

**Das Heilige Bildnis: Skulpturen aus Thailand**  
**The Sacred Image: Sculptures from Thailand**

*by Piriya Krairiksh; photographs by Brian Brake*

*produced for the exhibition organized by the Museum for East-Asian Art of the City of Cologne, in collaboration with the Department of Fine Arts and the National Museum, Bangkok, 1979-1980*

*in German and English; Museum für Ostasiatische Kunst, Museen der Stadt Köln, 1979; 247 pp., illus.*

At the beginning of the book there is a mention of HM the King of Thailand and HE the President of the Federal Republic of Germany as patrons of the exhibition, followed by the names of the Honorary Committee and the Working Committee. Then come three prefaces: the first is by the Director-General of the Fine Arts Department of Thailand, who introduces this travelling exhibition. The second preface is by Mrs. Chira Chongkol, Director of Thai National Museums. It comes as rather a surprise that Mrs. Chongkol states that every sculpture in this exhibition belongs to the National Museums system of Thailand except a single piece which has graciously been lent by HM the King. One sculpture (no. 53) belongs to the James Thompson private collection and has been totally ignored. Although Mrs. Chongkol writes as if she agrees with Dr. Krairiksh's opinion in classifying the visual arts in Thailand into four groups, namely that in southern Thailand, the Mon, the Khmer and the Thai arts, finally she acknowledges that Thai people "shared in the artistic endeavours of the people [in Thailand] throughout all periods". The final preface is by Dr. Roger Goepper, the Director of the Museum of East Asian Art, Cologne, who supervised the arrangements for this travelling Thai exhibition in West Germany. Dr. Goepper refers to the last Thai art exhibition in Germany in 1963, and does not thank the James Thompson collection for its loan. He expresses approval of the new categorization of Thai art into four groups by Dr. Krairiksh.

Then follows the introduction by Dr. Krairiksh on the "Sacred Image" theme, in which he explains the principles of Buddhism and the acquisition of merit in having Buddha images created. Dr. Krairiksh describes the history of Buddha and Hindu images in Thailand, the latter being fewer in number. He goes on to say that "a prime example [in creating a Buddha image] is the ceremony to invite the spirit of the Buddha to reside in the new image. Once an image is invested with an inner life, it acquires a character or identity of its own." (Here Dr. Krairiksh should have also explained that the miracles performed by a Buddha image or a *stūpa* according to the old Thai tradition occurred through divinities guarding that Buddha image or *stūpa* but not by the Buddha himself nor by his relics.) Later Dr. Krairiksh explains how the Buddha image should properly be worshipped.

The subsequent section is on "charms and amulets" and the "image-making" process which involves the pseudoscience of astrology. The writer also comments on the difference between Buddha images made for the tourist trade and for worship. Then arrives the "aesthetic aspects" and the creation of Buddha images which depends on the wish of the owner or the vogue of the period.

Lastly Dr. Krairiksh refers to his previously published recategorization of the visual arts in Thailand into four groups, as mentioned above, which follow geographical and ethnic lines. In "A summary of sculptural styles in Thailand", Dr. Krairiksh describes the four geographical divisions of Thailand: the central, the northern, the northeastern and the southern parts.

In the central part, there were three successive civilizations: Mon, Khmer and Thai. The Mon culture developed because of agriculture and overseas trade from about the sixth to the tenth century A.D. The Khmer which had lived around the Tonle Sap ('Great Lake') in Cambodia expanded its power into present-day Thailand around the middle of the tenth century, and in the beginning of the eleventh century controlled the central part of Thailand with the town of Lop Buri as their centre. The Thai, who began to make their appearance in inscriptions about the middle of the eleventh century, proclaimed their independence at the town of Sukhothai in the middle of the thirteenth century. The kingdom of Ayutthaya was founded in A.D. 1350, and later on expanded its power to cover the whole of Thailand.

In the northern part of Thailand the mountains had been inhabited by the Lawā people and other mountain tribes. Later on the Mon people from Lop Buri migrated to found the Haripuñjaya kingdom at the town of Lamphun. Inscriptions show that the Mon kingdom at Lamphun prospered from the eleventh to the end of the thirteenth century and was outside the Khmer political orbit. The Thai people moved south from southeastern China and declared their independence in the upper tributaries of the Chao Phraya River: the Ping, Wang, Yom and Nan. The Lān Nā (northern Thai) kingdom was set up in the late thirteenth century, and was destroyed by the Burmese in 1556.

In the northeastern part of Thailand there are two important rivers, the Chi and the Mun. Dr. Krairiksh expounds that the junction of the Chi and the Mun had been the cradle of the Khmer people who later on moved down south and settled along the northern shore of the Great Lake in Cambodia. They usually dug reservoirs for their irrigation. Later on they moved north and in the middle of the tenth century replaced the Mon in the Chi valley (**an opinion which still requires evidence to support**). The Khmer successively expanded their power up the Mekong River until they could subjugate the Thai on the upper valley of that river.

The Ayutthayan kingdom was able to capture Angkor, the capital of the Khmer empire, twice during the second half of the fourteenth century. In 1431 it was captured again. The Khmer then migrated to the south of the Great Lake and founded Phnom Penh as their capital. (**In reality they stopped at Phnom Penh for a short while and then moved on to Lovek.**)

In referring to southern or Peninsular Thailand Dr. Krairiksh means the area south of the

Isthmus of Kra on the Malay Peninsula where the original population were Mon, Khmer and Proto-Malay (**the Mon and Khmer are still rather doubtful**). The most prosperous period of this area fell between the sixth century A.D. down to the late thirteenth century. This part later on became the vassal state of the Sukhothai and Ayutthaya kingdoms, and the local population began to intermarry with the Thai people.

On a basis as summarized above, Dr. Krairiksh divides the arts in Thailand into the following categories :

*Peninsular styles :*

south 4th to 13th century A.D.

*Mon styles:*

centre 6th to 10th century A.D.

northeast 8th to 10th century A.D.

north 10th to 13th century A.D.

*Khmer styles:*

northeast 6th to 14th century A.D.

centre 10th to 13th century A.D.

*Thai styles:*

Lān Nā (north) 13th to 19th century A.D.

Sukhothai (north-centre) 13th to 15th century A.D.

Lop Buri (centre) 13th to 14th century A.D.

Suphan Buri-Sankhaburi 13th to 14th century A.D.

(west-centre)

Ayutthaya (centre) 14th to 18th century A.D.

Ratanakosin (centre) 18th century to the present

One can perceive that in this classification, Dr. Krairiksh has modified his former opinions as expressed in the book entitled *Art Styles in Thailand, a Selection from National Provincial Museums*, published in 1977 and reviewed by Professor H.G. Quaritch Wales and this reviewer in the *Journal of the Siam Society* (vol. 66 pt.2, July 1978). He has adopted under Thai styles the Lop Buri and Suphan Buri-Sankhaburi schools, the latter being equivalent to the former U Thong art style.

Next comes the description of each artistic group, beginning with 'Peninsular styles' in southern Thailand. Dr. Krairiksh postulates that the earliest Indian artistic influence began in southern Thailand and then expanded to central Thailand and southern Cambodia. (**It is rather surprising that here Dr. Krairiksh compares the Buddhist votive tablet found in a cave at Krabi Province with the bronze Buddha image discovered at Sungai Kolok, Narathiwat, although the Buddha on the votive tablet wears a monastic dress in the Gupta style [4th - 6th century] and the bronze Buddha that of Amarāvati art [2nd - 4th century].**) Dr. Krairiksh observes that artistic influence from India in southern Thailand came from both the southern and central parts of India. The latter belongs to Gupta art from Sārnāth but from about the middle of the seventh to the twelfth century the successive influences of the Mon, Pāla and Cham arts

appeared. This period can be classified as the second phase of the Peninsular styles, and at Chaiya or Grāhi in southern Thailand there appeared these three continuing art forms. **(It is here not clearly convincing why Dr. Krairiksh classifies the image of Padmapāṇi Bodhisattva [fig. 5] which is sparsely decorated to post date to the statue of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva which is more profusely decorated and was discovered at Wat Phra Baromathat, Chaiya. Dr. Krairiksh places the Padmapāṇi Bodhisattva [fig. 5] in the second artistic period of Chaiya, and dates the image about the beginning of the ninth century.)** As for the Cham influence Dr. Krairiksh cites as an example the clay Buddha image seated in European style with legs hanging down at Wat Tham Kuha, Kanchanadit District, Surat Thani Province.

The third phase of the Peninsular styles at Chaiya is characterized by the bronze Buddha image subduing Māra under Nāga of Grāhi which according to Dr. Krairiksh shows the combination of the Mon, Khmer, Pāla and local arts. **(For this Buddha image the reviewer can only detect the Khmer art mixed with the local style.)** This art form persisted at Chaiya though after it had been amalgamated into the Sukhothai kingdom in the early fourteenth century.

Apart from Chaiya Dr. Krairiksh says that other sites in southern Thailand produced only few *objets d'art* such as images of the four-armed Vishṇu wearing a cylindrical hat, which can be divided into three groups. **(Here the reviewer would like to express his opinion that the images of Vishṇu wearing a diagonal cloth/scarf over the thigh is probably earlier than those wearing a horizontal one, as the former resemble more the Indian prototype.)** Sites in such areas as Phunphin District in Surat Thani on the Bay of Ban Don probably date from the sixth to eighth century.

Dr. Piriya expounds that the town of Nakhon Si Thammarat also produced ancient art objects, such as the image of Vishṇu holding a conch on the left hip like that at Chaiya which dates to about the fifth century. At Tha Sala District a Vishṇu image resembling the Harihara image of the Funan kingdom was also discovered and probably dates to the same period of the sixth century. **(Here it should be added that Professor Wales, basing his theory on the excavations and ceramics found at Nakhon Si Thammarat, holds the idea that this town does not antedate the eleventh century and that the earlier sculptures were probably removed from some other sites.)** Dr. Krairiksh also believes that the inscription no. 23 which is considered to have come from Wat Sema Muang, Nakhon Si Thammarat really came from that site, and expresses his surprise that no Buddhist sculptures in the art style that he groups as the second phase of Chaiya between the eighth and ninth century were ever discovered at Nakhon Si Thammarat. **(If Dr. Krairiksh believes like certain other Thai that this inscription might have originated from Chaiya, his surprise then might be unnecessary.)** Dr. Krairiksh also refers to Sathing Phra District in the Province of Songkhla (Singora) where there exist sculptures in Mahāyāna Buddhism which resemble strongly Javanese art from the eighth to the tenth century. **(On this point Professor Wales has also the same opinion that the town of Sathing Phra probably developed in the eleventh century and that the small bronze sculptures discovered there were brought from some earlier sites.)**

Apart from the above-mentioned sculptures there are still foreign sculptures or imitations of foreign arts in southern Thailand such as the images of Vishṇu and his two attendants at

Takua Pa which show the Indian Pallava influence of the ninth century and those of Chola art in the tenth to eleventh century.

For this section the reviewer agrees with Dr. Krairiksh in using the epithet 'Peninsular styles', if he refers to all the arts discovered in southern Thailand. The reviewer however disagrees with Dr. Krairiksh when he writes at the end of this section that the word Śrīvijayan art is inappropriate because it has been used only for the Mahāyāna Buddhist art in southern Thailand from the seventh to the thirteenth century. The reviewer has already pointed out several times that the word Śrīvijayan art has been used to cover the antiquities in both Buddhism and Hinduism discovered in southern Thailand when the kingdom of Śrīvijaya was still in power.

*Mon art.* Dr. Krairiksh explains that since it has not been known for certain where the centre of the Dvāravatī kingdom was in central Thailand (it has now been more or less accepted that the centre was probably at the old town of Nakhon Pathom, east of Phra Pathom Chedi) and since its history has not been well understood either, it is more appropriate to change the name of 'Dvāravatī' art into 'Mon styles' in order to cover all the arts of the same characteristics and produced at various sites in Thailand from the sixth to the tenth century. (This reviewer thinks it should be extended down to the eleventh century.) Dr. Krairiksh believes that there were many independent Mon states in Thailand, and that the apex of Mon art in central Thailand was probably between the seventh and eighth century. He refers to the stone Wheel of the Law in Dvāravatī art and explains that the designs carved on the middle of their rim can be divided into six styles, the earliest one being the nearest to Indian art. Then Dr. Krairiksh classifies the characteristics of Mon Buddha images into the three styles of Lop Buri, of Nakhon Pathom and of U Thong (which should be checked for appropriateness). He then mentions the Vishṇu images in Mon art such as those found at Dong Si Maha Phot, Prachin Buri, eastern Thailand. (These Hindu images the reviewer always classifies apart from Dvāravatī art, as their facial features do not at all resemble the middle phase of the Mon Buddha images which show native characteristics.)

Dr. Krairiksh says that at about the end of the eighth century Mon art in central Thailand declined, but early in the eighth century Mon art appeared at Si Thep and Sukhothai. (The latter site is very doubtful, although two large stone Dvāravatī Buddha images have been there found; they might have been moved up from central Thailand during the Sukhothai period.) Mon art also spread to northeastern Thailand.

In the ninth century the Chi valley in northeastern Thailand fell under Mon cultural influence. The best known sculptures are from Muang Fa Daed in Kalasin Province. About the early tenth century Mon cultural influence in northeastern Thailand began to be replaced by that of the Khmer civilization. At the end of the tenth century the whole of northeastern Thailand was dominated both politically and culturally by the Khmers.

In central Thailand ancient Mon cultural centres such as at U Thong were abandoned. Some sites such as Lop Buri became Khmer centres. In the early eleventh century the Mon lost central Thailand to the Khmer, and limited themselves at the town of Lamphun in the Haripuñjaya kingdom in northern Thailand which became the centre of Mon culture in

Thailand for 200 years afterwards. This is the last period of the Mon before Thai political domination. Haripuñjayan art is a combination of the late Mon artistic expressions from central and northeastern Thailand, with some influences of the Pāla art from northeastern India.

Though this reviewer agrees with Dr. Krairiksh in many respects concerning the Mon period, he disagrees with the latter in changing the name of 'Dvāravatī art' into 'Mon art' as he can see no advantage in making such a change. Moreover the reviewer thinks that the dates of the Mon (Dvāravatī) art attributed by Dr. Krairiksh to various sites in Thailand are also of too early and too short a period.

*Khmer art.* Dr. Krairiksh begins by describing Khmer art in Cambodia, and cites the division of the Khmer art into many styles by Professor Jean Boisselier which can be used with the chronology of Khmer art in Thailand. He then refers to sculptures at Si Thep which fell under the Khmer empire from about the end of the sixth century, and says that Vishṇu images at Si Thep in northern central Thailand resemble more the Vishṇu statues of Khmer pre-Angkorian period than in the Mon art. **(Here one must not forget that at Si Thep have been discovered a large stone Wheel of the Law and Dvāravatī [Mon] Buddha images. Therefore if one will use the ethnic definition of Dr. Krairiksh, one has to refer to the Mon-Khmer or Khmer-Mon art and probably soon will follow the Indian-Mon, Indian-Khmer and Mon-Thai styles.)**

Dr. Krairiksh follows with Khmer statues of different periods found in Thailand: (a) from about the early eighth to the early ninth century, bronze images in Kompong Preah style in northeastern Thailand; (b) from the early ninth to the middle of the tenth century, the Khmer influence became stronger and many Khmer statues dating back to the early tenth century have been found in northeastern Thailand; (c) during the Khmer art of Khleang style (c. 965-1010) and that of Baphuon (c. 1010-1080) many Khmer images also appeared in the same area. Dr. Krairiksh mentions the Phimai temple which dates back to the early twelfth century and explains that here originated the Khmer crowned Buddha image. Most of the Khmer sculptures discovered in Thailand of this Angkor Wat period (1100-1175) are of bronze. The most important finds are five stone torsos of divinities unearthed at Ta Pha Daeng shrine in the old town of Sukhothai, which Dr. Krairiksh says are the combination of the Khmer Angkor Wat and the Bayon styles (the latter dating from c. 1177 to 1230). Then he continues with the Khmer Bayon style during the time of Jayavarman VII, the last great monarch of the Khmer empire.

At the end of this section, Dr. Krairiksh explains his disagreement with calling the Khmer art in Thailand during this period 'Lop Buri art' and to date it between the seventh and the fourteenth century, because it will be confused with the Mon art at the town of Lop Buri from the seventh to the tenth century. On this point the reviewer agrees if the Khmer antiquities found in Thailand will be termed as 'Khmer art in Thailand' and if it is also accepted that there exist certain discrepancies between it and 'Khmer art in Cambodia'. However this reviewer disagrees with certain datings of Khmer sculptures in Thailand in this catalogue by Dr. Krairiksh. This will be explained when we arrive at the pictures at the end of the catalogue.

*Thai styles.* Dr. Krairiksh subdivides 'Thai art' styles, beginning with Lān Nā art. He

explains that the early Lān Nā art or northern Thai style received influences from the Indian Pāla-Sena style and Khmer art from central Thailand. Then it was divided into two groups: that of early Chiang Saen and that of later Chiang Saen or Chiang Mai. Dr. Krairiksh disbelieves that the early Chiang Saen Buddha images date back to the eleventh century. According to him they probably originated from about the end of the thirteenth century and the late Chiang Saen Buddha statues would begin around the fifteenth century. He believes that the Sukhothai influence on Lān Nā art probably travelled northward at the same time as the arrival of Pra Sumana Thera, a Buddhist monk, at the town of Lamphun in 1369 and when King Tiloka of Chiang Mai captured the town of Sawankhalok in 1460. After the Burmese army had taken the town of Chiang Mai in 1556, Lān Nā art declined. Bronze sculptures gave way to wooden images. Although there was a revival of Lān Nā art in the nineteenth and twentieth century, the former religious zeal had already disappeared.

Dr. Krairiksh disbelieves that the town of Chiang Saen has ever been an important town in northern Thailand. According to him the important northern centre in Thailand is probably Chiang Mai, as Chiang Saen was only founded in 1327 and became the centre of art production only in the fifteenth century. Therefore he uses the term Lān Nā art to cover all the styles in northern Thailand before the land became amalgamated with the rest of the country in 1897. (Now it is believed, following the newly deciphered Sukhothai inscription no. 2, that the realm of King Si Nao Nam Thom of Sukhothai, the father of King Pha Muang, expanded in the north to the town of Chiang Saen. The town, therefore, should have already existed at least from the middle of the thirteenth century.)

*Sukhothai art.* Dr. Krairiksh agrees that early Sukhothai art was influenced by the early Chiang Saen style. Apart from this mixed style, which is exemplified in the 'Wat Ta Kuan group', there are three others which are the 'general group', the Kamphaeng Phet and the Phra Buddha Jinnārāja schools. For these four groups Dr. Krairiksh believes that only the Phra Buddha Jinnārāja school can be classified for certain. The other three groups have either too few specimens or too many, the last category being the general group. (It is sincerely hoped that one day Dr. Krairiksh might be able to accomplish a better classification of Sukhothai art.) He further says that at the present time the dating of Sukhothai Buddha images cannot be known for certain. He then discusses the seated, reclining, standing and walking Buddha images in Sukhothai art as well as Hindu images and Sangkhalok (Sawankhalok) ware. Sukhothai art also influenced the late Lān Nā and Ayutthayan styles, and the Sukhothai esthetic has since become very popular.

*Lop Buri art.* Dr. Krairiksh explains what he means by the term Lop Buri art, which is the art at the town of Lop Buri and at other Khmer sites in Thailand which shows Khmer influence and was produced during the transitional period between the decline of Khmer art in Thailand, from about 1230 to the development of Ayutthayan art. Buddha images of Lop Buri art reflect the influence of the Khmer Bayon style. One of the characteristics is to wear the monastic dress, but also wearing a diadem. The *ushnisha* (cranial protuberance) is decorated with superimposed lotus petals. Another characteristic is a leaf-shaped diadem which derived from the Indian Pāla school. The attitude of subduing Māra replaced that of meditation.

In the opinion of this reviewer, Dr. Krairiksh's consideration of Lop Buri art as part of Khmer art in Thailand, by acceptance of some differences between Khmer art produced in Cambodia and Lop Buri art which bears more than local influence, might be acceptable at least during this present period.

*Suphan Buri-Sankhaburi art.* This term is used by Dr. Krairiksh as a substitute for the former U Thong designation. He explains that since Buddha images of the first phase of U Thong style which show the mixture of Mon and Khmer influences were mostly found in the Province of Suphan Buri, he prefers to use the term Suphan Buri art for this group of Buddha statues. As for those of the second phase which display strong Khmer characteristics and have a flame-like halo on top of the head, their provenance is mostly from the town of Sankhaburi. Therefore the term Sankhaburi art is preferred for this group. **(In the opinion of this reviewer, these two provenances should be checked first whether they really produced most of the U Thong Buddha images of the first and second groups.)** As for the U Thong Buddha images of the third group which reveal Sukhothai influence, Dr. Krairiksh thinks that since they were produced during the Ayutthayan period, they need not have a separate name. **(One should, however, be reminded that this last group also possesses the permanent characteristics of the U Thong style: a small band on the forehead and a base that curves inward.)**

This division of Dr. Krairiksh is totally different from what he outlined in *Art Styles in Thailand* in 1977. In that volume Dr. Krairiksh included the total U Thong style with Ayutthayan art, and the reviewer has already expressed his disagreement in the *Journal of the Siam Society*, volume 66, part 2. Dr. Krairiksh has since changed his classification, in what might be a suitable compromise.

*Ayutthayan art.* For Ayutthaya-period art, Dr. Krairiksh has followed the former division of Ayutthayan artistic expression into four or three periods. The reviewer therefore omits a review of this section.

*Ratanakosin, or Bangkok art.* For Bangkok art Dr. Krairiksh shares the same ideas as former writers; so the reviewer chooses not to discuss this section. Dr. Krairiksh writes that "with the acceptance of Western ideas and technology around the middle of the nineteenth century A.D., the inspiration of traditional religious art died. Western materialism was not the cause of its death—the origins may be found in the decline of religion during the last phase of the Ayutthayan kingdom. However hard the early Chakri kings may have tried to revive the religion among the people and in the arts, they could only resurrect its outward appearance. The fervour that had once motivated the creative spirit had long since dissipated." **(This statement might contain some truth, but is probably not entirely true.)**

After this section there are a coloured plan defining the dates of various art styles at different sites in Thailand, a map of Thailand and 17 coloured pictures. Then follow the black-and-



white photographs of the exhibited sculptures accompanied by individual descriptions. Here the reviewer mentions only those examples with which he disagrees or to which he would like to add some information.

*Figure 1.* Dr. Krairiksh explains that Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva means the "lord who looks down from above", but certain scholars such as Mlle. de Mallmann defines him as "the luminous lord". Dr. Krairiksh also says that this bronze image is the earliest sculpture of Avalokiteśvara in Thailand. The reviewer is not so sure about this statement, and the date given by Dr. Krairiksh, i.e. late sixth century A.D., might be too early. What he describes as *yajñopavīta* (a sacred thread) might be simply a shawl.

*Figure 2.* The period of late in the sixth century A.D. is probably too early a dating. Although this image resembles the stone statue of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva in the Sārnāth Museum in India, the latter does not possess such a high chignon.

*Figure 3.* The date of this stone Buddha image is probably later than the sixth century A.D.

*Figure 4.* This image, if it indeed evolves from the statue of Vishṇu with the hands on the hips, should also be later than the sixth century A.D.

*Figure 5.* It is difficult to understand why Dr. Krairiksh dates this image to early in the ninth century A.D., because the ornaments are still very few in number. If one compares this image to figure 8 which wears full ornaments and is dated by Dr. Krairiksh to the tenth century A.D., one notices a vast difference. The reviewer thinks that this figure 5 might date back to the seventh or eighth century when the Indian Gupta style was amalgamated with the local elements. It is also hard to understand what Dr. Krairiksh means in stating that "the Chaiya style is distinguished by the preference for enrobing the Buddha in a *sarong* instead of the *dhōṭī*". A look into his glossary at the end of the book shows that the meanings of the two words are more or less the same.

*Figure 7.* In *Art Styles in Thailand* Dr. Krairiksh dates this image to the twelfth century A.D. and the reviewer has objected to his dating by saying that this image should be dated around the fourth or fifth century because it shows the mixture of Indian Amarāvātī and Gupta styles. Now Dr. Krairiksh has stepped up the date of this image to the ninth century A.D. which is preferable to the first dating.

*Figure 9.* The reviewer disagrees with the grouping of the image of Vishṇu wearing a cylindrical hat with Dvāravātī or Mon art as mentioned above, though sometimes the two types of statues have been found in the same area. This figure 9, Dr. Krairiksh says, appears to be the latest in the series of 'group A' wearing a horizontal scarf; therefore the date should be later than the seventh century A.D.

*Figure 10.* It was formerly believed that this tray was made of clay, and therefore could have been a toilet set. Now it is considered to be of stone, so it could have been a tray for foundation deposits as Dr. Krairiksh has suggested. In either case the reviewer disagrees with him in the interpretation of the carved scene as the Churning of the Milk Ocean. The reviewer thinks it only means fecundity and prosperity. For the pot with the cord decoration in the

centre need not be a nectar receptacle, as an Indian *pūrṇaḥaṭa* (pot of prosperity) is always ornamented with such a design. Moreover, what Dr. Krairiksh describes as a turtle is in reality a fish as evinced by its tail, fin and scales, especially in the example on the right of the tray. Śrī, the goddess of fortune seated on top of the blooming lotus, has already a characteristic Dvāravatī face. This tray, therefore, should be dated around the eighth to ninth century, rather than the seventh.

*Figure 11.* This stone Wheel of the Law is carved with a design totally different from that of the Indian Gupta and post-Gupta styles, *viz.* a lozenge intersected with a floral motif and short, curled foliage. Therefore its date does not belong late in the seventh century A.D., but should be the eighth or the ninth.

*Figure 12.* This terracotta head should be compared to the face of Umā in the large figure of Maheśvaramurti on the island of Elephanta in India, from the early post-Gupta style (about sixth century A.D.), as both are wearing the same type of short pendants in their hair.

*Figure 13.* This stone standing Buddha has already a characteristic Dvāravatī face and is also standing erect. Therefore its date should be about the eighth century.

*Figure 14.* The reviewer thinks this stucco scene should belong to the eighth or ninth century A.D.

*Figure 15.* This terracotta image should also be dated around the eighth or ninth century A.D. It should also be explained that the attitude of meditation by placing the left hand over the right one is wrong, which might have originated from the fault in the carving of the mould.

*Figure 16.* This image should also be dated around the ninth to tenth century A.D.

*Figure 21.* Since a large stone Wheel of the Law and a stone Dvāravatī Buddha image have also been discovered at the town of Si Thep, the sculptures at Si Thep if classified after Dr. Krairiksh's new scheme should have been termed Mon-Khmer or Khmer-Mon style.

*Figure 22.* It is not comprehensible why Dr. Krairiksh should say that this image is wearing a *sambāt* or *sampot*. The garment is in reality a short piece of cloth wrapped around the body and tied with a plain cord in an ascetic manner.

*Figure 24.* At its back this image has the end of the robe tucked in the form of a butterfly motif. Therefore it should be considered in the Khmer Baphuon style (c. 11th century A.D.)

*Figure 26.* As this small bronze image has a long piece of cloth hanging in front of the body and was discovered at Phimai temple, its date should belong to the early Khmer Angkor Wat style, not to the Baphuon. Dr. Krairiksh has moreover dated it to early in the twelfth century A.D., which is the transitional period between the Baphuon and Angkor Wat styles.

*Figure 27.* This image should also belong to the late Baphuon style or the early Angkor Wat period.

*Figure 29.* The reviewer totally disagrees with Dr. Krairiksh in classifying this stone Buddha image as "Khmer: Bayon period, Angkor Wat style" as that would create great con-

fusion in spite of the clear definitions by French scholars of Khmer art styles. The reviewer thinks that though the image belongs to the transitional period, if it still retains many Angkor Wat characteristics it should be classified as late Angkor Wat style. If the Bayon characteristics are more evident, then it should be termed early Bayon style. But the two names should not be conjoined in coining a different style.

The Buddha sat down to meditate and the Nāga Muchalinda came up to protect him from the rain after the Buddha had attained his Enlightenment for 35 days, not 42 days.

*Figure 30.* This stone torso of a goddess belongs to the late Angkor Wat style instead of "Bayon period, Angkor Wat style". The reviewer cannot accept the statement of Dr. Krairiksh that an image with a presumed likeness of Jayavarman VII has been found at Sukhothai. If he means a stone sculpture that was discovered at Wat Phra Pai Luang and is now preserved in the Ram Kamhaeng National Museum, that statue is a Buddha image in meditation unlike the portrait of Jayavarman VII such as the one found at Phimai.

*Figure 36.* The reviewer thinks that this bronze Buddha Haripuñjaya Bodhisattva was made later than late in the thirteenth or early in the fourteenth century A.D. as dated by Dr. Krairiksh. Although the statue displays the Indian Pāla influence, it is quite far removed from its prototype in such details as the flame-like halo which derives from the Sukhothai style, the difference of the design on the diadem and especially the stylized cloth motif on both sides of the ears. This reviewer would prefer to date it between the fifteenth and sixteenth century.

*Figure 41.* According to the chronicle by Luang Prasert, the most reliable for the Ayutthayan period, the Burmese army attacked Ayutthaya for the first time in 1548, not in 1558, and the event did not concern the request for the albino elephants. The demand for such elephants occurred later on. It might also be worth suggesting that the pot on the elephant's back could be a receptacle for the Buddha's relics.

*Figure 48.* This reviewer thinks that Umā wears two pieces of cloth. The frontal one has the upper end inserted underneath the jewelled belt and then hangs down over it. The lower end is divided into two parts, each part hanging down over each leg in a zigzag design. It is presumably not a cloth belt.

*Figure 49.* The inverted lotus-bud earrings of this temple guardian can be reckoned as having derived from Khmer art.

*Figure 53.* It should also be explained that the diadem, earrings and the monastic dress of this crowned Buddha image derived from Indian Pāla art, through the Khmer Bayon style.

*Figure 54.* Could the lifted index finger of the left hand of the Buddha have evolved from the stylized small bowl that the Buddha Bhaishajyaguru ('Buddha the Healer') holds in his hand in examples in the Khmer Bayon style?

*Figure 56.* This gold repoussé of the standing Buddha was found in the crypt of the main *prang* of Wat Ratchaburana which was built at Ayutthaya in 1424. Could this image have thus been made in the early fifteenth century, as quite a few of such examples have been found

nad King Borom Rachathirat II, the founder of Wat Ratchaburana, was also originally a native of the town of Suphan Buri?

*Figure 58.* The reviewer is not sure whether this stone head should belong to the early or late Ayutthayan style, the latter being probably late in the seventeenth century. Phra Ramesuan was sent by his father, King Ramathibodi I, to rule at the town of Lop Buri probably to protect the town against the Khmer empire rather than against the Sukhothai kingdom.

*Figure 64.* On the left of the pedestal of this Buddha image, the chief of Māra (evil spirits) might have already been converted into Buddhism as portrayed in some Thai mural paintings. Here the elephant of the king of Māra is lifting his trunk to the Buddha in the act of worship. This scene is also explained as a personification of the fighting in the mind of the Buddha whether he would go back to worldly pleasures or to continue his meditation until he would attain Enlightenment. At last he resolved to perform the latter act by pressing his right hand on his right knee.

*Figure 65.* It should be also explained that the dress of this bronze Lakshmī evolved from the dress of the Sukhothai bronze Hindu images. Dr. Krairiksh reports that this image wears "a belt with a double pendant", although such an appurtenance is simply not evident.

*Figure 67.* It should be mentioned that the two protruding parts above the ears are typical characteristics of the Ayutthayan crowned Buddha image.

*Figure 70.* Sometimes a Buddha image has a nine-tiered umbrella over his head, such as in the *ubosoth* of Wat Bovorn Nivet in Bangkok, because he is regarded as the Dharmarājā (King of the Law).

*Figure 71.* In his book *Art Styles in Thailand*, Dr. Krairiksh classified this image as belonging to the Ayutthayan style. This reviewer has objected. Now he has reassigned it to the Bangkok style, which concurs with the opinion of this reviewer.

Then follows the appendix on the consecration of a Thai Buddha image which is none other than the Buddha Paramāsayo of the grandfather of Dr. Krairiksh himself in 1917. This article describes in detail the ceremonial consecration of the Buddha image. Dr. Krairiksh fails to mention whether any ceremony was performed during the modelling of the Paramāsayo in wax.

Then come the drawings on various postures of sculptures, headgear, attitudes, attributes and the various modes of wearing a Buddhist monastic dress. After this section follows the glossary which unfortunately contains some errors such as Indra, lord of the 33 heavens and the Pāla as the Indian dynasty which ruled in northeastern India from the mid-eighth till the end of the ninth century. On page 148, figure 36, of the same book it is written "Indian art of

the Pāla-Sena period (mid-8th to late 12th centuries A.D.)". In *The Art of India* by C. Sivaramamurti, on page 559, Pāla art is defined as extending from 765 to 1175 A.D., and the Sena from 1095 to 1206 A.D. The Khmer word *sambāt* (*sampot*) should be explained in greater detail, and *trimūrtti* is probably misprinted. For *vajrāsana* the reviewer is not sure whether the word 'folded' or 'crossed' should be used.

At the end of the book there is a bibliography of both foreign and Thai books. The writer's acknowledgements appear, followed by the writer's biography and the contents of the book.

In short, in spite of some differences between the author and the reviewer and a few errors, this catalogue is still very useful in expanding the knowledge of history of art in Thailand to foreigners, and will make Thailand better known to the general public.

M.C. Subhadradis Diskul

Graduate School, Silpakorn University