conclusion that Thailand fits the mold of political parties frequently being "the projections of influential personalities" (p. 30) is at least readily confirmable in some cases, but it is virtually useless in the Thai context as a solid predictive tool. Likewise, the fact of national leaders performing a variety of roles in a transitional society seems to fit Thailand; unfortunately, at this level of subtlety, it also pinpoints the United States as a transitional society (although, granted, the conflicts of interest in Thailand are generally more obvious). Anyway, we are, in short, left with little more than a fine example of the amorphous nature of the Pye model à la Ray.

The Almond-Verva model fares a bit better—with more thanks, however, to the arrow and the target than to the archer. Almond-Verva's

point that ordinary citizens must find an equilibrium of pressure on and deference to the political elite is never really discussed. Instead, an extrapolation is inserted positing the need, and the favorable prospects, for a balanced active involvement in politics and deference to those in power by the non-governing elite. Seni is sighted as an exemplar. Almond-Verva's original point has a special potency for a country whose politicians have never taken mass-based politics very seriously. It also opens the door to an investigation of how opposition is expressed in Thai society. The extrapolation, instead, accepts the Western norm of expressing opposition and consequently should, by its own standard, be at pains to find a niche in a milieu characterized by a vigorous distrust of the notion of "loyal opposition". Patience and virtual political silence for the non-governing elite remains a necessity, not a virtue. Ray suggests that a good non-governing elite "should patiently wait their turn, until, for instance, they win a General Election" (p. 52). They are not holding their breath for such an occurrence in Thailand, in spite of Mr. Ray's optimism. Reasons for optimism reside elsewhere.

Interpersonal trust and co-operation, a balance of consensus and cleavage—these other two points of Almond-Verva mentioned are likewise discussed at the level of the elite and are found lacking. It all adds up to a rather scathing judgement of Thailand's chances for democracy. The gymnastic handling of the argument and the model, however, makes the exercise more exhausting than enriching. The impact leaves one skeptical, not only of the conclusion, but of the formula. It is too bad; Thailand and the Almond-Verva model deserve more of a chance.

All in all, *Portraits of Thai Politics* is still a really fine book, a solid, welcome addition to the primary source material on contemporary Thailand. The task of collecting remembrances from prominent personalities who have been at the heart of Thai politics for many years is a crucial task, and one that cannot be delayed for long. *Portraits* is an important, stimulating beginning which should be read.

*Martin Getzendaner*

*Institute of Politics,  
Kennedy School of Government,  
Harvard University*

Chira Charoenloet, *The Evolution of Thailand's Economy* (Thai Watana Panich Press, Bangkok, 1971), 262 pages.

The book under review is an extensive survey of Thai development in the 1950's covering virtually all aspects of the economy. Two general chapters on the geography, climate, resources, and nature of the economy are followed by chapters on agriculture, industry, infrastructure, international trade, monetary and fiscal policies, all leading to a concluding chapter relating the first six-year plan (1961-1966) to the development of the previous decade. In reviewing a book which covers so much territory, one can only hope to cover a few of the most important issues that it raises.

With respect to agriculture, the author correctly emphasizes the continuing importance but declining role of rice in total agricultural output, the slow increase in rice area planted during the 1950's and the apparent reversal of the century long decline in rice yield per rai, the need to concentrate efforts on increasing yields if rice output is to keep up with rising population and incomes in the future, and the remarkable increases in production of maize, kenaf, cassava, sugar cane and some other more minor crops. Moreover, he feels that the rapid expansion in area planted and output of new crops belies the commonly held view that farmers in underdeveloped countries in general and Thailand in particular are tradition-bound, unreceptive to new ideas, and unresponsive to market stimuli. The agricultural sections of the book are at their weakest when the author discusses possible government policies to promote expansion. He stresses that agriculture cannot be neglected in favor of industry in a strategy of development, thus correctly rejecting a view popular several years back that industrialization and import substitution were the keys to absorbing excess agricultural labor and raising the national level of well-being, but aside from saying that there is need for more irrigation, more agricultural credit, and more modern technology, etc. he does not indicate what crops or geographical areas should receive priority, or what obstacles lie in the way of further expansion, or the extent to which current government expenditures fall short of desirable levels in these areas.

In describing the growth of industry in Thailand, he points out the small size of the manufacturing sector, its dependency on processing agricultural outputs (e.g. rice mills, saw mills, sugar factories, spinning and weaving), and emphasizes that the limits to industrial growth are the small size of the domestic market, limited natural resource base, and the lack of capitalist entrepreneurship and a supply of managerial talent. To counter this last deficiency, he suggests that Thailand should adopt a different strategy based on the Japanese model of the last third of the 19th century whereby the government assumes the role of entrepreneur and establishes new industries where private initiative is lacking. To anyone familiar with the Thai experience of the 1950's, this is indeed an incredible recommendation. During that period over a hundred manufacturing establishments were set up under government auspices—some operated by ministries and others as separate state enterprises. By the latter part of the decade, it was readily apparent that the effort was a disaster. Badly managed, overstaffed, and inefficient, these enterprises were a drain on the national treasury and a threat to prospective foreign investment. This unfavorable experience led to a 1959 I.B.R.D. recommendation that the government withdraw from competition with the private sector and to the creation in 1959 of the Board of Investment to implement an earlier government act (1954) to promote private industry. While the author seems genuinely concerned that government policy only afford protection (and other promotion advantages) to those industries which are capable of becoming competitive in world markets in the long run, he seems to feel that the government promotion and protection policies have in fact been guided by this criterion (see p. 71). This appraisal seems to be an unduly generous interpretation of Thai government policies. The promotion policy groups industries into Class A, "vital and necessary", to the Thai economy, Class B, "less vital and necessary", and Class C "other worthy industries" and gives privileges in the form of exemptions from import duties and business taxes on capital imports to be used in the new plant, exemption from income taxes for five years, exemption of import duties and business taxes on imports of raw materials and other inputs for five years (the size of the exemptions varying between the three classes), guarantees against nationalization and competition from new state enterprises, privileges

to own land and bring in skilled personnel, and the right to repatriate capital and profits. Additionally the Board of Investment could give the promoted firm protection from import competition by higher duties or even a ban on imports. To this day, there is no clearly stated criteria by which certain types of industries are selected for promotion and certainly no criterion which states that such industries must be able to compete with imports or able to export without special privileges and assistance within some specified time period. Looking at Thailand's overall strategy toward industry, it is apparent that it is one of import substitution with the usual pattern found in less developed countries of favoring final consumer goods with relatively high tariffs, intermediate inputs with lower tariffs, and capital goods imports with still lower tariffs. The result of such a structure of protection is to promote the production of final goods and alter the structure of imports away from consumer goods toward intermediate and capital goods imports, an alteration in structure which the author notes occurred in the 1950's, and which has continued to the present. Whether such protected industries will eventually become competitive remains to be seen.

I would now like to turn to some overall impressions about this book which in turn will engender some comments on parts that I have not yet discussed. The book contains an impressive array of statistics; every major subject the author covers is accompanied by tables showing the behavior of economic variables under discussion over the decade of the 1950's. Such a lavish use of statistics is usually welcome (although none will appear new to the serious student of the Thai economy as they are from readily available sources), but the reader should be forewarned that the author seems totally oblivious of the quality of the data he is presenting. It is well-known that many Thai statistics are subject to error or are possibly misleading (e.g. estimates of agricultural production by different sources give conflicting results, estimates of the occupational distribution of the labor force are subject to large margins of error, estimates of government expenditure may or may not include that expenditure financed by foreign grants and loans, etc.) yet at no point in the book does the author question the validity of the data he is presenting or point out to the reader possible pitfalls in its interpretation. A

couple of examples may suffice to make the reader cautious about using data from this book. On pp. 35-39 the author presents production estimates in individual tables for cassava, maize, kenaf, and rice for selected years which are different in many cases than the estimates for the same crops for the same years presented in a comprehensive table for all crops on page 41. The discrepancies in some cases seem to be due to errors by the author or his printer but in other cases are unexplainable. On pp. 50-51 is a table which compares "irrigable area" with area actually under irrigation in 1960 for various types of irrigation projects for the several regions of the country. From this table one would conclude that by 1960 a large portion (over 80% in most cases) of "irrigable area" was in fact already under irrigation but what does "irrigable area" mean?--that area in each region which has been deemed capable of irrigation (by what criterion?), or that area in each region which is under cultivation or capable of being cultivated (one sentence in the text supports this view), or is it the target area to be irrigated by government projects completed or underway by the end of 1960. The last interpretation seems the most likely but neither the text nor the table make this clear and to someone unfamiliar with Thai agricultural statistics the meaning of the table could easily be misconstrued.

It should also be pointed out that the economic analysis contained in the book never exceeds a rather crude level of sophistication. While this is not inherently bad and may even be welcomed with joy by readers whose knowledge of economic theory is slight or nonexistent, the prospective reader should be warned that this deficiency does result in confusing and even self-contradictory treatment of several subjects by the author. Two examples will serve to make my point. Firstly, it is well-known that the "rice premium", is an export tax which discourages the export of rice, makes the domestic price of rice lower than the world price (thus benefiting domestic buyers of rice), and substantially reduces the incomes of rice farmers; it is clearly a regressive tax and at very stiff

rates. Yet despite his advocacy of measures to reduce the regressiveness of the overall tax system (p. 168), the author is still able to say on p. 170 that "it seems very likely that the tax [the rice premium] does not act as a serious disincentive and that if it were removed, little benefit would accrue to the farmer." On what basis can he justify that statement? Secondly, despite his strong emphasis on the role of investment in capital equipment, in infrastructure (roads, irrigation, etc.), and in human capital (e.g. education, health), the author nowhere sketches a simple model explaining those factors which lead to economic growth or explaining the relationship between rates of saving and investment (say as a percentage of gross national product) and the rate of economic growth. Such a model, while admittedly crude, would give the reader some idea what percentage of national income must investment be before the economy can be expected to achieve a certain growth rate and how far below that level the Thai achievement of the 1950's was. As the author's presentation stands, he is merely advocating more investment in irrigation, roads, education and health facilities, etc. (which we all would agree would be nice) without giving us any clue about the extent to which such investment was inadequate in the 1950's and what levels would have been desirable. As a consequence, his analysis of the First Six-Year Plan (1961-1966) is nothing more than a description of the objectives of the plan and the priorities for government investment as stated in the plan. He cannot tell us whether the levels of planned saving and investment called for are likely to be adequate to achieve the planned overall growth rate nor can he tell us the relationship between the sectoral growth rates (for sectors within industry and agriculture) foreseen by the plan and the levels of either past or planned government infrastructure expenditure. Hence the reader comes away with no clue as to whether the overall and sectoral growth rates planned are realistic or not.

By now, the reader of this review may understandably be somewhat puzzled as to why a book under review in late 1973 does not contain an

*ex post* evaluation of the achievements of the First Six-Year Plan (1961-1966) and perhaps a good portion or all of the Second Five-Year Plan (1967-1971) as well. The book, the author's dissertation from the Indian School of International Studies, was first printed in 1971 but reads like a book that was completed many years prior to that date, say 1965 at the latest (the latest reference in its bibliography is for 1963). If I am correct that a substantial number of years elapsed between the book's completion and its publication, it is puzzling why the author did not update some of the material in the book. It would not have been necessary to extend the entire coverage of the book to include the 1960's; it would have been sufficient to relate the development of the 1950's to the actual achievements under the First and part of the Second Plan (thus requiring a revision of the final chapter alone) perhaps explaining the extent to which the faster growth rate of the 1960's was dependent upon the development of the 1950's. Had the author done so, his book might have been a more valuable contribution. Without this alteration and with defects outlined above, the book is a poor substitute for more recent books covering the whole economy or substantial sectors over the entire period since World War II.

*William A. McCleary*

*Faculty of Economics,  
Thammasat University*

Ernst E. Boesch, *Communication Between Doctors and Patients in Thailand. Part 1 : Survey of the Problem and Analysis of the Consultations* (Socio-Psychological Research Centre on Development Planning, University of the Saar, Saarbrücken, West Germany, 1972), pp. 157.

The publication under review is the first of three research reports and as such summarizes and comments on the findings collected during the first phase of the study (November 1970-June 1971) when initial hypotheses were being tested in the field. Recordings made during medical consultations are also analysed with a view to assessing to what extent the protagonists' perception of their relationship is related to the *actual* process of interaction.

This study of the relationship between doctors and patients in Thailand is part of a larger programme, concerned with investigating the role of elites in the development process, being sponsored by the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft). Aside from its intrinsic interest this interdisciplinary study is significant as being specifically action-oriented in that it is intended that the research findings be implemented in the training of doctors at a number of Thai medical faculties (see *Outline of Follow-up Projects*. Saarbrücken May 1973)

Data was obtained by interviewing doctors about their work and about their patients; through interviews with patients about their illnesses, their experiences with the health services and the general circumstances of their lives; and by making tape-recordings of medical consultations in progress. The interviews and recording were collected in hospitals and health stations in Bangkok, Ayutthaya, Lopburi and Nakorn Sawan. Twenty-eight doctors' between the ages of 28 and 58 were interviewed, whilst 154 interviews were made with patients.

In his discussion of research techniques adopted Dr. Boesch is quite frank about their possible limitations and the consequent likelihood of bias in the data collected. He discusses, for example, the implications for his research findings of the status differences between interviewers and respondents (both doctors (p. 13) and patients (p. 25)), the human element is of course an irreducible in all interview situations but is of special significance in a society where there is constant *overt* recognition of status

differences, and great awareness of their implication for social interaction. Previous research has shown that the Thai medical service is strikingly under-utilized relative to that of other countries both developed and under-developed.

"In Africa, the average person visits a health facility about two times per year. In the United States the figure is around four, but in Thailand it is about 0.2 (Bryant, 1970 p. 56)"

With reference to an article on "Western Medicine in a village of Northern India" by Marriot, Boesch postulates that interpersonal communication is a crucial variable in determining the speed and extent to which medical innovation is accepted and new services utilized. Moreover difficulties in communication cannot be reduced to mere differences in language skills, but may arise from the fact that each participant operates within a totally different universe of meanings and behaviour, in medical as in all other spheres.

One symptom of the fact that doctor and patient inhabit, in effect, different subcultures is the fact that their expectations relative to their own and to the other's roles are incompatible.

The doctor perceives himself as hampered by his patients' ignorance, and lack of education; they do not consult him at a sufficiently early stage in their illness; they cannot describe their symptoms with any precision; they fail to follow the advice prescribed and change doctors very frequently.

Boesch found that most doctors concentrated on the overt symptoms of a disease and gave relatively little emphasis to case-histories or to the patient's current personal and social situation, a factor which further reduces the probability of effective treatment being prescribed.

Some practitioners rationalized their rather cursory consultations with reference to their excessive workload, but this burden was illusory in many cases as research showed. Eight out of ten of the doctors only allowed the patient between 10 and 40 seconds to explain himself (p. 82) and most consultations lasted a maximum of two minutes "regardless it seems to be of the total number of waiting patients" (p. 18).

Dr. Boesch hypothesizes that the length of time allotted to a consultation reflects the doctor's attitude more than his workload. He has got into the habit of forming his diagnosis too quickly because he does not enjoy interaction with his patients; he is impatient of them and considers attempts at explanation a waste of time. He further expects them to act "rationally"—by which he means to follow his directive which may not be at all "rational" in the patients' terms, (p. 17).

Of course as Dr. Boesch points out it is neither feasible nor necessary that each patient achieve a technical grasp of their illness and its treatment; but it is imperative that they be made to feel that the doctor understands and cares, that he is credible and trustworthy. Which is to say that in such a case effective treatment of the symptoms cannot be a purely commercial transaction but must have a sound moral basis. As patients are not yet convinced of the efficacy of Western medicine, or of its supposed superiority to traditional methods, the relationship with practitioner is clearly very crucial in determining their willingness to follow the treatment prescribed.

Some of the misunderstandings which arise (in the absence of any community of sentiment or belief) *are* based on purely semantic differences which would seem to be easily soluble with a little imagination and empathy on the doctor's part. He may for example prescribe a tablespoonful of medicine to be taken every four hours; an apparently simple instruction in a modern urban context. But a farmer may not have a tablespoon, or may not know which of the spoons he has conforms to that description. He may well have no means of telling the time with any precision; he may think that this periodicity applies to night-time too (p. 20).

On the other hand it is differences more serious than purely lexical ones which prevent the patient for asking for clarification on these points and so losing face.

It is not surprising that a course of treatment which seems both incomprehensible and irrelevant is not closely followed, particularly when its authority is also—in the view of the patient—open to doubt. The persistence of the symptoms confirms the patients' original scepticism

and he totally discontinues the treatment or seeks advice elsewhere; the probability of a accurate diagnosis of his symptoms decreases accordingly.

It is interesting to compare the doctor/patient relationship with other superficially similar types of patron/client relationship existing in Thai society. In the classic type of regularised patron/client relationship the status asymmetry is clearly defined and permanent. The patron provides material and other support for his clients, in turn, they provide him with a reserve of manpower he can call upon, which (in itself) is a validation of his status superiority. Both parties can earn merit through the enactment of this symbiotic relationship, as a by-product of the correct performance of these recognised social roles.

The doctor/patient relationship at least in the contexts covered by this study i.e. in government hospitals, clinics, and health centres also exhibits clear status asymmetry; neither party is in any doubt as to the doctor's superiority. Whereas, in the orthodox patron/client relationship however, each party recognises a moral obligation (which is expressed in idiom of merit-making) towards the other, this is not true between doctors and patients. The doctor in the context of government service does not need to form any personal bonds with his patients, in fact his behaviour would suggest that he shrinks from personal involvement, and tries (consciously or otherwise) to keep the interchange as brief and impersonal as is possible; he treats the symptoms rather than the patient. In a sense the doctor's attitude to the relationship can be almost commercial, or rather contractual, in that he sees no need to stabilize or prolong the relationship. He does not need a large number of patients to validate his professional standing, in that his career depends more upon his relationship with his professional colleagues than upon those with his patients. His primary loyalties are with them, and from them he receives moral and intellectual reinforcement (p. 23). On the other hand the doctor acts upon the assumption that his superior status is sufficient to render his advice authoritative; that patients should act "rationally" (p. 17) as he directs, regardless of whether or not he has given them any reason so to do in their own terms. The doctor, according to this survey appears to want the *noblesse* without any attendant *oblige*!

The patient on the other hand, in the absence of any real understanding at least needs to know that the doctor understands and cares before he will feel a commitment to following the course of treatment. He needs in a word to create the moral bond which is unnecessary and even distasteful to the doctor, but he has no apparent means of achieving this. Some patients may try to pay more for the services than is demanded in the hopes of securing "special" treatment (p. 32).

This study is very timely for Thailand in that doctors are being used increasingly in development activities (FP and Health Education). But it is important not to lose sight of the fact that the conditions he describes are not peculiar to Thailand or to "developing countries"; patients in Europe and the States also complain that their doctors are remote and "elitist", although the gap is narrower in that in most cases it would not be true that the doctor and patient inhabit "different subcultures."

It is inevitable that members of an elite highly specialised professional group—lawyers, priests, doctors—are to some extent, and by definition, and of necessity removed from the people to whom they minister. Of all these professional groups it is perhaps the doctor who deals most exclusively in human distress, and were he to become emotionally involved with each case then he could not function; to some extent his ability to treat the disease rather than its human vehicle is a defence against such crippling involvement, and yet the disease cannot be understood out of its context. The good doctor must strike a balance by taking into account the patient's case-history and current personal/social condition, and by providing treatment in a humane and compassionate way without emotional involvement.

For the patient on the other hand the disease *is* him. His world-view is completely changed by the fact of his illness. He needs both psychological and physiological care and attention, and for this reason may well attempt to obtain the doctor's emotional involvement in his case. These inconsistencies and inequalities in supply and demand as between doctor and patient would seem to be a feature of the relationship universally, but there is no doubt that these difficulties are vastly compounded in a developing country where the modern medical system is alien and incompletely accepted.

The study raises a number of questions for further investigation; for example, it would be interesting to see whether doctors are prepared to invest more effort in communicating with their patients in private clinics where there is a direct relationship between their income and their ability to attract patients. It is possible of course that the gap between the doctors, and the patients who attend private clinics may from the outset be appreciably smaller.

A further query relates to the role of the nurse in doctor/patient interaction, is it possible that they can or do act as liaison between the two parties, having in many cases a foot in each subculture?

The examination of this deep-seated lack of communication, and, on the part of the doctors of an apparent absence of concern about this lack, suggests limitations, in the short-term at least, on the doctor's potential as a change agent, a function he has currently been assigned in the Thailand National Family Planning Programme. Although one of the obvious solutions to the problem lies in improved general standards of Health Education, it would appear that, at this stage, the doctor is not best qualified to take any very significant part in this effort. If the *needs* of the patient cannot surmount the barrier between the two, how much more difficult would be the communication of unfamiliar and often repugnant (e.g. contraceptive techniques new concepts).

In summary the fact that official medical practitioners are relatively unutilized by the majority of the population suggests that further study of traditional medical practitioners of all kinds is in order. In that they apparently have the ear and confidence of the patient or potential patient it is important to explore how if at all they might be incorporated in official health development programmes without destroying the basis of their support in the community. As they would appear to provide treatment for physiological symptoms and at the same time give psychological satisfaction interdisciplinary studies which both examined their social relationships and analysed the techniques and remedies they purvey would be of great value.

*Jane Bunnag*

*D.S.C.S.,  
Bangkok*

Nguyen Van Phong, *La société vietnamienne de 1882 à 1902 d'après les écrits des auteurs français* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1971) pp. 388.

The author of this elegant and densely written book is a Roman Catholic priest, educated during the colonial era in what is now the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and, since 1954, at various universities in France, where he is now a member of the prestigious Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) under whose auspices, in part, this study—originally a dissertation at the University of Paris—has been published.

I mention these details because they help to explain what some readers might find the peculiar angle of vision from which Dr. Phong has chosen to analyze Vietnamese society at the end of the nineteenth century. Scrupulously avoiding Vietnamese-language sources (except where they have been rendered into French) he sets out to reconstruct his own society through the testimony of a generation of French writers. Using techniques absorbed in his French academic training (which include heavy, but palatable, doses of sociological theory) Dr. Phong describes Vietnam in terms that Vietnamese of the time would not have used.

In his introduction ("*Les auteurs et leurs écrits*") Dr. Phong moves swiftly over some of the territory mapped out some forty years ago by Louis Malleret in his classic study, *L'Exotisme indochinois et la littérature française*. The center of the book ("*La société vietnamienne dans son organisation et dans ses transformations*", pp. 65-264) is followed by a short concluding section (pp. 265-348) in which he evaluates his sources and Vietnam's colonial experience as a whole.

As if the problems posed by an alien angle of vision, a vanished society and severely limited sources were not enough to absorb him, Dr. Phong, in what can only be called a *tour de force*, has selected the twenty years of the colonial era in which the interaction between France and Vietnam (especially in the north) was most intense, when the French angles of vision, in many cases, produced the most distortions, and when Vietnamese political, social and economic institutions were undergoing a bewildering and revolutionary process of disintegration. In other words, the "Vietnamese society" which he reconstructs is not the "timeless" one which many Frenchmen of the time wanted, and professed to see, but one that was tearing itself and was being torn apart.

Because he has chosen these twenty years, rather than an earlier period, most of his data comes from the northern parts of Vietnam. This would seem to suit Dr. Phong's institutional bias, for the northern parts of Vietnam were the ones in which Chinese influence, the mandarin, and imperial power (to name only three phenomena) were stronger than they were then (or would ever be) in the south. In the north there were fewer collaborators, many more people, less wealth, and more prolonged, better organized resistance. The French response to the Vietnamese in the north was different from their earlier response in Cochinchina, but in both places, as Dr. Phong points out (p. 292), the destruction of Vietnamese institutions that was taking place around them was not seen as a tragedy but often as a "picturesque adventure".

A French writer in the 1880s argued that France was "revolutionizing" Vietnam. Certainly many of its institutions, especially at the pinnacle of society, and many of its commonly-held attitudes were destroyed, or overturned, in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. The emperor and his mandarin, for example, never re-emerged. The "Indo-China" created out of whole cloth by Governor Doumer at the end of the century was much more like the place the French abandoned fifty years later—institutionally, at least—than it was like the place the French had first discovered, in some cases, barely twenty years before.

Dr. Phong's surprisingly unpolemical book provides fresh insights into Vietnam and the colonial experience. Its wealth of detail (see, for example, the pages on food, clothing, and the theatre) is extraordinary. As a dividend, the reader will encounter dozens of marvellous quotations, such as Clemenceau's definition of a protectorate as "governing a government", or a *Figaro* correspondent's complaint that Vietnamese society was "from our point of view incomplete and even illogical".

The book's extensive bibliography is arranged, interestingly, in terms of the years in which books or articles first appeared. The evolving concerns and perceptions of the French, as revealed by the titles, form the basis of an essay in themselves.

As the best analysis in a western language of Vietnamese society in the late nineteenth century, Dr. Phong's book is also an absorbing study, from both sides of the exchange, of the *mission civilisatrice*.

David P. Chandler

*The Crawford Papers.* A Collection of Official Records relating to the Mission of Dr. John Crawford sent to Siam by the Government of India in the year 1821. (Bangkok Vajirañāna National Library, 1915, reprinted by Gregg International Publishers, Ltd., Farnborough, 1971), pp. xi, 285.

In 1821 Dr. John Crawford was sent by the Government of India on a mission to the courts of Bangkok and Hué in an effort to obtain more favorable trading conditions for British merchants going to those countries in order to eventually open new markets for British manufactured goods and to provide a stimulus to flagging British trade. From the point of view of accomplishing its aims the mission was a failure, and at the Siamese court the mission generated so much suspicion that the Phra Khlang, who acted as Foreign Minister, was moved to write a letter of complaint to the Indian Government. Crawford's published journal of this mission\* though being a highly informative and valuable account tends to be somewhat reticent about certain of the points of tension between Crawford and the Siamese court. It was in order to rectify this deficiency that the Vajirañāna National Library in 1915 obtained permission to publish the collection of documents in the archives of the India Office pertaining to Crawford's mission (p. iii).

At the time of the mission both the political and economic fortunes of the ruling faction at the Court of Siam were flourishing, and the princes and ministers of this group were not inclined to look favorably on Crawford's proposals, particularly as the effect of the measures proposed in his original instructions would have been to sharply curtail or even end the long-standing and lucrative royal trade monopolies from which the Siamese court derived a large part of its revenue. The British deprived themselves at the outset of the one bargaining counter that might possibly have brought success, i.e. permission for the Siamese to buy firearms in British territories (pp. 162, 177). With the Thai mood as it was, the rumors that the British might use force if their demands were not met acted not as a lever to persuasion but as an irritant, an irritant which was exacerbated by the mission's surveying and information-gathering activities (pp. 84-87, 219, 268-269). Incidentally, these documents hint that the idea of using or threatening the use of force was

---

\* Dr. John Crawford, *Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Courts of Siam and Cochin-China*, London, 1828.

not altogether absent from Crawford's mind (pp. 45-46, 151-152), and thus the rumors attributed to Crawford's interpreters and reinforced by the indiscreet conversation of the captain of the mission ship were perhaps not entirely without substance (pp. 95-96, 269). Thai apprehensions concerning British surveying activities were also perhaps not totally unwarranted, despite Crawford and the Indian Government's dismissal of such fears as groundless (pp. 84, 171), since the mission's survey of the Sichang Island group in the Gulf of Siam was the basis for Crawford's recommendation that one of these islands be obtained as a British entrepôt (pp. 163-164), a measure that would undoubtedly have been inimical to Thai interests. (See, for example, Crawford's suggestion on pages 151-152 that these islands be used as a base to blockade the Thai court into submission to any "just or necessary" British demands "should the arrogance of the Siamese embarrass us.") Fortunately for Siam this proposal, although endorsed by the Indian Government, was vetoed by the Company directors in London (pp. 177, 219-220).

Perhaps the most enlightening aspect of the *Crawford Papers*, is what they reveal, by the very nature of the points of tension between Crawford and the Siamese and through the arguments advanced by either side in defense of their own position or conduct, about the wide divergency between the world-views of the Thai and the British at the time, a divergency which encompassed ideas on such fundamental issues as the rights of governments and the nature of diplomacy. In other words this was not a case in which both parties while seeking their own ends still subscribed to the same ground rules, but one in which each party held fundamentally different ideas about what the rules ought to be. Thus, although both parties might appear on the surface to be talking about the same thing, neither party understood the basic assumptions which led the opposite party to take the positions it did. A prime example is the case of the negotiations over the restoration of the Rajah of Kedah. The Rajah, after being accused by the Governor of Nakhon of treason and having suffered an invasion of his territory by forces from Nakhon, had fled to Prince of Wales Island to the protection of the British. Crawford, who was then on his way to Siam, had been asked by the government of Penang to seek the Rajah's restoration. Crawford did so, expressing the British point of view that the Rajah's behavior was excusable in light of his oppression by the Governor of Nakhon. In the eyes of the Thai court, however, the Rajah's behavior could not

be so easily excused. Not only was he accused of intriguing with the Burmese, who were preparing an invasion force at this time, and obstructing the attempts of the Governor of Nakhon to mobilize for defense, but he significantly chose as the occasion to announce his revolt the Water of Allegiance ceremony.<sup>1</sup> Setting aside the question of whether or not the Governor of Nakhon had fabricated or at least exaggerated the charges against the Rajah of Kedah for his own purposes, if the Rajah of Kedah were indeed innocent of the charges or unjustly maligned or if he had indeed been oppressed, in a traditional Southeast Asian context his only resort to prove his innocence should have been to personally lay his case before the king, trusting in the king's benevolence and wisdom to give him just treatment. His very presence would have argued for his innocence or at least in mitigation of his guilt. Therefore his unwillingness to come to the capital was seen by the Thai court as a *de facto* admission of guilt. Thus the Phra Khlang's reiterated statement to Crawford that "the Rajah of Queda is not a child, he knows the customs of the country, and if he wishes to be restored, he must come into the presence, and submit his cause to the King" (p. 36). To Crawford this merely demonstrated the determination of the Rajah's enemies to gain bodily control of him, Crawford making little apparent effort to understand the principle underlying the Thai court's stand. The Thai, in turn, saw British intercession on behalf of a vassal who knew what was expected of him as being unwarranted interference. Thus the Siamese court turned a deaf ear to Crawford's intercession.

Crawford's correspondence with his own Government contained in the *Crawford Papers* makes it abundantly clear that he subscribed to the Indian Government's opinion that countries not sharing the heritage of Western ideas of diplomacy and statecraft were somehow "barbarous" and needed to be dealt with somewhat in the manner of a parent admonishing a wayward child. The Thai court returned the dubious compliment of misunderstanding by viewing the British mode of diplomatic procedure as being highly peculiar. Thus Crawford's attempt to negotiate points not mentioned in the Governor-General's letter was seen by the Thai as an attempt by Crawford to exceed his authority (pp. 83-84, 268). For the point here it is irrelevant whether Crawford asked for

1) Manuscript Division, National Library, Records of the Second Reign, C.S. 1184 (B.E. 2365), no. 3.

the establishment of a British consulship as he claimed or for permanent residency for British merchants as the Thai court claimed since neither was mentioned in the Governor-General's letter. The amount of discretion which the Governor-General had allowed Crawford seemed to the Thai officials to be most unusual and the Phra Khlang "chose frequently in conversation to make this very point the subject of personal complaint to myself, artfully congratulating me on the confidence reposed in me by so high an authority" (p. 84). Perhaps, as the Phra Khlang's letter of complaint to the Indian Government implies, the Thai court did not really believe Crawford's claims to independent discretion or at least were entirely unsure of how far this discretion extended, and thus, out of prudence perhaps, refrained from entering into any agreement with so unusual an agent.

One of the most entertaining pictures conveyed in the *Crawford Papers* is that of British officials, who found it necessary to take a "high tone" in their dealings with Asian principalities, inveighing against the "haughtiness," "arrogance," and "national vanity" of the Siamese. It was a matter of representatives of two proud and self-confident civilizations confronting one another. Within their own world the Siamese had legitimate reason to be proud. That this world was threatened they were hardly aware at the time of Crawford's mission, as is evidenced by Crawford's observation that the principal portion of the army was kept on the Burmese frontier, no apprehension of invasion from any other quarter (i.e. by sea) being entertained (p. 126). That such an awareness was rapidly being awakened, however, is attested to by the anxious tone and the astuteness of the Thai officials inquiries into the actions of the British (pp. 93-99, 203).

There are very few Western-language accounts of Siam during this period and thus the *Crawford Papers* are a valuable source to scholars. This edition is a photolithric reprint of the original 1915 edition published by the Vajirañāna National Library and is to be welcomed for making this interesting collection of documents more generally available.

*Lorraine M. Gesick*

Yoneo Ishii, Osamu Akagi, Noriko Endo, *A Glossarial Index of the Sukhothai Inscriptions* (Discussion Paper No. 53, The Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, November 1972) iii, 233 pp.

Along with H.L. Shorto's Dictionary of the Mon inscriptions, the present work provides a second example of the type of tool required for the full exploitation of Southeast Asia's epigraphic record.

The inscriptions treated are nos. 1-2-3-5-7-8-9-11-13-14-15-38-40-45-46-49 of the Thai corpus, all in Thai and published in volumes 1 and 3 of *Collected Inscriptions*. All but nos. 9-13-14-15 have also been studied by A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara in their "Epigraphic and Historical Studies".<sup>1</sup>

Each word of the inscriptions is listed in Thai alphabetical order, and in Thai script, and following it are indicated all of its occurrences by means of sets of three numbers, for example, 1-2-3, indicating the number of the inscription, the number of the face of the inscription and the line in which the word occurs. Meanings are indicated for each entry in English with the warning that they "are given by way of example and may or may not be applicable for every instance" (p. i).

The arrangement generally makes it very easy to locate and compare contexts, but there is, I feel, one serious defect which should be remedied in future compilations of this type. That is the presentation of the material in modern Thai spelling which in many cases is very different from the orthography of the inscriptions and may in certain contexts disguise real difficulties of interpretation or involve an arbitrary choice of definition. Such glossaries should always show the original orthography whether compiled in a non-western script or in romanized transliteration. In fact, since some Thai inscriptions, such as no. 9 among those treated here, are written in Khmer script, which is essential to know when attempting to place them in their historical context, the use of a "graphic" transliteration is perhaps to be preferred.

In certain cases not all contexts of a word are placed together. Take for example, the title written today พระยา (*brah̄yā*). In the Sukhothai inscriptions written in Thai script, with the exception of no. 49, if

1) Published in JSS beginning with vol 56(2), July 1968.

I am not mistaken, this word is always written ប្រាណ (*braṇā*) but in the glossary one finds on p. 119 the entry ប្រាណ, "a term placed before the honorific name, a king", and references to inscriptions 1-2-3-9-40-45-49, in all of which, except for no. 9, in Khmer script, and no. 49, the original spelling is *braṇā*. The same is true for the entry *baṇā*, "a king", on p. 115 with a reference to inscription no. 14, and the entry *braḥṇā*, "the king", p. 117 referring to inscriptions 5-7-8-9-11. This, however, does not exhaust the occurrences of these titles. Others are found in the entry *cau brahyā* on p. 36, where in fact they missed one, 14-1-39, and the entry *samtec cau brahyā* on p. 184.

It would be much more helpful if all occurrences of *braṇā*, whether associated with another title or not, were grouped together, and I would also like to see separate sections grouping all titles, all personal names and all place names.

Even as it stands, however, with certain features needing revision and incomplete with respect to the whole body of Sukhothai inscriptions, the glossary still provides the opportunity to make some interesting comparisons with relative ease.

Take for example inscription no. 49, already singled out for its unique use of *brahyā*, which in the inscriptions and chronicles I have examined does not generally occur before the latter part of the 19th century. This inscription has been studied by Griswold and Prasert who see it as the work of an Ayutthayan Chief Resident at Sukhothai in the year 1412.<sup>2</sup> M.C. Chand, on the other hand, seems to doubt that the person in question was Chief Resident, without, however, proposing any other position for him, but above all denies that the language of the inscription shows the ruler of Sukhothai to be no longer an independent monarch. According to him, Nai In Sorasak, as an Ayutthayan, was simply unacquainted with the Sukhothai royal language.<sup>3</sup> I shall not enter into this controversy at the present time beyond pointing out that according to the Laws of the Military and Provincial Hierarchies Nay

2) "Epigraphic and Historical Studies" (EHS) no. 1, JSS 56 (2), July 1968, pp. 207-250.

3) M.C. Chand Chirayu Rajani, "A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara 'Epigraphic and Historical Studies nos. 1-8'", JSS vol 61(1), January 1972, pp. 261-301; see p. 272.

In Sorasak (*inśarasākti*) was a *praṭtaeñ* in the *krom* of *tāmrvac hñai s̄ay* with a *śakdinā* of only 300 and thus an unlikely candidate for the position of Chief Resident anywhere.<sup>4</sup>

M.C. Chand, as our glossary shows, was right in taking note of the unusual language of the inscription, though whether it is due to the author being Ayutthayan and unfamiliar with the language of Sukhothai must await further research. It is the only one of the inscriptions listed in the glossary to make use of the "pronoun" *π* (dh), originally written *η* (d), and glossed as "His Majesty, His Excellency, = *พ่น*", although I have also found it in nos. 48 and 51, both from Chainat. It is also the only inscription of the collection to show a title with *ອກ* (*òk*) or the expression *ອຸ້ວ* (*ayū hūā*) in a king's title, as in *bò ayū hūā cau* on p. 123, both of which are of very frequent use in texts of a somewhat later date. The possibility of this inscription representing a regional or dialectical peculiarity deserves further attention, and it is with research tools such as the present glossarial index that such investigation may be profitably undertaken.

Kyoto University is to be complimented for undertaking this type of work, and I hope we will see additional volumes including the whole corpus of Sukhothai, and eventually all Thai inscriptions.

Michael Vickery

School of Humanities,  
Universiti Sains Malaysia,  
Penang

- 4) See the *guru sabhā* edition of the old Thai laws in 5 volumes, vol I, p. 288. Of course the law text may be very corrupt. The present consensus of scholarly opinion seems to place the promulgation of this law in the reign of King Trailok (1448-88). If this is true, or if the section in which the title *inśarasākti* is found is an even later insertion, the title might have been applied to some quite different function in earlier times. It might even, by this reasoning, have been a purely Sukhothai rank in 1412, and the existence of "Hivāñ Sarasakti (Luang Sōrasak)" as an Ayutthayan title at the end of the 17th century (EHS I, p. 231, n. 50) is not sufficient to prove that the title Sorasakti (*sarasākti*) had always been Ayutthayan, any more than *rāma kāṃphaeñ* as the head of one section of the Ayutthayan *kalāhom* ministry (Laws I, p. 281) should be considered evidence that *rāma gāṃphaeñ* (the titles are synonymous) was an Ayutthayan rather than Sukhothai personage. The Ayutthayan administration seems to have taken over titles from a number of sources, including Sukhothai,

Phayaphrom, *The Poem in Four Songs*. A Northern Thai tetralogy translated by Søren Egerod (Lund, Studentlitteratur, Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 7, 1971). 204 pp.

Søren Egerod, Professor of East Asian Languages at the University of Copenhagen and Director of the Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies, has translated into English a lengthy love poem by Phaya Phrom Wohan (พระยาพรหมโวหาร), one of the greatest poets of Northern Thailand. *The Poem in Four Songs* is an excellent example of *khâaw* (คำว), a type of Northern Thai verse somewhat similar to the Thai *klwon pèet* (กลอนแปด). In addition to his romanized transcription and translation of *Four Songs* (pp. 10-121), Professor Egerod has provided a brief introduction containing a sketch of Phrom's life (pp. 5-8) and a vocabulary list of words found in the poem (pp. 124-203).

Egerod has based his translation on two printed editions of *Four Songs*: one by Sanguan Chotisukharatana which also contains Phrom's vita, the other published by the Charoen Müang Press in Chiangmai. The only printed text available at present bears the Sanguan copyright and is published by the Pratuang Wittaya Store in Chiangmai. This edition is virtually identical with Egerod's text and forms the basis of this review.

Most of the information on Phrom's life on pages 5-7 appears to be a direct translation from the Thai vita by Sanguan. It can also be found in Manee Phayomyong's *The History and Literature of Lanna* from which the supplementary comments below have been taken.<sup>1</sup>

Phrom (1802-1887) evidently was quite a 'swinger'. Manee (p. 143) says he had a total of forty-two wives. Since only three are mentioned by name, however, the others may have been mistresses or simply brief affairs. A native of Lampang where his father was a high official of the court, Phrom became a novice at the age of 17 and later entered the monkhood. At age 22 or 23 he left the monkhood and put his temple education to use writing legal documents. He also built an excellent reputation as a composer and reciter of love poetry. He entered the service of the king of Lampang and was granted permission to study

1) ประวัติและวรรณคดีล้านนา โดย มณี พยอมยงค์, 2513.

under and work with the royal poet, Phaya Lomawisai, a close friend of Phrom's father.

Phrom's troubles began when, as an authority on elephants, he was sent to Phrae to examine and perhaps purchase a particular elephant for the king of Lampang. According to the beast's owner, the price was a 'mere 2,000 rupees' (Manee, p. 144), but the king understandably wanted the elephant carefully examined before parting with such a sum. On the way to Phrae, Phrom gambled and managed to lose all the king's money, a misfortune for which he was sentenced to death in absentia. The trip was not an entire loss, however, since he met a lady named Chom, the former wife of another losing gambler.

Phrom became a poet in the service of the king of Phrae. His affair with Mom Chandra, a court lady and favorite of the king, led to Phrom's imprisonment and sentence of death. While in prison he was visited regularly by Chom who had been sent to the court by one of her former husband's creditors to be a maid. Thinking to get a New Year's poem out of Phrom before beheading him, the king postponed the execution. But Phrom used the time to escape. How he escaped is not clear, though Manee (p. 147) writes that some sources said it was because a monk in Lampang, Phra Kassapatherachao, put a spell on the prison bars which caused them to become flexible. The spell was written on a piece of paper, hidden in a packet of sticky rice, and handed in to Phrom. At any rate, Phrom fled to Lap Laeng (ลำปาง), also called Lap Lae (ลำเล), in Uttaradit, the faithful Chom fleeing with him.

How long Phrom and Chom lived in Lap Laeng is not known, but it would seem to have been a period of not more than a year or two. They were a happy couple until one day when Phrom, returning from a business trip to dun some Mon and Thai clients, found Chom gone. She had returned to Phrae, some neighbors said, under threat of punishment by the king, but Phrom believed she had run off with a new lover. *Four Songs* was written as a lament and love letter to Chom and expresses Phrom's continued love for her and deep distress over her disappearance. When and from what place the poem was written neither Egerod nor Manee mention,

The last twenty-six years of Phrom's life were spent in Chiangmai, once again in service as a royal poet. His last wife was Princess Bua Chandra by whom he had a daughter, Sri Wai, his only child. Manee is not clear, but either mother or daughter had the nickname 'Pig Manure'. Sri Wai died childless in 1926.

In addition to his own compositions, Phrom worked with Phaya Lomawisai to revise the latter's *khâaw khloong* composition Hong Hin (หงส์หิน) and was commissioned by the Princess Mother Thipkesontharong (เจ้าแม่ทิพย์เกษรทรง) to adapt the Thai drama *Phra Aphaimani* by Sunthorn Phu to *khâaw* style.

The publication of Professor Egerod's translation of *Four Songs* is noteworthy in that it is, to our knowledge, the first translation into English of a complete Northern Thai poem. *Four Songs* is a beautiful poem which affords some glimpses of village life in the mid-nineteenth century. There are passages describing personal emotions, aspects of the culture, flora of the region, and the like. For example, there are descriptions of disease (pp. 50, 98), fruits (pp. 75-76), desserts (pp. 77-79), social relations (pp. 27-31), contempt (pp. 83-84), and of course love-making (pp. 17-19, 45).

Egerod's inclusion of a comprehensive list of vocabulary found in the poem should be a considerable help to students who wish to read other Northern Thai poetic works. The word /nĕem/ 'even though' (43:235), however, should be added.<sup>2</sup>

As a 'first' the translation might have been clarified and supported by several types of supplementary information. Except for the excellent vocabulary list, however, the information which is provided is very inadequate. The lack will be most critical for students without an extensive background in Standard Thai language and literature. Three areas worth mentioning are an errata list, an informative introduction, and notes.

Although an errata sheet has been included by the publisher, an irritatingly large number remain. Our reading turned up almost 70 additional misprints and there may well be others. It is unfortunate

2) References in this review will be cited by page (43) and line (235).

that space in a journal such as this must be taken to correct a text, but inasmuch as *Four Songs* will be used by students we include the following list.

<i>Page : line</i>	<i>Erratum</i>	<i>Correction</i>
7	intervowen	interwoven
8	Chotisukharatang	Chotisukharatana
10:13	?oon	?oon
11:53,57	fâj	fâj
13:95	cəj	cəen
13:97	dew nám	dew phaa nám
13:101	nfi	nfi
13:122	măj	măj
14:128	pũa, kan	phũa, kăn
14:133	naaj	naaj
14:146	tõj	tõg
15:184	dếεg	dếεg
17:221	kan	kan
17:242,246	The lines are reversed.	The correct order of lines in the passage is 241, 246, 243-245, 242.
21:364	khwên	khwêen
22:385	pyan	pÿan
24:458	sould	should
26:508	ciarṃa.j	ciarṃà.j
31:677	caj	căj
31:688	khaw	khăw
34:773	thăj	thěj
34:783	lÿan	lyan
36:9	khếεj	kếεj
37:32	cîj	cíj
37:43	thõj	thõj
37:54	năn	năn
40:128	phũa nốoj	phũa kăw nốoj
40:146	dốoj	tốoj
41:183	hÿj jen ṇiab phág	kố? maa fũu tân
41:186	ṇiab	ṇiab
43:254	daaj	taa.j
45:304	tad	tăd
48:389	pÿan	pÿan

<i>Page : line</i>	<i>Erratum</i>	<i>Correction</i>
54:592	dǎj	tǎj
59:117	pīi	pīin
66:347	līib	hæm
67:397	hōon	hōon
69:457	lǎo	lǎa
74:620	?aaŋ	?aaŋ
75	557 cǎg...mían	657 kan wǎa cǎg kīn
76:692	[~?aaw...tāan]	[~?aaw] bōog tāan
76:696	Chiengmai	Chiengrai
77:712	lōn	lōm
77:715	pée	bée
78:746	sǎj nǒm	sǎj sǎj nǒm
81:838	khǎŋ	khǎj
82:897	ký	kyd
82:898	mýŋ	nýŋ
84:956	khýn	khýn
85:981	From...	From the time...
89:53	býan	býan
89:60	lěen	kěen
100:419	near	far
100:420	far	near
107:662	hǎj	hǎj
111:781	nǎŋ tǎo	nǎŋ loo tǎo
111:803	tōon	tōon
116:963	khwǎw	khwǎj
116:968	bōo	pōo
120:1084	tian	tian
124:2	seperate	separate
126	= bōo mīi	= bōo mīi
126	= bōo nǎa	= bōo nǎa
131	se deen deen	see deen deen
136	hīa	hīa
139	Entries are out of order.	Omit first jǎag. Move jaaŋ and jǎan jōŋ after second jǎag below.
193	too midday	toon midday

Professor Egerod's introduction to the *khàaw* poetic style is very brief and sketchy. It would have been much more helpful to the reader if information on the structure of *khàaw* had been provided. Such information, similar to that found in most Thai books on poetry, would have included a diagram of the syllables comprising hemistitches (วรรค), lines (บาท), and stanzas (คัณฑ์, ๓๐); patterns of internal and external rhyme; and tonal restrictions on certain syllables. The single phrase describing *khàaw* as 'a rather free poetical form, consisting of lines with 3, 4, 5 or 6 syllables and interwoven rimes' (p. 7) is both inadequate and misleading.

In the romanized text variant forms are placed in brackets. A knowledge of the structural principles which apply in hemistitch- or line-final position would have indicated, in over a dozen cases, which form was in fact the correct one and would have led to a revision of the translation in one or two places. For example, on the basis of the tone and/or rime system the variants which should be rejected are 21: 360, 34: 759, 53: 567, 60: 143, 62: 213, 72: 559, and 111: 778. On the other hand, those variants which are actually the correct forms are 12: 87 and 24: 465 which need a high tone, 48: 407 and 58: 97 which need a short falling tone, 90: 93 which needs a high tone, and 120: 1078 which needs a final *-ād* to rhyme with *pād* in 1080. In 23: 415 the variant form is semantically more appropriate. In 119: 1059 both mid and rising tones are permitted in hemistitch-final position, though the latter, as in the variant form, is more frequent.

A special case involving structure but without a variant form is 34: 783. The final tone of this hemistitch must be mid, not long falling (cf. 54: 607, 85: 987, 121: 1124). Thus instead of *tā'lee lyaŋ* 'A sea of stories' the text should read *tā'lee lyaŋ* 'The shimmering sea'.

In several places two hemistitches have been run together whereas they should have been kept separate (10: 1, 28: 596, 29: 611, 31: 674, 52: 545, 56: 1, 65: 335, 74: 641). In half of these the first hemistitch ends at the right-hand margin, thus making the break difficult to spot unless one is counting syllables carefully.

Some explanations of the translation are provided and occur bracketed in the text. There are a number of other places, however, where

a note is needed to clarify certain cultural references in the text. For instance, what is special about Bangtaphan golden ear beads (10: 19-20)? what is an elephant flag (11: 40)? what is the meaning of 'like the figure of an elephant which is placed in the satuang offering tray' (26: 525)? does the 'Glorious Mirror' (27: 570) have a literary reference? does 'Southern' in its frequent occurrences refer to the territory under the control of Bangkok? where is 'the city of Long' (66: 357)? what kind of mango is 'the mango-which-the-crows-sit-around' (75: 674) or the dessert called 'squeezed-through-a-hole-so-it-has-a-tail' (79: 774)? In what way is the language used by Phrom in *Four Songs* 'a skillful mixture of an extreme Northern colloquial... and a rather learned style with many Pali and Standard Thai loan words' (p. 7)?

The translation itself is a prose rendering of Phrom's lengthy love lament. Professor Egerod states that his translation, which

'does not attempt to follow the meter or render the rimes, does endeavor to catch the particular flavor of the constant change of stylistic levels. Its guiding principle has further been to err, if err it must, rather in being too close to the original wording than being too far removed from it' (p. 8).

Given the almost contradictory nature of these two aims—flavor and literalness—there are a number of passages in which the translation comes across smoothly. For example, in 17: 221-226,

Those words which you spoke  
at the very beginning  
did not come true at all,  
every single one was lost,  
wherever I search in my mind  
I find nary a one.<sup>3</sup>

And in 108: 681-691,

How are you, my darling,  
do you still think of me,

---

3) 221 kan fāu kǎu  
222 nǎn nǎw pathǎm  
223 bōo sǎm sǎc laa.j  
224 sǎm hǎa.j kuaa cǎ.j  
225 kǎi hǎa nǎ.j  
226 bōo mǐi sǎc nǎo.j

do I enter your mind,  
 the way I, Phrommin, think of you?  
 or  
 do you just live and eat,  
 not delirious or staggering  
 the way I am all the time,  
 talking to myself  
 like an idiot  
 of nothing but love?<sup>4</sup>

And again, in 43 : 258-261,

Of all human beings under the sky  
 in the whole wide world  
 nobody has  
 such grief as I.<sup>5</sup>

Nevertheless, the overall impression of *Four Songs* is that of a literal wordiness which tends to destroy the 'flavor' of the poem. Egerod declines to 'follow the meter and render the rimes'—structural elements in Northern Thai poetry—but vigorously pursues the repetition of near synonyms—another structural element. Repetition, especially when it involves alliteration or internal rhyme, enhances the poem. Translated literally, however, the repetition produces a ponderousness which bogs the English reader down. Thus, in 10:11-12 the text reads

---

4) 681 pěn sǎn dǎj cǎa nǒng cǎn  
 682 fǎn kǎi hōd thǎeŋ  
 683 lǎmpēŋ pīi cǎn  
 684 nǎn mǎn khǎa phommin  
 685 lǎy wǎa nǒng  
 686 nǎb jǎu nǎb kǐn  
 687 bōo kwǎŋ maw wǐn  
 688 sǎmǎe dǎn khǎa  
 689 tǎa fǔu tǎa  
 690 pēed piāŋ pěn bǎa  
 691 maa ʔǎdthǎʔwaa lām lǎg

5) 258 mǎmǎd lām fǎa  
 259 lǎog lǎa tǎŋ khǎeŋ  
 260 phǎj bōo thalōŋ  
 261 kām tǔg tǎw khǎa

bủ'phả phẩj

bỏo hẩj hỷad ợđ

in which bỏo 'not' is followed by three verbs. The line is translated as

The flowers will open

and their fragrance will never evaporate  
or dry up or cease.

But surely the line could be simplified to something like 'The flowers will open and never lose their fragrance' or even 'The flowers will open and be ever fresh', though the latter rendering departs more radically from a literal approach.

Occasionally even idioms get translated literally. The idiom *maw lom* means 'madly in love, crazed with love, love-drunk' but is rendered as 'intoxicated with the air around me [from no other cause than love]' (11: 60, 12: 63). Egerod translates *cả khwăn* 'to gossip' as 'speak ill of your guardian spirit' (37: 48) and *nintaa khwăn khĩa* 'to slander me' by the ghastly phrase 'slander the ego that sits on top of my head' (34: 768)!

One of the worst of the mistranslations which occur from time to time is 17: 241-247. Lines 242 and 246 were reversed in copying and hence have skewed the entire passage. The passage should read

241 If it were only my bedpartner-

246 a brief, fleeting affair-

243 who had deserted me,

244 I would not be overly upset.

245 But my beloved wife!

242 I cannot find her anywhere;

247 she has slipped away, beyond the horizon.<sup>6</sup>

A few others are the following: (1) 10: 8 *lăn waatĩa sẩj*, given as 'Even if you do not care about my words', should be 'if the wind blows'. The word *waatĩa* (ဘာက from ဘာ) is 'wind'; Egerod treated it as *waataa* (ဘာ)

6) 241 kan wĩa pển cẩu  
246 nỏog nĩa pĩaj cẩj  
243 tẻn nỉ cẩag pẩj  
244 bỏo nỏoj bỏo hẩj  
245 mĩa khĩn tĩan cẩj  
242 cẩg hẩa nẩj dẩj  
247 pỏoj kẩj myy pẩj khỏog fẩa

from 𐄢𐄢𐄢𐄢 'word'. (2) 10:14 *cǎa phiab káw*, given as 'My words will be figurative', should be 'My words will refer to the past' and links up, after a long parenthetical appositive, with 10:28 'Even if you do not remember . . .'. (3) 13:96 *khǎw sǔn pēēŋ* is translated as 'mixture of rice and flour' but refers to the fermenting agent (*pēēŋ lāw*) used in making rice wine. (4) 95:255 *bòo nǎa nūŋ khób*, translated as 'I am not in the mood to wear all of those garments', is more accurately rendered as 'I cannot get myself to wear [any of] them'.

One problem area is that of appositional phrases used by Phrom in referring to his beloved Chom. Most of the more than 60 phrases begin with either *mêe* or *cāw*, translated 'Lady . . .', 'you . . .', or 'you my . . .'. Many of the renderings simply fail to convey the significance of the compliment and are thus rather meaningless without some kind of note or retranslation. Some unclear phrases are 'Lady of the Chinese silk from the south' (15:166), 'Lady with the colors of the day cooling toward dusk' (19:294), 'Lady Silk, Color of the Moon' (25:486), 'Lady of the Glorious Mirror' (27:570), 'Lady with the oily eyepits' (38:94)<sup>7</sup>, 'Lady of the leaves shaking on the branches' (57:72), 'you whose skin is crawling with chicken lice' (58:72), 'you gem like a heavenly egg' (104:573), and 'Lady with the oblong face like the betel leaf' (115:935).

Although this review is not the place to discuss Professor Egerod's general principles of translation in the light of modern translation theory, it seems quite obvious that his literal rendering is neither poetic in itself nor able to capture more than a fraction of the spirit of the original work. A careful literal prose translation can serve, however, as an intermediate step, a 'meta-text'<sup>8</sup>, toward producing a dynamic equivalence poetic translation which recreates much more of the feeling which the author intended to convey. Dynamic translations from Thai to English

7) Or, 'you of such strong emotions' (*mêe tǎa man naj*).

8) For a discussion of some of the theoretical issues see Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1969. Also Howard A. Hatton, 'Cross-cultural Translation of Poetry: A Thai Example' (unpublished paper).

have been discussed or produced by Prince Prem Purachatra<sup>9</sup>, P. Na Pramuanmark<sup>10</sup>, M.R. Seni Pramoj<sup>11</sup>, and James N. Mosel<sup>12</sup>.

Without attempting to either disparage the magnitude of the task attempted by Professor Egerod or disregard the numerous passages he has translated correctly, *Four Songs* suffers from three ills: insufficient exegesis of the Northern Thai text, hasty proofreading, and a literal approach to translation. It is our hope that Professor Egerod will produce a thorough revision of *The Poem in Four Songs* which will not only do justice to Phaya Phrom but will open up the beauty and richness of *khâaw* poetry to English readers.

*Herbert C. Purnell & Phairat Waree*

*Cornell-Yao Project  
Chiangmai  
&  
University of Illinois*

- 
- 9) Prem Purachatra, *Introduction to Thai Literature*, Chatra Press, 1964.
  - 10) P. Na Pramuanmark, 'Translating Thai Poetry', *Phasa lae Nangsi* Vol. 1, Pt. 2, 1959, pp. 50-52.
  - 11) M.R. Seni Pramoj, 'Poetic Translations from the Siamese', *JSS* Vol. XLVI, Pt. 2, 1958, pp. 215-216; and 'A Poetic Translation from the Siamese', *JSS* Vol. XLVII, Pt. 2, 1959, p. 179.
  - 12) James N. Mosel, *Trends and Structure in Contemporary Thai Poetry*, Data Paper No. 43, Cornell University Southeast Asia Program, Ithaca, New York, 1961. Especially see his free verse translation in 'A Poetic Translation from the Siamese', *JSS* Vol. XLVII, Pt. 1, 1959, pp. 103-111.

Vimolphan Pectathawatchai, *Esarn Cloth Design* (Faculty of Education, Khon Kaen University with financial support from the Ford Foundation, 1973), pp. 55, 18 photographs, 31 colored plates.

วิมลพรรณ ปัตถวัชชัย, *ผ้าอีสาน* (คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยขอนแก่น จัดพิมพ์ โดยได้รับทุนอุดหนุนจากมูลนิธิฟอร์ด โรงพิมพ์พิตเนส กรุงเทพฯ กรกฎาคม ๒๕๑๖).

*Khun Vimolphan* is to be commended for her commitment to preserving the rich cultural heritage of northeast Thailand. Her dedication to this goal finds expression not only in her presentation of the varied silk and cotton cloth designs identified as northeastern and the processes involved in their production but in her *beau geste* to donate the proceeds of the sale of the book to the Faculty of Education, Khon Kaen University, to assist in the establishment of a Center of Northeastern Art and Culture.

The author has provided us with much detailed information in both verbal and pictorial form concerning both cotton and silk spinning, reeling, dyeing and weaving techniques. The designs depicted in highly articulate colored photographs are representative of the most typical pillow and *sarong* skirt designs of the northeast. Those who find the silk *sarong* designs visually appetizing might be interested to learn that the boiled worm, after the silk has been removed, is eaten as a favorite delicacy of the villagers.

Unfortunately, the author has paid less attention to the customs and traditions involved in the production of silk and cotton thread and the subsequent weaving. One thinks of the magical chants that are intoned after the silkworms have bred as well as the magical and practical means used to assure that the worms are not touched by insects, especially flies. The loom itself has meaning as an extension of the female personality, and, in remote northeastern villages in the not too distant past, a fine was levied if a male touched the loom. A similar fine was levied for touching a girl, the amount differing according to

which part of the body was touched. Much of northeastern courtship is carried out as the young maiden weaves to the accompaniment of the poetic sallies of her suitor.

The author should be encouraged to pursue her researches into other aspects for the rich treasure of northeast culture: folk tales, folk music, lullabies and the like. One hopes that *Khun Vimolphon* will not only record in descriptive terms but attempt to understand such facets of the northeast cultural landscape in their total socio-cultural setting including the instructional role in molding ideal personality and character traits.

The present volume *Esarn Cloth Design* merely whets our intellectual appetite. One looks forward to more such efforts to illuminate and preserve northeastern culture. The English translation is of high quality as is the printing and color reproductions. The printers deserve our praise as does the Faculty of Education for arranging for the publication of this book.

*William J. Klausner*

*Asia Foundation,  
Bangkok*

Amin Sweeney, *Malay Shadow Puppets* (Trustees of the British Museum, London, 1972), 83 pp., bibliographical note, glossary, 30 black & white, 8 color plates.

This little book is a finely cut gem. In both size and content it is compact yet complete in a way that leaves the reader asking very few questions. It is profusely illustrated with the set of puppets acquired for the British Museum by the author, and the photographs have been taken so as to show clearly the finest details of carving.<sup>1</sup> Too, the book's value is deepened by its use of comparative photographs, as when we are shown puppets of the same character carved by three different people, and three puppets of the same character type in transition from traditional to modern style.

The standard of recent books on the shadow play has not been uniformly high; indeed, at times the subject seems to be master of the author, leading him to cloak guesswork in the guise of fact, and to indulge in more or less wild speculation at times. But in Sweeney's case the opposite is so obviously true that his is a most gratifying book to read. In his research he has laboriously followed every lead, leaving nothing up to speculation. Sweeney clearly is master of his subject.

And what, exactly, is his subject? Sweeney offers us a flood of information regarding much more than Malay shadow puppets alone, an unsuspected treat were one to judge solely from the title, and in a style that is forthright and uncluttered. He intentionally excludes from consideration the type of shadow play known as *Wayang Jawa*, or that which derives its primary influence from Java, thus limiting his scope to *Wayang Siam*.

In chapters on the social context of *Wayang Siam*, the puppets, the performance, the repertoire, and the chief characters and the basic tale, Sweeney not only gives us the broad outline of what *Wayang Siam* entails,—that it is a medium for recounting The Ramayana, that it is basically a rural rather than urban dramatic form, that there is both Thai

1) For those who may wish to achieve similarly happy results in photographing shadow puppets, this is done by placing the puppet against a cotton screen with a light directly behind the puppet, as well as one in front.

and Javanese influence in evidence, etc., but he also includes a wealth of detail. Thus we learn that some of this Javanese influence was derived from cigarette cards depicting Javanese puppets and issued with the cigarettes of Thomas Bear Co. Ltd., that the puppeteer's use of high-flown language for the more refined characters is a ruse consisting merely of linguistic distortions since he knows nothing of classical or literary Malay, and that far from being limited to the basic tale of Rama, the standard repertoire includes many inventive stories of peripheral relevance to that epic.

Actually, the full extent of Sweeney's efforts is not manifest in this book, which is in many ways a condensation of his Ph.D. thesis done for the University of London.<sup>2</sup> He knows personally almost every puppeteer in Kelantan, and is thoroughly familiar with every dramatic motif used in the shadow play there. His impeccable fluency in Kelantanese Malay, acquired in nearly two decades of exposure, has been instrumental in this respect. It has enabled him to conduct the first thorough-going scientific inquiry into the Malay shadow play, and it will be quite some time before his results are improved upon.

But though the *savant* may prefer to concern himself with the Ph.D. thesis, for *savant* and layman alike the British Museum monograph is rewarding in its reliably informative text and beguiling in its wonderful illustrations.

*Derek Brereton*

*Ithaca,  
New York*

---

2) Amin Sweeney, *The Ramayana and the Malay Shadow Play* (National University of Malaysia Press, Kuala Lumpur, 1972).

Theodore Bowie, Ed., M.C. Subhadradis Diskul, A.B. Griswold, & Brian Brake, *The Sculpture of Thailand* (The Asia Society, New York, 1972), pp. 137, numerous plates.

I have mixed feelings both about this catalogue and about the exhibition it accompanies. The exhibition, which consists of sculptures from public and private Thai collections, opened in the fall of 1972 at the Asia House Gallery in New York and has subsequently been taken to other cities in the United States and Canada. It is indeed wonderful to see so many beautiful works of art become better known to a large number of people, who have either attended the exhibition or enjoyed the photographs in the splendidly produced catalogue. Such exhibitions and catalogues, moreover, are monuments to the international cooperation and financial generosity necessary if enterprises of this sort are to succeed. My misgivings arise merely as the result of a sense of disparity between this cooperation and generosity, on one hand, and the final results, in the exhibition and its catalogue, on the other. A show and a book that might have been important surveys of the art of Thailand are less than that, being merely an exhibition with some real masterpieces and a catalogue which records the show. That perhaps is enough, and nothing more ambitious was really intended. Yet the feeling remains that something more might indeed have been achieved.

The character of the exhibition and of *The Sculpture of Thailand* is largely the result of the varying points of view of the contributors to the project. A prime mover in this exhibition, as in the one which was sent to the United States in 1960, was Professor Theodore Bowie. It was he who made the original selection of objects, which initially were supposed to consist only of newly discovered works. The final selection was the responsibility of the director of the Asia House Gallery, Mr. Gordon Washburn, a man of impeccable taste but with no claim to special knowledge of Thai art. In the catalogue, similarly, different hands are at work. Professor M.C. Subhadradis Diskul is given credit for the description and dating of the objects, but it is clear from style alone that his entries have been edited and revised by Mr. A.B. Griswold. In addition, Professor Jean Boisselier, who has been studying Dvāravatī art intensively

in recent years, may have been consulted about the dates of the problematic stuccos and terra cottas. Other parts of *The Sculpture of Thailand* are the work of Mr. Griswold and of Brian Brake. Mr. Griswold's short essay on "Images of the Buddha", which takes up most of the introductory pages, is concerned largely with the monastic garment. It is a valuable summary of observations Mr. Griswold has written about elsewhere at greater length. But the brief historical survey or stylistic discussion that might have been expected in a book of this sort is missing altogether. As for the photographs by Brian Brake, many are wonderful. Scholars may think the shadows in some excessively dark, however, and Buddhists find some of the composite plates offensive. It is clear in sum that disappointments have arisen in part for the same reason that broth gets spoiled. It is not likely, furthermore, that it will be possible to have another such exhibition in the near future.

My remaining comments are about some of the catalogue entries. Absence of a comment does not necessarily indicate agreement with the entry.

1. Ca. first half of the 7th century? Gray sandstone. It has been pointed out (e.g., reference under 10a & 10b) that the arrangement of the coiffure resembles that of some Cambodian sculptures assigned to the 6th century.

2-3. The juxtaposition of these terra cottas with ¶1 is the sort of happy accident possible in such an exhibition, and both terra cottas may date from the same period at the stone Avalokiteśvara. The slender proportions of the waist suggest the presence of influences also discernable in early (late 6th - early 7th century) Pallava sculpture (e.g., K.R. Srinivasan, *Cave-Temples of the Pallavas*, New Delhi, 1964, pl. VII B). It is possible that ¶2 functions merely as a guardian figure and is not proof of the existence of Mahāyāna Buddhism at Khūbua.

10a & 10b. Another happy juxtaposition: the relationship between the Si Thep reliefs and a Prakhonchai bronze has been recently noted by Albert Le Bonheur ("Un bronze d'époque préankorienne représentant Maitreya," *Arts Asiatiques* XXV [1972], p. 142). "8th-9th": if 9th, then early 9th.

13. No satisfactory records were kept at the time of the recovery of the Khûbua terra cottas and stuccos. According to a small book published by the Fine Arts Department in 1961 (*Samut nam chom borân-watthusathân samai thawârawadi tambon Khûbua Changwat Râiburi*), #13, #6, and #26 were found at Siūpa 40, #2 and #3 at Siūpa 39.

15. This bronze is somewhat of a puzzle; though possibly Dvāravatī, it might also be later (even 13th century).

16. The pleated shawl which lies on the Buddha's left shoulder is thought to suggest "a date around the middle of the Dvāravatī period." This motive surely has some chronological significance, but what that may be exactly is not easy to specify. The pleated mantle appears in Java at Chandi Sewu but not at the Barabudur and in Champa at the 9th-century temple of Đôngduông. Perhaps the authors are right in assuming a point of introduction during the 8th or 9th century.

17. In "An Ekamukhalinga from Peninsular Siam" (JSS LIV, 1 [Jan., 1966]), S.J. O'Connor said that "seventh through eighth centuries would seem a reasonable guess" as a date for this object.

18abc. The position of the Čhûla Pathon reliefs is a crucial problem in Dvāravatī chronology. Contrary to what the catalogue entry states, there are no panels with specifically Mahāyāna scenes or figures. If there are connections with the art of Java, they consist of schemes of composition which are like those of reliefs at the Barabudur. By no means do these schemes necessarily indicate influence from Java. The jewelry likewise fails to show "Śrīvijayan" influence; the crown and necklace of the personage identified as Kuvera on #18b can be seen, for instance, entirely as a development from types found on the 7th-century Cambodian Avalokiteśvara of Rach-gia (J. Boisselier, *La statue khmère*, pls. 12, 15b). These considerations do not make the suggested 8th-9th century date wrong; they merely broaden the range of possibility sufficiently to include the 7th century. Fig. 18c may be a representation of a scene depicted at Qizil in central Asia (M. Bussagli, *Painting of Central Asia*, p. 84, "600-650").

22. Ayudhyā period. Similar terra cotta figures have been found in the river at Ayudhyā.

23. Gray sandstone. Although Boisselier has said that none of the Brahmanical images found at Si Thep is earlier than the 8th century ("Rapport de Mission . . . 1964," *Sinlapâkôn* IX, 2, p. 53), the exploding fullness of their volumes suggests a date before rather than after that (ca. 700) of the Harihara of Prasat Andet.

25. Although it is hard to prove that certain types could not have persisted as late as the 9th or 10th century, some features found on the figures at the end of the Cambodian lintel of Vat Prahar—second half of the 7th century (P. Dupont, "Les linteaux khmêrs du VIIe siècle," *Artibus Asiae* XV [1952], fig. 25), namely the tiered arrangement of hair and the broad sash, are present on the attendant figures here. It is not yet clear what names should be given to these figures; to my knowledge there is no example of the type in which either figure has Brahmā's lateral faces. The monster on which the Buddha stands should perhaps be understood as a relative of Viṣṇu's Garuda, intended to symbolize the Buddha's power (*bala*: the *Abhidharmakośa* speaks of the Buddha's *nārāyaṇabala*). I do not know who first called this monster Banaspati or when. It is curious that this name is used in Javanese to refer to *kīrtimukha* (*Bijdragen* 112, p. 305), a usage which suggests some legitimacy for the Thai nomenclature.

26. Taken as a whole, the stuccos from Stūpa 10 at Khūbua exhibit a flattening of the facial structure and a two-dimensionality in jewelry that suggest a date later than that of the Chūla Pathon reliefs, possibly one in the 9th century. Justification for an extended rather than contracted Dvāravatī chronology can be found in the conservatism of some aspects of contemporary Cham art.

28. Probably in part the result of Cambodian influences that seem to have penetrated central Siam in the mid-10th century.

32. This bronze probably dates from about the time of the construction of Prāsāt Hin Phimāi (ca. 1100 A.D.). It represents an unidentified Tantric divinity.

33. From a Nāga-protected Buddha. 12th century.

35. Close in style to the carvings at Phimāi and hence ca. 1100.

37. Perhaps 12th century.

38-40. The dates seem too conservative. The necklace of the Buddha #40 can be related to those on the Nāga heads of the Buddha of Grahi, and so for this piece a date in the second half of the 12th century is entirely possible.

42. Perhaps mid-13th century.

43-44. Probably 14th.

45. Perhaps mid-13th century.

46. First half of the 13th century.

47. Perhaps second half of the 13th century. The form of the incised line indicating the fold in the shawl relates the bronze to #45.

49. Or 15th century.

52. 16th century?

53. The circle is not so much a "Wheel of the Doctrine" as a representation of Mt. Meru, standing at the center of the Buddhist world-system. Clearly identifiable are the sun and the moon (indicated by a rabbit and a peacock), the concentric oceans and mountain ranges surrounding Mt. Meru, and the figures with differently shaped faces who represent the four continents.

64. More likely of Sukhothai than Northern workmanship.

74. Perhaps as early as the 15th century. *Phraphuttharûp lae phraphim nai kru phraprâng Wat Ratchabûrana*, Bangkok, 1959, fig. 31 and stucco figures at Wat Ratchabûrana, both dating from the 1420s, are stylistically related.

76. Possibly late 11th or early 12th century (judging from the modeling of the eyes). The pedestal is not original. This image was the gift of King Prajadhipok; how the notion of a Chaiyâ provenance arose is not known. The earliest images of this type were perhaps made in the 10th century in northeastern Thailand, then under Cambodian influence.

79. Possibly older than the catalogue suggests.

*Hiram W. Woodward, Jr.*

Philippe Stern, *Colonnnes Indiennes D'Ajanṭā et d'Ellorā* (Published as the 11th research volume of the Guimet Museum, Paris, 1972), 188 pages, 193 illustrations with 13 plans and sketches.

Professor Philippe Stern, the former Chief Curator of the Guimet Museum, Paris, was the first person to have applied the method of using the evolution of various motifs to date ancient objects and monuments. Through this "method", he has succeeded in correcting formerly held chronology of Khmer and Cham arts. This work on India is, however, the publication of old research dating back to 1935 on which he has already expounded for several years at the Ecole du Louvre, Paris.

At first the writer explains that what he calls Gupta art in this book refers especially to the Indian classical Buddhist art which might have been created after the time of the Gupta dynasty, whereas what he terms post-Gupta art is the art after the Gupta period and pertains mainly to Hinduism. That is the reason why he classifies the Ajanṭā caves in the Gupta period and the Ellorā ones in the post-Gupta.

Prof. Stern begins by stating that the Ajanṭā caves Nos. 9, 10 and 12 belong to ancient Indian art before the Gupta period. He then divides the rest of the Ajanṭā caves into four phases: the first one comprises caves Nos. 11, 7, 6, and 15; the second, Nos. 5, 4, 16, 17; the third, Nos. 2, 1, 19; and the fourth, Nos. 20 to 27. He also explains that caves 9, 10 and 12 are in the middle, at the right of which (facing the caves) are situated caves Nos. 7, 6 and on the left, caves Nos. 14 and 15. For the second phase, caves Nos. 5, 4 continue No. 6 on the right and 16, 17 follow No. 15 on the left. For the third phase, caves Nos. 2 and 1 continue No. 4 on the right and cave 19 that of No. 17 on the left. During the fourth phase, caves Nos. 20 to 28 are all carved after cave No. 19 on the left. Prof. Stern then concludes that the sites of all these caves support his chronology hypothesis.

He then goes on to describe his method of research by using the evolution of motifs. For the first phase of the Ajanṭā caves which he terms "beginning" he uses various motifs such as plans of the caves and the three different forms of columns. For the second phase which he

calls "modifying", he lists the evolution of the plan of the caves and columns which show mixed forms from phase I and at the same time bear more ornaments. For phase III, the best period of the Ajaṇṭā caves for him, there are again the continuation of the evolution of columns and their respective order: those that are nearest to the shrine which is carved into the back wall being the most decorated. Phase IV which is called "prolongation" consists of larger female figure brackets and a new kind of capital, a *pūrṇaghaṭa* or flowering vase.

Prof. Stern also includes the first and third caves of Aurangābād into this fourth phase of Ajaṇṭā as they possess many elements in common. He also states that these characteristics continue into the first phase of Ellorā.

For the Ellorā caves, Prof. Stern indicates that Hinduism flourished at the expense of Buddhism and various caves belonging to different religions were carved at the same time. For instance, in Ellorā phase I, Buddhist caves Nos. 1 to 10 were constructed at the same time as cave 14 (Hinduism of Śaivism mixed with Vaishṇavism) and cave 21 (Śaivism only). Each sect carved its caves further along the left side of the hill (when facing the caves). Those of Jainism are of the latest and therefore were carved on the extreme left.

Prof. Stern also divides the Ellorā caves into 4 phases as those at Ajaṇṭā. Phase I which includes Ellorā caves 1 to 10, 14, 19, 20, 21, 26, 29 continues phase IV of Ajaṇṭā. There are however some differences such as the new forms of entablature and columns, isolated shrines from the back wall and the popularity of bas-reliefs in place of mural paintings. Prof. Stern also includes in this first phase of Ellorā the Elephanta cave on an island in front of Bombay, caves 6 and 7 at Aurangābād, cave 3 at Bādāmi and also *vihāra* No. 18 at Sāñchī.

Phase II of Ellorā includes caves Nos. 11, 12 and 15. Here most of the columns are unfinished so Prof. Stern has to rely on other sculptural motifs such as the belt and headdress of deity figures, the tail and head of *makara*, forms of garland and *kūḍu* (horse-shoe shaped arched window).

Phase III comprises only one cave, Kailāsa or cave 16. It continues the evolution of phase II with some new motifs such as a vertical decorative band, a narrative scene in a garland, and the first appearance of two superimposed capitals: a turban on top of a *pūrṇaghāṭa*.

To phase IV belong all the Jaina caves. The two superimposed capitals have become frequent and sometimes the vase in the *pūrṇaghāṭa* motif is totally hidden behind leaf-motif or sometimes a vase is repeated twice one on top of the other. Prof. Stern has also suggested that the decline of the Ellorā columns exists only for large ones. This might be because during that period Indian architects paid more attention to the construction of durable temples in an open space. The caves' small columns still preserve their elegance and beauty.

Next comes the conclusion chapter in which Prof. Stern explains his four-fold intentions: to show the evolution of columns both at Ajaṇṭā and Ellorā, to determine their successive chronology, to detect the evolution line from which one might try to date other Indian antiquities, and to demonstrate the use of motif evolution to date ancient objects and monuments in general.

The writer then goes on to describe the beauty of Ajaṇṭā and Ellorā caves in which he admires especially the mural paintings in cave I of Ajaṇṭā and the bas-reliefs of cave 15 at Ellorā.

Then follow two additional short chapters and five appendixes. The first additional chapter deals with the contemporaneity of Buddhist and Hindu sculptures in Indian art and the second one describes the difference of motifs between the first and second phases of Ellorā. This latter chapter is rather unnecessary as it more or less repeats what the writer has already described.

The first appendix is very important. Here Prof. Stern explains that his method of using motif evolution is able to contribute only a relative chronology. It has to be *hung*, as he uses the word, to the dates in inscriptions in order to be able to establish an absolute chronology. But as there are no clear dates at Ajaṇṭā or Ellorā, one has to use inscriptions at other sites that possess the same motifs such as cave 3 at Bādāmi and Khmer inscriptions at Sambor Prei Kuk. Through this method Prof. Stern says that one can date the first phase of Ellorā about the second

half of the 6th century A.D. and its third phase (cave 16 or Kailāsa) about the third quarter of the 8th century.

The second appendix concerns the northern architecture of India which is rather irrelevant to the subject of the book. The third enlarges upon the "method" that the author has already explained. Here he adds that it can be used along with other archaeological methods such as "stratigraphic excavation" and the motifs used in tracing the evolution line might be just simple and unimportant motifs instead of very conspicuous ones. The fourth explains the reason why this book came to be published 37 years after the original research had taken place. The fifth appendix states that the writer is not so sure about the date of rather heavy sculptures carved in front of Ajañṭā caves such as those in front of cave 19. He thinks that they might have been added during the first phase of Ellorā and carved on the space where there had originally been mural paintings.

In writing this book, Prof. Stern had probably not seen the book entitled *Ajañṭā to Ellorā* written by Dr. Walter Spink and published by Michigan University, Ann Arbor, U.S.A. In that book Dr. Spink also tries to date the caves at Ajañṭā and Ellorā. Their results differ somewhat as is apparent in the following table of comparisons.

<i>Prof. Stern</i>	<i>Dr. Spink</i>
Ajañṭā caves 7,6,15	Ajañṭā caves 6,11,7 (about 460 A.D.)
16,17,4	16,4,17
19,1,2	15,18,2,19,1,20
20-27	3,5,14,21-29
Aurangābād Buddhist caves	Aurangābād caves
Elephanta	Elephanta
Ellorā caves 1-10,14,21	Ellora caves 27,28,19,26
	20,29,21
Bādāmi	Bādāmi
	Ellora caves 17,14,5,6
	1,2,7,8,9,3,4,10-12
Ellorā cave 16 (Kailāsa) about 750 A.D.	
Jaina caves at Ellorā	

One can perceive that their Ajaṇṭā chronology is more or less the same and the difference lies mostly at Ellorā where Dr. Spink places the Jaina caves of the last numbers at the top in contrast to those of Prof. Stern. Here the reviewer inclines to think that the chronology of Prof. Stern is more justified because if one reads carefully Dr. Spink's book, one will notice that he has to try his best to explain why these caves at Ellorā which he places at the end of the Ellorā period resemble Elephanta which he places more or less directly after Ajaṇṭā. This problem will not occur in Prof. Stern's chronology. It is also noticeable that Dr. Spink has not continued his research right down to cave 16 or Kailāsa at Ellorā which is dated about the middle of the 8th century, otherwise his Ellorā chronology might have been along the same line as that of Prof. Stern.

This book of Professor Philippe Stern, though rather tiring to read because it is full of dry detailed examinations of various motifs and repeats itself too often, is very useful for the exposition of the "method" used by the author for dating ancient objects and monuments. For those who believe in applying this "method" in art and archaeology, it should be studied as one of Prof. Stern's classic contributions to the subject.

*M.C. Subhadradis Diskul*

*Faculty of Archaeology,  
Silpakorn University*

Phra Khamphi Thupawong [พระคัมภีร์อภิปวงค์ (ตำนานว่าด้วยการสร้างพระพุทธรูปเจดีย์)] (Bangkok, 1968), 235 pp.

N.A. Jayawickrama, editor and translator, *The Chronicle of the Thupa and the Thupavaṃsa* (Luzac and Co., (for the Pali Text Society, Sacred Books of the Buddhists, vol. 28), London, 1971), 286 pp. 6 plates, map, glossary.

The appearance of a Thai translation of the Thupavaṃsa, a late Pali Buddhist chronicle from Ceylon composed probably in the thirteenth century, together with a Pali text of the work from Thailand, provides a valuable new addition to the body of printed editions of this work. A new English translation of the same work by N.A. Jayawickrama entitled *The Chronicle of the Thupa and the Thupavaṃsa* now offers important explanations and clarifications of the contents of the Thupavaṃsa. Thupas(Pali) or stupas(Sanskrit) as they are more commonly known, are large mound-shaped structures which enshrine or commemorate a relic of the Buddha. The most important early stupas were in existence in India and Ceylon by the beginning of the Christian era, and accounts of them are included in the main chronicles of the Buddhist faith such as the Mahāvaṃsa, the Dipavaṃsa, and the Dāṭhāvaṃsa. The Thupavaṃsa is a later reworking of material in these earlier chronicles. Taken at face value, the Thupavaṃsa is a confusing accumulation of details concerning the building of particular stupas, mixed with a thread of general Buddhist history. It commences with details of the life of the Buddha and of His predecessors, Dipankara and Vessantara, then with the account of the division of the Buddha's bodily remains, the emperor Asoka's building of 84,000 monasteries, and the spread of Buddhism to Ceylon and other neighbouring lands. The remainder of the work is devoted to the construction of stupas in Ceylon.

The language of the Thupavaṃsa is stilted and stylized. It is full of the conventionalized paraphernalia of Buddhist narrative, of flower garlands, nectar, and fragrant ointments, pearls and golden bells, gems, etc. and of the conventions of the monkhood and laity surrounding the stupa building efforts. Magical events occur frequently. But from

Jayawickrama's astute introduction to the work we learn that the *Thupavamsa* is more than a pious narrative of holy building works, for in its later parts it comes to treat exclusively and in great detail the life of the Ceylonese warrior king *Duṭṭhagāmaṇi* (101-77 B.C.). Popular tradition here overcomes the religious scruples of the Buddhist chroniclers, and the work encapsulates a heroic story in epic style.

In the context of Thailand, Buddhist chronicle traditions from Ceylon were adopted in the creation of local traditions for important Thai relic stupas, most notably in the case of Nakhon Sithammarat which houses an important relic at Wat Mahathat. The old chronicles of the city have borrowed and adopted from Indian and Ceylonese Buddhist histories to create a history for their own stupa. The Thai translation of the *Thupavamsa* gives little background regarding the traditions of Buddhist chronicles. Its brief introduction by the Fine Arts Department provides only scant information about the work and its context. It does mention in passing a number of sources from which the *Thupavamsa* was allegedly compiled, i.e. the *Mahāvamsa* and its commentary, the *Samantapāsādikā*, jataka commentaries, and Sinhalese sources. Jayawickrama offers a more detailed analysis of these possible sources and reaches somewhat different conclusions. The Thai introduction credits the translation from Pali into Thai to Pui Saengchai and Phithun Maliwan, and it appears to be an excellent translation. The work was done from a palm-leaf manuscript in five volumes preserved in the National library in Bangkok, which also possesses an incomplete summary version of the work on palm leaves. Footnotes to the Pali text reproduced in this printing give variant readings from two sources which unfortunately are identified only by initial letters.

*Henry D. Ginsburg*

*British Museum*

