

## REVIEWS

Roger M. Smith, ed. *Southeast Asia: Documents of Political Development and Change* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974). Glossary, Index, 608 pages.

This volume from the Cornell University Press is a continuing sequel to the series of books on Southeast Asia and is a linear descendant of Professor Kahin's *Government and Politics of Southeast Asia* (1959, 1964). However, due to the fact that Kahin's book is rather outdated, the utility of Smith's work is limited. An overarching picture of complex political change in Southeast Asia could not be adequately glimpsed from Smith and associates' presentation. The general terrain is mapped but serious gaps in the literature remains unattended.

Admittedly, under the format, a comprehensive inclusion of important political documents could not be done. As it stands, the book is quite a hefty volume and presumably is directed at students more than serious researchers with specialization in the field. The book's limited scope is useful to a general understanding of political phenomena and dynamics of Southeast Asia. However, no attempt was made to integrate or theorize about the diverse experiences of the various systems studied. Each contributor has been given a free hand in the selection and organization of documents.

In his preface, Professor Smith observes that countries in Southeast Asia face the problems of war, *coups d'état*, revolutions, and the common experience of the centrality of violence in political change. While scholars have been interested in the study of political violence in Southeast Asia, they must acknowledge the scarcity of primary data translated into English. Especially for the researcher whose mastery of languages is limited, prospects of undertaking a comparative study on a cross-societal level would appear doomed from the start. In this day and age where research funds are dwindling, and the scope of study must correspondingly be dictated by resources available, books and monographs in the genre of *Southeast Asia: Documents of Political Development and Change* are more than welcomed. Smith and associates are providing the academic community with invaluable service, and despite the scope of the book, it is hoped that other scholars would publicly share their collected

primary data. The dissemination of basic documents would lead to a "democratization" of knowledge and perhaps the "country specialist" would become a phenomenon of the past. With Smith's book in the students' arsenal of tools, they could also critically re-examine the basic assumptions underlying the analysis of past authors.

The book is divided into eight chapters according to the countries covered, namely, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and the Philippines. The documents and speeches are introduced by essays showing their significance, time and spatial locations. In line with the earlier criticism that this book provides a general view of political change, the serious researcher must supplement his work with other sources such as Herbert Feith & Lance Castles, ed., *Indonesian Political Thinking. 1945-1965* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970) on Indonesia.

Going into specifics, Clark D. Neher's section on Thailand appears to be inadequate. While his choice of documents is sound, the structural organization is rather confusing and sketchy at best. The reader cannot get a good grasp of the dynamics of political change in Thailand from Neher's presentation. In attempting to delineate the various components of change into categories of "Coups and Revolutions", "Government and Politics", "Economic Development", and "Foreign Relations", the picture of the whole is obscured. Furthermore, there are gaps in the literature which imparts only a partial understanding of the Thai political formula.

Examples are in order. "Of Coups and Revolution" fail to integrate the attempted coup of R.S. 130 to the Revolution of 1932, and the demands of the royalists as represented by the Boworadej rebellion of 1933 is nowhere in evidence. Documents from other incidents are also left out; to wit, announcements of the 1947 Coup Group, Khuang's letter to the King following the *coup de main* against him in 1948, the case against army general staff officers in the October 1, 1948 coup bringing to light the question of "professionalism" within the army, documents from the Pridi-Seri Thai rebellion of 1949, and the Manhattan *coup* of 1951. Of a more recent nature, documents from Sarit's *coup* of 1957 and Thanom's *coup* of 1971 are also left out.

The section on "Government and Politics" is brief and could be misleading to the unwary reader. Nothing is mentioned of Phibun's second stint as Prime Minister (1948-1957) and its implications on democratic government. Speeches by Sarit and Thanom, while acceptable choices, however do not represent the underlying nuances of the emerging political equation expressed in the terms of "Thai Democracy" which this reviewer feels is the most critical variable in the understanding of modern Thai political change.

On "Economic Development", the reader is presented with an uncritical view of economic development by the First Year Plan, 1961-1966 which for all intents and purposes appears credible on paper, but in reality lacking in long-term planning and organization. The discrepancy between the underlying assumptions of the plan and the impressive theoretical presentation of development are never brought to light. It should be pointed out to the reader that despite the Plan's modern economic prescriptions, it does not fully reflect Sarit's notion of development and modernization which perhaps mitigated the full implementation of the Plan itself. Also, no mention is made of the role of foreign capital and United States economic aid policy which played a very vital part in Thailand's economic growth (not development).

The section on "Foreign Relations" is also out-dated, ending in 1967. The critical period of the 1970's is not dealt with although Thailand's future course of diplomacy depends largely upon *détente*, the Nixon Doctrine, and prospects of fruitful regional co-operation.

As stated earlier, this book does not present a theoretical framework and there lies its main weakness. The documents and speeches may lead the student towards skewing his conclusions in line with an analysis based upon the cultural and personality approach while structural aspects of politics and society are disregarded.

Aside from the above and rather obvious gaps in the literature, Professor Smith and associates have shown us the inadequacies of available documents in English. Hopefully, their work will prompt others to follow suit.

*Thak Chaloemtiarana*

*Faculty of Political Science,  
Thammasat University*

George Rosen, *Peasant Society in a Changing Economy: Comparative Development in Southeast Asia and India* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), pp. 254.

This is a pioneering effort to link the characteristics of peasant society to national economic development in a comparative analysis of four Asian countries: The Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, and India. Professor Rosen draws on his intimate knowledge of India, his practical experience as Chief Economist of the Asian Development Bank, and the professional literature on Southeast Asia for the study. He is uniquely qualified within the economics profession to venture a multidisciplinary synthesis of this nature. Although the analysis may not satisfy all specialists whose disciplines are involved—the anthropologist, the historian, or the economist—it is a careful and a useful experiment to bridge the gaps which often separate the specialists.

The author's thesis is that the nature of peasant society profoundly affects the path of a nation's economic growth, which, in turn, feeds back and alters the structure of peasant society. Successful development must reconcile traditional social values and objectives with the imperative of rapid economic change.

By "peasant society", the author refers to the social organization which encompasses both rural and urban sectors, rather than purely village society. In the Thai case for example, he relies more heavily on Akin Rabibhadana's historical-anthropological study of the early Bangkok period than the numerous contemporary village studies. Among the characteristics of peasant society, he identifies the following as particularly significant: patron-client relationships structure much of economic and political behavior and provide security by the redistribution of output and wealth; family loyalty is paramount to all other interests (Philippine society has been described as an "anarchy of families"); with the exception of India, peasant society disparages commercial occupations; although peasants are the majority of the population, a small urban elite controls the prestige and power of the society.

Economic development requires balanced growth between the agricultural and industrial sectors. In agriculture the adoption of the new, high-yielding technology is required to avoid a Malthusian crisis caused by the convergence of population growth upon a fixed land area. Agriculture must subsidize the industrial growth necessary to absorb the surplus food and labor in the countryside and provide cheaper inputs for modernizing agriculture. The shortages of global food production which have occurred since the author formulated his model prompts reexamination of this conventional emphasis upon industry. In the open economies of Southeast Asia, where balance in supply and demand can be achieved through foreign trade, investment in agriculture may provide the highest economic and social returns. This is particularly true of Thailand where agriculture has already heavily subsidized industry through the rice premium, where the full potential of the green revolution awaits further adaptation to the Thai environment, and where the opening of the upland frontier continues to absorb the rapidly growing population.

How does the author's comparative methodology elucidate the experience of Thailand? The discussion on Thailand is restricted to the period prior to October, 1973, and it focuses on peasant society and its history, national policies and government, and economic implications. While there are marked similarities in the social structures of the four countries, Professor Rosen believes that family solidarity and patron-client relationships are weakest in Thailand. Tenaciously maintaining his independence in traditional agricultural activities, the Thai peasant seeks a patron only when confronted with demands which are threatening and unfamiliar. In exploring the impact of peasant society upon national policies, the comparative framework yields useful insights why—compared to other countries in the study—the Thai bureaucracy is relatively more effective, less overstaffed, more capable of maintaining financial stability. Moreover, Thailand's more favorable land endowment promotes greater rural equality with the unique consequence that organized landlord groups have been absent and the government has been able to tax rice farmers heavily for the benefit of the urban population. Rosen believes that

Thailand's historical independence may explain why it has been most successful in assimilating its pariah entrepreneurial group, the Chinese, an accomplishment which permits the government to use its prestige positively to develop policies and institutions to raise productivity.

Except for what may be misplaced emphasis upon industry, the author's conclusions are moderate and sound (p. 167):

Thailand has been remarkably successful in maintaining its political independence and social characteristics, while adapting selected institutions and even commodities of Western culture to Thai requirements as seen by its leaders. In the process there has developed a uniquely Thai-Western culture, based primarily on Thai social characteristics. The only country in Asia with more success in such selective adaptation of Western culture is Japan, if measured in terms of economic growth, although not in terms of political stability or peace. It is to be hoped that Thailand will retain this capacity to choose, and the flexibility it implies, by not imposing unduly rigid controls in the political and economic fields, while at the same time retaining an approach toward living and a set of social relationships that are humanely satisfying and reasonably equitable in Thai eyes.

The central theses of this volume are of great significance, and the argument, while not always convincing, is provocative. It should precipitate a dialogue concerning the social constraints and costs of economic change in Asia.

*Laurence D. Stifel*

*The Rockefeller Foundation,  
New York*

Stephen Fitzgerald, *China and the Overseas Chinese: A Study of Peking's Changing Policy, 1949-1970* [London: Cambridge University Press, 1972], pp. 268.

The Overseas Chinese have posed a serious problem for the various countries in Southeast Asia, particularly since the Communist regime was installed on Mainland China some twenty-six years ago. In Thailand which in the past had played a vital part in the American-sponsored anti-Peking containment, the Overseas Chinese have also (in varying degrees) earned the suspicion of serving as a "Fifth Column" for Peking. Stephen Fitzgerald, author of *China and the Overseas Chinese*, reminds us that for China too the Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia is a "problem", and, for a fact, it has become her policy since the Cultural Revolution (1966-1969) to "abandon" or discount these 12-million "compatriots" as figuring in a viable foreign policy.

Such, however, is not to deny the importance of the Overseas Chinese in the Chinese policy of the past. The Overseas Chinese have been a vital source of political financing since the days of Dr. Sun Yat-sen at the turn of the century, and during the first years of the People's Republic of China, the Communist leaders encouraged Overseas Chinese to send remittances to relatives and friends in China, thus benefitting considerably from this mode of foreign exchange. (According to U.S. intelligence, for the first twenty-years, an average of US\$ 80 million per annum was remitted; such sums were either used directly by individual benefactors or invested in Overseas Chinese companies established by the state for the benefit of the domestic Overseas Chinese, which include relatives and friends of the Overseas Chinese abroad. Figures for remittances from Thailand are far from certain, but for the period between 1953 and 1957, yearly outflows ran into the hundred million baht, with those for 1957 exceeding two hundred million.) Therefore, up till 1957, Peking was committed to a policy of providing special privileges to friends and relatives of the Overseas Chinese, while welcoming back returned Overseas Chinese individuals for resettlement and studies. On the ideological plane, the justification for such a program was that it was in line with the Maoist advocacy for a "United Front"

tactic to further the socialist revolutionary cause, and that, after all, the majority of the Overseas Chinese, both domestic and abroad, were of the proletarian background to start with.

On the practical side, Peking's policy of "using" the Overseas Chinese became problematic from the start both on the domestic and international fronts. In Southeast Asia, any support by China of the domiciled Overseas Chinese would tend to provoke the indigenous governments and peoples, thus endangering the status of the Overseas Chinese themselves. Secondly, in an effort to nullify the effect of the US containment program, it was in the interest of the Chinese government to instill a friendly atmosphere aimed at rallying indigenous Southeast Asian governments to its side—or at least to "persuade" the latter from collaborating with the American "imperialists". Any outright moves to champion Overseas Chinese would only negate the above objective—save for instances where vocal support was made in reaction to persecution of the Overseas Chinese by local authorities, an obligation deemed unavoidable by Peking. Thirdly, as pointed out by Fitzgerald, the Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission (the body in charge of Overseas Chinese matters under the direct jurisdiction of the State Council or the Chinese government) often found it next to impossible to formulate a unified, general policy *vis-a-vis* the Overseas Chinese, as they are a heterogeneous group whose loyalty or subservience to Peking is sometimes questionable. (Particularly, their long exposure to a different social background in Southeast Asia generated a high degree of unfamiliarity with the Chinese, especially the new Chinese society, their original cultural and racial affinity notwithstanding.) Therefore the over-generalized assumption of the Overseas Chinese being easily manipulated by Peking as a "Fifth Column" does not seem to hold up well when one takes this question into consideration. In addition, Fitzgerald insists that Peking seems to have grasped the problem more fully than



has Taipei. For one thing, Peking has followed the Overseas Chinese development very closely through news media and other means, and for another, it has viewed the entire problem with less sentimentality and attachment to the *jus sanguinis* principle, popularized by Sun Yat-sen's advocacy on Chinese nationalism in his famous Three Principles of the People and exerted as an irrevocable policy by the Kuomintang Party.

Domestically, preferential treatment given to those under the classification of domestic Overseas Chinese during the first eight years gave rise to resentment and unhappiness among the populace of Kwangtung and Fukien, the traditional areas of Chinese emigration to Southeast Asia. Besides, the differentiated status of such privileged Chinese created a contradiction in the application of the guiding ideology of socialist construction, which basically stresses equality and the proletarian spirit. In 1965, the Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission recommended that the domestic Overseas Chinese undergo a basic re-education program to rectify their attitudes and thinking, a move which followed the expressed desire of the Chinese government after 1958 to treat the domestic Overseas Chinese as being "equal" to the rest of the Chinese population. With the Cultural Revolution which was launched in the following year, the Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission disappeared from the scene after severe criticisms from the Red Guards, and the thirty-odd Overseas Chinese farms in Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Fukien, Kwangsi, Yunnan, and Liaoning (established by the Chinese government explicitly for the Overseas Chinese), along with all Overseas Chinese investments (which amounted to some eight hundred million baht in 1964), were also abolished. Returned Overseas Chinese who were enrolled in high schools and universities were encouraged to participate in the revolutionary "struggles" against the "capitalist-roaders" and "revisionists" in Chinese society, while the number of places in China's learning institutions reserved for returned Overseas Chinese was also

subsequently restricted. According to Fitzgerald, the Cultural Revolution's attacks were generated basically against the Overseas Chinese Affairs Commission's views regarding Overseas Chinese abroad, but, nonetheless, the end result was the sweeping away of the existing "contradictions" in the domestic scene.

This is not to say, however, that Peking has completely severed its erstwhile links with the Overseas Chinese. Since the Cultural Revolution, though the general policy is to discourage Overseas Chinese from returning to China and to encourage, as emphasized by Premier Chou En-lai, them to become as much as possible a part of the indigenous society in Southeast Asia, Peking has been explicit with its readiness to protect the interests of Chinese nationals abroad, and even to resettle those who find it inevitable to return to China for one reason or another – but it has also been quick to point out the discontinuation of the privileges which existed formerly. Peking continues to welcome remittances, though it no longer places such a great emphasis on them. In short, Fitzgerald observes that the Chinese government now treats the Overseas Chinese issue as part of its overall foreign policy, with the stress on the overall foreign policy as being above any considerations for the Overseas Chinese.\*

It is argued by the author throughout the book that China's policy with regard to the Overseas Chinese has generally been based on practical considerations, and its basic features may be described as the "Three Goods". These are: "nationality", or encouragement of local Chinese

---

\* During the height of the Cultural Revolution, the revolutionary fervor spilled across the border and there were serious incidents in Hongkong, Macao, and Burma where Chinese nationals exhibited a considerable degree of chauvinism. According to Fitzgerald, these "riots" were not instigated by Peking, but were more spontaneous reactions by local Chinese residents who used their own initiatives to cause unrest. In such areas, the Overseas Chinese have maintained close contact with China.

residents in Southeast Asia to opt for indigenous citizenships; "non-interference", or abstention from political participation and corresponding respect for indigenous laws and customs by the Overseas Chinese; and "resettlement", or effort by the Chinese government to relocate returned Overseas Chinese individuals who have found their residence in Southeast Asia incompatible. Recent communiques signed by Peking with Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand would tend to lend support to Fitzgerald's assertion. Peking's foreign policy, like the foreign policy of any rational state, is predicated upon the assumption of national interests. The national interests regarding this particular issue are to safeguard the well-being of the Overseas Chinese, but at the same time, to foster friendly ties with neighboring Southeast Asian countries and rid Chinese society of class contradictions. The ideal policy is of course to encompass all such considerations, but it seems quite clear where the priorities lie.

Fitzgerald's exposition should make us pause to reflect on our endeavor to solve the Overseas Chinese question in Thailand. In one respect, Thailand is more fortunate than most countries in Southeast Asia in that integration of the Overseas Chinese has thus far worked rather smoothly, and in this respect, the current Peking line on the Overseas Chinese should aid the assimilation process. It is the feeling of this reviewer that an understanding of the current Peking stand would not only lessen the apprehension among the indigenous with regard to the potential Chinese role as a "Fifth Column", but it would concurrently cause the Overseas Chinese in the country to abandon any fantasy about Peking championing their cause and to turn increasingly to Thai society itself.

*Sarasin Viraphol*

*Political Science Faculty,  
Chulalongkorn University*

A. Phibunsongkhram, จอมพล ป. พิบูลสงคราม (*Field Marshal P. Phibunsongkhram*) (Montri Press, Bangkok, 1975), Vol. I. 288 pages.

Of all the Thai books in the recent book market, none has attracted more attention than the one entitled, "Field Marshal P. Phibunsongkhram". The reason behind this popularity is probably threefold.

The first and most essential point is, of course, its title. Phibunsongkhram, popularly known as Phibun, has had a profound influence on Thai politics not only in the birth of Thai democracy in 1932 but also increasingly in the 1940's and the early 1950's in being a kind of driving force as Thailand entered an era of aggressive and expansionist nationalism. As the author says in the preface, "... one cannot talk democracy without Lincoln as one cannot talk Thai politics without Phibunsongkhram..." (p. 2). The second reason for the book's popularity lies in the author's own name which arouses curiosity among readers who look for new light on the subject. Lastly, this is a study of leadership in Thailand which is currently beset with leadership problems.

"Field Marshal P. Phibunsongkhram" is a handy pocket book of nearly 300 pages. The price, at 30 baht a copy, is high by Thai standards. Its author is Major-General Anant Phibunsongkhram, the eldest son of Phibun.

The book is divided into two chronological sections: from Phibun's childhood to the birth of Thai democracy in 1932 and from 1932 to Phibun's first accession to power in 1938. (Phibun was twice Premier, from 1938 to 1944 and again from 1947 to 1957). The contents of the book include the preface, the author's stated purpose, the life of Phibun in his childhood and the political events in Thailand from 1932 to 1938 with the emphasis on the role and success of the People's Party.

Regrettably, this long-awaited book falls short of expectations. It neither illuminates the history of Thai politics nor gives a balanced account of Phibun's life, times, and impact. The author offers us little new or different from what has already been written by others. This reviewer, who is "neither friend nor opponent of Phibun but the one with

sheer interest in learning the story of his life in its true sense", (p. 32) sees this book as regrettably weak and narrow. It is too bad that the author, the eldest son of Phibun, with opportunities to know, to understand and to share the ups and downs in both happy and troubled times with his father for 46 years (the author was 56 years old in 1974 p. 44) completely fails to get really "inside" the life of this great statesman of our time.

The major weakness of the book stems from the quality of its sources. Throughout its 288 pages there are few places where one can find an original word of or about Phibun. The author relies exclusively upon secondary sources and latter-day accounts—some only one or two years old. He depends heavily on Lt. General Prayoon Pamornmontri's memoirs—indeed several parts are based on nothing else—without apparent awareness that biography or history is more than the recollections of one or a few participants. (See Lt. General Prayoon Pamornmontri, "The Man Under Five Reigns", published in *Fah Moungh Thai* weekly magazine from 1974 onwards). And though there are several new inclusions the proceedings of the National Assembly, the author's memorandum of the War Criminal Case of 1938 they are far too few.

The author also fails to preserve the strict objectivity as set out in his own purposes (p. 31). In many places he openly launches verbal attacks on those who do not belong to Phibun's clique and upon those who have voiced opposition to Phibun's government. To mention but a few, M.R. Kukrit Pramoj, incumbent Prime Minister (July 1975), is blamed for calling Phibun by his full name, "Pleak", instead of by the more generally used initial "P.". M.R. Seni Pramoj, venerated gentleman and statesman, then Thai Ambassador to Washington, is derided for his efforts in going from Washington D.C. to the New York airport on a very cold morning to welcome the son (the author) and daughter of Field Marshal P. Phibunsongkhram, then Prime Minister (p. 210). M.R. Seni is further criticized for his academic comments on Thai politics (p. 208). *Phya* Manopakorn, the first Prime Minister, is charged with being the first person to dissolve the National Assembly and to abolish the Constitution of 1932 and for being the sole cause of democracy's failure in

Thailand (p. 14). Heaviest attacks, however, are reserved for *Phya* Songsuradej, the master-mind and promoter of the People's Party of 1932. He is portrayed in the book as a self-centred, selfish and conceited person, and as an opportunist and an extremist, comparable to *Phya* Chakkri, a well known traitor in Thai history during the fall of Ayudhia in the 16th century (pp. 140-142).

No man can be fully objective but I fault the author for his thin pretense at neutrality. He should be reminded that when emotions come before reason in historical writing the results are unconvincing. One begins to harbor doubts and to search for hidden reasons behind all the elaborate rationalizations. Since the author is quite absorbed in his efforts to glorify Phibun as an absolutely pure and perfect politician, there are some points one would like to raise. For example, the author writes, "If we ask 'Who abolished the first constitution?' the answer is simply 'Khuang Aphaiwong, M.R. Seni Pramoj and Pridi Phanomyong, the 4th, 5th and 6th Prime Ministers, respectively. They are all civilians and not military men.'" (p. 19)

This explanation is not acceptable. The overthrow of the first constitution was, in fact, prompted by sensible reasons. Khuang, Seni and Pridi put in the first constitution's place the more democratic constitution of 1946. The difference is clear by comparison. The Constitution of 1946 provided for a two-house national assembly. The lower house or the House of People's Representatives was fully elected. The upper house was elected indirectly by an electoral college chosen especially for the purpose. But according to the Constitution of 1932, the assembly was made up of two categories of members equal in number one elected and the other appointed, which ensured complete control of parliament and cabinet by the People's Party.

One may also disagree with the author's interpretation regarding the abolition of the Constitution of 1946. The author says that the military *coup* group of 1947 had to abolish this constitution because they simply wanted to follow the civilians' lead of the year before (p. 20). This statement is hard to believe in a country like Thailand where the military always plays a leading role in politics. One need not seek far

for reasons to explain why the military had to resort to such tactics. When the government of *Luang Thamrong Nawasawat* was overthrown by the *coup d'état* of 1947, the *coup* promoters could not possibly continue the old upper house filled with recalcitrant members. They had no alternative but to set aside the Constitution of 1946 and hastily drafted a provisional constitution to use in its place. The new constitution served them admirably as it provided for the control of the National Assembly by the Executive—a blow to democracy. And four years later, by a “radio” *coup* Phibun reinstated the Constitution of 1932, thus damaging the cause even further by resorting to what can only be seen as an authoritarian response to political criticism.

There are other points which should be challenged, especially the author's espousal of Phibun as the sole spearhead of demands for political freedom and the maintenance of democracy in Thailand! (pp. 18, 25, etc.)

The book does, however, give some glimpses of Phibun's personal qualities. For instance, Phibun was a cry-baby, a hard-working and ambitious man, and a loving father and husband. The rare and well-chosen photographs also enhance the volume.

While the excesses of the author and the lack of explicit documentation for some of his judgements may trouble some readers, the author deserves compliments for having had the courage to “speak out”. The book deserves to be read.

*Thamsook Numnonda*

*Faculty of Arts,  
Silpakorn University*

Chai-Anan Samudvanija, 14 ตุลาคม : คณะราษฎรกับกบฏบวรเดช (14 October : The People's Party and the Bowaradej Rebellion), (Bangkok, College Books, 1974), pp. 133.

This book is one of an important series of works on modern Thai political history which the author has written or edited in the past five years. These include a study of proposed political changes in the Fifth Reign, a volume on the early political-social writer Thianwan, an article (in *Sat Kan Muang*) on King Prajadhipok's efforts to lay the foundations for representative government in the last years of the absolute monarchy, and, most recently, a major collection of political documents covering the years 1874 to 1935. Despite this substantial corpus of historical research and writing (all in the Thai language), Dr. Chai-Anan is by training not a historian but a political scientist, and he has also written extensively on contemporary Thai politics and has participated actively in the political process.

The volume under review is a study and reappraisal of the unsuccessful armed uprising which Prince Bowaradej led against the Bangkok government in October of 1933. In a lengthy essay the author gives a brief account of the rebellion itself and then attempts to show its relation to other political struggles of the 1930's and to draw parallels between the events of October 1933 and the events of October 1973. A substantial part of the essay is based upon a long, previously unpublished letter of one *Khun* Roengronchai (Tuan Komarathat), a relatively minor figure in the rebellion, giving an account of the alleged motives and goals of the rebel group.<sup>1</sup> The essay is followed by an appendix, taking up some two thirds of the total work and which Dr. Chai-Anan terms the most significant part of the book, giving the texts of 16 political documents from the period 1932 to 1939. These include minutes of

1) The letter, in the original hand-written Thai text, is reproduced on pp. 28-33. It was sent in February 1934 from Indochina, where the writer had sought asylum following the collapse of the revolt, to Prime Minister Phahon.

Another "rebel" source mentioned is *Luang* Homrornran's (Tu Palakawong na Ayutthaya) *Mua Khaphachao Kə Kan Kabot*, a 1949 work now rare; however, although the author says (p. 24) that he is including sections of this work in the appendix he does not do so.



meetings of the National Assembly, texts of laws restricting political activity and decrees establishing special courts to consider political cases, and a variety of other official proclamations. All 16 of the documents in the appendix have been published previously, although a number of them are not easily accessible.

The book is attractively produced, with a soft cover depicting *Khun* Roengronchai's letter, and at 15 baht is reasonably priced.

On at least two major points Dr. Chai-Anan is undoubtedly right. The first is his contention that the traditional interpretations of the Bowaradej rebellion, based almost exclusively upon the not-disinterested pronouncements of the victorious side, are inadequate. As the author convincingly argues, the revolt must be seen in the context of a lengthy process of political struggle set in motion by the events of June 24, 1932, which marked the end of the absolute monarchy but only the beginning of the effort to establish a new political order in Siam. One may question, however, why the author rather arbitrarily chooses 1939 as the end of this phase of political development. While the events in that year were of great consequence, later events, such as the 1944 parliamentary *coup* which deposed the Phibun government, were also part of the continuing contest for power within the leadership of the original *coup* group.

Secondly, Dr. Chai-Anan is also right in his insistence upon the importance of primary sources and the documentary evidence, even if his sharp criticisms of the methods and motives of other Thai writers seem at times exaggerated. Of the appendix documents the National Assembly minutes are perhaps the least known and most interesting, although in one or two cases their relevance to the main theme is tenuous, and the letter reproduced in the text, the only new evidence presented, is an important addition to what the author correctly describes as the very limited body of documentation differing from the official government view. At times, however, one wishes that the author would follow more closely his advice to others on the importance of careful scrutiny and use of the documents. For example the text of King Prajadhipok's abdication statement, as in Dr. Chai-Anan's other works, has a paragraph missing, and more seriously, when the statement is quoted in the text in

the key paragraph about the King's being willing to surrender his powers to the people as a whole, but not to any individual or group to use in an autocratic manner (it is this paragraph which appears, printed over the Democracy Monument, on the new five baht stamp commemorating the October 1973 uprising), the phrase "to the people as a whole" is left out.

Another document mentioned is the draft constitution which Raymond B. Stevens and *Phya* Sri Wisarn Waja, on the orders of King Prajadhipok, drew up early in 1932. The author says (p. 11) that he has been searching for this important document for seven years without success; in fact there is a copy of the Stevens-*Phya* Sri Wisarn Waja "Outline of Changes in the Form of Government" in the Papers of Prince Damrong, and it has been published by the present reviewer in *Siam's Political Future: Documents from the End of the Absolute Monarchy* (pp. 82-93).

But to agree with Dr. Chai-Anan on the importance of the documentary evidence and that the conventional interpretations of the Bowaradej rebellion are misleading does not necessarily mean to accept his views, and particularly his attempts to find parallels to the Bowaradej rebellion in recent Thai political events. The author's interpretation is based in substantial part on the single letter of *Khun* Roengronchai, and while there are grounds for accepting the letter's assertion that many of the rebel group were motivated by what they saw as a communist threat to Siam, embodied particularly in the return of Pridi from Europe following the June 20 "second *coup*", the letter is a calculated and somewhat self-serving appeal to Phahon for clemency. In particular Dr. Chai-Anan's account practically leaves out Bowaradej himself, on the grounds that the conspiracy was initiated by lower ranking officers and that Bowaradej and other leaders were invited to join only shortly before the uprising. While this is true, the leadership and its background are significant in assessing the rebellion. The author does mention that Prince Bowaradej was commonly believed to be close to the King, thus contributing to the "royalist counter-revolution" interpretation of the affair. It might have been pointed out, however, that by 1933 the common belief was no longer valid. Earlier in the Seventh Reign Bowaradej

had enjoyed royal favor; he had been recalled in the first days of the reign from a retirement that was not altogether voluntary and appointed to high office, in 1928 he had succeeded Prince Boriphat as Minister of War, and in 1929 he had been raised in princely rank from *mom chao* to *phra ong chao*. However by 1930 he was at odds with the King and other members of the royal family over military spending, and at the time of the 1931 "Bowaradej crisis" which resulted in his resignation from the Cabinet in protest against government policy on pay raises, the King, in the United States, drafted a cable regarding Bowaradej's behavior which said in part:<sup>2</sup>

Minister of War's action is absolutely contrary to decision on this matter. I cannot understand why he has done this and cannot understand his arguments in the least. I much regret that he should have taken such action and under these circumstances can only accept his resignation.

And by early 1932 Prince Bowaradej was even regarded as a possible leader of a plot against the absolute monarchy.

Bowaradej's past raises questions as to what his plans were if the revolt were successful. He was known primarily as the advocate of a large military establishment, having once argued that Siam should prepare for an eventual war with China, and a proponent of strict control of the press. As noted above, he had strained relations with King Prajadhipok, and while other rumors held that the revolt was undertaken on Boriphat's behalf, Bowaradej was also on bad terms with that prince. The government claimed, without offering evidence, that Bowaradej's real intention was to make himself king. The sixth point of the ultimatum which the rebels submitted to the government was a demand for regional military autonomy which would ostensibly have had the effect of partitioning the kingdom into semi-independent fiefdoms. (It was this point which the government side refused to agree to; the first five points, which were more democratic in nature, it claimed were already being carried out). Shortly after the failure of the revolt Prince Devawongs

---

2) National Archives, Seventh Reign, Ministry of War, 3/6. The last sentence was subsequently crossed out of the draft cable.

Varodaya, who was close to the King, wrote to an American friend concerning the affair:<sup>3</sup>

The rising would have been successful if Prince Bovoradej (whom I think you know) hadn't taken part as leader. He is not popular and is credited with the idea of establishing a military dictatorship. There were many factions and groups of men beside his own who hated the present Government and were ready to help to overthrow the Government, but as soon as it was learnt that Prince Bovoradej was leading the troops from Korat, many of them, especially those of Bangkok, abstained. The Government was able, therefore, to defeat Prince Bovoradej and his friends who have taken refuge in French Indo-China. Prince Bovoradej has really done a lot of harm to the cause of the Princes. He shouldn't have taken part, but should have let his friends do it in cooperation with the other groups.

Other major leaders of the rebellion had backgrounds similar to that of Prince Bowaradej, and whatever the motives of the rank and file may have been it would seem hazardous to discuss the nature of the rebellion without at least raising the question of the leadership and the uncertainty of its goals. Dr. Chai-Anan, however, devotes little attention to this problem, and in fact relatively little attention to the actual rebellion, but on the basis of the *Khun* Roengronchai letter and a scattering of other evidence argues that the Bowaradej rebellion was an abortive early attempt to establish true democracy in Thailand, a movement sharing the goals of the October 1973 uprising. Some valid points are made about the similarities of the "official" views of the two events, of the dissension and indecision within the ranks of the respective elites, of some of the points of the 1933 rebel ultimatum and the 1973 student demands, and of the inspiration drawn from the writings of King Prajadhipok by proponents of democracy in both periods, but at times the analogy is carried to extremes. The "October 14" of the title is of course an attempt to suggest a chronologically significant link between the two events, although in the case of the Bowaradej rebellion the choice of a specific date is a somewhat arbitrary one, and the repeated emphasis on "forty years to the day" reads better mathematically than historically

3) The letter, to Francis B. Sayre, the former Foreign Adviser, was dated February 23, 1934. The original is in the Sayre Papers (Washington).

(the author apparently has a penchant for this type of number game; it is presumably not mere coincidence that his foreword is dated June 24). And given the admittedly fragmentary nature of the evidence, and the complexities suggested above in assessing the true aims of the Bowaradej rebellion, it is difficult to accept without serious reservations the judgments implicit in the author's concluding juxtaposition of the aspirations for "true democracy" of the "Save the Nation Party" (Bowaradej's group), "heroes of the 14th October 1933", and of the "heroes of the 14th October 1973".

In several other instances also analogies are based upon questionable or unexplained grounds, as for example the raising of the case of Lt.N. Nen Talalakshamana in a glowing dedication without providing more than a sketchy indication in the text of the relation of the 1939 conspiracy trials to the theme of the book.

Finally, while there is never any doubt about the author's point of view, its presentation would be more effective if it relied more upon direct statement and less upon such devices as circumlocutions, veiled allusions, and rhetorical questions. And like many of the writers he criticizes, the author cannot refrain from a heavy-handed moralizing when controversial personages such as Pridi and Phibun are discussed.

But despite these misgivings concerning style, and on the more serious question of the author's assessment of the events of October 1933 and their supposed parallels to the events of October 1973, this is a significant book presenting a challenging new interpretation of a crucial period in modern Thai political history. Whether or not one accepts all of his conclusions, Dr. Chai-Anan is certainly right on the need to question and re-examine the traditional view of the Bowaradej rebellion, on the need to see this event not as an isolated anomaly but in relation to a series of political upheavals of the 1930's, and on the need to go more systematically into the primary documentary sources. Both historians and political scientists can well hope that he will maintain his remarkable pace of productive research and writing.

*Benjamin A. Batson*

*Cornell University*

Chadin Flood (Kanjavanit), Trans. *The Dynastic Chronicles Bangkok Era The Fourth Reign B.E. 2394-2411 (A.D. 1851-1868) by cawphraya thiphaakorawong*. The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, Tokyo. Vol. 1. 1965; Vol. 2, 1966; Vol. 3, 1967; Vol. 4, 1973; Vol. 5 (Index) forthcoming. Published with the assistance of UNESCO.

The Dynastic Chronicles of the Bangkok Era rank as the most important series of historical texts written by Thai scholars in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries of the Christian Era. The full series includes six studies: the chronicles of the first, second, third and fourth reigns by Chao Phraya Thiphakorawong, and the chronicles of the second and early fifth reigns by Prince Damrong Rajanuphab. The series continues to be the best history of the Chakkri dynasty, which has now been on the Thai throne for more than 190 years. The scholarly standards of Chao Phraya Thiphakorawong and Prince Damrong were high. Both men made intensive use of contemporary documents and both added their own insights to their work. Their books present a complete and accurate view of history as the Thai saw it. This important set of works should be made available to a much wider audience: foreign scholars, especially those engaged in comparative studies; foreign students; and the foreign public.

Chadin Flood, with the assistance of The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies in Tokyo, Japan and UNESCO, has made a valiant effort to bring Chao Phraya Thiphakorawong's chronicle of the fourth reign to the attention of a larger public. *The Dynastic Chronicle of the Fourth Reign* is probably the volume of greatest interest to the English-speaking reader. It was Mongkut, Rama IV, who signed the 1855 Treaty of Friendship and Commerce with Great Britain, opening his country to western diplomats, consuls and traders. Mongkut's reign was also one of internal development: much stress was placed on royal ceremonial, increased support for Buddhism, the construction of canals and roads, the strengthening of ties with tributary states, and the conduct of religious and diplomatic relations with other Southeast Asian kingdoms, notably Burma and Cambodia.

Chadin's efforts to provide the foreign public with an English translation of this chronicle begins to fill a vital need. There are many

people interested in Thai culture who have not had an opportunity to learn Thai or to enjoy the delights of its literature. In this multi-national world, translation often provides the only means through which people in one country can begin to understand the people in another. Such work is essential to international communication.

The task of the translator is a difficult one. Ideally, he or she should be equally at home in each of the languages in which he or she works. A good translator should be aware not only of the formal grammatical patterns of a language but of its social uses. The way in which a language is structured and the manner in which it is used reflects the social order and people's feelings about themselves. In addition the flow of a language, the ways in which words and sounds interact, is important.

The task of a translator becomes even more complex when the two languages involved represent very different approaches to language use, as in the case here of the Thai and the English languages. The Thai language impresses the average reader, raised on English, with its emphasis on the syllable and with its stress on the tonal value given each syllable. Often the difference in meaning between two monosyllabic words is determined only by tone. A shift in the tonal value of a single syllable can change the meaning of a statement. The tones can lend themselves to all types of sound patterns. Indeed, the Thai display much skill in and derive much joy from manipulating these sound patterns. Many devices exist, particularly the use of repeats, as when two or three words, each having the same meaning but different tones, are spoken in succession. Translation cannot duplicate this type of manipulation in another language. It is a linguistic feature of Thai which will forever belong to the Thai people alone. It is not a feature that foreigners can readily acquire and utilize even when they know the Thai language well.

The Thai language reflects social stratification to a far greater degree than most western languages, especially American English. There is one vocabulary which is reserved for the royal elite, another for the high officials, and still another for the peasant community. The

elite terms are highly Sanskritized polysyllables which directly contrast with the popular monosyllables. Many terms in the ordinary language have been borrowed from Teochiu or from other Chinese dialects. In addition to the type of vocabulary used, high status is indicated by the use of elaborate titles, the length of which is often correlated with rank. There is great concern with personal relationships, especially in regard to superordinate and subordinate associates.

Patterns of language organization vary. In Thai, the words, polysyllabic and monosyllabic, are organized into phrases. Although the basic grammatical structure is simple (subject, verb, object) the additions and elaborations may be such that the basic structure is obscured. Much Thai prose reads like Proust. The association of ideas can be marvelously, bewilderingly free. Subjects and references may be dropped entirely; some sentences never seem to end; or the author may get lost in sound-play, creating repetitious passages which add little to the sense of the essay.

Thai is not a language which lends itself readily to translation. Whether the translator chooses a free or a literal approach, he or she faces serious problems. If a literal approach is chosen, the translator must decide whether or not the translation should conform more closely to the grammatical patterns of the Thai or to the patterns of English. In cases where a literal translation cannot work, either because its patterns would not make any sense in another language, or where the dropping of the subject or of references would confuse the foreign reader, the translator must decide on a different mode of action. What is more suitable, a paraphrase or an "explanatory" passage?

The translator must also consider the reader for which his or her work is intended. There are different types of readers with different needs and demands. The highly educated professional will want a critical edition of the text, translated with sophistication, voluminously and accurately footnoted, complete with maps, textual notes, appendices, and index. The average university student or university graduate will want something that is first of all readable, in which clear explanations of the more puzzling features of the text are explained and where the



necessary background information is provided. The more general reader will be most concerned with readability; he may be willing to have his intellect stretched somewhat, but does not want it overtaxed.

There are, then, a number of problems that need to be considered in the task of translation. Unfortunately, these problems have not been carefully thought out in Chadin Flood's translation of *The Dynastic Chronicles Bangkok Era The Fourth Reign*. Her approach to the translation from Thai into English may discourage this work's use by the very people that would be most interested in it, namely, the scholar, the student, or the general reader with an interest in Thailand. For one thing, the text is too full of romanized, italicized, phonetically transcribed Thai words to encourage its use by anyone but the most persistent student of Thai culture. The responsibilities of the translator have been, in part, abdicated, for the reader must constantly shift from standard English to a romanized, transcribed Thai text. Unless the reader already knows some Thai, his task is almost hopeless. Most, although not all, of the Thai terms could be put into English. There are, as Appendix H illustrates, accepted English names for all of the major towns of Thailand. There are also accepted English transcriptions for all major Thai titles. I do not understand why the names of many foreign visitors, American, British, French, Portuguese, and others, should appear in a Thai transcription. *The Bangkok Calendar*, published from 1858 to 1873 contains lists of foreign residents in Bangkok along with announcements of visits of foreign envoys. The Singapore press could supply the correct names of many foreign visitors and their ships. Consular accounts and studies on foreign relations should yield the names of foreign ambassadors and governors. Thai names can be put into English. Weights and measures can be converted into acceptable English equivalents, as can units of currency. I am sure that most readers would rather deal with, say, 200 baht instead of two *chang* ten *tamlyng*. At the very least, the long strings of phonetic symbols could be broken up: *nakh<sup>oo</sup>n khyankhan* instead of *nakh<sup>oo</sup>nkhyankhan*; *somded caw phrajaa* instead of *somdedcaw-phrajaa*; *dusid mahaapraasaad* instead of *dusidmahaapraasaad*; etc.

The existence of the phonetic script does provide a better guide to pronunciation than would English equivalents. However, it has been

my experience that the average student, who knows no Thai, is as confused by the phonetic symbols as he would be by the actual Thai. His usual pronunciation of these terms, because of his confusion and because there are few breaks, is even more garbled than it would be if English were used. I strongly feel that the personal names of all foreigners referred to in the text should be in their own language or in their English versions, that all personal names and titles of Thai should be in their English versions, and that all place names should be in English. The Thai spelling in the Thai script, an accompanying transcription, and the English version used in the text can be given in appendices for the benefit of those who read Thai and who have had some experience with its transcription.

In general the English text is very flat and prosaic. It does not carry the social overtones that the Thai text does. Everyone, whether of high status or low, speaks with the same vocabulary. Aside from some of the ceremonial descriptions, the contrasting character of the passages in the royal language does not come through. The dropping of much of the royal terminology is legitimate, for it cannot be adequately expressed in English, and its removal contributes to readability. Nevertheless, there are higher and lower forms of English and the English text could be less prosaic than it is.

In some instance the Thai language can pose rather unique problems. There are cases where the literal translation of the Thai does not enlighten, but rather misleads the reader. As Chadin Flood notes (volume 3, pages 10-12) there often was no relationship between the title which accompanied a position and the actual functions performed by the person who held the position. The most apparent examples are the positions of the Kalahom and the Mahatthai before Chulalongkorn's reorganization of the government in 1892. The term Kalahom does translate as Chief (or Head) of Military Affairs while that of the Mahatthai does translate as Chief (or Head) of Civil Affairs. However, as Chadin explains, the Kalahom held civil, military, and judicial authority over southern Thailand while the Mahatthai held civil, military, and judicial authority over central Thailand, the north and the northeast.

(The north at this time was under its own autonomous leaders who owed allegiance and paid tribute to the King at Bangkok. The Mahatthai supervised these tribute missions. The towns along the east coast of the Gulf of Thailand were the responsibility of the Department of Trade [Harbors]). In this situation what should the translator's response be? There are a number of possible options. There is no reason why the functional translations, Ministry of the South and Ministry of the North, could not be used. Another alternative could be to use the Thai terms, Kalahom and Mahatthai, with a note of explanation, preferably in the text, when the terms first appear. The translations used here, the Chief of Military Affairs and the Chief of Civil Affairs, can confuse those who are not familiar with the Thai system of government in the nineteenth century or who do not, normally, read footnotes.

Another aspect of the same problem is the translation of *fai thahaan* (page 3) by the word army when no army, in the usual sense, existed. Except for those men who served in the palace guard, or who were retainers and sometimes bodyguards of the more important princes and nobles, the Thai, in the nineteenth century, had no standing army. If war occurred, or if a campaign were mounted, as in the case of the Chiangtung expedition, the troops were peasants conscripted through *corvée*. They were led in most cases by their own headmen or by relatives of their headmen. The number of riflemen brought up from the palace guard was very small.

Still another example of a literal translation that may prove misleading occurs in volume 1, page 130, which refers to the "arrival of Mr. Harry Parkes to alter the treaty". The Thai word *kee* can be translated as alter; but it also means to revise, to correct, to repair, to mend, or to improve. In a footnote, volume 3, page 100, the translator writes that "in the text, there was no mention of an alteration, but merely the exchange of ratified treaty documents". A bit more was involved. Harry Parkes arrived bringing not only the ratified treaty but also "An Agreement entered into between the undermentioned Royal Commissioners, on the part of their Majesties the First and Second Kings of Siam, and Harry Smith Parkes, Esquire, on the part of her Britannic

Majesty's Government". The agreement contained twelve articles clarifying such matters as the status of the treaty concluded in 1826 and the jurisdiction of the British Consul over British subjects, etc. It was accompanied by a schedule of taxes on land and certain types of produce and by a set of customs-house regulations. The complete text of the treaty and the agreement of Harry Parkes is provided in Sir John Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam*, Oxford, 1969, volume 2, pages 212 to 248. The agreement of Harry Parkes was (see article 12) incorporated into the treaty concluded by Sir John Bowring and thus can be said to "improve", "clarify", or "change" it. In this type of situation the word *kee* does carry some weight, but in a sense that is not satisfactorily expressed either by the word "alter" in the text or by the explanation given in the footnote.

In some places greater precision in translation is needed. One phrase, a frequent one which cannot readily be rendered into English and which is usually, for the legitimate purpose of simplification, left out, is *khaa thuun la?ong thulii phraabat*. It is a very high term used when a person or a group of people speak to the king, stating that they are like "the dust on his feet". In volume 1, page 3, line 29, the first two syllables, the *khaa thuun*, are separated out from the rest of the sequence, and translated as the "king's servants". When the same phrase appears elsewhere, as on page 4, lines 13-14, the separation is not made and nothing appears in the text. If a student or curious reader should attempt to use this section as a source in a study of the membership of the Grand Council, he would face a dilemma: Did or did not the Grand Council include servants of the king? While all of the members of the Grand Council would declare themselves "your Majesty's loyal servants", I doubt that any of the personal attendants, housekeepers, etc. in the palace would be members of the Grand Council. The confusion here stems from the various ways in which the word servant is used in our society and in Thai society.

Even where English equivalents for Thai terms exist, they are not always adequate. In these cases, further explanation, in a footnote or in an introductory essay, would be helpful. One example is the word

*pryksaa*. It appears frequently in the Thai text, and is, perhaps, one of the most important words in the Thai political lexicon of that period. The English equivalent would be "consult", but the Thai word carries more weight than this. No policy was developed at Mongkut's court without first having a *pryksaa*, consultation with the high officials was essential to the formation of court policy. Mongkut's concern with *pryksaa* was an important element of his character; it was one of the ways in which he showed that he was a good king. Although the outward rituals and the language of kingship suggest that the monarch was absolute, in practice consensus determined the course of government. The term *pryksaa* is translated there, for stylistic reasons, in a number of ways, some of which do adequately convey its importance, others of which do not fully express what is going on.

For example, volume 1, page 3, lines 2 to 10 read:

At six o'clock in the afternoon, high ranking Buddhist monks, members of the royal family, and government officials from the civil service and the army assembled. After coming to an agreement, the elder members among them drew up a petition which they carried to the two brothers of the late king, . . . *phrajaa phiphadthanakoosa* read the petition of the elder members to the brothers.

A more literal translation, which attempts to illustrate in greater detail the relationships among the various members of the assembly is:

At six o'clock in the evening there met together the Heads of the Buddhist Order who were the leaders of the Buddhist Religion, the higher and lower members of the royal family, and the officials from the civil and military departments. All those of high rank, who were the leaders, agreed in the deliberations. The wording of the invitation, in accord with the wishes of all of the officials, was finished. Then the statement that came out of the assembly was taken to be presented to the two royal descendants, . . . Phraya Phiphat-tanakosa was the person who read the decision of the assembly, respectfully stating that . . .

The translator needs to be aware of the changes and shifts that take place in the meaning of words over time. As the Thai government changed, former political terms were retained but were given new meanings in keeping with the new political system. Occasionally some of these Thai terms are translated in their twentieth century meaning, not in their nineteenth century meaning. For instance, the words "voted unanimously" in volume 1, page 4, line 5, have a modern content that did not exist in 1851. I am sure that the assembly had reached a consensus, a kind of a "sense of the meeting", but I very much doubt that an actual vote was taken.

Especially disappointing is the treatment given the various ministries and departments, volume 2, pages 430 to 452. The expectant reader finds such statements as the "*Ahlangsinakha* Department of the Royal Treasury" (page 432); turning to the footnotes for enlightenment he reads (volume 4, page 255) "*The Ahlangsinakha* Department of the Royal Treasury: *from phraahlangsinakha*". He remains unenlightened. Here the translator does not appear to understand either the text or the Thai system of administration. The translation gives the impression that there was *one* central treasury which was divided into a number of subordinate departments. There is no evidence in the administrative records of the period that this was, in fact, the case. The records indicate that a number of separate, probably autonomous, departments existed which had responsibility for or control over certain funds. Some functions overlapped. The names of the departments in this section (volume 2, pages 432-433) might better be translated as: the Department for Trade (or Department of the Treasury for Trade); the Royal Treasury; the Department in charge of the Palace Grounds (? *plamaan*-palace, *anakad*-space); the Treasury for Gold; the Department of the Treasury of the Left; the Department of the Treasury of the Right; the Department serving as a Treasury for Officials; the Bureau in charge of Weapons; the Department in charge of Royal Property; the Bureau in charge of the King's Food (? *ahlang wiser*); the Department in charge of the Orchard Taxes; and the Revenue Department.

The use of Thai terms in this section is especially confusing. Some of the Thai terms are used as modifiers of the English word which follows, as in the "*phonphan* Police Department", where the word *phonphan* refers to the rank of the people serving in the department. In many other cases the Thai term has the same meaning as the English word which follows it, the "*thanaajlyaghoo*k Spear Department" where *thanaajlyaghoo*k simply means "those in charge of spears", or as in the " *?aasaajaj* Volunteers Department" where *?aasaa* means "volunteers" and *jaj* "larger" or "greater". The *saan taangpratheed* (page 443) "The Legal Courts Dealing with Foreigners" was known as the International Court in contemporary British Documents. "The Department of Lathe Workers" (page 445) probably should be the "Department of Potters". In the "Department of the Smelters", smelting might better be translated as metal casters.

I would also like to raise some questions about the translator's use of footnotes, particularly about the types of material, terms, and discussions which appear in them. The western dates should most certainly appear in the text, or, at least, at the bottom of the same page as the text. While I am aware of the charm of "On Sunday, the tenth day of the waning moon of the sixth month", or of "In the eleventh month of the year of the Snake, the ninth of the decade", these formulas are far less enlightening than "May 25, 1851" or "October, 1867", especially since the sixth month in the Thai calendar can be April and the eleventh October. I see no reason why the Thai versions cannot be retained, provided that the Thai date when it first appears is accompanied by the western.

The interpretative footnotes could be very useful. I wish there were more of them. Not all of the unfamiliar Thai words in the text are discussed in the footnotes. Many are completely overlooked. Although the task would be a difficult one, I would like to see more attention given to the regalia used in the royal ceremonies and to the types of ceremonial dress worn. It is possible that the Fine Arts Department or some of the officials who are responsible for planning present royal ceremonies can help in this matter. For example such Thai words as *laajkudan* (volume

1, page 6, line 24), *krajlaad*, *nawwakro<sup>2</sup>* *bangkali* (page 8, line 23), and many others are not explained in the footnotes. There appears to be no consistent pattern which would explain why some of the Thai terms are discussed in the footnotes when others are not.

It would have been desirable to give more attention to Thai relations with Laos, Vietnam, Burma, and the Malay States in the notes. Much space is given to translations of documents from other sources to elaborate on Thai-Khmer relations. A comparable amount of space devoted to Thai relations with other Southeast Asian Kingdoms would provide a better balance to the work.

The appendices are important. Some, particularly those dealing with the genealogy of the Chakkri dynasty, the members of the royal family, titles, ranks, measures and currency, should be examined by the reader before moving to the text. A note calling attention to these appendices should have been included in the front matter. It should not be necessary to have so many footnotes like this one, "Page 337, line 15: Concerning *phra<sup>2</sup>ongcau phagphimonlaphan*, see Appendix B, IV (13)".

The maps supplied in Appendix I and Appendix J need to be keyed to the text. Neither map is very useful for the fourth reign. The map in Appendix I, "Siam under Rama IV" is very misleading. The area, given here as Pattani, was still divided into "seven states": Pattani, Yiring, Nongchik, Yala, Saiburi, Raman, and Rangae. In addition there were three smaller kingdoms north of Kedah: Satun, Polit, and Kabangpasu. All of these smaller kingdoms sent tribute regularly to Bangkok.

While the map in Appendix J does give some indication of the location of many of the place names in the text it excludes a fairly large number. Among the towns and place names which cannot be located are: *nakh<sup>2</sup>onkhyankhan*, *chiangtung*, *chiangrung*, *lomsag*, *ja<sup>2</sup>ong*, *kamn<sup>2</sup>adnob-phakhun*, *raheeng*, *suwannaphum*, *nakh<sup>2</sup>onnaajog*, *sangkhonburi*, *saming-khaburi*, *nakh<sup>2</sup>onchajst*, and the islands of *chaang*, *ng<sup>2</sup>oom*, and *phalikan* in Thailand; *baanm<sup>2</sup>oo*, Mergui, Moulmein, and Tenasserim in Burma; Kampot in Cambodia; and Hué, Quang-nam, Bien-hoa, Gia-dinh, Ha-tien, and the island of *puul<sup>2</sup>ok<sup>2</sup>ongda<sup>2</sup>on* in Vietnam. The use of the phonetic transcription instead of the standard international names makes it



difficult for the non-Thai-speaking reader to locate many of these places in an ordinary atlas. (Some place names, however, have changed over time and no longer exist. These changes should be indicated in the footnotes).

Maps of Bangkok, one of the inner city showing the relationship of the Royal Palace to the Sanam Luang, the Second Palace, and the main temples and forts, and a second giving the plan of the Royal Palace, are badly needed. Without them the ceremonial procedures cannot be made fully clear.

Basically the key to a good translation is planning. A work that is well thought out and carefully organized is a joy and a delight to the reader. Careful planning would also eliminate many of the problems that appear. A careful consideration of the available resources (Where would I go to check this item? Whom could I contact about this issue? What kind of reference materials do I need?) would have eliminated many errors and tied up many loose ends.

My critical comments, in respect to this first attempt to translate, in full, a major Thai historical text, should not discourage further attempts at translation by the present translator or by others. I hope to encourage reflection about the problems involved in the translation of and editing of a Thai book for a foreign public and to suggest possible solutions. Hopefully there will be more translations of Thai literature into English in the future for I am confident that an audience for them exists.

*Constance M. Wilson*

*Department of History,  
Northern Illinois University*

R. Bonney, *Kedah 1771-1821: The Search for Security and Independence* (Oxford University Press, East Asian Historical Monographs, Kuala Lumpur, 1971), xvi, 215 pp.

Thawisak Lomlim, *ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างไทยกับมลายูในสมัยรัตนโกสินทร์ตอนต้น* (Thai-Malay Relations in the Early Bangkok Period) (Phrae Phittaya, Bangkok, 1973), 220 pp.

As the title of the first book under review indicates, it is concerned with the efforts of the rulers of Kedah to secure that state's independence and safety from invasion and reprisals from its neighbors, that is, the competing giants of Siam and Burma. In seeking these ends the policy consistently employed by four successive sultans was to try to obtain a military alliance with the British in return for certain concessions. As Bonney presents it, the story has a distinct dramatic quality, and thus a synopsis of what one might call the plot would not be inappropriate. Bonney's version of events in Kedah from 1771-1821 proceeds briefly as follows.

In 1771 Sultan Muhammed Jiwa (r. 1723-1778) invited the British to Kedah for the first time to help put down an internal rebellion in which Bugis mercenaries had taken part. It was in response to this appeal that Francis Light first came to Kedah. He arrived after the rebellion had already died down, but nevertheless Sultan Muhammed signed a contract with him granting Light's company trading concessions in return for defensive assistance. Sultan Muhammed offered further concessions if Light could get his firm to provide offensive assistance against Selangor to which the rebels had fled. Light's company did not agree to this and thus the matter stood until the arrival of Edward Monckton from the East India Company offering a defensive alliance to Kedah in return for certain trade and customs concessions. Again Sultan Muhammed wanted an offensive alliance to which the Company would not agree, and thus the matter was eventually dropped thereby depriving Kedah of the defensive alliance it would later seek so desperately.

The next act occurred in 1785 when Sultan Abdullah (r. 1778-1798), aware of a massive invasion of Siam being prepared for in Burma and fearing the consequences of demands, counter-demands and the inevitable reprisals being visited on his own small state, offered the lease of

Penang to the East India Company on certain conditions, including most importantly that the British would help defend Kedah against any invasion by her enemies by land or sea. When the English reply arrived in July 1786 it was evasive on the question of defense assistance for Kedah. At this point Bonney marshals evidence to show that, contrary to what many writers have said, Sultan Abdullah did not agree to the British reply as terms for the lease of Penang, nor did he sign any paper to that effect but rather held to his original proposals as the only conditions for such a lease. Furthermore, Bonney asserts, Light was perfectly aware of all this and thus his formal taking possession of Penang was against all the rules of international law. In turn, Sultan Abdullah's resolve in 1791 to drive the British out by force when he could get no satisfaction from them was perfectly justified, especially since in the meanwhile a final unfavorable reply to the question of defensive assistance for Kedah had arrived from the East India Company, a reply which Light seems not to have bothered to communicate to Sultan Abdullah. Such an attempt was thwarted, however, by a pre-emptive strike by Light and Sultan Abdullah was forced to agree to terms dictated by Light. These did not, of course, include provision for defensive assistance although a phrase in the agreement, "Queda and Penang shall be as one country", (Bonney, p. 101) was such, according to Bonney, as to imply to the Malay mind just such a defensive alliance. However, events would show the Company did not choose to recognize this interpretation. Thus, Kedah was the loser on all fronts, for in the meantime the expected Burmese invasion of Siam in 1785-86 had brought the inevitable demands from the Burmese for assistance followed in turn by demands from the victorious Siamese forces for tribute and submission, to which Sultan Abdullah had no choice but to agree.

The rest of the story follows with the inevitability of all tragic drama. In 1800 Abdullah's successor Diya'u'd-din, partly perhaps in order to consolidate his own precarious position as raja, contracted another treaty with the East India Company which added Province Wellesley to the territory leased to the Company but which still did not provide a reliable guarantee of defensive assistance to Kedah beyond another expression of the sentiment that "the Countries of Purlis and Kedah and Pulau Pinang shall be as one Country". (p. 107)

Diya'u'ddin was soon ousted by his nephew Tunku Pangeran, Abdullah's son, who in order to achieve this end had actively sought the support of the Siamese by going personally to the Siamese court with tribute offerings and doing obeisance to Rama I. However, Tunku Pangeran, who had now taken the title Sultan Ahmad, soon became disillusioned and by 1810 he too was pleading with the British to ratify "the engagements contracted for by Mr. Light with my late Father" (p. 123) and to come to Kedah's assistance because "Quedah and Pinang are as one Country", (p. 123) The major reason for the Sultan's distress was, of course, that Kedah had once again been caught in the middle when the Burmese attempted to wrest isthmian Siam from Thai control upon the death of Rama I. Although acquiescing to heavy Siamese demands for men, arms and boats, Sultan Ahmad's loyalty to Siam had been cast into doubt by rumors of his also having given in to Burmese demands for assistance. Thus his position was at best precarious. The Governor of Penang gave him cold comfort, advising him to comply to all Siamese requests. In order to discredit the rumors of his disloyalty Sultan Ahmad was obliged to send his son with tribute to the Siamese court in 1812, but his son returned with an order to Kedah, as a test of the Sultan's loyalty, to bring Perak into tributary status with Siam. Upon receipt of this order Sultan Ahmad renewed his pleas to the British since he neither wished to invade Perak nor to suffer the consequences of disobedience to Siam. Again the British advised him to obey and he was eventually obliged to invade Perak and bring it into submission to Siam. Nevertheless, even this credit was not enough to protect him when again his loyalty was called into question when the Burmese were making warlike preparations and the Siamese were making counter-preparations in the years 1818-1821. Finally in 1821 Rama II authorized the Governor of Nakhon Sithammarat to invade and secure Kedah. The British at Penang did nothing to hinder this move and Sultan Ahmad was forced to flee his country. It is at this point that Bonney ends his narrative.

Bonney's primary sources are largely manuscript records from the British India Office Library, the National Library in Singapore, and the British Museum as well as such printed collections as the *Burney Papers*

and the *Crawford Papers*. Bonney utilizes his sources to argue his case both ably and persuasively, frequently noting where previous writers have, according to his reading of the sources, made minor and sometimes major factual errors, often with a resultant distortion in interpretation. The chief weakness of Bonney's book is that his unfamiliarity with Thai materials sometimes leads him to make minor errors or to leave some points unclear.

Thawisak's book, as a thesis originally entitled *A Study of Thai-Malay Tributary Relationships, 1781-1868*, is, unlike Bonney's, not concerned with a single dramatic theme but rather is a more general treatment of Siam's relations with her Malay tributary states, centering on the problems posed to Siam by those states, the causes of such problems and the various solutions tried in order to solve them. Thawisak's sources are largely Thai manuscript documents from the Manuscript Division of the Thailand National Library as well as chronicles and the invaluable *chotmai luang udom sombat*. Although not providing us with any new information on the subject of Thai-Malay tributary relations, Thawisak's scholarship is quite acceptable and his book may serve as a clearly presented summary of the subject and is valuable for this reason. After a chapter of introduction on pre-Bangkok Thai-Malay relationships he has a general chapter on development in Rama I's reign followed by a single chapter on Pattani, two chapters on Kedah, and a chapter on Kelantan and Trengganu together. These chapters deal with the relationship of each of these states to Siam through the reign of Rama IV.

Unfortunately, Thawisak does not seem to have been aware of Bonney's book published two years before his own, and thus where he relies on English-language secondary sources shown by Bonney to be in error he repeats the same errors in his own book. These are in general, however, not significant.

In addition to a clear factual summary Thawisak provides an explanation of Thai motivations in seeking Malay tributary states in the early Bangkok period. Not only was it a matter of tradition and prestige but in the early years of the Bangkok dynasty the Malay tributaries provided a food surplus, so necessary in a time of rebuilding, as

well as other economically profitable products. Finally, there was the strategic importance of Kedah as long as the Burmese remained a threat.

There are a few final points arising from one or the other or both of these books in need of note or clarification. First is the question of whether or not Kedah was tributary to Siam during the reign of King Taksin. The Thai chronicle of the First Reign records Rama I's younger brother observing that King Taksin did not subjugate the Malay vassals. (Thawisak, p. 20) Elsewhere Thai chronicles record that the ruler of Nakhon in King Taksin's time in order to sound out the Malay rulers' leanings was ordered to seek a loan of 1,000 *chang* of silver apiece from Pattani and Kedah to buy arms. (Ibid.) Prince Damrong, with these two pieces of information to go on, concluded that the rulers of Kedah and Pattani had not agreed to the Siamese requests and thus had never come into tributary status to Thonburi. Thawisak accepts this conclusion. (pp. 21-22) However, Sultan Muhammed in his discussions with Edward Monckton in 1782 remarked that his overlord the Siamese king had forbidden him to allow Europeans to settle in Kedah. (Bonney, p. 43) Thawisak was aware of this piece of information but concluded that it was an evasion on the part of Sultan Muhammed because he did not find Monckton's proposals agreeable. (Thawisak, p. 112) In addition to this, however, Sultan Ahmad's representatives in discussion with the British in 1814 also stated that Kedah, although unwilling, had been obliged to submit to the Siamese during the reign of King Taksin. (Bonney, p. 134) At that date there would seem to be no ulterior motive in making such a statement, unless to emphasize Kedah's woes.

The accession of Tunku Pangeran to become Sultan Ahmad is another point where obscurity lingers. Both Bonney and Thawisak are agreed that Pangeran personally did obeisance at the Thai capital, but Thawisak's sources, the Thai chronicles, treat this event as the natural succession of Tunku Pangeran upon the death of his uncle. (Thawisak, p. 56) Either the chronicle is mistaken or Tunku Pangeran and, probably, his Thai sponsor were not entirely honest with the Thai court. Also, the Thai chronicles clearly state that it was the Governor of Nakhon who conducted Tunku Pangeran to the capital while, Burney, Bonney's source, claims it was the Governor of Songkhla. (Bonney, p. 111).

The date of the invasion of Perak is another point in which Bonney and Thawisak are not in agreement. Thawisak, relying entirely on Thai sources on this point, assumes it took place in 1813 immediately after the order had been sent out to Sultan Ahmad. However, Bonney, shows conclusively that forces from Kedah did not actually move against Perak until late 1816, Sultan Ahmad trying every other expedient first. Both authors, however, agree that the order to invade Perak was designed as a sort of loyalty test for Sultan Ahmad.

Elsewhere, Bonney citing Low speaks of a Burmese invasion of Thalang in 1818. (p. 157) Thai primary sources for this year quite clearly show that, although the Siamese were uneasy and on guard against such an attack, no actual attack took place.<sup>1</sup> Bonney wonders in a footnote why this interesting event escaped the notice of the Burmese chronicler. Perhaps it escaped his notice because it never happened.

A good point made by Bonney concerns the role of personal rivalry between Sultan Ahmad and the Governor of Nakhon in precipitating Siamese invasion of Kedah. Bonney remarks that they both held the Thai rank of *chaophraya* and, Ahmad being the younger, this made the Governor of Nakhon jealous. (Bonney, p. 163) Actually, the Governor of Nakhon was not raised to this rank until 1822 after he had taken Kedah and, in fact, as a direct reward for this feat<sup>2</sup>. This fact, of course, does in no way diminish the force of Bonney's argument. Thawisak, following Prince Damrong, also notes that the reason Sultan Ahmad did not try to be reinstated through audience at Bangkok as long as *Chaophraya* Nakhon was alive was that he knew *Chaophraya* Nakhon would obstruct any such attempt. (Thawisak, p. 102) In discussing the Governor of Nakhon's machinations in trying to get Rama II's permission to invade Kedah, Bonney speaks of the Governor's influence at court through his nephew the Wang Na. Although Bonney has his personages right, this prince, *Chaophraya* Nakhon's nephew, did not become Wang Na

1) Thailand, National Library, Records of the Second Reign, Chulasakarat 1180, nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; Chulasakarat 1181, nos. 2, 3.

2) Thailand, National Library, Records of the Second Reign, Chulasakarat 1184, No. 11.

until the accession of Rama III in 1824. Incidentally, one must not lose sight of the fact, very clearly pointed out by Thawisak, that the invasion of Kedah took place with Rama II's full authorization upon what he believed was conclusive evidence of Sultan Ahmad's collusion with the Burmese. Thus when Crawford and then Burney tried to get Sultan Ahmad reinstated by throwing all the blame on *Chaophraya* Nakhon's jealousy and implying that the Thai king had not been fully aware of what was going on, they were not being very tactful, to say the least, aside from the fact that the Thai considered the whole affair an internal matter and not any business of the British, anyway.

To conclude, either of these books taken for itself has something to offer to make its reading worthwhile. Taken together they are rather provocative as counterbalances to one another, both in the way of sources used and in the perspectives from which the same set of events are viewed in either book. The most outstanding example of the latter is, of course, the different interpretations of Sultan Ahmad's behavior. To the early nineteenth-century Siamese, whose memory of the devastation of 1767 was kept alive by recurrent Burmese attacks, Kedah was of pivotal strategic importance since if the Burmese gained a foothold there all of peninsular Siam would be gravely threatened. Thus they could not afford a disloyal vassal in that state. Indeed, since Sultan Ahmad originally owed his throne to Siamese support, the Siamese were not entirely unreasonable in expecting him to be loyal to them in a contest with their arch-enemy. Incidentally, as there was no Burmese invasion of Thailand and South Thailand in 1818 or thereafter and no massive Burmese force in the immediate area the ruler of Kedah in this instance did not have the same excuse as he had in former times for treating with the Burmese. From another point of view, however, Sultan Ahmad's behavior, like that of his predecessors, can be seen as the poignant struggle by the ruler of a small state in the unenviable position of being caught in the midst of a quarrel not of his own making and beset by both sides trying to preserve that state's independence and at the last its very existence.

Lorraine Gesick



Prasert ๙a Nagara, *โคลงนิราศทริภุญชัย สอดกับต้นฉบับเชียงใหม่* [The *Hariphunchai Nirāt*, Edited from a Chiangmai Manuscript]. 3rd ed. No publisher stated, 1973. [16], 244 p.

Prasert ๙a Nagara, *มังรายศาสตร์ เรียบเรียงเป็นภาษาปัจจุบัน* [The Code of Mangrai, Edited in Modern Language]. Bangkok: Cremation of *Luang* Hotrakityanuphat, 1971. (28), 126 p.

Prasert ๙a Nagara, *ผลงานค้นคว้าประวัติศาสตร์ไทย* [Researches in Thai History]. Bangkok: Cremation of *Nai* Bunruang ๙a Nagara, 1971. (9), 124 p.

The most demanding part of the historian's craft arises in his encounter with his original sources. Faced with a text, he must with scrupulous honesty determine just what his sources can tell him; and it may require all his knowledge and all his skills to squeeze the last drop of information out of what may prove to be a difficult, or even perverse, source.

The sources of early Thai history are not plentiful, so it has become all the more important to use to the fullest extent possible the sources available to us. Unfortunately, the older the source, the more difficult it is for the historian to be fully certain that he understands it. There is much in the language of the inscriptions and the early chronicles and literature that is unintelligible to the modern reader; and even words that have come down to the present day may have undergone changes in their meanings. Further difficulties arise in trying to set the evidence of such sources into their proper contemporary context: the places mentioned might be found on no modern maps, and the dates included might not be readily verifiable.

Over the past decade, Dr. Prasert ๙a Nagara has become widely known as a scholar unusually adept at solving problems that arise in dealing with early Thai texts. His work in collaboration with A.B. Griswold on the inscriptions of Sukhothai, published in this Journal, shows the hand of one with an extensive knowledge of the Thai language, its dialects, and its history, and a wide acquaintance with its literature.

The only hint that Dr. Prasert, now Under-Secretary of State for State Universities, was trained as a statistician comes through indirectly in the meticulous rigor of his work. The three volumes reviewed here stem from Dr. Prasert's happy avocational interest in unlocking the puzzles of early Thai texts.

The *Hariphunchai nirut*, in *khlong* verse, is believed to be the earliest *nirut* to have survived to the present day. In a comprehensive and informative preface to this volume, which was written in 1944 and first published in 1960, Dr. Prasert convincingly establishes its date as equivalent to A.D. 1517. It was written in Northern Thai by a young Chiangmai man who went on a religious pilgrimage to Lamphun, and was addressed to a certain Lady Si Thip to express the author's sense of pain and longing during his separation from her. This poem long has been regarded as an exceptionally difficult work because of its archaic language. Dr. Prasert has established an accurate text by using four Chiangmai palm-leaf versions and four folding Thai books from the National Library in Bangkok. He presents two main versions of the text stanza-by-stanza. Each stanza is followed by a paragraph explaining obscure words, and a final paragraph for each of the 180 stanzas renders that stanza in modern Thai prose. (A good sample of the work in translation, and of the uses to which it might be put, is to be found in A.B. Griswold, *Wat Phra Yun Reconsidered*, Siam Society, 1975, pp. 44-48.) The volume also includes a brief explanatory note on toponymic references by Wichit Yotsuwan. The index to this book, which runs to 36 pages, glosses every word to be found in the text, and will be found extremely useful in reading other texts of similar difficulty and antiquity.

The *Code of Mangrai* is a collection of laws of the old principality of Lanna Thai (Chiangmai) traditionally attributed to King Mangrai (r. 1259-1317). In an introduction written jointly with Professor Griswold, Dr. Prasert suggests that the first sections of the code may indeed date that early, and that all of it must date from prior to the beginning of the Burmese occupation of the North in 1568. The earliest of the three manuscripts consulted by Dr. Prasert in establishing his text, however,

dates only from A.D. 1800. The text is given in modern Thai, with parenthetical explanations inserted to elucidate difficult words or indicate differences between the manuscripts. Written in a style much less formal than that of the *Three Seals Code* of King Rama I, the *Code of Mangrai* reads much like a collection of decisions made by a king on legal matters submitted to his judgment. Piece by piece, the text enables the reader to construct a vivid mental picture of Northern Thai society in ancient times. This is a delightful text that presents the lives of real people in the distant past, and it is suffused with a pervading sense of justice and morality that can never dim with age.

The collection of *Researches in Thai History* reprints thirteen of Dr. Prasert's Thai-language articles on the history of Sukhothai and Ayudhya that appeared in a wide variety of journals between 1966 and 1971, as well as two previously unpublished works. Many of the ideas and conclusions presented in these articles also have found their way into the series of "Epigraphic and Historical Studies" that Dr. Prasert and Professor Griswold have written for the *JSS*. What is evident here that is hidden in the *JSS* series is Prasert's own style of solving textual and historical problems; an approach compounded partly of wide-ranging knowledge, partly of sharp logic tempered by wit, and perhaps ever so slightly of the twinkle one can sense in his eyes as he moves into and through a problem! Were we to turn the tables on Dr. Prasert, and read these articles as "texts" by which we might discover the skills he brings to the study of history, we would note his expressed respect for the contributions that the social sciences—especially linguistics, anthropology, and archaeology—can make to our understanding; and we would note his sure expertise in determining exactly what is written on the stones and precisely what can, and what cannot, be concluded from that information. He demonstrates his extensive acquaintance with the early masterworks of Thai literature and the texts of its history; and in an article apparently written especially for this volume he even gives us a *précis* of a previously unpublished Northern Thai manuscript, the *Tamnān phūn 15 rāṭchawong*, which outlines the reigns of the first fifteen kings of Lanna Thai.

One article in this collection is especially important because it raises a problem not yet fully faced in Thai historiography: the date of the foundation of Ayudhya. As Dr. Prasert explains it, all the manuscripts agree in dating Ayudhya's foundation on the sixth day of the waxing moon of the fifth month in the year of the Tiger, C.S. 712. Historians naturally have assumed that that date fell at the beginning of the year (*songkrān* usually falling in the fifth lunar month), towards the end of March, 1350. However, using the astrological formulae that were used in that day and continue in use to the present, Dr. Prasert demonstrates that C.S. 712 did not begin until the 20th day of the fifth month (March 28, 1350); and there was no sixth day of the waxing moon of the fifth month until the end of that year, when it fell on March 4, 1351. In this useful and provocative article, Dr. Prasert briefly and clearly explains the mathematical calculations required to check Thai chronology, and implicitly challenges historians of Thailand to do their arithmetic homework.

Taken together, these three volumes are extremely impressive; all the more so when we realize that they were written in the scarce free time of a man busily engaged in another profession. They are instructive evidence of the persistence in Thailand of a long-standing historical tradition by which such active men of affairs as *Chaophraya* Thiphakara-wong, *Phraya* Prachakitkrachak, and Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, to name but a few, helped revive and improve our understanding of the past while they were engaged in building their country's future.

David K. Wyatt

Cornell University

A.B. Griswold, *Wat Phra Yün Reconsidered* (The Siam Society, Monograph No. 4, 1975), pp 88.

To the general reader, Wat Phra Yün is something never heard of before, so he may be puzzled why A.B. Griswold has entitled his monograph "Wat Phra Yün Reconsidered". On the contrary an expert in Thai art and archaeology is likely to recall that it was once referred to by Prince Damrong in his well known monograph, *Monuments of the Buddha in Siam*, as resembling the Ananda Temple in Pagan. However, the prince stated nothing further about its date and other characteristics; and no one seemed to have paid much interest to this temple ever since. As the reviewer, I am surprised when Griswold says... "the scholarly world was attributing it to the fourteenth century...". As a matter of fact, any art historian who happens to see this temple would figure out at the first glimpse that the present structure is surely the outcome of a large scale alteration as with many of the ancient monuments in the living *wat* of today.

This monograph contains six parts. The first is an introduction to why Wat Phra Yün was chosen as the focal point of study. The second to the fourth are devoted to the historical framework. This is probably the best of the whole work since it provides the reader with reliable sources of how Ceylonese Buddhism established by Parakramabahu I (1153-86) spread into Pagan, Martaban and Sukhothai and became the main religious practice of these kingdoms. Central to the spreading of this doctrine was the role and activities of the Forest-dwelling monks who were patronized by kings and rulers. The celebrated monk of the case in point was Phra Sumana Thera of Sukhothai. He went to Martaban to be re-ordained and to study under the Udumbaragiri sect; and upon returning to Sukhothai he was greeted and appointed by King Li Thai as a high ranking monk of the country. Later when King Gü Na of Lan Na wanted to set up the Udumbaragiri sect in his kingdom, Phra

Sumana was invited to go there. In honour of this learned monk, Gū Na had built for him the forest dwelling monastery of Wat Phra Yūn, about 1 kilometre to the east of the city of Lampun. At Wat Phra Yūn, Sumana found the ruins of a standing Buddha left over from the Haripunjaya period. He restored it and then asked the king to have a *mandapa* built to shelter it together with three other newly made images. This is why the temple of Wat Phra Yūn, a large *mandapa* with four niches at the cardinal points, came into being. Although later Sumana moved to his new residence at Wat Suan Dok in Chiangmai, this *mandapa* still remained in importance as the first monument of the Udumbaragiri sect ever established on Lan Na soil.

Part Five is the main body of the monograph, focussing on the reconsideration of the present structure of the temple which was thought to be the production of the fourteenth century. Griswold claims that it is in fact a new edifice built to cover the original one of Sumana Thera. This is evident through testimonies of three senior monks in Lampun who had seen the original temple with its Buddha before the restoration in 1901. To conjecture the original *mandapa* and its Buddha, Sukhothai monuments and images are used as prototypes, while those of Lan Na of the period after Sumana are traced and compared to find out some similarities. For the *mandapa*, Griswold points out many conjectural forms but eventually chooses the square structure with a succession of hipped roofs like a Sukhothai *mandapa* in Muang Chalieng as his best alternative.

At this point I find it hard to follow Griswold, who is preoccupied with the concept that before Sumana, all art and architecture in Lan Na were solely influenced by those of Haripunjaya, so he seems to overlook certain key monuments such as the *stupas* of Chedi Chiang Yan in the compound of Wat Phra Dhat Lampun and of Wat Pa Sak in Muang Chiang Saen. They are of square structure having four niches at the four cardinal points; each niche contains a standing image of the

Buddha; and the top of the building is crowned with a round shaped *stupa*. This architectural style is likely to have received influence from Nakhon Sri Thammarat which passed through Sukhothai to Haripunjaya and Chiang Saen some time during the thirteenth century. Such monuments should be taken as prototypes for the later *stupas* like those of Wat Chedi Luang, Wat Chiang Man and Wat Lok Mori which were rebuilt and built from the reign of King Tiloka. All of these later monuments, although solid masonry, do not only manifest a line of evolution from the early group but also look more relevant to the miniature *mandapa* or shrine cited by Griswold as having some resemblance to the *mandapa* of Wat Phra Yün. Further, one should bear in mind that the temple of Wat Phra Yün was unique as it was designed to house four standing Buddhas, so it was considerably different from the Sukhothai *mandapa* which served as a place for one single sitting Buddha. If I have to conjecture this unique *mandapa* with four niches, I would follow the traditional style by putting a round shaped *stupa* as its top instead of hipped roofs as suggested by Mr. Griswold, which look so unsymmetrical.

What Griswold says about the original four images which were buried inside the present edifice is very interesting. He has reasonably proved that, through studying and comparing the Sukhothai standing Buddha to those of the Lan Na in the period after Sumana Thera, the original standing Buddhas of Wat Phra Yün which were restored and made by this monk should have their robe in an open mode with both hands hanging down. They were likely to have become a model for the Buddha images of the following periods in Lan Na.

Part Six, the last one, concerns the restoration of Wat Phra Yün in 1901 by a craftsman named Nan Panna Muang to fulfill the wish of Chao Inta Yong Yot, the ruling prince of Lampun at that time. This resulted in the reconstruction of the original temple. It assumed a new shape of solid square masonry erected on top of a steep pyramidal basement that

covered the original images inside. At each niche of the new structure above the basement, a newly made standing Buddha smaller than that of the original one was sheltered; and on top of the building were three receding false storeys topped with a large *stupa* surrounded by four smaller ones. The present structure was no doubt influenced by the Burmese style as are many of the *stupas* in the North today.

Apart from the text, Griswold has provided the reader with appendices on testimonies of the three venerable monks who witnessed the temple of Wat Phra Yün before its reconstruction, and also with conjectural plans of the original structure and photographs of *stupas*, *mandapas*, images of the Buddha, the monks and the craftsman who were involved in "Wat Phra Yün Reconsidered". Many of the illustrations are historical since they were taken before the monuments crumbled down or underwent some alterations. There is one unidentified *mandapa* in fig. 22 which derives from an old file of the Fine Arts Department. Here I would identify it as the *mandapa* of Wat Phra Yün in Amphur Muang, Uttaradit, which, at the present time, has not yet changed so much.

The only unhappy thing in this book is that throughout the text, the author has spelled and pronounced the place names in Sanskrit in spite of the fact that they were already corrupted and pronounced in Thai terms. This sounds unpleasant and perhaps pedantic to Thai readers. On the whole, to be fair to the author, this monograph is very stimulating and helpful for those who are interested in the history and archaeology of Thailand during the Sukhothai and early Ayuthya periods.

*Srisakra Vallibhotama*

*Silpakorn University*



Yoneo Ishii, Osamu Akagi, Shigeharu Tanabe, *An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Governments*, Volume I, Part I, *The Law of Civil Hierarchy and The Law of Military and Provincial Hierarchies*. (Discussion Paper No. 76, The Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto, August 1974), 179 pp.

This second research tool issuing from Kyoto's Center for Southeast Asian Studies is something which has long been desired by students of Ayutthayan and early Bangkok history, and is made even more interesting by the indication in its Preface that it "is only one part of a larger compilation . . . of names of officials who have appeared in other historical sources".<sup>1</sup> As the title states, the present index treats only the two hierarchy laws of the "Law of the Three Seals of 1805",<sup>2</sup> and this statement is refreshing in that it shows the compilers' intention to avoid speculative interpretations and assumptions, such as that these laws were promulgated by King Trailok in the 15th century, and deal objectively with the texts as given by Rama I in 1805.

In the first section of the index each title has been listed in Thai alphabetical order according to *rāṭchathinnānām/rājadinnām*,<sup>3</sup> or where this is lacking, *tāmnaen*, and assigned a "registration number"<sup>4</sup> from 10001 to 12046. Following the *rājadinnām* and *tāmnaen* are the "name of department to which the official belongs (in parenthesis), rank (yot [*yas'*]), and dignity mark (sakdinā)".<sup>5</sup> Finally there is a column showing, for each title, its location in Lingat's (and the Khuru Saphā) edition of the laws.

Immediately following section I are notes, most of which provide the characters for titles, 15 in number, which the compilers have identified as Chinese, and a Supplement quoting articles 24, 25, 26, 28 and 29 of the Military Law and stating that "The officials included following

---

1) Preface, iii.

2) *ibid.*

3) Although the compilers of the index use a phonetic transcription, I prefer, when dealing with pre-modern texts, to use a graphic transliteration.

4) Index, p. 1.

5) *Ibid.*

sections can not be identified dignity marks".<sup>6</sup> I shall return to this in a moment.

Section II lists all the officials according to level of *s'aktinā* and grouped by *yas'* and finally there is a chart showing graphically the possible ranges of *s'aktinā* for each *yas'*.

Such an index makes it very easy to compare any title from the laws with other, similar titles, and, perhaps of more value, to quickly check whether titles found in other sources are part of the hierarchy implied by these two laws.

It also makes clear the great complexity of these titles and the impossibility of breaking all of them, including some of the most important, into a neat arrangement of *rājadinnām*, *tāmnaeñ*, *yas'*, etc. Thus among the *yas'* the compilers included not only *okbañā*, missed by both Quaritch Wales, whose book has for long been the standard work on the subject,<sup>7</sup> and Jones<sup>8</sup>, but also such terms as *kumrūdaeng/kumṛtaeñ* and *pradaeng/pṛaṭhaeñ*, which have never been discussed by anyone, but which, as I shall attempt to demonstrate below, are of great interest.

Another illustration of the intricacy of the system is in the various, four to be exact, *pṛaṭhaeñ* to which nearly all of the provincial governors are said to be subordinate (๔๗). They have names such as *culādeb sāy* which look like either *rājadinnām* or *tāmnaeñ*, but are not, apparently, mentioned in the laws themselves and thus in the index are shown, with asterisks referring to the titles of the governors concerned, at the bottom of the page.

The complexity is further apparent in the use of parentheses, and another indexing category, brackets, not mentioned by the compilers in their preface, to indicate official position not specifically mentioned in the laws, but known from other sources. I would have preferred that

6) *ibid.*, p. 112.

7) H.G. Quaritch Wales, *Ancient Siamese Government and Administration*, London, 1934.

8) Robert B. Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks Including a Translation of Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam by King Chulalongkorn*, Data Paper Number 81, Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, June 1971.

these not be included, in conformity with the compilers' obvious intention, shown by their refusal to attribute these laws to King Trailok, to avoid speculation and let the texts speak for themselves. For although there would probably be no argument about the insertion of *cau mo'an* for each of the provincial governors, in certain other cases these bracketed indications of position may be, following the line of Quaritch Wales, imposing 19th-century practice on an older system which was different. Thus, following the titles of the religious officials in article 19 of the Civil Hierarchy Law, they have inserted *lūkkhuns' alhluon*,<sup>9</sup> not mentioned in the law and which may not have existed when the law texts were first composed, but which, of course, is accurate for the 19th century.<sup>10</sup>

I think it would be better in such an index to omit everything not included in the laws themselves and which is inevitably interpretive, and place it in notes or in a separate section devoted to analysis and interpretation.

I would also like to see a section outlining the principles on which *rājadinnām* and *tāmnaen* are defined, for this is not obvious in every case, and students may therefore have some difficulty in finding certain titles in the index. For example, one desiring to locate the chief officer of the civil division has to decide whether both *cākri* and *samuhanāyak* are *tāmnaen*, or whether the latter, in the middle of the *rājadinnām* is alone to be considered *tāmnaen*. In fact, the index shows the entire title, minus *yas'*, as *rājadinnām*, with *samuhanāyak*, in brackets, ostensibly as *tāmnaen*, although it is also part of the *rājadinnām*, and *mahūtdaiy* in parentheses as position.

The same sort of problem arises with the other great ministers. For the *bañā yamarāj*, etc., Minister of the City (*mo'an*), it seems clearly that his *tāmnaen* is *kram brah nagarpālpañ*, found in the middle of the *rājadinnām*. The index unnecessarily inserts *cau* before this *tāmnaen* and even more unnecessarily adds *brah nagarpāl* again in parentheses. In the case of the Minister of Fields, *ḍkñā baldeb*, etc., the *tāmnaen* would

9) for example, nos. 11117, 11309.

10) Quaritch Wales, pp. 74, 167, 180, 185, 188, but note that he is wrong in saying that the "twelve Brahman officials...retained the old Thai appellation *lūkkhun*" (p. 180). if he is referring to the law text.

again seem to me to be a term in the middle of the title, *krahsetrādhipatī*, but the index gives him no *tāṃnaeñ* at all, adding the term *nā*, in parentheses, to indicate his position. The treasury minister, *òkbañā s'rī dharrmarāj*, etc., also appears to have a *tāṃnaeñ*, *koṣādhipatī*, in the middle of the titles, but the index indicates *tāṃnaeñ* as *cau kram glāñ*, terms not found in the law text, and adds *glāñ* redundantly in parentheses. For the palace minister, *òkbañā dhārmādhiphātī*, etc., the treatment is even less adequate. Although his *tāṃnaeñ* would seem to be *s'rī rātna-maldiarpāl*, in the middle of the titles, the index assigns him no *tāṃnaeñ* at all, gives two indications of position, *cau kram* in brackets and *vāñ* in parentheses, and omits his *yas'* entirely. Even if my suggestions here turn out to be wrong, all of this group have the same type of title, and should be treated in the same way. If *kram braḥ nagarpālpatī* is accepted as *tāṃnaeñ* for the first, then the corresponding terms of the other titles should be so treated, and if the terms *nā*, *glāñ*, and *vāñ* are to be inserted in the index for the last three, then *mo'añ* should occupy the same place in the first instance.

For the brahman officials the situation is even more confusing since they have been interpreted as without *yas'* and with *tāṃnaeñ* preceding *rājadinnām*. Thus, for the first official in article 19 of the Civil Hierarchy Law one must search under *mahidhardharrma*, etc., although I don't feel such a choice would be evident to all.

The answer is not, as one might at first think, to leave the titles in their normal order beginning with *yas'*, for when other sources are brought together in a larger index it will be seen that a single official position sometimes had different *yas'* although the *rājadinnām* remained the same. As an example we may take the Minister of the Palace (*vāñ*), who in the body of the Civil Hierarchy Law is *òkbañā dhārmādhipatī*, etc., in the preambles of the two hierarchy laws *cau bañā dhārmādhipatī*, etc., and in a certain section of the Ayutthaya chronicles *braḥ dhārmādhikaraṇa*.<sup>11</sup> There is probably no simple solution to this problem, but

11) This appears in the long versions of the Ayutthaya chronicles (Royal Autograph, British Museum, Bradley, *bāncāndanumāś*), at the very beginning of the reign of King Trailokanath, dated in those versions 796 (A.D. 1434). The passage has been translated by Quaritch Wales, p. 78.

a preliminary discussion of the system and more explanatory footnotes would probably be helpful.

Although at the writing of this review I have had too little time to study the index intensively and have perhaps missed points which deserve discussion, I would like to call attention to one set of entries in which I feel the compilers are in error. They are numbers 10820, 10821, 11614, and 11615, for the titles *braḥ cau lūk dhoe/hlān dhoe* and *samtec braḥ cau lūk dhoe/hlān dhoe*,<sup>12</sup> each followed in the law by the indication *s'aktinā cau kram/palat kram* with *s'aktinā* varying between 500 and 800. These are all in article 5 of the Civil Hierarchy Law which according to Quaritch Wales<sup>13</sup> and by the logic of the index itself (its treatment of the rest of articles 4 through 6), should be *mahātlek*, although the index, for position, has "(*tāḥkram*)", a term not found in the law in this connection. Neither, of course, is the term *mahātlek* mentioned in the law, and thus it is not possible to know from the law text itself exactly who the *mahātlek* were. Quaritch Wales, in the context cited, is also rather vague, merely indicating that *mahātlek* are listed between the royal family and the *cau bañā mahā uparāj*. If the compilers used a complete, official list of *mahātlek*, or other sources indicating precisely who these officials were, it would be helpful to include a note to that effect. It also seems to me that the titles of article 3 should be considered *mahātlek*, rather than *rājavāns'*, as in the index, but can cite no evidence except some remarks in *Lords of Life*.<sup>14</sup> If the compilers have in fact used a definitive list of *mahātlek* I apologise for this criticism.

Furthermore, the compilers have inserted, in brackets, *tāḥ pen* (๓๓๒) to give the meaning *braḥ cau lūk dhoe/hlān dhoe tāḥ pen cau kram*,

12) I cite here from the law texts, Khuru Saphā edition, Vol. I, p. 223, article 5 of the Civil Hierarchy Law, since there are typographical errors in these entries of the index. No. 10821 should be "... hlān dhoe", not "... lūk dhoe", and in no. 11614, "... hlān dhoe" should be corrected to "... lūk dhoe".

13) op. cit., p. 76.

14) H.R.H. Prince Chula Chakrābongse of Thailand, *Lords of Life*, London 1960, p. 284, where two of the titles of article 3, Rama Ragop/*rāma-gap* and Anirudh Deva/*amirud devā* are mentioned as belonging to two brothers, one of whom kept "full control of the Inner Court (Department of *Mahadlek*), assisted by his younger brother as his deputy".

"the royal child/grandchild appointed as cau kram", as though they feel this section of the law is referring to royal princes themselves. However, this would be in direct contradiction with article 2 in which a *braḥ cau lūk dhoe* and *samtec braḥ cau hlān dhoe* have *s'aktinā* of 6000 in ordinary circumstances and, "if [they] have a *kram*" (ถ้ามีกรม), their *s'aktinā* is increased to 15,000. For the *braḥ cau hlān dhoe* the respective *s'aktinā* are 4000 and 11,000. I would like to suggest that the entries of article 5 mean, "samtec/braḥ cau lūk/hlan dhoe, the *s'aktinā* [of] the cau/pālat kram [of their kram]", that is, the persons in question in this section of the law are the commoner officials who headed the staff of each prince's *kram*. The relationship I suggest was standard practice in the reign of King Chulalongkorn who is known to have followed, where possible, the prescriptions of the old laws as he understood them. In 1900, for example, his son (*braḥ cau lūkyā dhoe*) *braḥ aṅg cau cira-praḥvūt vartej* was given the rank of *kram hmū'n nagar jaiys'rī surtej* with *s'aktinā* 15,000, while the *cau kram* and *pālāt kram* of the new *kram* were given respectively 600 and 400 *s'aktinā*.<sup>15</sup>

In their remarks on p. 112 it seems to me that the compilers have shown undue hesitation in their statement, noted above, that the dignity marks (*s'aktinā*) of the officials mentioned in articles 24, 25, 26, 28, and 29 of the Military Hierarchy Law could not be identified. As I read these articles, they do not speak of individuals, but provide simply that *all* the officials of specified *yas'* should have a proportional amount of their usual *s'aktinā* in certain circumstances, such as withdrawal from government service or transfer to one of the provincial capitals (arts. 24, 25), that wives, minor wives (*anubharryā*) (art. 26) and some other relatives (art. 28) have a certain proportion of an official's *s'aktinā*, and that equivalencies of the *s'aktinā* of officials in the palace *kram* should be calculated in a certain way (art. 29). This is not to deny, though, that there may be some obscurities in the text.

Designed as an index, this publication does not include any interpretive comment on the text of the laws or their history, but since the purpose of such an index is to facilitate analysis and interpretation, it

15) Natthavut Sutthisongkham, *Phra pravat lae ngan samkhan khong chomphon krom luang nakhon chaisri suradet*, Bangkok 2414, p. 155; and see King Chulalongkorn's essay on royal lineage in Jones, op. cit., note 8, above.

may not be amiss here to offer some suggestions along those lines which other students may more easily check and criticize with the aid of the index in a joint effort to go beyond the formulations of previous writers.

As probably all readers are aware, these laws have traditionally, by Prince Damrong, Quaritch Wales, and subsequent scholars, been attributed to King Trailok (1448-1488), although it would seem that in 1805 this might not have been so. The rationale for this is that the laws' preambles contain Trailok-type titles and in the long versions of the Ayutthaya chronicles there is a vague statement about that ruler changing the titles and duties of certain high officials.<sup>16</sup>

The date in the law preambles is 1298 which would normally be interpreted as *s'aka*, equivalent to A.D. 1376. However, the preamble also specifies "dog year" which is not true for 1298 *s'aka*, but for 1292 and 1304, six years off either way. Quaritch Wales, possibly following Prince Damrong, declared the date to be 1454 A.D., or 1376 *s'aka*<sup>17</sup>, and Phipat Sukhathit, in an article devoted to the law dates emended it to 1278 *culāmaṇi*, equivalent to A.D. 1466.<sup>18</sup>

The various writers who have concerned themselves with the subject have accepted that the statement of the chronicles plus the two laws show conclusively that King Trailok established the governmental system still known in the 19th century, in which there were two Prime Ministers (*āgramahāsenādhipatī*), the *cākṛī*, or *samuhanāyak* and the *kalāhom*, and four lesser ministers for *vāṇ* (palace), *mo'aṇ* (city), *glāṇ* (treasury) and *nū* (fields), as well as divided the population into civilian (*balaro'an*), under the *samuhanāyak* and military (*dahār*), under the *kalāhom*. In addition the civil division included departments for six *mantrī*, or councillors, directly responsible to the king.

As I see it, this structure does not come forth from any of the documents in question and is the result of an effort to force them into patterns known in the 19th century. To stay within the boundaries of the present subject, and due to lack of space, I shall only treat in what follows the two laws, emphasizing what they say rather than what is generally considered to be their meaning.

16) see note 11, above.

17) Quaritch Wales, pp. 22, 34, 173.

18) Phipat Sukhathit, "Sakarāt chulamani". *Silpākṇ* 6 (5), Jan. 1963, pp. 47-57.

We should first take note of the preambles which, as the term implies, normally come at the beginning of each law and contain the date, the titles of the king, often the circumstances in which the law was promulgated and the official to whom the king addressed the law, presumably because he was the one in charge of the matter in question.

The preambles of the two hierarchy laws are not quite identical but the differences do not permit any deduction as to which might be earlier. A point which deserves thought is that both are addressed to the palace minister, as though he were at the head of the administrative system, and an outright anomaly is that the "preamble" of the Law on Military and Provincial Hierarchies, which follows the civil law, does not come at the beginning of the text, but in the middle, between the military and provincial parts.

The structure of the texts, beginning with the Civil Law, is, following the preamble, the ranks of the royal family, then the *mahātlek* and various categories of royal family servants, all obviously directly dependent on the king. They are followed by an official called *cau bañā mahā uparāj*, etc., whose identity puzzled Quaritch Wales<sup>19</sup> and whom we shall ignore here. After this come the great ministers, beginning with the *cākri*, each of them followed by smaller, apparently subordinate departments. Interesting in this connection is that the six *mantri* do not immediately follow the section on royalty, where one would expect them if they were directly dependent on the king, but follow the *vāh* (palace) minister as though their subordination to the king were through that official.

Then immediately after the end of the Civil Law, with no form of transition, we find the titles of the *kalāhom*, listed in the same manner as the high officials of the civil division and followed by his subordinate departments. This gives the appearance that at an earlier stage the *kalāhom* and all the military had been part of the same law as the other ministers and only the provinces were included in the second text.

As for the structure of the hierarchy as shown by the laws, let's look at it from the point of view of *s'aktinā*. Ignoring the *cau bañā mahā uparāj* there were eight officials in the Civil Hierarchy with the

---

19) Quaritch Wales, p. 77.



highest *s'aktinā* of 10,000 who, together with the *kalāhom* of the Military Hierarchy, seem to have made up the highest level, below the king, of the central government. They were :

— cau bañā cakrī śrī angrākṣ	samuhaḥ nāyak āgamahāsenādhipati . . eku
— bañā yamarāj . . . . .	kram braḥ nagarpāl[mo'an]
—òk ñā baldeb rājasenāpati . . .	krahseṭrādhipati[nā]
—òk bañā śrī dharrmarāj . . . . .	koṣādhipati[glān]
—òk bañā dhārmādhipati . . . . .	maldiarpāl[vān]
	āgamahāsenādhipati
—òk ñā braḥ satec . . . . .	śrī subhañrāj . . .
— braḥ mahārājagrū . . . . .	bramacāriyādhipati s'rī buddhācāry
— braḥ mahārājagrū braḥ rāja praḥrohiṭācāry . . .	buddhācāry
—cau bañā mahāsenāpati . . . . .	samuha braḥ kalāhom

The titles have been broken up to facilitate comparison and dots indicate portions which have been omitted.

The main point I wish to make here is that there were indeed, as Quaritch Wales and other writers have indicated, two "chief ministers", *ag(r)amahāsenādhipatī*, but the *kalāhom*, chief of the "military division", was not one of them. They were the *cākṛī*, chief of the "civil division", and the *vān*, Minister of the Palace, although the *cākṛī*, who was *s'rī angrākṣ*, "royal bodyguard", was superior, shown by his designation *eku*.

Another instance in which the laws show a structure at variance with received views concerns provincial administration. From the time of Rama I (1782-1809) the provinces were divided among three of the ministries, *mahātdaiy*, under the *cākṛī*, *kalāhom*, and *glān*. This three-fold division first appears in the *braḥ dharrmanūn* law at a date equivalent to A.D. 1633 if *s'aka* era is presumed, or 1743 if the *culāmanī* hypothesis is correct.<sup>20</sup> Both Prince Damrong and Quaritch Wales,

20) The English equivalent of the title of this law has been given by Quaritch Wales, p. 168, as "Law of the Constitution of Law Courts and on Official Seals"; and by Akin Rabibhadana, "Law of Procedure," in *The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period 1782-1873*, Data Paper Number 74, Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, July 1969 p. 187.

however, preferred to place the division in 1691,<sup>21</sup> while King Rama I himself said that, "in the Ayutthaya period the southern *mo'an* were placed under the *kram dā* [part of *glān*] because the *kalāhom* had done something wrong",<sup>22</sup> while he intended to distribute them among the three major ministries. His statement implies two previous arrangements, the one immediately preceding 1782 when all southern provinces would have been under the *kram dā*, and an earlier one with all southern *mo'an* under the *kalāhom*. We know of still a third, earlier, structure because La Loubère observed that the *mahātdaiy* had general control over all the provinces of the kingdom.<sup>23</sup>

The hierarchy laws, however, show an arrangement quite different from all of the above. There, as I noted earlier, each of the provinces is listed as subordinate to one of four *praṭtaeñ* entitled *culādeb sāy*, *inpañā sāy*, *ṣārabhās khvā*, and *senāt khvā*, whom the compilers of the index apparently did not recognize in any of the sections of the law. A search through the various ministries reveals that all had rather low-ranking officials called *praṭtaeñ*, the meaning of which term seems at present to be unknown. None of the listed *praṭtaeñ* have titles corresponding to those of the provincial law. However, in the registrar's department we find the relevant titles given to officials who are *kumṛtaeñ*, probably from Old Khmer *kamrateh*. The full titles of these four, plus two other *kumṛtaeñ*, who are of intrinsic interest in other respects, are as follows.

—k. culādeb	bhāktī	s'ri kāntān bala dahār khu'n fāy sāy
—k. inpraṇyā	dhikāriy	bala ro'an khu'n fāy sāy
—k. peñā	dhikāriy	khu'n fāy sāy nòk
—k. ṣārabhās	jātikārī	s'ri kāntān bala ro'an khu'n fāy khvā
—k. senāt	jātikārī	s'ri kāntān bala dahār khu'n fāy khvā
—k. dhārm	ādhikārī	khu'n fāy khvā nòk

- 21) Quaritch Wales, p. 86; Prince Damrong, *tamnan kan ken thahan thai* (The story of recruiting thai soldiers), in *Prachum Phongsawadan*, Part 23, Khuru Sapha edition Vol. 14, pp. 76-167, see p. 129, where it is stated that the division occurred in the reign of King Phetracha.
- 22) *braḥ rājabansūvatār kruñ rūtanakosindr* (Chronicle of the Bangkok period) *chapāp hò samut haen jāti*, "rajakāl dī 1" (First reign), Bangkok, 2505, p. 26.
- 23) Simon de La Loubère, *The Kingdom of Siam*, Oxford in Asia Historical Reprints, Oxford University Press, 1969, p. 89.

These titles are obviously more complete versions of those given to the *praṭṭaen* in the provincial law. The main term shows a difference only in the second, and here *inpraṭṭyā* and *inpaṇṇā* are easily understood as equivalents. Since *kumṛṭtaen*/*kamrateṇ* is a well-attested title of known meaning, but one which eventually became obsolete in Ayutthayan times, this section of the Civil Hierarchy Law is one which has suffered relatively little tampering. It is also certain that the provincial law is of later composition than this part of the civil law and that either the title *kumṛṭtaen*, after its meaning was forgotten, was assimilated to *praṭṭaen*, or all the *praṭṭaen* were originally *kamrateṇ*.

The provincial law, in addition to showing all of the provinces directly under the registrar's department rather than the *kalāhom* or *cākṛṭ*, also divides them between the "forces" (*bala*) of *dahār* and "forces" of *ro'an* via the four *kumṛṭtaen* who were the central officials in most direct contact with the provincial governments. The reader will recall that a division between *dahār*, under the *kalāhom*, and *bala ro'an*, under the *cākṛṭ*, was a feature of the 19th-century Thai administration, but there are very few cases of one-to-one correspondence between the two structures. Most of the *dahār* provinces of the laws became later *mahāt-daty* (*bala ro'an*) provinces and vice versa.

The provinces, then, at the time this part of the law was first composed, were dependent on one of the *mantrī* who, in the listing of the law, follows the Palace Ministry and, I have suggested, was subordinate to it. This hypothesis is strengthened when we remember that it was to the Palace Minister, probably in his capacity as an (the?) *agramahāsenādhipati* to whom the laws were addressed. We might in this connection also note that in the post-Angkorean, or at least 19th-century Cambodian administration, which, with care, may be used for comparison,<sup>24</sup> the registrar was explicitly under the palace.<sup>25</sup> If it is true, as I have argued, that similarities between Ayutthaya and post-Angkorean Cambodia were due to influences from the former to the latter, the Cambodian structure might be evidence for the postulated earlier Ayutthayan structure outlined in the law.

24. See my remarks on this question in a review of Jones, *op. cit.*, note 8 above in JSS Vol. 62 (1), Jan. 1974, pp. 159-174.

25. Etienne Aymonier, *Le Royaume du Cambodge*, Tome I, p. 67.

On internal evidence alone, then, it is possible to identify different layers of composition in the laws, probably reflecting changes in government structure over time. There was thus a time when the two Prime Ministers were the *cäkrī* and *vāñ*, with the former holding slightly higher rank, and possibly a still earlier stage when the *vāñ* was the sole Chief Minister. The provincial articles of the Military and Provincial Hierarchy Law are later, in their present state, than parts of the Civil Hierarchy Law. I have already noted that the position of the "preamble" of the Military and Provincial Law indicates a possibility that the military and civil departments had at one time been included in a single law text, and now that we find the provinces subordinate to officials of the civil division, we might reasonably conclude that at an earlier time there had been only one law text concerning all civil, military and provincial officials.

The dates of the preambles also provide some evidence for this. As noted above they are presently inaccurate, but what they should be is difficult to determine. In any case, the possible errors are not such as would have resulted twice through random mistakes in copying due to similarity of certain numbers. This means that one preamble was probably copied from the other after the erroneous date was already in existence.

None of these layers may be dated absolutely on the basis of these two laws alone, and in the absence of adequate external evidence may never be dated, but work in that direction is to be encouraged, and the present index together with the additional volumes planned by the Center for Southeast Asian Studies are among the essential materials required for such work.

*Michael Vickery*

*School of Humanities,  
Universiti Sains Malaysia,  
Penang*

Dik Keam (comp.) *Bansavatar Khmaer: Sastra Sluk Rut Vat Setbur* (Khmer Chronicle: The Palm-Leaf Manuscript from Vat Setubor) (Phnom Penh, 1975), n.p.

When this book appeared, in the last hours of the Khmer Republic, Dik Keam wrote that he intended it to inaugurate a series devoted to Cambodian chronicle histories, or *bansavatar*. His plan was overtaken by events, but the text at hand is historic as well as historical, for it represents the first time that a chronicle from a major "family" of *bansavatar* has been printed in khmer.\* The "family" originated with a text compiled shortly before 1820 by a Khmer official named Nong: the earliest surviving manuscript of the original text dates from the mid-nineteenth Century. Later recensions, like this one, compiled in 1877, differ from the original by including additional prefatory material and chronological data for the years 1820-1860, when King Norodom took the throne. Until now, scholars wishing to read chronicles from this tradition consulted manuscripts (in Phnom Penh, Bangkok, and Paris) or used often inaccurate French and Thai translations. Partly because many Khmer viewed the manuscripts as sacred, and partly because the French made no effort to publish an edition of the *bansavatar* in the colonial era, no complete Cambodian chronicles were printed in Khmer before 1969, when a Cambodian scholar, Eng Sut, published his *Akkasar Mahaboros Khmaer* (Documents about Cambodian Heroes), drawing on a second "family" of texts. As Michael Vickery has shown (in still unpublished work) *bansavatar* in the "Nong" tradition are more reliable than those in the one represented by Eng Sut's *Akkasar*, and so for people interested in Cambodia's "dark ages"—the period between the abandonment of Angkor and the arrival of the French—the *wat Setubor* text is essential reading.

---

\* For much of the data in this review, I am indebted to discussions with Michael Vickery, and to his unpublished research.

In many ways, it is a disappointing text. Like all surviving *bansavatar*, it says nothing coherent about the Angkorean era, beginning its non-legendary chronology in the 1400s. Moreover, the text is impossible to check, for there is no way to determine, evaluate or consult the oral or written traditions on which it is based. Finally, like its cousins, it says little about events—except invasions or revolts—outside the capital, or indeed outside the royal palace. This is not surprising, but the chronicle is useful as a record of the past which knowledgeable Cambodians, in the 1870s, thought it important to preserve. The picture of Cambodian society that emerges is of one organized sporadically in authoritarian terms, with peasants liable to unpredictable calls from bureaucratic patrons, monks and foreigners for their allegiance, of a nation “held together” by the isolation of its villages, social deference, village Buddhism and ceremonial practices, initiated by the king and imitated everywhere, keyed to the agricultural year. Were these dark ages “feudal” in a Marxist sense? Was monarchy effective or in eclipse? It will be interesting to see the historiography of this period, as it develops under the incumbent regime, and to see what lessons are drawn from it and from texts like this, which are essential “building blocks”, *faute de mieux*, in reconstructing Cambodia’s past.

*David P. Chandler*

*Monash University*

*The Discovery of the XIVth Dalai Lama*, written by Sonam Wangdu, translated by Bhikkhu Thupten Kalsang Rinpoche, Ngodup Poljor, and, John Blofeld (Klett Thai Publications, Bangkok, 1975), pp. 67.

This present translation is an adventure story told by a pious and devout man, a member of the party that went in search of the newly reborn Dalai Lama. It is not an adventure story about exploring some wild, unknown places or meeting with all sorts of unlooked for dangers; it is an adventure story in the life and traditions of Buddhist Tibet, as well as an adventure story in the realm of rebirth.

At the passing away of the XIIIth Dalai Lama, oracles and the sacred lake Chos Khorgyal were consulted and all omens examined for their meanings. With all of the information obtained from these various sources, a party of men set out in search of the newly reborn Dalai Lama. They encountered difficulties along the way from the sheer physical environment itself and they also encountered major difficulties with the Chinese Governor Ma Bu-fang who put many obstacles in the path of the party in their search. All difficulties faded into insignificance as the party began their examination of children who showed promise of having been reborn beings and with the near certainty that one child was indeed the Dalai Lama. The joy of the discovery and the reverence with which it is related is moving, but not in a worldly emotional way. It is related in a way which is pure, clean, spiritual. It is a meeting between those who are treading the same path to purity. One is allowed a glimpse into the life of the Dalai Lama as a small child and one cannot help but be impressed with the reverence paid to one so small by men of great learning and piety.

As the tale unfolds, one is introduced to many facets of Tibetan life, both from the point of view of the influence of the physical environment on the people and from the religious point of view. One can feel that religion was indeed a very great part of the Tibetan people's heritage,

that it was in fact their main concern in this life. The treading of the Way of the Blessed One was very much alive in Tibetan life.

Rebirth is a basic tenet of Buddhism, regardless of school or sect. In Tibet, oracles and omens were not only consulted and interpreted, but recognition tests were also devised to know if in fact a child was the reborn being for whom they were searching. In this case, personal articles of the XIIIth Dalai Lama were mixed with identical articles and placed before each child whose responses were carefully noted. Also noted were the child's responses in his being able to recognize members of the party, who were disguised as richly dressed men and their servants, but who were in fact Lamas and other religious officials.

To the non-Buddhist, much of what is related in these few pages may seem incredible, perhaps even a hoax; but to the Buddhist, whose belief in rebirth is firm, much of what is related here is by the way. It is natural that such things should take place and that such beings be searched for and found. With increasing research being done in the West with regards to the possibility of rebirth, this work will prove to be of interest.

The translation is smooth and very readable. The book itself is quite well laid out from the point of view of the normal Thai English publication. The only drawback, however, is the price which is a bit on the expensive side for a book of this size\*. If one doesn't mind the price, the reading experience will be a joyful one.

*Sommai Ingonon*

*Mahamakut Rajavidyalaya  
Buddhist University,  
Bangkok*

---

\* hard-back, 45 baht; soft-back, 30 baht.



*Visakha Puja* (Buddhist Association of Thailand, Bangkok, 1975), pp. 107, 35 plates.

*Visakha Puja*, the annual publication of the Buddhist Association of Thailand, continues its high standard of academic excellence with this 1975 volume. The articles included in this book provide the reader not only with incisive commentaries on the philosophical intricacies of Buddhist doctrine but also with insight into how the Dharma may be reified into everyday behavior patterns.

Homage, in the form of the sermon delivered on the seven day rites, is justly paid to the learned, wise and righteous scholar, His Highness Prince Dhaniniwat, who passed away on September 8, 1974.

With judicious use of example and metaphor and an unerring sense of the apposite phrase to reveal "the inner meaning", *Chao Khun* Phra Upali explains the verse "The Security of Taking the Refuges" and the Dalai Lama illuminates the wisdom of "The Diamond Sutra". An excerpt from the Life of the Buddha is rendered into exemplary English prose and poetry translation by Phra Khantipālo. This is followed by an interesting and informative thesis on Vipassana (Insight) by Bhikkhu Nāgasena of the Wat Sai Ngam Vipassana Center. Next, the reader is offered an illuminating series of articles in which the Dharma is shown to affect the personal life style, beliefs and actions of the authors. Thich Nhat Hanh paints a sympathetic and understanding word portrait of Vietnamese montagnards; Mrs. Stanton describes her experiences in being guided in meditation practice by the Burmese Venerable U Ba Khin and in returning to his Center years later and Eric Blitz outlines the innovative work in the field of curing narcotic addiction being undertaken at Wat Tam Krabok under the direction of Phra Chamrun.

Two provocative articles by Charles Keyes and Soedjatmoko concern Buddhism's struggle to adapt to the pressures of secularization and modernization. Soedjatmoko maintains that religions in Asia, including Buddhism, cannot escape the responsibility of not only participating in the national development process but in articulating the direction and goals such development should take. Dr. Keyes speculates on the adaptive patterns Buddhism has adopted in the increasingly secularized urban society of Chiangmai.

This volume also includes several poems inspired by Buddhist thought and doctrine and numerous photographs of Buddhist religious art and sculpture, Buddhist ceremonies and Sangha participation in community service activities. There is a most memorable series of photographs of Thailand's most renowned monk meditation masters.

The Editor of *Visakha Puja* is to be commended for bringing such a rich and varied collection of articles to the attention of the English speaking academic community as well as to those genuinely interested in Buddhism as a religion, philosophy and way of life.

*William J. Klausner*

*The Asia Foundation,  
Bangkok*

Jamshed K. Fozdar, *The God of Buddha* (Asia Publishing House Inc., New York, 1974), pp. 184.

The World Council of Churches (representing the vast majority of non-Roman Catholic Christians in the world), following a consultation in 1970 in Zurich, issued the following statement: "All mission in fact requires this approach of openness to and respect for the other. This respect must involve our openness to the other, including our being open to the realities and possibilities of this mission to us".

For too long Christian "mission" has been carried out in the spirit of imperialism and triumphalism. Christianity has all the answers and must prevail. But a new attitude is beginning to assert itself, and the book under review is an excellent starting-point for genuine dialogue. From the Buddhist side, it dares to question some of the fundamental assumptions about Buddhism long held both by Buddhists themselves and others. But it is not a polemic. References to other religions are very few. Rather, by going to the sources of Buddhism itself it seeks to present its case, and does so with clarity, backed up by extensive quotation from Buddhist and Hindu sacred writings.

I came to Thailand with the understanding that the Buddha, if not an atheist, was at least indifferent to the existence of God, or gods.

Buddhism was a way of life, a philosophy, a code of conduct, and as such hardly qualified for the name "religion" at all. Buddhism, in other words, was a kind of humanism, overlaid in practice by popular accretions over the centuries which sometimes gave it a "religious" hue, but which were essentially foreign to the genius of Buddha himself.

The book in question is *The God of Buddha*. It is unfortunate that neither on the dust jacket, nor in the body of the work, are we given any information about the author or his background, not even his nationality. But that he is thoroughly equipped for his task, and writes out of a wide knowledge of original sources, is evident from the text. In reading books about Buddhism or by Buddhists I usually find the language extremely esoteric and wearisome; but not here. The English (whether first or second-hand) is crystal clear.

In his introduction, the author argues his basic premise. The Buddha was born a Hindu, and lived and taught in a Hindu environment. Behind all the polytheism and popular syncretism of Hinduism there stood a belief in one underlying purposive Reality, or Mind, without which the whole system would be meaningless. The Buddha did not repudiate this concept, but assumed it, just as in the Christian Bible, the whole doctrine of God as Creator is assumed in the New Testament and by Christ, although little is done there to explicate it further. "Who denies God, denies himself. Who affirms God, affirms himself" (Taittiriya Upanishad II 6.1). Or from the Buddhist literatures "There is, O monks, an Unborn, Unoriginated, Uncreated, Unformed. Were there not—there would be no escape from the World of the born, originated, created, formed".

Next follows a section entitled "Doctrine". This section is divided into 15 sub-sections each dealing briefly but pointedly with aspects of Buddhist belief—Dharma, Faith, Detachment, Selfless Action, Soul—Mind and Self, True Self, Heaven and Hell, The World of Devas (gods) and Spirit Beings, et cetera. In this section, and throughout the book, parallel italicized columns set out relevant Buddhist and Hindu texts, and a Christian reviewer is strongly tempted to add a third column of Biblical parallels.

There follows a longer section on "Nirvana" and the book is rounded off by the fourth part, "The God of Buddha", and an epilogue.

Jamshed Fozdar maintains that the Buddha not only believed in God, but also, in considering human beings, in the existence of a "real self", the soul-mind which "is not extinguished in the state of liberation".

— "The Buddha shows that when the bubbles of our ignorance and cravings have burst, our real self will emerge to the vision of reality and partake of eternal life . . . we must discover that splendrous world in our own soul and obtain joyous peace in the ineffable bliss of the true nature of the soul in perfect harmony with the Cosmos and the operation of its eternal plan". In dealing with the nature of God some of his argument reads very much like the argument from design (now often rejected by Christian thinkers as no longer acceptable on strictly semantic grounds) with which Christianity has often bolstered its case. But that Buddha believed that God exists admits of no question, in his view. "The Buddha . . . strongly implies that the acknowledgment of the underlying Reality is imperative for recognizing the futility of the mundane life, and thereby, for detaching ourselves from the ephemeral so as to reach the depth of the eternal". Fozdar rejects the view that "the Uncreated, the Unmade", is to be identified with the Dharma, which is but the path to be trodden if we are to reach our goal. Similarly Nirvana is not the Uncreated either, but rather the condition of being in harmony (here or hereafter) with the Uncreated, the Unoriginated. But at the same time, the Buddha refused to speculate about what was essentially beyond the scope or power of man's mind to know—the metaphysical essence of the Unoriginated and the content of the state or condition called "Nirvana".

Where does the dialogue come in? As stated earlier this book is a fresh statement of the Buddhist faith, not a conscious argument with anyone. It would be of great interest to have the reactions of thoughtful Buddhists themselves as to the extent that the book impresses them as being in line with the Buddhism they believe and practise. Christians, for their part, must make considerable amendments to their preconceived ideas about Buddhism if "The God of Buddha" does indeed reflect the message of the Buddha himself. They have much to learn, both in terms

of parallel beliefs which the two faiths share, and in the points at which the two faiths do not appear to converge. It is, for example, true that the Christian presentation of God and the state of bliss (Nirvana or Heaven) has, generally speaking, been anthropomorphic to such an extent that it has often become incredible, a point Fozdar makes in one of his rare comments on "Judaeo-Christian concepts". But is not any talk at all about "the Unoriginated, the Uncreated" inevitably anthropomorphic? To speak of the "Unoriginated" as Mind still leaves us with an attempt to explain God by an analogy with the only minds we know—human minds, our own and, indirectly, those of other people. And why is it acceptable to analogize in this way from human minds to the Divine mind, but not from human feelings (e.g. of "love") to those which may characterize the Heart—Mind of the Eternal? Such reflections leave open the possibility that the attempt to understand the Eternal may not rest solely on the efforts of our own minds, but that they may receive illumination from the action of the divine Mind itself to communicate with man, in other words by a revelation from that Mind of the true nature of things, temporal and eternal. Fozdar argues that to admit "interference" or further illumination from the side of God would be a denial of the perfection of the universe-system which the Uncreated originally established. But if it is accepted that man really has some freedom, for good or ill (and is not completely at the mercy of a Karmic pre-ordained pattern for his life) then is not God equally free, not to repudiate the work of His hands, but to inject new elements into the world of human experience? Has God really retired, or is He still at work?

The book concludes with an excellent and valuable glossary of Hindu and Buddhist terms, absolutely essential for the Western reader. There is also a selected bibliography (of original sources available in English and some commentaries) and an index. The book is clearly printed and well set-out. It can be highly recommended for study and as a departure point for inter-faith exchange.

*Harold F. Gross*

*Vadanavidyalaya Academy,  
Bangkok*

Oliver D. Cresswell, *Early Coinage of South East Asia* (Numismatics International, Dallas, 1974,) pp. 39, +19 Pl.

Since 1932, when Le May wrote his pioneering *Coinage of Siam*, the only major works to appear on Southeast Asian numismatics include *Studies of Old Siamese Coins* (a 1961 reprint by the Siam Society of articles published between 1937 and 1949), the 1962 reissue of Le May and a volume in Thai entitled *Thai Numismatics* (B.E. 2509) by Ch. Yorbunkoed.<sup>1</sup> None of these titles have been available in any quantity on the U.S. market and undoubtedly prompted the publication of *Early Coinage of South East Asia*.

*The Medieval Coinages of Lan Na and Lan Chang, Early Thai States in Northern Southeast Asia* might be a more appropriate title, as Cresswell concerns himself solely with issues of that region. The book is divided into two major sections, 'Lannatai' and 'Lanchang', both having an introduction to the area and a list of kings from each principality. Other than some unnecessary errors the historical overviews tend to be quite well done.<sup>2</sup> A weakness is that no sources are given for the information.<sup>3</sup> Following in the footsteps of Le May and Kneedler,<sup>4</sup> Cresswell generally presents a good analysis of the coin types. Numbers have been assigned to the varieties, aimed at making it easier to identify items without having to resort to long descriptions. His plates are largely taken from the above two sources; unfortunately the reprints were used for copying, resulting in a loss of detail.

- 
- 1) I have not been able to acquire a copy of this last volume and can only refer to a review in *J.S.S.*, vol. LV, Part 2 (July, 1967), pp. 307-08. Another interesting book, though admirable mainly for its illustrations is *Coins in Thailand* by Chaweewan Viriyabus, Bangkok (1973) in Thai and English.
  - 2) The most obvious one is, "Forced by pressure from the Han people, who today form the bulk of the population of China, they (the Thai) had to emigrate from Nanchao, their state in South China". (p. 7)
  - 3) Such basic texts as G. Coedès, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Honolulu (1968), D.G.E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, New York (1964) and the classic work of Notton remain unmentioned.
  - 4) R. le May, *The Coinage of Siam*, Bangkok, 1932. 2nd edition (1962); W.H. Kneedler, "The Coins of North Siam," *J.S.S.*, vol. XXIX, (1937), pp. 1-11, (I refer to the reprint, vol. X, pp. 3-28).

There are a number of points, particularly as related to the K'ā K'im pieces, which should be clarified. The K'ā K'im or Chiang money of Lan Na may be described as a bar of silver cut and bent into the form roughly resembling a ring. There are normally punched some three different marks on each arm; one giving the place of issue in archaic Thai script, along with the representation of a wheel and a numeral which Cresswell is apparently unable to identify.<sup>5</sup> "If compared, even in the clearest examples, with the Thai numerals for 4 and 5, shown at the foot of Plate II, it is just impossible to identify any of these numerals . . . with either the Thai 4 or 5". (p. 13) Cresswell fails to realize that he is comparing 13th and 14th century numbers with their modern counterparts, which are often not recognizably related.<sup>6</sup> The alphabets and numerals from the reigns of Ram Khamhaeng (1283), Lu Thai (1357), the Chiangmai area (1518) and examples of Lao script are given by Rajadhon.<sup>7</sup> With such comparative material it should be possible to both identify the numbers involved (probably a 4) and tentatively order items in terms of their style. This analysis, of course, would have to be done in conjunction with the place-names on the coins.<sup>8</sup>

"Kneedler does suggest that the wheel symbol represents the Royal Mark of, we must assume, a particular monarch. I feel that this line of thinking cannot be sustained . . . to attempt to assign each one to a particular one of the fifteen sovereigns of Lannatai . . . would be a valueless exercise". (p. 14) It is probable that initially the wheel symbol was a stamp of authority, guaranteeing full value of the coinage. As

- 
- 5) This coinage is unique in 14th century Thailand in that both the denomination and place of issue are clearly marked. Cresswell's remarks concerning these coins are at times unconventional. See f.n. 6.
  - 6) Kneedler, *op. cit.*, p. 9, "They always contain three marks; near the centre is the figure "4" (the smaller marked coins of this type weight 1/4 the larger, or 1 bat); near the tips of the coin is the stamp which I shall call the royal mark; in the centre is the name of the principality of Lannat'ai in which the coin was issued".
  - 7) P.A. Rajadhon, *The Nature and Development of the Thai Language*, Thai Culture Series, No. 10, Bangkok (1963), pp. 18-19.
  - 8) See Kneedler, *op. cit.*, Pl. XIII and Cresswell, Pl. III.

time passed there would be a natural progression in the design, but with the basic wheel motif still in mind. Many of the now-separate designs (in Plate II) are undoubtedly slight variations of the same ruler. And while the marks on the coins would be distinctive for a particular reign, it is not necessary to assume that they were radically changed with each new one. It is not unlikely that the same symbol was kept for succeeding reigns (for example, when passed from father to son). The later sovereign, in emulation of his father, might take on that mark with only a small distinction (a double line?) for his own.<sup>9</sup> Carefully considered with the study of inscriptual material a general ordering might well arise.

"... those Ka Kim which bear a second wheel mark on the inside beside the cut never have the same wheel mark there as on the outside of the leg and had this mark been a Royal Mark they must surely be the same ..." (p. 14) Why should that necessarily be so? The second mark was necessarily placed on the inner surface at a time removed from the actual minting process.<sup>10</sup> Most likely it is a marking under a different regent; either a successor or validation for use in another area. The practice would be analogous to the counter-stamping of Spanish dollars during the 19th century by King Mongkut of the Bangkok dynasty.<sup>11</sup>

9) See Kneedler, *op. cit.*, Pl. XIV and Cresswell, Pl. IV. Le May, *op. cit.*, p. 11, "It is probable that these 'bracelet' coins were used in the north prior to the advent of the Suk'ot'ai script, and represent the earliest types of coinage issued by royal authority in Northern Siam". However, Cheweevan Virayabus, *op. cit.*, p. 155 writes, "... it was used by the merchants, and not by the government". No reference is listed. While I do imply that the minting was done by the government, quite possibly it was only supervised by it with the actual manufacture being carried out by private parties.

10) That area affords maximum stability while punching, but *only* after the coin has been manufactured. An excellent example is shown on the left center of figure 92 in *Coins in Thailand*.

11) See the counter-stamped dollars on Plate V of U. Guehler, "Notes on Old Siamese Coins", *J.S.S.*, vol. XXXVII, Part 1 (1948), pp. 1-25. (Reprinted 1961, vol. X, pp. 90-123). Also, Le May, *op. cit.*, Plate XXII, 5.



Instead of considering my interpretation of the data, Cresswell feels, "The only solution to this problem which commands any support is that the wheel mark represents the mint master who manufactured the coin". Surely, "... the different form of the wheel mark to be found on the outside of the leg beside the cut on some coins is readily explained as the "signature" of the official who carried out the second inspection of the coin". (p. 14) However, no evidence is presented to support this unusual theory.<sup>12</sup>

Ngon Hoi or 'flower money' in the form of large semi-flat discs of relatively pure silver are thought to be "... the only form of metallic money in use in South East Asia at a time when no such thing as national boundaries existed. These flat pieces of Ngon Hoi form the earliest coinage of South East Asia and from them were developed the domed pieces..." (p. 20) Used in the Thai kingdom of Lan Na (hence from the 14th century), the above statement is obviously false. Only one earlier example is needed to refute this; e.g. the flat 'Indian-type' coins found in Burma, Thailand and Cambodia. "... these coins are of very old age, probably dating back to the first centuries A.D."<sup>13</sup> That they were 'struck in India or Burma' remains unclear, but no exact counterparts in India are known. They are at least a thousand years earlier than the Ngon Hoi, and represent a medium of exchange accepted over the whole of Southeast Asia. About there being no 'national boundaries' at this time, one can only smile.

- 
- 12) He goes on to say, "Unfortunately, it is impossible to attribute individual marks to individual mint masters in the light of present knowledge but if this ever were possible then it would be possible to allocate a definite date to many of these coins". (p. 15) Le May never gives any indication that such a system existed in Thailand or Southern China. Considering the conditions they were working under it is unlikely that a 'double-stamping' check was ever adopted.
- 13) U. Guehler, "Symbols and Marks of Old Siamese Coins," *J.S.S.*, vol. XXXVII, Part 2 (1949), pp. 124-43. (Reprinted 1961, vol. X, pp. 124-48) And, E.H. Johnston, "Some Sanskrit Inscriptions of Arakan", *Bull. School of Oriental and African Studies*, vol. XI, Part 2 (1944), pp. 383-85. ('Early Coins of the Kings of Arakan').

Certain varieties of the Ngon Hoi appear with red and yellow stains on their surfaces. Kneedler believed them to be caused by the addition of egg yolk or chicken blood.<sup>14</sup> This long-held misconception has been corrected by Cresswell. "The stains appeared to be more in the nature of impurities in the metal rather than . . . yolk and blood". (p. 25) His method of testing the egg theory, however, does not hold together. "Not having any silver at my disposal, nor for that matter any means of melting it, I decided to carry out the experiments using lead, which has a sufficiently low melting point to make it a suitable substitute". In the first place, lead will not react with substances readily and so exhibits chemical properties entirely different from silver. The melting point is irrelevant. Normally, upon contact with the yolk of an egg, silver will tarnish due to the sulphur content. Animal blood is highly corrosive and might have some effect. The only way for the colors to remain the same (red and yellow) no reaction (oxidation) could have taken place, being merely mixed with the molten metal. Unless one is working under very controlled conditions, that is not very likely. Impurities in the silver are a probable cause of the color change.

In attempting to date the Lat coinage of Lan Chang (which is essentially a flat bar of metal, often referred to as 'tiger tongue') Cresswell suggests, "... a tentative dating of each class, estimating the length of production of each class from its comparative commonness or rarity today". (p. 36) This idea was apparently derived from Le May and is critically examined by Guehler.<sup>15</sup>

Le May says: "The only indication I can give to its (each coin of the Ayuthia period) probable date, is the *frequency with which each is found today*". This to my opinion is an erroneous conclusion. The frequency with which each coin was found in le May's time and now a-days is according to my experience *entirely different*. And such a variable

- 
- 14) Kneedler, *op. cit.*, p. 4, "... like the other forms of Tok money to be described, (it) shows some yellow and brown, or red; the silver or alloy having been poured onto egg yolk or chicken blood in the process of manufacture."
- 15) U. Guehler, "Further Studies of Old Thai Coins," *J.S.S.*, vol. XXXV, Part 2 (1944), pp. 147-172. (Reprinted 1961, vol. X, pp. 29-69; c.f. p. 51).

frequency seems to me a very doubtful and uncertain indication as to the respective age, because any edition of coins may have, or almost certainly has, varied in its total issue. In addition: During the same reign several marks have apparently been issued in more than one edition, slightly varying from one another. Therefore a coin issued in small numbers during a short reign is probably more rare now than a coin issued in large numbers during an earlier and longer reign.

Earlier issues were also often melted to provide metal for new production; formerly common varieties might then suddenly become very rare.<sup>16</sup>

The early coinages of South East Asia present a field of peculiar difficulty for the student. Since the label "primitive" has been attached to them, they have been considered as unsuitable for serious study". (p. 5) Hopefully, popularizing work such as this will reverse the image. It must be emphasized that accuracy is just as important a goal, though. Oliver D. Cresswell has made an important contribution to Southeast Asian numismatics; it is unfortunate that the errors detract from its overall value. If revised in future editions, *Early Coinage of South East Asia* could well become the standard reference for the early coinages of Lan Na and Lan Chang.

*Robert Wicks*

*University of Washington,  
Seattle*

---

16) Cresswell omitted an important though rare type of Lat money from his discussion. Guehler (1948), Plate V, 7 illustrates an example with a 'nob' impressed with the chakra wheel. "This coin has been recently discovered and is known so far in two specimens. It belongs to the various kinds of "lat" money . . . The coin weighs 118 gm. It is stamped on the obverse with an elephant on four places and with a chakra wheel on the little handle. On the reverse there are three stamps of the chakra wheel." (Reprint, vol. X, p. 117.)

