

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

Les Samrè ou Pèar, populations primitives de l'ouest du Cambodge, by R. Baradat; 101 pages, 45 tables of anthropometric measurements, 84 photographs and one picture plate.

Under the above heading, the *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, Vol. XLI - 1941--Part 1, has published a most interesting monograph on the primitive Samrae or Pear written by M. R. Baradat, a veterinary inspector in the French Indochinese Civil Service. These primitive people are not unknown to those of us who are acquainted with some of them under the name of Chong. Our Chong live in the hilly tracts of Chantaburi and Krat (Trēt), where several thousands of them still speak their ancestral tongue. Our "primitives" are, by the way, not so very primitive. Dr. A. Kerr says that those of *chanquat* Krat are *a peaceable, industrious and good humoured people*. The Chong living in *chanquat* Chantaburi possess many pack bullocks for transporting the cardamum fruits, gathered by them in the hilly forests, down to the river ports of Chantaburi. The Samrae or Pear have been the object of an anthropological study by the late Dr. Jean Brengues, published in JSS. Vol. II, 1905. Dr. Brengues calls these people Porr. A vocabulary of the Chong language, besides that made by Dr. Brengues, has more recently been taken down by Nai Noe Isarangura. The above-quoted words of Dr. Kerr are contained in a short introduction which the Doctor wrote to Nai Noe Isarangura's vocabulary (1).

M. Baradat's carefully compiled monograph treats the ethnic groups domiciled in *chanquat* Pratabong (the Pear); and the Cambodian provinces of Siemreap (the Samrae); Kompong Thom (the Pear) and Kampot (the Sa-och).

(1) *vide* JSS. Vol. XXVIII, Part II, 1935.

was tremendous. The sky became overcast until the sun disappeared from sight. The whole phenomenon was then changed and it cleared up all the world over.

(b) King Janaka's message :

Instead of an envoy delivering an oral message as in the Cambodian version, the Thai *Ramakien* formulates the message as a royal autograph from King Janaka to King Daśaratha in the following terms.

Janaka, King of Great Mithilā, to the illustrious Monarch of Ayudhya whose majesty is as it were a precious canopy giving protection to all that dwelleth in this world, greetings !

Whereas We have a daughter whose beauty is a divine creation, We have therefore assembled by invitation royalties from every state to participate in a trial of strength by lifting up the great arrow of victory belonging to the Lord of the trident.

Since Rama, in that great assemblage of gods and seers, presided over by Indra in person, has succeeded in lifting the arrow, We beg to invite Your Majesty to come to our court in order to be present at the nuptial rite to be celebrated in consequence, so that the couple may perpetuate their dynastic line and uphold the world thereby for ever after.

Upon the receipt of the letter, it may be added, Daśaratha expressed his gratification to the envoy of Janaka and at once gave directions summoning his other sons, Bharata and Śatrughna, from their maternal grandfather's court in order to accompany him to assist at the marriage of Rama. No other reference is made to the feat of strength on the part of King Daśaratha.

From the evidence, therefore, of the Thai *Ramakien*, it may be concluded that, while extending the dictum of M. Przyluski as to the story of Rama prevailing in Cambodia and the Insulinde to Thailand, the *Ramakien* does not necessarily agree in every detail with the Malay and Javanese versions as suspected by M. van Stein Callenfels. There are besides numerous other instances in which the *Ramakien* differs from them. On the other hand it has a greater affinity with the Cambodian *Ram-kerti* in very many respects. The similarity of their names is a clear proof of it.

D.

Bangkok, 1st July 1942.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

Les Samrè ou Pèar, populations primitives de l'ouest du Cambodge, by R. Baradat; 101 pages, 45 tables of anthropometric measurements, 84 photographs and one picture plate.

Under the above heading, the *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, Vol. XLI—1941—Part 1, has published a most interesting monograph on the primitive Samrae or Pear written by M. R. Baradat, a veterinary inspector in the French Indochinese Civil Service. These primitive people are not unknown to those of us who are acquainted with some of them under the name of Chong. Our Chong live in the hilly tracts of Chantaburi and Krat (Trēt), where several thousands of them still speak their ancestral tongue. Our "primitives" are, by the way, not so very primitive. Dr. A. Kerr says that those of *chanquat* Krat are *a peaceable, industrious and good humoured people*. The Chong living in *chanquat* Chantaburi possess many pack bullocks for transporting the cardamum fruits, gathered by them in the hilly forests, down to the river ports of Chantaburi. The Samrae or Pear have been the object of an anthropological study by the late Dr. Jean Brengues, published in JSS. Vol. II, 1905. Dr. Brengues calls these people Porr. A vocabulary of the Chong language, besides that made by Dr. Brengues, has more recently been taken down by Nai Noe Isarangura. The above-quoted words of Dr. Kerr are contained in a short introduction which the Doctor wrote to Nai Noe Isarangura's vocabulary (1).

M. Baradat's carefully compiled monograph treats the ethnic groups domiciled in *chanquat* Pratabong (the Pear); and the Cambodian provinces of Siemreap (the Samrae); Kompong Thom (the Pear) and Kampot (the Sa-och).

(1) *vide* JSS. Vol. XXVIII, Part II, 1935.

All these groups, together with that of our Chong, belong to one and the same family, and they speak the same language with some slight dialectical differences. The Samrae of Siemreap have, however, given up their proper language for that of the Khmer. Their peculiar accent, called *rodeun*, still betrays their true origin. The author says that, besides a number of analogous traits, which ally the Samrae with the Phnong, Stieng and Kui, our Soai of *changwat* Roi Mt, Surin, Srisaket and Ubon, there are distinct ones of a parentage with the Weddahs of Ceylon. The Samrae should therefore be ranged within the Weddid group. The distinguished German anthropologist, Professor Egon Baron von Bickstedt, who lectured before the Thailand Research Society during March 1939, expressed also that opinion, and he furthermore rejected Dr. Brengues' statement concerning the existence of Negroid blood in the veins of these people—5% among the Porr living in the district of Srè Ten Yor. Dr. Brengues' arguments for his opinion being the frizzly hair and deep swarthy skin colour found among these people.

The many skeletal remains of Negritos, Melanesians and Proto-Australians encountered in the caves of French Indochina (Annam and Laos) (2), together with the typical negroid features of some of the individuals photographed by M. Baradat show, however, that both Dr. Brengues and the eminent German savant were right.

From the point of view of cephalic index, M. Baradat's anthropometric measurements show the Samrae to be mesaticephalics, while the Khmer are sub or fully brachycephalics (round heads). Dr. Brengues wrote that there are many dolicocephalics (long skulls) among the Porr. One is therefore justified in supposing that these primitives represent a crossing, or crossings, of Proto-Austroloids, Weddahs and Negroids. The same may also be the case with the Khmer, but here Indonesian blood is pre-dominant. There is probably some Indonesian blood also in the Samrae.

The number of the combined Chong, Samrae, Pear or Porr and Sa-och is not great (3), and their number is diminishing by absorption into their Cambodian neighbours. Besides, most of them do not like to be

(2) *vide* Dr. Jacques Fromaget's *Les récentes découvertes anthropologiques dans les formations préhistoriques de la chaîne annamitique* in *Proceedings of the Third Congress of Prehistorians of the Far East*, p. 54.

(3) From the figures given by the author, they total less than 26,500 individuals in the present or former French territory. The number of Chong in the former circle of Chantaburi is unknown.

known as the despised savages of the jungle, the oppressed slaves of yore, but wish to be considered as civilized Khmer, though the so-called Khmer Pā or Khmer Dong (of the jungle and forest) do not exceed them much in culture.

The history of the Samrae is one long story of oppression and martyrdom. During more than a thousand years these poor people were reckoned as being almost lower than animals by their Khmer overlords, and were the object of regular slave hunts. Everybody's hand was lifted against them, the despised Chong or Tchouangs, as the Chinese ambassador to the court of Angkor, Tchou Ta Kwan, already wrote at the end of the XIII century C. E. At that time many thousands of them were state slaves, and they were no doubt employed in the stone quarries on the flanks of the Kulen Chang plateau, to hew the material used for the construction of the numerous and gigantic temples of King Jayavarman VII, at the end of the XII century C. E. The name Chong means thief, and to apply this name to any non-Chong is still considered a deadly insult in Cambodia. Some of these state slaves were also used as iron miners and blacksmiths at Pnom Dek, the well-known iron deposit to the east of Siemreap. They became excellent armourers, and they used to manufacture the weapons of the Khmer armies of ancient days. Though surrounded by Kui (the Kui Autor) the Pear at Pnom Dek have preserved their dialect, and proudly call themselves Kandal. They do not intermarry with the Kui. The Sa-och in Kampot province now number only 200 souls. They lived formerly at Kep, where a Catholic father, Gagelin, visited them in 1830. In 1833, dissatisfied with Khmer rule, they sought the protection of the famed Thai general, Chao Phraya Bodindechā, at Chaudoc. He sent them by sea to Ratchaburi (Rathuri), from where they were finally removed to the north of Kanchanaburi at Kwae Yai. They live now in the villages of Nong Bua, Latcha and Kobuk (Koh Buk). They are known there under the name of Khā or Chong Ut (Khā Ut = Sa-och ?) (4). The learned Father J. F. Schmitt in an article in *Revue Indochinoise* (in 1906, we believe) called these people erroneously Negritos.

The Sa-och may perhaps be considered as the last remnants of the coastal Samrae, the author says, and adds that there is a close relation-

(4) His Excellency Lieutenant-General Phot Phahonyodhin, who is well known also as a great *shikari*, has visited them there and kindly given me some information about them.

ship between them and the aborigines of the Malay Peninsula. The latter point is not so easy to demonstrate, but contact should then be sought with the Senoi and the Sakai, who in their veins have both Weddid and Negrito blood.

Physically, the Samrae look strong and robust, possessing the powerful legs characteristic of real mountain people, but due to the prevalence of malaria the fertility of their women is low. Insufficient food, especially lack of sufficient rice, also contributes to the reduced virility of this tribe.

The author relates the legend about the Samrae melon gardener, who became king of Angkor, but rejects this tale as rather unreliable. We agree! Another, still more fantastic, myth attributes the origin of the Sa-och to a union between a Khmer peasant and the queen of the monkeys! The credulous Khmer, who accept the incidents of the Ramayana as facts, do not consider this tale as unreasonable at all!

The Samrae are good *mahouts* and bold hunters of elephants which they capture by lassoing. They were also formerly good soldiers, and in 1710 C. E. an army of 10,000 Samrae installed Prince Kaeo Pā on the royal throne of Cambodia. There is undoubtedly much Samrae and Kui blood in the Khmer, who themselves are a product of these people, strongly mixed with Indonesians, and later on, Chinese.

It is said that the Samrae women, not so long ago, were very shy and afraid of strangers, and would hide in their huts when a party of traders were approaching their village. The purchase and sale of the goods was done by barter and carried out in the same manner as described in my paper *Further Notes about the Chaobon* (5). The barter was done without any actual conversation between the parties involved, but only by the tacit acceptance or rejection of the objects placed on the ground in two rows facing one another.

This form of barter is called *silent trade* and is known, besides among the Samrae, among the Khā tong lu'ang; the Weddahs of Ceylon; the Kubus in Sumatra; the Punas in Borneo, and various Pygmy tribes in Central Africa.

The Samrae are otherwise not shy, and men and women used to bathe naked in the rivers within sight of one another.

(5) *vide* JSS, Vol. XIII, part 3, 1919, p. 50.

The Samrae, and especially the Pear, are bad agriculturists, and the latter mostly cultivate *rais*, i. e. plots of cleared jungle. Their rice harvests are frequently poor causing much distress. Jungle products in the form of eatable tubers and roots, game and fish, cannot replace their staple diet, which is rice; and that though their menfolk are accomplished jungle people and clever hunters with their cross bows. Very few of these people care for or understand how to use simple irrigation. They are a happy-go-lucky lot. They breed some buffaloes necessary for ploughing their fields, where such are found. They possess few oxen but some pigs and fowls which are necessary for their magic rituals and sacrifices. Their industries are of the most simple and primitive.

By character, the Samrae, and kindred tribes, are apathetic, credulous, careless and improvident; and they do not take kindly to any form of work that demands a continuous effort.

Though adultery is frequent among them, and both men and women are extremely sensual and erotic, which is seen from their obscene love songs, all morality is not absent, and these poor people have some good points to their credit. Fertility on the part of the women is much valued, and it is rare that a man deserts a girl who is to become the mother of his child. Marriage seems to be quite a picturesque ceremony with real bridal costumes, both for groom and bride. All feasting with these people develop, however, too often into drunkenness, one might say into poisoning of alcohol. There are no traces of a matriarchy ever having existed among the Samrae tribes.

The Samrae have the curious custom of kindling a fire at the side of the grave of a newly interred corpse. This custom is also found among the Semang pygmies of Perak (6). In case one dies in the natural way, the bones are dug up after three years and cremated. The ashes may be placed in a cave or the nearest Buddhist temple (7).

The Samrae of Siemreap inter the ashes in the original grave.

People who have died a violent death, or women dead in child bed, are never cremated, as was formerly also the custom in Thailand.

The Samrae, Pear, Chong and Sa-och are animists *par excellence*, and so far Buddhist doctrines with their high ethics have not influenced them much with exception of softening or abolishing some of their more

(6) *vide* Father Schöbesta: *Bei dem Urwaldzwerger von Malaya* in the writer's review in J. S. S. Vol. XXIII, Part 2, p. 231.

(7) The Kui of *amphó* Suvannavari or Kongchiam on the bank of the Mekhong, *Changwat* Ubon, place the ashes in a cave near the outlet of the Mūn river.

barbaric customs, such as the father's sacrifice of his first born to the tiger of the jungle in order to save the village community from the ire of bad spirits, etc. These primitives believe in a whole Olympus of spirits, benevolent and wicked ones. Chief of these are Okya Mau, the good one, and Okya Meas, the malicious one. Both of them seem to have been mighty hunters and tribal leaders of yore, since deified. In addition there are a host of lesser spirits among them, also female ones.

There exists, however, a supreme god too, Sdach Nung, a purely immaterial being, inaccessible and distant.

Have we not here the idea of the benevolent but remote and unadored High God, as found among the Nāga tribes of Assam, and among many Negro tribes in Africa, a dying primitive monotheism? We believe so. The wizard is the most important person in the village, but his life is made miserable by the imposition of a number of *tabus*. He must also live in strict monogamy, and must not be absent from the village on long journeys. The wizards are called *Khway*, and they are the conductors of all the annual magic ceremonies which are necessary for the common weal and protection of the village community against all kinds of misfortunes, whether by man, wild beasts or wicked spirits. And here we met with an almost identical institution like that found among the Khā Charai, namely wizards who are chiefs of fire and water. Among the Charai these wizards are exalted to be kings of fire, water and wind. With the Pear we find only wizards of fire and water, and a wizard "from above". Would the latter be identical with the Charai king of wind? A comparative study of such institutions or offices among the primitives of Indochina might be well worth the trouble. Would it perhaps lead us to some connection with the hoary idea of divine kingship?

Among the many superstitions concerning the magic power of the wizards related by M. Baradat, I recognize several well known to me from my long sojourn in northeastern Thailand (1908-1919). Such a one is about the wizard, who, holding a small bronze image of a bull in his hand, is able, by incantations, to send an invisible bull to attack and even kill an unsuspecting victim who may be many miles away. The person, who possessed this magic power, lived somewhere in *changwat* Ubon and was not a wizard, but a witch.

The spirit possession of a wizard, powerfully aided by monotonous music, song and a liberal amount of alcohol, is, of course, well known in northeastern Thailand, and I have witnessed it several times, the difference

being only that here the possessed person was always a woman. This kind of spirit possession is met with all over Eastern Asia, from Insulinde in the south to Mongolia in the north, where the Shamans are the most spiritual executors of what may not be wholly a fraud, though fraud it must be in most cases.

The Pear still possess some customs which indicate a former widespread totemic cult, and totemic clans are yet existing. The members of these clans have no longer any clear idea of what totemism really means but merely stick to the old traditions and forms because their forefathers have done so.

There is only one totemic festival left now, and this is celebrated but every six or seven years. It is connected with the sacrifice and eating of the totemic animal (a chicken) but it seems also to be connected with certain elements of a phallic cult. During these festivals the men sing and dance while their women are only onlookers. The children generally adopt their mothers' totem, with the exception of the eldest son, who, as his father's successor, must take the father's totem. Ordinarily the totem animal is strictly *tabu*, and must not be molested even if it be a crocodile. Certain traditions and myths found among the Porr (Pear) might indicate that human sacrifices took place in remote times. Remnants of a former widespread zoölatry, or adoration of certain animals, such as the tiger, the crocodile, the barking deer, the hare and the king cobra, are still much alive. These animals are considered to harbour a divinity.

The Samrae love to sing and to dance. In some dances both sexes take part. These dances are often very sensual, and the women then become very provoking. There are also animalistic dances where some of the actors will carry horns of the wild ox on their heads. M. Marchal says that this is the survival of a primitive Indonesian dance which harks back to the time when the Hindu civilisators had not yet arrived in Cambodia, i. e. about 2,000 years ago. The purpose of this dance was certainly to attract the game in order that it should more easily fall a prey to the hunter. It was thus a piece of sympathetic magic. In 1934, after the first International Anthropological and Ethnological Congress had taken place in London, a party of members of this Congress toured a part of England, and there, at Abbot's Bromley (Staffordshire), we had the opportunity of seeing such an ancient animalistic dance which no doubt has been handed down from the times when England was inhabited by a people of hunters. This dance is mentioned by M. V. Goloubew (8),

(8) *vide* BEFEO, tome XXXIV, part 2, 1934, p. 791.

who compares it with the Samrae dance, called *Leng Trot*. The actors at Abbot's Bromley wore deers' antlers on their shoulders. As far as memory serves, a cave picture, going back to the Magdalenian age, also represents such a dance. According to M. Baradat the *Sueng Ausong* or animal (wild bull) dance is still existing in *chanquat* Surin as a fertility rite executed at the New Year festivities.

In concluding his valuable monograph on the Samrae, M. Baradat asks whether one should try to save the particular kind of culture which is the Samrae's, and endeavour to develop their faculties of adaptation toward civilization, or rather not try to prevent their assimilation into the mass of the Khmer people. The reply is difficult in view of the Samrae's small number and their low birth rate. We believe, however, that an attempt should be made to preserve them, and what is good of their culture, first of all by teaching them to build better houses and till their fields better, and at the same time provide them with a medical service which should combat the prevailing malaria that saps the strength of this people. Their language might be reduced into writing and taught in their schools, together with Khmer. Speaking from a purely scientific, especially anthropological point of view, we think also it is too early that these not uninteresting people should disappear.

M. Baradat's monograph contains a great number of very good and clear photographs of the various types met with among the Samrae, Pear (Porr) and Sa-och of what one would call Negroid, Weddid and Cambodian faces. M. Baradat's monograph should be widely read by all who are interested in the anthropology of southeast Asia.

In 1924, Professor George Coedès wrote in his *Études cambodgiennes*, under *L'Extension du Cambodge vers le sudouest au VII^e siècle*, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Chantaboun* (9), that the valley of Chantabun was probably colonized, at an undetermined date, by a group of Hindus (independent of Cambodia?). Furthermore that, as the names found in the inscriptions studied by him are not Cambodian ones, Chantabun province must have been inhabited by another people. What were these people? Could they not have been Chong? (10).

ERIK SEIDENFADEN.

Bangkok, 1st April 1942,

(9) BEFEO. Vol. XXIV, 1934.

(10) The names mentioned are Taaühv, Ranočarūm, Ranhvan.

The Ramakien of the King of Thonburi, with a note by Ki Yupo, publ. B. E. 2484 (1942). บทละครรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์สมเด็จพระเจ้ากรุงธนบุรี มีเล่าเรื่องหนังสือรามเกียรติ์ และ เรื่องงานสร้างชาติไทย เป็นเรื่องประกอบ พิมพ์แจกในงานศพนายอาคม อินทรโยธิน เมื่อวันที่ 23 พฤศจิกายน 2484

The book under review was published for presentation on the occasion of the cremation of Akom Indrayodhin, son of Lieutenant-Colonel Kamchorn Chaturong and a grandson of His Excellency General Um Bijayendrayodhin, member of the Council of Regency. It commences with a short preface signed by the Director-General of the Fine Arts Department, followed by an obituary notice of the deceased, whose remains were to be cremated on the occasion.

The main portion of the book consists of (a) the text of the four manuscripts of the *Ramakien*, from the pen of the King of Thonburi, pp. 1-134; (b) a survey of the *Ramakien* by Ki Yupo, pp. 135-180; (c) a sketch on the subject of the reconstruction work of the new Thai state, liberated from chaos by the King of Thonburi (A. D. 1767-1782) by Prida Srichalalai, pp. 181-240.

That there was a version of the *Ramakien* from the pen of the King of Thonburi is a fact long since known and admitted in Thai literary circles, just as Angkor had been known to Khmers and Thai ages ago. Angkor, however, was only made known to the Western World towards the close of the nineteenth century. Hence it is said to have been "discovered" by a Frenchman. The King of Thonburi wrote his *Ramakien* in C. S. 1132, that is A. D. 1770. King Chulalongkorn was the first to write and publish about this version of the *Ramakien* in his *Phra Rajavicharn* in A. D. 1915. Following, therefore, the analogy of Angkor, one might say that he it was who "discovered" the *Ramakien* of the King of Thonburi.

The four manuscripts here published are written in four *samud*, or folii, the pages being as usual blackened and the lettering done in gold. The *samud*, marked 1, contains the episode of Prince Mongkut, son of Rama, which is a late part of the story. The 2nd, 3rd and 4th *samud* go back, however, to an earlier part and present the story in continuous sequence. The 2nd *samud* commences with Hanuman, sent in search of the demon Virunchambang, making love to the nymph Vanarin, from whom he obtained the information that his victim was hiding in the foams of the ocean. The demon was duly discovered and killed in a combat.

Thosakanth, i. e. Ravana, on hearing of the death of Virunchambang at Hanuman's hands, resorted to inviting the ancestor, Malivaraj, living in Heaven, to come down and arbitrate the case which had led to war between him and Rama. Then follow details of the arbitration, the proceedings described probably revealing the characteristic features of judicial procedure in force in the latter days of Ayudhya, since it seems that the King of Thonburi as well as the three monarchs after him based their ideal of administration upon that of those days. The arbitration, however, did not produce the result expected by Thosakanth, because the gods and goddesses bore witness in favour of Rama's defence. Thosakanth thereupon set out to accomplish a *götterdämmerung* by throwing figures of the witnesses into sacrificial fire. The victims were to include even the ancestor Malivaraj, recently arbitrator of his case. The rite, however, was frustrated in time by a party of celestial beings, led by Bali, Ravana's adversary who upon being killed on earth had acquired divine form in the heavens. Thosakanth and his queen suspected that the situation of his carefully concealed area of sacrifice must have been revealed to the enemy by Phiphek, i. e. Vibhishana, the brother who had been banished for advising against the retention of Sida (Sita). Another sortie was therefore planned to the camp of Rama, where Thosakanth was to kill his brother with the magical javelin named Kabilapat. At the critical moment, however, Phra Lak, i. e. Lakshmana, stepped in front to shield Phiphek with the result that he was thrown to the ground senseless. As night approached, the fighting ceased, and Thosakanth returned triumphant. The recovery of Phra Lak was only possible if accomplished within that night. Hanuman was therefore sent in quest of medicinal herbs and tools which were scattered far apart in each different quarter of the universe, including a mortar from the world of *Nagas* underground and a pestle which Thosakanth was using every night as his pillow. All this was accomplished by Hanuman before sunrise, which was the stipulated limit. Hanuman had a little more time still to wreak further vengeance upon the demon-king by tying during his sleep Thosakanth's hair with his queen's in a magical knot which no one knew how to untie. The ludicrous position could not be hidden from the Court and the King's preceptor had to be sent for. The seer himself was unable to untie the knot, but he knew that the magical spell could only be overcome if the King submitted to the shame of having his head boxed in public by Montho, his queen.

Judging from standards of literature immediately preceding as well as immediately following his time, the poetry of the King was certainly crude. No one, however, should blame a man engaged in so many other important activities for not being a gifted poet. King Rama I, whose *Ramakien* followed within 27 years, was a soldier-statesman of exceptionally high culture. No apology is needed on behalf of the King of Thonburi for failing to come up to his standard.

A feature of his version of the *Ramakien*, which helps to confirm its reputed authorship, is the frequent allusions to Buddhist metaphysics in the dialogues. History tells us how fond the royal author was of metaphysics. Montho, the queen, for instance, when asked for advice regarding the conduct of the campaign, clothed her recommendation not to retain Sida with a long discourse in metaphysics, which was often unintelligible. The muddle might have been intended as coming from the mouth of a woman. The passage runs thus:—

พระจอมแสนแก้วของเม็ย	ปลาอาสวะเสี่ยหย่าหม่นใหม่
เม็ยจิตไม่นิทราลัย	ถันะมิทธะภักย์มีมา
อันซึ่งความทอซ้ความร่อน	ตัวนิรน์วิกิจจา
อกุศลปนปลอมเข้ามา	พาวธัจจะให้ เป็นไป
ประการหนึ่งเม็ยมีเหตุ	เวทนาพาลงหมกใหม่
ผายซงการแพชนะใสร์	สุดแต่ได้สังสมมา

And after a few more such sentences, she suddenly summed up courage and came to the point:—

เม็ยเขาอามันมาโย	ไม่ควรถืออากถินี
------------------	------------------

Translated, the above passages might run something like this:

Oh, dearly loved Lord of mine,
 Shed thyself of sins.
 Thy soul, should it be not asleep,
 Yet sloth may overcome.
 Care and worry, images of doubt,
 Obstruct a life of virtue.
 Evil-doing, breeding pride,
 Steal within. And moreover
 Sensation leads to doom.
 Winning a battle or defeat,
 That's merely due to evil deed. . . .

And finally, the real advice she was probably intended by the author to mean to give:—

Why take to thyself another's wife ?

Such a dame is just a witch.

Reading the above speech of Queen Montho, one feels at first tempted to ask what the author was actually driving at. Were I to attempt to make a guess at an answer to such a query, I should say that the author meant all that to be an attempt at preaching on the part of a woman, who is not at ease in dealing with such a topic, in order to lead on to the real advice, which she was afraid to give without preliminary beatings about the bush.

The names of the principle characters conform to those adopted by Rama I and the Thai versions arising out of that King's *Ramakien*. Such a system was probably in vogue in the latter days of Ayudhya. Rāvāna is invariably Thosakanth. Vibhishana is of course Piphek. Kusa and Lava are Mongkut and Lob. One does not know of course how names were actually spelt in the manuscripts in question, for the spelling in the book has been to a great extent brought up to modern standards of usage. Montho, with the cerebral *nth*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *nd*, is here written มณโฑ , i. e. with the dental *nth* as in the original Sanskrit *nd*, with the second half, *-dari*, omitted of course. In connection with this name, it is worth noticing that in one place the royal author got nearer still to the original Sanskrit by calling her มณโฑคีรี , Monthokiri. In my opinion, it goes without saying that the book would have been more interesting had the editor of these MSS. found a way to indicate the original spelling of these names. One readily agrees that it may not be practical to retain every phase of spelling in the MSS. for the spelling of the period, as one knows, was perplexingly unreliable. Within a few pages from one another, one word may be spelt two or three different ways, for no standardization seems ever to have been reached. In spite of such a chaos, it is often surely possible to deduce something from the nature of such an unreliability itself. This, however, is a debatable point which cannot be solved within the few pages of such a review as mine.

The survey, by K. Yupo, of the earlier versions of the Thai *Ramakien* is more or less pioneer work, and, in spite of differences of opinion, I am ready to commend Mr. Yupo's attempt to serious students of Thai literature. Mr. Yupo enumerates the following versions so far known and in the keeping of the National Library:—

1. *Ramakien, bot phāk, Ayudhya period.*

This, in Mr. Yupo's opinion, was the text of a recited accompaniment to a shadow-play, and not for the *Lakon* as are the later versions. Its age is fixed from about A. D. 1688 to 1758, that is after the age of King Narai up to a few years before the fall of Ayudhya—a period thought to have been one in which much value was given to magic, a prominent feature reflected in this version of the *Ramakien*.

2. *Ramakien, bot lakon, Ayudhya period.*

This, as its name signifies, was dramatic literature. Mr. Yupo says that this was at first thought to have been the King of Thonburi's version, but he has detected many differences of technique and has attributed it to a late Ayudhya period. It only exists in fragments, which have so far remained unpublished. From the few fragments quoted in this survey, one can agree with Mr. Yupo that the diction is quite different from that of the King of Thonburi, the rules of prosody being more accurately observed.

3. *Ramakien, dramatic version of the King of Thonburi.*

From the *Memoirs of a Princess*, edited and fully annotated by King Chulalongkorn, published in 1915 under the title of *Phra Rajavicharn*, i. e. *The King's Annotation*, and reprinted on several later occasions, Mr. Yupo quotes a passage to the effect that in his war of subjugation of the southern peninsula the King of Thonburi acquired the theatrical troupe as well as all the paraphernalia thereof from the Chief of Nakon Sri Dharmaraj. Now, the date given in the preface of this King's *Ramakien* is C. S. 1132, i. e. 1770, which turns out to be only a few months after the conclusion of the southern campaign, which fact of course confirms the date. Mr. Yupo goes on to compare this version with that of King Rama I, pointing out many similarities between their wording. A sort of an analysis of the personal traits in the character of its royal author, as-revealed in the play, follows, featuring his intense devotion to Religion, his straightforwardness, his sense of humour, his preference for quick action and so on.

4. *Ramakien, version of King Rama I.*

Contrary to expectation, this version though similarly enumerated in successive order, is only touched upon by way of comparison in wording with that of the King of Thonburi. It is, of course a very long work requiring an immense amount of study to be able to be presented in a critical survey.

5, 6, and 7. *Ramakien of Rama II, Rama IV and Rama VI.*

These versions though enumerated as if to receive similar treatments, are again not touched upon at all beyond enumeration. As a matter of fact one is led to acquire the impression that the writer really set out to give a historical and analytic sketch of the version of the King of Thonburi in consonance with the general theme of the whole book, but somehow omitted to limit his scope when giving a title to his sketch. The little sketch is nevertheless of great historical value in so far as it treats the subject.

The third and last portion of the book, dealing with the work of reconstruction undertaken by the King of Thonburi, covers a most interesting field of historical study. The greatness of the monarch has been established beyond doubt long ere this. The name of the King of Thonburi needs no propaganda to make it great, for it is already so. It is a pity therefore that in this study of the monarch's work, real scientific criticism is scarcely separable from propaganda.

D.

2nd May 1942

PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST IN OTHER JOURNALS.

Owing to prevailing circumstances, none of the usual publications from learned or scientific institutions have been received from sources other than Japan and French Indochina. The present note is therefore very short.

BULLETIN DE L'ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT.

Tome XL, 2, 1940.

Sastri, K. A. Nilakanta : *Sri Vijaya*, pp. 239-314.

A comprehensive and scholarly review of all the latest results of research in connection with the history of the great maritime power of South-Eastern Asia from its beginnings in the seventh century down to the last days towards the end of the thirteenth. It is divided into 9 sections and supplemented by another on Śrīvijaya art and a bibliography.

Coedès, G. : *Études cambodgiennes*.

No. XXXIII, *La Destination funéraire des grands monuments khmers*, pp. 215-343.

This *étude* has already been noticed and summarised in the table of contents, in English, of our Thai number, part 2, recently published. In that number we have a *resumé* of the whole article in the Thai language, undertaken by H. H. Prince Devavongs, who added many interesting notes and observations of his own.

XXXIV, *Les hôpitaux de Jayavarman VII*, pp. 344-347.

XXXV, *Les gîtes d'étape à la fin du XIIe siècle*, pp. 347-450.

The two *études* examine in detail the Khmer monarch's activities on behalf of public welfare. The hospitals were probably constructed of light material so that none have survived to our days. The halting places marked the roadways of the Khmer empire which radiated from its capital of Nakon Thom in every direction, some of which point to townships in the north-eastern provinces of Thailand, such as Pimai. Enumerations of them exist in the stone inscriptions set up by Jayavarman VII.

Levy, P.: *Les traces de l'introduction du Bouddhisme à Luang Prabang*, pp. 411-424.

From a brief examination of texts, of oral traditions and archeological documents, M. Levy concludes that inspite of an imposing mission of artists, sculptors etc. which came from the Khmer capital in the fourteenth century A. D., Khmer art has left but little influence upon that of the Lao. Buddhism of a particular type probably arrived at Luang Prabang before the XIV century.

BULLETIN DE LA SOCIETE DES ETUDES INDOCHINOISES.

Nouv. serie, Tome XVI, 4.

Berland, H.: *Les papiers de Crawford, envoyé special au Siam et en Cochinchine par le Gouvernement des Indes en 1821*, pp. 7-134.

Crawford's mission to this country arrived during the reign of King Rama II, and after a long stay in Bangkok returned without having accomplished its object in negotiating a treaty. A publication, from the author's own pen, exists in two volumes entitled *An Embassy to Siam and Cochinchina*. It is full of accurate observations of the city of Bangkok and Thonburi.

Tome XVII, 2, 1942.

Paris, P.: *L'Amérique précolombiennes et l'Indochine*, pp. 35-70.

American visitors to our part of the world have often expressed their having been struck by the similarity between our art and that of the Mayas of America. M. Paris has now brought together striking proofs, not only of their similarity, but actually of their seeming and irrefutable connection. The Asiatic elephant has been definitely recognised in central American remains of Mayan art; the Khmer *dvarapala*, the *linga*, Tonkin turbans, the wheel of the Law such as the one at Phra Pathomachedi and even the scene of the churning of the ocean of milk by Visnu all find their counterparts in Mayan art. M. Paris suggests, in explanation of these affinities, trans-pacific navigation between Cambodia and Central America on the one hand and Indonesia and the south coast of Peru on the other.