

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

โบราณวัตถุสถานในสยามภาค ๒ และ ๓—หลวงบริบาลบุริบหาน์เรียบเรียง

Antiquities and ancient sites in Siam,

2nd and 3rd part by

Luang Boribal Buribhand

90 pages, 21 illustrations, Bangkok, 1934 & 1936.

The above-mentioned two parts constitute the continuation and conclusion of Luang Boribal Buribhand's Siamese Archaeology, part 1 of which has already been reviewed in the columns of the Journal of the Siam Society.<sup>(1)</sup> These two parts treat of Siamese art and architecture during the periods of Chiengsaen, Sukhothai and Ayudhya, and Bangkok. In the following review a brief mention of the contents of these parts accompanied by a few critical remarks will be given. Before doing so the writer of these notes would, however, like to plead not guilty on his own part at least to the charge against certain European writers preferred by Luang Vichitr Vada-karn, the Secretary General of the Royal Institute.

The Khun Luang says in his preface to the third part of Luang Boribal's Archaeology that prior to the conquest of Siam by the Khmer (and Môn) the Thai were not at all a barbarian people, as European writers like to pretend when they compare the Khmer empire to ancient Rome and the Thai to the Germanic barbarians who destroyed the classic civilisation. Students who are acquainted with the history of the Thai nation, especially the period of the Nan Chao empire, which perhaps represents the climax of Thai power, will, of course, not subscribe to the appellation of Barbarians to the Thai. According to Chinese chroniclers the Thai of the Nan Chao empire were a civilised people with an elaborate civil and military organization

(1) JSS, Vol. XXIX, part 2, pp. 162-168.

and, what shows the high stage of their social status, woman was free and respected, in glaring contrast to her despised and down-trodden position in contemporary civilized China. Luang Boribal takes the opportunity to include a brief sketch of the antecedents of the Thai people, their age-long wars of defence against the ever-encroaching Chinese and their subsequent migrations southwards into the present Shan states and Tongking and the seizure of what is now called Sib Song Panna and Sib Song Chu Thai (the word Chu is evidently a corruption of Chao, *i.e.*, the land of the twelve Thai chiefs).

The ancestors of the Thai of the Menam Plain and N. E. Siam seem all to have come from the north-east when King Phrom of Sib Song Chu Thai and his successors extended the Thai dominion over what is now French Laos, including the Mekhong valley with the old Khmer cities of Luang Phrabang and Viengchandr, as well as Northern Udorn and right over westwards to Petchabun and Chalieng (old Savankaloke). As a result of the Thai successes against the Khmer and Môn in the 13th century three strong Thai states emerged, *viz.*, Lan Nā Thai embracing the ancient Yonok of North Siam, Lan Nā Chang with its capital in Viengchandr, and Siam with its capital at Sukhothai. Chiengsaen was founded in A.D. 1328 by King Saen Phu of Chiengmai, and here developed during the 14th century the well known school of art which is characterized by the very fine images of the Buddha. The likeness in style of the Buddha images of Chiengsaen with those of contemporary Nakhon Srithammarat, due to their common inspiration of the Pāla art (of the 8th-12th century), has already been treated of in the review of Luang Boribal's book on the Phra Sihing image.

The oldest monument in North Siam is Wat Chedi Chet Yot lying on the plain west of Chiengmai on the site of the old Môn town, Mu'ang Maeraming. The style is that of Bodh Gaya, and Luang Boribal thinks that the great Burmese conqueror, King Aniruddha (in the 11th century), may have been instrumental in building it. This temple was restored 300 years later by the staunch leader of the Thai Yuan of Lan Nā Thai, King Dilokraja. There is, however, no actual proof that King Aniruddha ever conquered North Siam, so this monument may as well be due to the Môn of the Hariphunchai kingdom (Lamphun) who copied it from that in Pagān, which itself constitutes a copy of the actual Bodh Gaya temple. Most of the temples in North Siam have been "repaired" so many times that

they would not be recognized if now seen by their original builders. The few still fine monuments go back to the time of the great temple repairer King Dilokrajā (1442-1477), during whose reign Ceylonese art and religious culture dominated. In our days many, far too many, of the oldest and finest religious monuments in the North have been spoiled by zealous but ignorant monkish "architects," chief among them being the renowned Phra Srivichai.

Happily the Government has now stepped in and forbidden such "restorations" without the permission of the Royal Institute. Though the author does not say so, it seems reasonable to suppose that the Buddha image of the North (besides being influenced by Pāla art) must have taken certain features from the Môn art of Lamphun which no doubt represented an offshoot of the Dvāravati art of Lophburi. From the beginning of the 16th century, when the Burmese got the upperhand in North Siam, oppressing its population for more than 200 years, their style in temples, *chedis* and even in the images is clearly perceived. This Burmese influence was not for the good, the Northern Thai art degenerated into what was called "Lao" images and "Lao" *chedis*. The style of the Buddha images of Lān Nā Chāng must surely first of all have been influenced by Khmer art and next by that of Lān Nā Thai. Though a few fine examples may be found, the style of the images of this part of the Thai dominions is generally rather poor and inartistic.

To his treatment of Chiengsaen art Luang Boribal adds an interesting note on the coinage used during that period. He mentions the canoe-shaped coins of the Mekhong valley called Ngo'n Hāng, Tu, Hoi and Thong Lāt, both of silver and copper, which were used from Luang Phrabang in the north to Djampassak in the south, from the oldest times of the Thai occupation to quite recently. The smallest exchange was, as all over this part of the world, the cowrie shell. In Lān Nā Thai another kind of coinage was used, called Ngo'n Chieng, Kha or Kha Khim which was originally produced by pressing together the two halves of a Chinese silver bracelet. Besides these coinage silver bars were also used, as they still are to-day in the interior of China, where smaller change is produced by cutting bits off such bars.<sup>(1)</sup>

(1) For more detailed description of the various Thai coinage see Dr. R. S. le May's standard work "The Coinage of Siam," as well as Dr. Kneedlers' "The Coins of North Siam," JSS., vol. XXIX, pt. 1.

The conquest of the Nan Chao kingdom in 1254 by the armies of the great Kubilai Khan was indirectly the cause of the Thai uprising against their Khmer overlords and the foundation of the first independent Thai kingdom in Siam proper, about A. D. 1257.<sup>(1)</sup> The liberty-loving Thai of Nan Chao would not accept the Chinese rule and they emigrated southwards to the settlements of their brethren in Lān Nā Chāng. Thus reinforced the Thai dared revolt against the Great king in Angkhor Thom with the result that soon after not only most of the central and southern parts of the present kingdom of Siam became parts of the realm of the Ruang dynasty but the entire Malay peninsula, down to Johore and Malacca, became vassal to Siam.

We are not going to follow the author in his narrative about the two Thai vassals who united to overthrow the Khmer power nor in what finally happened to the Ruang dynasty as the hitherto accepted theories which are due to the learned research work by Professor George Coedès is at present being taken up for critical revision by two of our own *érudits*, namely, Phya Indra Montri (Mr. F. H. Giles) and Phya Nakhon Phra Ram,<sup>(2)</sup> so much the more as the title of Luang Boribal's books is Siamese Archaeology and not Siamese History.

The sacred architecture of Sukhothai and Savankaloke belong both to the Brahmanic and Buddhist religion. The first one is represented by various *prangs* or *prasats* in both of these cities and elsewhere. Necessarily Khmer architecture must have influenced the new born Thai architecture of the Sukhothai era very much. With regard to the most important class of Buddhist architecture:—the *phra chedis*, Luang Boribal divides them into three types: the true Sukhothai *chedi*, the Ceylonese *chedi* and a type evolved through a mixture of the Ceylonese and the Srivijaya *chedi*. The so-called pure Sukhothai *chedi* should, according to His Royal Highness Prince Damrong, have come to Siam from China to which country King Ramakhamheng is said to have made two voyages. This contention of the venerable learned prince is, however, open to grave doubts after Phya Nakhon Phra Ram has shown that the manufacture of

(1) This date may now be challenged by Mr. F. H. Giles in his forthcoming book on the history of the Sukhothai kingdom.

(2) When this was written Phya Nakhon Phra Ram was still with us; he has since died. His death was a sad loss to historical research work in this country.

pottery in old Siam was done by Thai long before there were any kilns at Savankaloke. We may go so far as to doubt that the Chinese were at all the inventors of glazed pottery. Several students of our day are coming more and more to the conclusion that the highly civilized and powerful Chu, which for hundreds of years was the rival of the Chinese Chou dynasty, represent the ancient Thai who may very well have invented the glazed pottery. The story of King Ramakhamheng leaving his country twice to make prolonged visits to the Chinese courts and bringing Chinese potters back with him has always seemed suspect to us. It seems more than improbable that a king in those turbulent days should dare to leave his country for such long periods. Think only of the long and perilous voyage by sea in a clumsy junk of those far off days—and then come safely back again to find his throne and the allegiance of his people intact? No! the story of King Ramakhamheng's voyages to China and the potters he brought back with him belong most probably to the world of fairy tales. The truth is that the potters of Savankaloke were Thai who came down from Lān Nā Thai. We do not therefore believe that the true Sukhothai *chedi* was modelled on a Chinese pattern. More comparative study of that particular form with contemporary *stupas* in Burma would most likely give us the key to its true origin. The *chedis* in Ceylonese style were probably not direct copies of those in Langka Dvipa but were brought to the Thai of Siam from the Môn country in Burma via the Môn principality of Lamphun. One misses in this book of Luang Boribal a description in the architectural sense of the various monuments enumerated. Instead of being a work on archaeology, as it should be, it has become more of a history of Buddhism and of Siam. There are too few technicalities. One would like to have heard something of the evolution of the *stupa* or *chedi*. How did the spire evolve for instance? Are the rings, still seen in the Ayudhya *chedis*, not representing the tiers of umbrellas of the original *stupas* in India? We believe so. Also the origin of the many tiered roofs and their carved *cho fās*; the trapezoid shape of the frames of the windows and doors of the *bōts* and *viharns*; the transformation of the Khmer tower into the solid Siamese *prang*; these and many more architectural details should have been treated and an attempt to solve the question of their origin and development have been made. In speaking about the third class of *chedis* of old Sukhothai—Savankaloke Luang Boribal thinks that this originated from

a blending of Ceylonese and Srivijaya styles using the cubic base of Srivijaya and the drum and spire of Ceylon. The niches containing Buddha images or being empty are also a Ceylonese trait (as seen in Wat Kukut in Lamphun).

The Buddha images of the Sukhothai era Luang Boribal divides into three types exemplified respectively by the images of Phra Attharos (the gigantic standing image in the viharn of Wat Sraket, Bangkok); Phra Ruang (the other gigantic standing image now seen in the northern viharn in Phrapathomchedi) and finally the Phra Buddha Chinaraaj and Chinasi (the first is still in situ in Wat Maha That in Pitsanuloke with a copy installed in Wat Benchamabopit, Bangkok). The faces of these images are different in character; in the first type they are round, copying the Singhalese images; in the second the faces are long. Of this second type more images were made than any other type. Luang Boribal thinks the type originated during King Phra Maha Thammaraja Lithai's reign. The third type has oval faces and no doubt represents the finest and highest development in Siamese art. Only few images were made with the noble features of the Phra Buddha Chinaraaj.

It must, however, be added that already during the Sukhothai era the stiff and unnatural characterized the Siamese images. This became even worse in the later Ayudhyan schools, if they may be called so. The idea of making all the fingers of equal length; the too projecting heels; the too long arms; the enormous upholstered shoulders all go to make these images very ugly and anatomically speaking faulty to a degree. To begin with, the Thai of Sukhothai tried to make stone images, of which a few are left, this they gave up soon and went in for casting metal images, an art in which they, as well as the Ayudhya Thai, proved very skilful indeed. Famous are the two walking bronze Buddhas now in the gallery of Wat Benchamabopit (mentioned in my review of Monsieur J. G. Claeys' "L'Archeologie du Siam" in JSS., Vol. XXVII, Pt. 1, 1933, p. 120) which though not beautiful in anyway show the attempt of the Thai to produce something original of their own, as they so far had *created* nothing in art or architecture, perhaps with the exception of their glazed pottery and their beautiful tiered roofs. The so-called Phra Prathān, i.e., the Buddha image built up of bricks and plaster is also a Thai product, most probably a copy of certain Khmer images which were constructed in a like manner but of fashioned sand stone.

The majority of the Buddha images seen in the temples of Bangkok such as Wat Sraket; Suthat; Chetuphon (Poh); Bovornivet; Benchamabophit and Mahathat to name the most important ones, hail from old ruined temples in Sukhothai, Savankaloke, Phitsanuloke, Kamphengphet, Lophburi, Ayudhya and Phetchaburi among others besides from Chiengsaen.

The two famous images, viz; Phra Kaeo Morakot and Phra Sihing are of course not of Thai handicraft. As far as we can surmise they both of them were made in Ceylon and go back to the 12th century A. D. The foot prints of the Buddha as well as the votive tablets of clay, metal or wax (Phra Phim) were well known during the Sukhothai era. Both of these forms for adoration of the great Sage from Benares hail from India. Of special interest are the many fine standing cast bronze images of Indian deities made by the Thai of Sukhothai-Kamphengphet down to as late as the beginning of the 16th century A. D., of which quite a number have been saved and are now exhibited in the large Hall of Honour in the National Museum. A rather unique collection, we think, and probably one of the finest at least east of Suez and of which Siam may be legitimately proud.

Luang Boribal also mentions Phra Thaen Manangsila, the stone on which sat good King Ramakhamheng, this patriarchal prince, when he received all and sundry, from the highest to the lowest of his subjects in audience. This famous stone is now a part of the royal throne and may thus be likened to the other famous stone of Scone, which is part of the British King-Emperor's coronation chair. The coinage of Sukhothai, as well as the famous porcelain from the kilns of Savankaloke, is also briefly treated by Luang Boribal, but for fuller information one ought to read the publications on those matters by such experts as Dr. R. S. le May and the late Phya Nakhon Phra Ram. Part III of Luang Boribal's Archæology is the least interesting, not due to any faults of the author, but because the forms of art and architecture during the 417 years of Ayudhya's existence as capital of Siam as a matter of fact offers little in the way of innovations from what the Thai had already produced during the Sukhothai and the Chiengsaen eras and certainly nothing which constituted a real improvement. The reason for this stagnation must be sought in the almost incessant wars fought first with Cambodia and then with Burma. While the wars and intercourse with the latter did not bring much in the way of cultural

elements to Siam, it was otherwise as regards Cambodia. When the Thai of the Menam plain by the middle of the 13th century cast off the yoke of the Khmer they were already strongly mixed with both Môn and Khmer blood, customs and manners. As a result of the long and successful wars with Cambodia, great numbers of Khmer captives were brought over to and settled in Siam at such places as Rajaburi; Bān Khamen in Nakhon Chaisri; Ayudhya and other places too.

This influx no doubt was responsible for an increased number of Khmer words being incorporated in what we to-day call King's Siam-ese, besides many ideas hitherto foreign to the Thai of the Menam valley. It also no doubt influenced the administrative system and machinery of the Ayudhya state and altered the whole conception of kingship. From being benevolent patriarchal rulers, to whom the broad populace had direct access, the kings now became divine beings and often cruel masters who no longer treated their subjects as children but as slaves. Such a form of social order might also influence the arts and discourage the free development of creative idea and artistic progress.

From the architectural point of view Luang Boribal divides the Ayudhya era into four periods. The first lasted 141 years from 1350 to 1491 from the foundation of Ayudhya as capital to the end of the reign of King Phra Boroma Trailokanart. and is characterized by the *prangs* built during that period, such as those at Wat Putthaisawan; Wat Phra Ram; Wat Maha That and Wat Rajaburana, all in Ayudhya, and the great *prangs* in Suphanburi and at Wat Mahathat in Phitsanuloke. Their model is said to have been the Khmer *prasat* tower of Wat Mahathat in Lophburi.

The next period spans over 140 years, from 1491 to 1630, this is the era of *stupas* or *chedis* such as in Wat Sri Sanphet; *Chedi Yai* or Wat Chaophraya Thai at Ayudhya and the famed *chedi* at Dorn Chedi, where the national hero Phra Naresuan Maharaja won his brilliant victory, on an elephant's back, over the Crown Prince of Burma. The *chedi* of this period are built on Ceylonese lines.

The third period lasted 102 years, from 1630 to 1732, it is characterized by a return to the building of *prangs* following the Cambodian style such as Wat Chai Watthanaram in Ayudhya and Phra Nakhon Luang on the banks of Menam Sak, between Ayudhya and Thā Rūa. The *chedi* of Wat Chumpon Nikayaram at Bang Pa In also belongs



to this period. During this time were also constructed the many buildings and fortresses in Bangkok, Ayudhya and especially in Lophburi which are due to the handiwork of French engineer officers in the service of King Narayana the Great. These engineers also built the city walls of Khorat or Nakhon Rajasima. The fourth and last period covers the space between 1732 and the tragic downfall of Ayudhya "the incomparable" brought about by the wanton and cruel Burmese in 1767. Luang Boribal says that this last period is characterized by the care and thoroughness with which all work is carried out. It was mainly a period of restoration of ruined or delapidated temples, even the ancient Wat Mahathat in Savankaloke benefitted by this zeal for repairs. No new styles were introduced with the exception of certain details of ornament. The author also gives a long list of the royal palaces and residences of Ayudhya, Lophburi and Phra Nakhon Luang but, as usual, without any architectural details. We may add that the present fine building, called Phra Thinang Dusit Maha Prasat in the Grand Palace compound, is said to be an exact copy of a palace of the same name in Ayudhya of which now only a few broken stones are left. The palace called Phra Thinang Chandraphisal, which to-day houses the Lophburi Museum, is also said to represent the original building in all its exterior details.

Speaking on the art forms of the Ayudhya era Luang Boribal says these included images of the Buddha; Boddhisatvas; preaching chairs; book cases; book chests and palm leaf manuscripts. Images of the Buddha of metal and of stone must have been produced by hundreds of thousands during the four hundred odd years of Ayudhya's existence as capital of Siam. Besides Ayudhya, Lophburi must have been a great centre and workshop of Buddhist images both in stone and metal. Famous are the Phra Nāk Prok or the Buddha enthroned on the Nāga of Lophburi handiwork (not mentioned by the author).

The oldest school was, however, the Uthong whose finely executed bronze images still show the marked influence of the Khmer. This foreign influence, if one may use such an expression, lasted till the end of the reign of Phra Boroma Trailokanart. After that time the Sukhothai style became the dominating one till the Bangkok era commenced—with the exception of the period during the reigns of King Prasat Thong and Narayana (1630-88) when the Cambodian style and the working in stone was encouraged again.

Typical examples of the Buddha images of the second period are the gigantic bronze statue of Phra Mongkol Bopitr in Ayudhya and the image now contained in the Eastern Viharn of Wat Chetuphon (Pho) in Bangkok. Wall paintings also belong to the Ayudhya period though we are not sure that there may not also have been frescoes on the walls of the now ruined temples of Sukhothai, Savankaloke and Kamphengphet. Whether this form of art was inspired by the cave paintings of Ajanta, as opined by Dr. Quaritch Wales, seems still somewhat doubtful. Remains of the wall pictures from the Ayudhya period are still seen in Wat Yai, Petchaburi; in Wat Maha That Mu'ang Thung Yang at Uttaradit and in the inner chamber of the great chedi in Wat Srisanphet, Ayudhya. The concluding chapter of the 3rd part of Luang Boribal's Archæology treats of the palaces and temples of Bangkok. As already said in our former review we think that such buildings are of too recent a date to enter the cadre of an archaeology and we shall therefore refrain from including this last chapter in our review. If one might be allowed to utter a wish it is this:—That Luang Boribal, who is not at all an unpromising writer, may, in a near future, find time to revise and complete this book of his. Our advice is to leave out all that of the history of Buddhism and of Siam which is not strictly necessary and instead add a much fuller *technical* description of the various monuments. By doing so we are sure that a much more satisfactory work could be produced, replacing the present somewhat sketchy pamphlets.

ERIK SEIDENFADEN.

Bangkok, April 1937.

ROBERT LINGAT—*L'Influence Indoue dans l'ancien droit siamois*. Les Editions Domat-Montchrestien, Paris, 29 pages.

Monsieur Robert Lingat, Doctor of Law, Judge of the Supreme Court of Siam and a Vice-President of the Siam Society, who is well known by his learned work on *L'esclavage privé dans le vieux droit siamois*, which most probably will become the standard work on that subject, has written a very interesting and instructive pamphlet treating Hindu influence in the ancient Siamese laws.

The author says that we know fairly well the contents of the ancient Siamese laws, *i.e.*, the laws which were in force during the

Ayudhya period, thanks to a code compiled in 1805. Some of them are still in force even to-day. A study of these laws shows that certain parts of them go back to the very beginning of the kingdom of Siam. It has already long ago been noted that the old Siamese laws as published in the Code of 1805, bear a clear imprint of Hindu influence, so for instance with regard to slaves of which this code recognizes seven different classes, the same number as given in the Laws of Manu. Further that the interest on loans may not exceed the amount of the capital besides many other concordances proving the near relationship between the ancient Laws of Siam and the Code of Manu.

The learned historian H. R. H. Prince Damrong fully endorses these views, but he ascribes them to a quite recent origin namely the conquest of Siam by the Burmese king Bureng Naung during the years 1569 to 1584. Mr. Wood, author of the excellent "A History of Siam," agrees with Prince Damrong, and the Siamese jurists have also adopted the views of His Royal Highness.

The author goes against the fixing of such a recent date for the introduction of the Hindu inspired laws of Siam and argues that the origin of the *Dharmaçastra* or Code inspired by the Laws of Manu is to be sought at a very much earlier date. His arguments are weighty and convincing. First of all why should the Burmese, in whose country the Laws of Manu were in force, impose such laws on the Siamese? The Burmese had at that time a rich legal literature such as *Dhammasatthams* composed in Pali or in their own language modelled on Indian *Dharmaçastras*. If they desired to impose on their vassals a new code of laws it would probably have been one of their own *Dhammasatthams*.

But even then it is not probable that the Siamese, once they had freed themselves from the yoke of their oppressors, would have retained a foreign law forced upon them.

Present day archaeological research work assists us, however, in arriving at another and more satisfactory solution.

After having explained briefly the contents of the introduction to the *Dharmaçastra* or Phra Thammasāt, Mr. Lingat points out that the Pali *gāthās* expressly state that this code in a *Môn* version came from Ramaññadesa to Siam where it was finally translated into Siamese. It therefore follows that the Siamese have never known the Hindu version of the *Dharmaçastra* but only its *Môn* version.

At the time of the Burmese conquest of Siam the Rāmaññadesa or Môn kingdom of Lower Burma had long ago been absorbed by the Burmese. It is not probable either that the victorious Burmese should have forced a Môn code on the Siamese vassals. Thanks to the penetrating studies undertaken by Professor G. Coedès we now know that about the 8th century A. D. there existed two large Môn kingdoms in Siam, a southern, embracing the Menam plain with its capital at Lophburi and, provisionally, called Dvaravati, and a northern, embracing most of the territory of the former months of Payab and Maharasthra with its capital at Hariphunchai or Lamphūn. The first of these kingdoms was conquered by the Khmer in the beginning of the 11th century. The Khmer, however, did not suppress the Môn civilisation and the Môn continued to profess their national religion, the Hinayana form of Buddhism.

The Thai immigrants, who entered the Menam plain (from the north-east), came on slowly and by degrees absorbed the aboriginal population, chiefly Môn, thereby being strongly influenced by their high culture.

It is well known that the Môn possessed a brilliant civilisation (probably prior to that of the Khmer). The Môn of Lower Burma, with their capital at Hamsavati, lost their independence for the first time in 1057 A. D. when the Burmese king Anuruddha conquered them, but it was *their* cultural gifts and old civilisation which transformed the rude barbarous Burmese into civilized men, and Pagān's splendid temples were also no doubt built by Môn architects and craftsmen. (It is not an exaggeration to state that the bulk of the population of Southern Burma to-day consists of Burmese speaking Môn; while in Siam, up to the time when the wholesale immigration of Chinese began, the population must have been 50% Môn plus a very strong infusion of Khmer blood. The present Môn population of Siam is not the descendants of the "Dvaravati" Môn but later comers, prisoners of war or fugitives from Burmese oppression. Their exact number is not known but the people *speaking* Môn do not probably exceed 40-50,000 individuals). There is Môn blood in the Royal family of Siam and many of its most distinguished soldiers and civil servants have been and are of Môn origin. It seems certain that, at the time the Thai entered the Menam valley, the Môn domiciled there already possessed a written code of laws whose origin was in India. The Siamese *Dharmaçāstra* or *Phra Thammasāt* is a Môn *Tham-*

*masatham*, which because of its Buddhist character was easily adopted by the Thai immigrants. It is thus incontestable that the Hindu influence in the ancient Siamese laws was due to Môn intermediary.

M. Lingat's arguments for a Môn origin of the *Dharmaçastra* are much strengthened by the discovery (in 1930) of an inscribed stela in Sukhothai giving a part of this code. The date is 1344 A. D., during the reign of King Lo'thai. It seems therefore more than likely that Ayudhya received its *Phra Thammasāt* from Sukhothai.

The *Dharmaçastras* are, of course, not real codes in the modern sense but rather natural laws or directives and are supposed to originate from half divine persons or *rishis* and must be studied in connection with the Vedas. As the Môn were Buddhists by religion, and not Brahmanists, their jurists, most of them monks, had to transform the *Dharmaçastra* into a Buddhist inspired code in which there was no place either for Brahmasvayambhu, the self-existing supreme Being, or Manu.

Besides the *Dharmaçastra* there existed both in old Burma and old Siam collections of laws called *Rajaçastras* or Royal commandments, but while the *Dharmaçastras* continued to be valid during the shifting reigns the *Rajaçastras* automatically ceased to exercise any power at the death of that particular king who had issued them.

The *Rajaçastra* was in fact a complement to the *Dharmaçastra*.

M. Lingat concludes his lucid and penetrating study of the old Siamese laws by aptly comparing the influence of the Hindu codes with that exercised by the Roman Law in Europe.

ERIK SEIDENFADEN.

Bangkok, 15th April, 1938.

H. MARCHAL—*Banteay Srei*—Edition A. Messner, Saigon, 20 pages, 19 illustrations and 1 plan.

Banteay Srei (the beautiful fortress), or to call it by its ancient name Içvarapura (Siva's town), is a small but exquisitely decorated stone temple which lies in the great forest 25 kilometres to the north-east of Angkor Thom.

It was built in the year 967 A.D., just one year before Jayavarman V. ascended the throne of Cambodia.

This temple is unique in the sense that it has been possible to reconstruct it entirely, or at least so the central part of it, in such a way that it gives one a perfect impression of what the Khmer temples were really like about a thousand years ago. The author rightly deplores that a great number of the finest temples of the Khmer have suffered so much either by the elements of nature, sun, rain and wind or by the vandalism of man. The partial destruction of the former imposing central tower of the temple standing on the top of Phnom Bakheng (near the southern gate of Angkor Thom and formerly the centre of the capital preceding Angkor Thom) is thus due to Buddhist monks. Though Banteay Srei is small compared with so many other temples in the formerly extensive Khmer empire it has this advantage that it shows us an architectural composition of great beauty with all its finely sculptured details almost intact.

The temple consists of a central courtyard on which stand three towers, the middle one preceded by a kind of antechamber, two so-called libraries, really places of worship also, surrounded by a triple enceinte. In the courtyard, between the second and first, or innermost enceinte, are the remains of 6 buildings the purpose of which is not mentioned. The second and third enceinte are separated by a broad moat and access to the temple is from the east through a long alley, flanked by galleries, which leads through a *gopura* in the outmost enceinte over a chaussée to the *gopura* of the second enceinte. The dimensions of the three sanctuaries are small, thus the central sanctuary reaches a height of 9 m. 80 only, but on the other hand the exquisite workmanship distinguishes this temple to such a degree that it may without exaggeration be called the jewel among the temples of Cambodia. The summits of the three towers are fashioned in the likeness of kalasas or the vases containing the symbolic water. (The general rule is, we believe, that the tops of the sanctuaries are crowned with a lotus flower's bud).

The temple was dedicated to Siva as several lingas were found and the bas-reliefs are decorated with scenes representing mythological episodes from the life of the Brahmanic gods.

Some years before the archæological service started the restoration of the temple two Europeans most impudently detached three sculp-

tures representing *tevdas*. Fortunately the theft was discovered in time and the sculptures saved and are now in their original place. (We believe that this theft is described by one of the perpetrators in a novel called *La voie royale* written by André Malraux!) One of the elements of sculpture, which adorn the temple and which is rarely met with in Cambodia, but known in Java, is that of Kāla biting an elephant's head. M. Marchal ingeniously remarks that this Ogre's head (Kāla) no doubt in the beginning played a prophylactic or magic rôle but later on developed into a purely decorative motif. (See also M. Marchal's *Des influences étrangères dans l'art et la civilisation Khmers*, reviewed in my *A Note on the archaeological aspect of Rev. Dr. S. G. McFarland's Account of his visit to Angkor Wat in 1872* in JSS. vol. XXX, Part I, pp. 51-55). On the terraces on which the towers rest one sees several human figures sitting à la javanaise (*i.e.*, kneeling with one knee on the ground) some of which have ogres' heads and one a typical negro's head. The latter points of course to the existence of the negroid elements in the Khmer people formerly mentioned by me.

It is also to be noted that while the bas-reliefs of Angkor Wat and Bayon often show a clumsy and confused execution those of Banteay Srei are all of them executed carefully and in a true and happy artistic manner. The heavenly dancers depicted on the bas-reliefs of Bantray Srei wear a long skirt in contrast to the apsaras of Angkor Wat and Bayon who are clothed in excessively short garments.

In other words the art of Banteay Srei is superior to that of the age of Angkor Wat and Bayon two hundred years later.

The merit of having reconstructed Banteay Srei is due to M. Marchal and the reconstruction of this temple may be called his masterpiece. Such reconstruction work is called in French *anastylose*, and it consists of rebuilding a ruined temple by help of its own material and using, when it is justified, new material to replace old, which has disappeared, in a discreet manner. Similar methods have been used with great success by Dutch archaeologists (from whom M. Marchal learnt them) in Java, for instance at the restoration of the famous Prambanam temple.

We have here in Siam a great number of splendid ancient Khmer temples which could easily be restored by the above mentioned method, and it is to be hoped that the responsible authorities will take

this matter in hand before it becomes too late. This would of course involve the sending out and training up of young Siamese archaeologists preferably under French tutorship.

ERIK SEIDENFADEN.

Bangkok, 17th April, 1938.

SOME NOTES ON THE ECONOMIC AND AGRICULTURAL LIFE of a little known tribe on the eastern frontier of India by Tarak Chandra Das,  
Lecturer in Anthropology, Calcutta University.

The above notes, which were published in *Anthropos*, Vol. XXXII, 1937, have been forwarded by their author to the Editor of the Siam Society with the request for a review.

The tribe in question is the Chiru and belongs to the Old Kuki Group. Mr. T. C. Das' notes should be read in conjunction with Lt. Colonel J. Shakespear's excellent book *The Lushei Kuki Clans*, published as far back as in 1912, but still, as far as the reviewer's knowledge goes, a kind of standard work on these Tibeto-Burmese peoples.

The Chirus, who live in Manipur State, Assam, are not numerous, being less than 1,300 in number who speak their own tongue.

They are essentially an agricultural people, other occupations such as hunting, fishing or the gathering of edible fruits and roots playing a secondary role.

The Chirus use cattle and buffaloes for the ploughing of their paddy fields and rear also pigs and fowls together with Mithun, a domesticated species of wild ox (*Bos frontalis*), the latter three kinds of animals being used for spirit sacrifices.

Trade is very little developed and all necessities such as clothing and implements are manufactured by themselves—their women spinning and weaving all the cloth used by the community. There are two different methods of cultivation: The valley or plain land, and the *jhum* or hill cultivation which corresponds to our *rai* cultivation in Siam. The settlement on the plains seems, however, not to suit these people who are ingrained hill people.

Both sexes take almost equal part in the operations of the fields, with the exception that women are not allowed to handle the plough and the leveller. The *jhum* fields do not belong to individual householders, the right of property being vested in the village community.



Moreover, if any plot is allowed to lie fallow, any other household may clear and cultivate it. We believe that a similar state of things at least formerly held good among the Thai Gao and Thai Vieng of North East Siam.

As no hired labour is obtainable in Chiru land several households or families join forces when the fields are to be prepared and the paddy planted. They help one another in turn until the whole work is finished. The individual owners do not pay any wages to the helpers but supply them with food and drink. This is exactly the same custom as we have among our Siamese peasants.

The Chiru villages are small, none of them possessing more than 40 households. Increase in population leads to the establishment of new villages due to the individualistic turn of the Chiru mind, which has also bred an extreme democratic spirit in their social and political life.

The Lushei Kuki tribes still possess the bachelor house, an institution which is found as far east as among Melanesians, Papuans and Polynesians.

The custom of marriage by service is also still in force, a custom well-known among certain Thai and Hill tribes in French Indochina. The author says that the bachelor house, marriage by service and the common property of *Jhum* land all go to maintain the authority of the village community (and the headmen's influence), while the type of individual ownership of plain land asserts the right of the family heads and by and by will break up the power of the village community. Mr. Das' article is quite interesting, but makes the impression of being a detail torn out of a more complete picture such as is found in Colonel Shakespear's above mentioned work. Still it should be read by all students of social economics of primitive peoples.

ERIK SEIDENFADEN.

Bangkok, 15th August 1938.

## THE NEW INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

A monthly journal published at Bombay.

We have received for review two numbers of the first volume of the *New Indian Antiquary*, the management of which is to be congratulated upon the happy choice of the name of a well known periodical which had ceased publication some five years ago. The scope includes every subject connected with Indology and Oriental Learning, and, as the Editors have pointed out in a foreword (Vol. I, no. 1, p. iii), the journal is intended to fill a much needed gap, namely the lack of space in current *Quarterlies*, and to provide a medium of expression for research scholars.

In the first number of Volume I, there are articles on a variety of subjects of Indology. The *pièce de résistance* is perhaps *The Buddhist Tantric Literature (Sanskrit) of Bengal*, pp. 1-23, by S. K. De. It gives a survey of this literature which flourished under the Buddhist Pāla kings of the 10th and 11th centuries. The Tantric system was developed out of Mahayanism and consisted mostly of esoteric doctrines and rituals couched in a highly obscure and perhaps symbolic language. Most of it is lost in Sanskrit but is preserved in Tibetan translations. The author makes a detailed resumé of the various masters of Tantrism and their works in a chronological sequence with special attention to their identity and provenance. The article is fully supported by references in footnotes.

In *Southern India, Arabia and Africa*, pp. 24-36, Mr. Nilkanta Sastri summarises the research work being done in connection with the relationship between South India and her western neighbours.

Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy's *Notes on the Kathā Upanishad*, are published in instalments and both numbers under review contain them—a *valli* being published in each number. The author is of course the authority on the Kathā Upanishad.

A short article on *Schopenhauer and India* by Heinrich Zimmer is a variation in style from other contributions. Its German original was published in the Jubilee volume of the Schopenhauer Society to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the great philosopher's birthday. The present is an abridged English version. Its gist may be almost summed up by a sentence in the peroration: *to Schopenhauer was given, not the mentality. . . . but a genuine glimmer of this vision (i.e., vision of reality, in India).*

Most of the other contributions are on literary or philosophical subjects. The best known of the remaining contributors is without doubt Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, who writes in her usual vivid manner on the subject of *A Hallmark of Man and of Religion*, pp. 77-80, an interesting phase of Indian Thought.

The second volume also consists largely of matters literary and philosophical, although Linguistics is much to the fore by the inclusion of an article: *Echo-words in Toda*, by M. B. Emeneau, pp. 109-117. A biography of *Sambhaji Angria* by Surendranath Sen, pp. 118-126, provides interesting reading.

To judge from the two numbers under review the Journal should be welcome in all Indological quarters. What, however, would more interest us on this side of the Indian Ocean would be matters concerning that phase of Indology which deals with what has been often termed Greater India, especially the eastern portion of it, on which subject no article has as yet been included.

D.

Bangkok, 19th August, 1938.



## PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST IN OTHER JOURNALS.

*Annual Bibliography of Indian Archeology.*

Vol. XI, 1936.

Mauger, H.: *The Phnom Bayang*, pp. 18-24.

A 7th Century Khmer temple, romantically situated on a steep hillside (pictures given) in Takéo province of Cambodia ; it forms with its avenue of approach an imposing monument, consisting of a sanctuary, a *maṇḍapa*, and a *prāsāt*.

Stutterheim, W. F.: *The Exploration of Mount Pananggungan, eastern Java*, pp. 25-30.

The shape of this mount first attracted the author's attention because it corresponded with the traditional Indian conception of the great Meru of Indian Cosmology ; and was therefore likely to have enjoyed some degree of sanctity in earlier times, so that there was every likelihood of religious monuments having been built. Upon later examination, which was facilitated by a forest fire, the conjecture came true. Dr. Stutterheim describes the monuments and gives also a local legend of its having been the top of the original Mount Meru transferred hither from India.

*Journal Asiatique.*

Tome CCXXIX, Avril-Juin 1937.

Renou, L.: *Notes sur les origines védiques de Ganeśa*, pp. 271-274.

The question revolves round the discovery of a passage in the Taittirīya Aranyaka of an elephant-headed deity.

*Bulletin de la Société des Etudes indochinoises.*

nouvelle série Tome XII, no. 2, 1937.

Marchal, H.: *Le Nāga dans l'Art khmèr*, pp. 9-18.

The writer believes that in no country has the cult of the serpent been conveyed in a form so sculpturally and artistically perfect as in

Cambodia between the VII and XIII centuries. Studies are made in this article of the different examples of the decorative *motifs* of the *Nāga* on the monuments of Khmer art.

Stern, Ph. : *Le Temple khmèr : formation et développement du Temple-Montagne*, pp. 83-88.

In a clear and readable manner the author presents us with a reconstruction of the history of Khmer architecture with regard to its temples. The characteristic of this art is the amalgamation of two originally separate elements: the sanctuary-tower and the tiered platform, or *pyramide à degrés* as he calls it. The decisive moment of this evolution came when the sanctuary-towers were placed upon the pyramid, such as at Phnom Bâkhèng and eastern Mébôn.

He then goes on to deal with the development of the two separate themes as well as of the gallery and the material employed, citing for examples the various monuments with their dates (revised). The gallery like the towers were placed upon the platform at first with some hesitation but became later consummated at Tàkéo and Angkor Wat. As for material, brick was at first used but was gradually replaced by sandstone and laterite, Tàkéo again being an evidence of the turning point.

*Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient.*

Tome XXXVI, fasc. 2, Avril-Juin 1937.

Martini, F. : *Dasabodhisatta-waldesa*, pp. 271-413.

The work dealt with is a part of the *Anāgatavaṃsa*. It adds to the legend of Metteyya the stories of nine other *future Buddhas*. It bears no date, no names of scribes, and no indication as to the redaction of the original. There are reasons, in the author's opinion, for believing that the person who wrote this was a Cambodian, for the work is written in bad Pali of the literary type which drew its inspiration from mediaeval Siam and Cambodia and bears resemblance to the *Samgitivaṃsa* of Siam. The author's treatment consists of an edition of the Pali text, a French translation, an index and appendices.

Dupont, P. : *L'Art du Kulén et les Débuts de la Statuaire angkoriennne*, pp. 415-426.

An interesting article on the Angkor period of Khmer Art, illustrated by some 15 plates.

Burnay, J: *A propos des Inscriptions portugaises de deux canons cochinchinois à Bangkok*, pp. 437-440.

This rectifies certain points of interpretation of the Portuguese inscriptions on the two canons as published in the *Bulletin des Amis du Vieux Hué* (1919) by the Rev. Père Cadière.

Goloubew, V.: *Reconnaissances aeriennes au Cambodge*, pp. 465-477.

Students of ancient Khmer geography have come to realise the extent to which ancient sites can be localised and realised in their proper proportions by aerial photography. The discovery of an older Angkor Thom around the pivot of Mount Bâkhèng is a classic example. M. Goloubew here describes to us in his usual vivid manner his aerial progress over (1) Bantây Prei Nokor in Kampon Čâm, and (2) the region of Añkor and the Phnom Kulên which covered the most interesting area of ancient Khmer civilisation. The article is illustrated by 4 plans and 5 plates.

*Verhandlungen van het Koninklijk Instituut  
vor Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië.*

Deel 1, 1938.

Terpstra, H.: *De Factorij der Oostindische Compagnie de Patani*, pp. 1-246.

The *transactions* of the Royal Institute for Linguistics, Geography and Ethnology of the Netherlands Indies seem to be published for the first time and are separate from the well-known *Bijdragen* of the same Institute. This number is entirely taken up by Dr. Terpstra's article on the Factory of the East India Company at Pattani, a concern which exercised not a little influence upon contemporary history in Ayudhya. Mentions of it abound in the *Analysis of van Vliet's Historical Account* published in this and the preceding numbers of our Journal. It is written in Dutch and is complete with a map and an index.

*Bulletin of the Raffles Museum, Singapore.*  
series B., Vol. I, no. 2, 1937.

Collings, H. D.: *Recent Finds of Iron-age sites in southern Perak and Selangor*, pp. 75-93.

do. no. 3,

Evans, I. H. N.: "*Melanesoid*" *Culture in Malaya*, pp. 141-146.

An answer to Dr. van Stein Callenfels' *Melanesoid Civilisation of Eastern Asia* (in the same Bulletin, ser. B, no. 1, May 1936).

Stutterheim, W. F.: Note on a "neo-Megalith" in old Batavia, pp. 147-149, 1 plate.

Callenfels, P. V. van Stein,: *The Age of Bronze Kettledrums*, pp. 150-153, 1 plate.

These drums are of particular interest for readers in this country, especially those interested in Court ceremonial, since they are employed there as accompaniments to ceremonial fanfares. The Siamese Court also uses miniatures of these in the form of what has been termed *Pāṇḍava drums*, or colloquially the *Pongpong*. The age is fixed at about 100 A. D.

*The Journal of the Malayan branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

Vol. XV, part 3, Dec. 1937.

Braddell, R.: *An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Times in the Malay Peninsula and the Straits of Malacca* (contd.), § 3 Pre-Funan, pp. 64-126.

This section deals with the introduction of the Indians into the history of the Malay Peninsula and the Straits of Malacca, and takes up among other interesting topics the much debated controversy of the situation of Lankā of the story of Rama. Without giving a pronouncement either way, the author deals at some length with the evidences of a "very strong connection in Malay tradition" between the name Lankā and the island of Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula. The possibility of Kedah territory being associated with the name is also dealt with.

Vol. XVI, part 1, 1938.

Maxwell, C. N. : *Language Affinities*, pp. 1-99.

The affinities treated are between the Malay, Sanskrit and Bantu dialects of Africa, with ultimate references to European languages.

Wurtzburg, C. E. : *A Letter from Captain Light to Lord Cornwallis*, 1788. pp. 115-122.

Interesting on account of references to this country.

21st August, 1938.