

BOOK REVIEWS

Ayer, Margaret, *Made in Thailand, the Story of a Country's Arts and Crafts*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1964.

Margaret Ayer, 'author-illustrator of eight books for children and, as a free-lance artist... [illustrator of] over 150 more' has obviously mastered the technique of talking to youngsters. None of *Made in Thailand's* twenty-one chapters exceeds fourteen pages of large 'Caledonia' type text (which on a full page allows some 175 words), and none lacks either a line drawing or a photograph; in fact, there are usually more than one of each--in one instance six illustrations nicely interrupt a thirteen page narrative. Within each chapter all over-long themes, all semblance of that continuity which distresses a child's concentration is carefully avoided. And all ideas are explained clearly, in simple down-to-earth English words arranged in short sentences. Occasionally, of course, the ideas being presented become somewhat distorted through simplification, and, regrettably, a bit of misinformation has crept in here and there, but in attempting to instil such material into the minds of the young it appears necessary to overemphasize, to exaggerate in order to effect even a transient impression.

Actually Miss Ayer discusses much more than 'a country's arts and crafts', in fact she offers a bit of everything, but when speaking of Thai handiwork she obviously has something to say. And not only to the youngsters. Particular sections and fragments in the chapters entitled 'The Thai Work With Metal', 'The Thai Make Pictures', 'The Thai Make Music', 'Weaving', 'The Bountiful Soil' and 'Beauty From Mud' should prove informative even to those who consider themselves well versed in things Thai.

Parents can introduce offspring to Thailand in no better way than to present them with this book (\$ 3.95); Thai parents, in particular, will doubtless appreciate its value as a means to further their child's command of the English language.

Du Bois, Cora, *Social Forces in Southeast Asia*, Harvard University Press, 1962.

The appearance of a review three years after publication might well be regarded askance; when, in fact, the book being considered consists of 'three lectures delivered at Smith College in April 1947', first printed in 1949 and now reprinted a second time to 'meet a small but continuing demand', suspicion may resolve itself into outright annoyance. But Cora Du Bois' slim volume is no ordinary treatise, for (in the words of its flaps) it 'rises above statistical science and narrow specialization' in presenting 'exciting theses and stimulating ideas for both factual investigation and creative speculation'. Though Dr. Du Bois herself conceives of the purpose of these lectures as merely 'to give interpretive insights such as essayists often advance', we are not overbound by modesty to deny that recurring stimulation that derives from and is the hallmark of art.

Each of the lectures forms a chapter in *Social Forces in Southeast Asia*.

The first of these, entitled 'Some General Concepts', is concerned with simply outlining several ideas deeply engrained in cultural anthropology. It appears to have no place even in this svelte setting, but, fortunately, it occupies but half the number of pages of each of the other chapters. The discussion is indeed that which would, of necessity, be included in a series of lectures to a body of eager collegians; here it constitutes rather an impediment, if not an imper-tinence. It might have enhanced, however, had the material been presented in the form of argumentative footnotes nicely complementing the 'interpretive insights' of the pertinent essays.

It should not be inferred, however—certainly it is not implied, that there is here to be found no stimulating material, no theses fostering speculation; in fact, there are presented exciting hypotheses aplenty. And, even a brief consideration will serve to remove any doubts unintentionally instilled.

Firstly, in speaking of the Great War, Dr. Du Bois makes the point that 'stark and inescapable necessities of the military situation forced consideration of social data . . . [as] facts with which to deal,

Social theories went by the board largely because they were not adequately illuminating to practical action'. Here, in subtle repose, the theoretical/practical dichotomy; a dichotomy falsely drawn, yet, in its appealing simplicity, universally embraced. Obviously, and particularly in this instance, social data are compiled on the basis of some theory as to what constitutes pertinent information; they are not in themselves basic abstract facts (in fact, there are no such things) but 'facts' in a particular *schema*. Further, and simply, 'practical action' proceeds according to some hypothesis-some theory-concerning an expectation; the theories of so-called 'practical' men differ from those of so-called 'theoreticians' only, perhaps, in degree. In this instance, social theory of the time, apparently inadequate in the situation, was replaced.

Again, in pursuing this misguided course rather more plainly, Professor Du Bois acknowledges that

The relation between man as a biologic and psychologic unit on the one hand, and as a product of his geographic and social environment on the other hand, has been widely perceived both theoretically and practically but without a structured theory adequate to guide practice.

That 'a structured theory adequate to guide practice' in this instance has not yet been forthcoming might possibly be due to difficulties inherent in separating out man's supposed component parts; if so, the promise of this 'structured theory' is cause for apprehension. For Dr. Du Bois' two men are one; the separation is effected only through wholesale qualification. To then consider each separate and distinct, endowed with extreme values of superimposed categories, and attempt to put them back together again is nonsense.

Cora Du Bois' 'Nothing can be more tedious than quarrels about definitions' must evoke a responsive twitch from anyone who has even once become entangled in academic debate. Definition (and Dr. Du Bois proceeds immediately to her own) is, of course, absolutely necessary to communication; apparently the tediousness involved stems from attempting to reconcile differing ideas about the meaning of certain symbols, that is certain words or phrases. But

why are there differing ideas about these meanings; why do some prefer one definition to another; and why is this matter not settled somehow so that time might be spent more profitably? Might it not be that, since inherent in any definition is an assumption or a set of assumptions, allowing a certain definition, in a logical system, is tantamount to accepting a particular conclusion; that is, a conclusion from which apparently but little variation is possible. And, might it not be, then, that for some the particular conclusion is unacceptable. An example is provided by Dr. Du Bois herself, when, in examining the institution of marriage, she states that

first every known society has some form of marriage—in other words, it is a universal institution; second, when marriage as it is found in many different societies is compared, the only common denominator that remains appears to be the device of associating men and women in order to localize children in their society.

Obviously, if this 'common denominator' is for me an unacceptable definition of marriage, then the institution of marriage ceases to be universal. And, if it is not universal than perhaps, and by way of example, it should not be equated with institutions that are in propounding a relevant hypothesis.

Pulling up what is fast becoming a full trot into things by-the-way, and leaving such as 'Culture is constantly changing. At no time and in no place has it been observed at rest' and 'There is little room at the top of a pyramid' (of course stood on its head . . .), yet Dr. Du Bois' conclusion to this lecture prods comment. Allowing that the concepts she has discussed cannot be rapidly tested through research for all the world and, further, that speculation based upon concepts and data possessed can lead to no definitive results, 'Yet so urgent have the practical problems of certain parts of the world become that even *dull tools are better than none* [my italics]'. This do-something-don't-just-stand-there and some-facts-are-better-than-none philosophy has somehow managed to delude even learned folk like Dr. Du Bois into thinking it synonymous with progress. The do-nothing-till-you-hear-from-me and a-little-knowledge-is-a-dangerous-thing school hasn't a hope; its 'reactionary'. Dull tools are not incisive, they tear.

In Southeast Asia makeshift solutions may, in fact, cause considerable, even irreparable damage, not only in the particular situation or to the 'developing' country involved, but to the prestige (and, thereby, the ability to make amends and offer better answers) of the developer.

Though the bulk of the discussion in 'Some Social Factors Discernible in the Southeast Asia of 1940'—the second lecture in the series—is devoted to a gross consideration of antecedents, itself deserving of extended comment, and the opening remarks plus 'map' warrant a non-too-constructive criticism, Professor Du Bois offers a number of apparently reasonable diagnoses; the more so for having been based on 'only a few social structures about which a little is known and on a few attitudes unscientifically estimated'. The 'factors discernible' are grouped, undoubtedly for purposes of presentation, for the 'classes' are emphatically interdependent, under four main headings: class structure, economy, European philosophical values and prestige.

However much we may sympathize with Dr. Du Bois in her lack of definitive information (a point which, though emphasized, is placed in too discrete a position as regards the hypotheses) this must not dissuade criticism of a too liberal generalizing, a gross simplifying or an unfounded classifying. In Southeast Asia the basic work, the unique investigations, from which generalization must evolve has not yet been accomplished. A discreet silence need not be maintained in such a situation, though wisdom would so counsel, but any hypotheses offered should be couched in terms unmistakably humble. Professor Du Bois' discussion of social aspects of the Southeast Asia of 1940 is decidedly not humble; but perhaps this necessarily results when, is using a pre-stressed form and allocating observations therein, matters become irresistibly clear. The discussion of class structure will serve to indicate the general tenor of the hypotheses offered throughout. For example it is stated flatly that

Economically these overseas Chinese are a source of considerable wealth to the homeland. Remittances flow steadily from Southeast Asia to China.

Now, though basically true, this statement is deplorably bald; for it

disregards completely the fact that it was Chinese labor and enterprise which produced the wealth from which remittances were drawn off.

Again, apparently through extending the naively compartmentalized class structure form, Dr. Du Bois is enabled such statements as

by 1940 the upper Asian class had split into the carefully preserved museum pieces on the one hand, and on the other, into the new intellectual group.

and

Today the Chinese in Southeast Asia are . . . split into . . . the landless wage earners on the one hand, and on the other, the moderately well-off, and occasionally very rich, entrepreneurs.

Now, what is common to both the 'carefully preserved museum pieces' and the 'new intellectual group' which allows them to agglomerate into the 'upper Asian class'? At worst, an argument stressing transition within the class as opposed to a difference in extremes would have to contend with birthright as the agglutinant. Assuming this, then, the genesis of the new intellectuals, that is, those who had been exposed to Western ideas and ideals (granting an equal exposure), may be pondered. It seems, and Dr. Du Bois agrees, that the 'intellectuals' must have been fostered by those 'carefully preserved museum pieces' who allowed, nay, encouraged, study abroad or at transplanted Western institutions. This suggests that some 'museum pieces' were less 'carefully preserved' than others. Similarly, the landless wage earner/entrepreneur dichotomy does not enhance an appreciation of the Chinese position in Southeast Asia; to 'see' these two groups requires blinkers closely set, for not only does each embrace a motley membership but the one grades into the other; and, in this regard, differences within the two classes may well be greater than those between.

Taken somewhat further this gross delimiting leads to such subtleties as

There is little in common between the Chinese colonial in Southeast Asia and the bourgeoisie of Europe, except that both have thriven and grown powerful between upper and lower millstones.

Dismissing the rather peculiar concluding analogy, the question is who is *the* Southeast Asian Chinese colonial and who *the* European bourgeoisie? Do such caricatures warrant consideration in an hypothesis?

Despite an unfortunate oversimplifying, though, to be sure, in some instances because of it, there is much in this lecture which stimulates thought.

The discussion of the more social aspects of the economy of Southeast Asia in 1940, for example, includes several imaginative theses. One such conceives of the areas of deficit food in southern Asia as a 'by-product of the introduced European economic system' which severely dislocated indigenous economies. Though to my knowledge rice shipments from 'king's stores' to impoverished areas had occurred intermittently long before the introduction of European economic systems, certainly both the magnitude and the permanence of this trade awaited that commercial organization afforded by Western and, latterly, Chinese enterprise. Whether the introduced Western economic systems *caused* inadequate food supplies through dislocating native economies (granting that such dislocations did indeed occur) and introducing a more pliable labor force, or whether a more efficient organization merely *allowed* deficits to be made up economically, and in so doing gave greater notice to impoverished areas; well, this is debatable. It might well be that receipt of food-stuffs at reasonable cost allowed relief from the extension of an unprofitable cultivation.

Again, in discussing the effects of the introduced plantation system Dr. Du Bois deplures

European capitalistic enterprise [which] failed to establish, in time, that nice balance between what it was extracting from Southeast Asia and what it could put back into the area in the guise of purchasing power. It was defeated by its own preoccupation with what was proved to be, in the long run, uneconomical profit.

Might it not be that the failure to establish a 'nice balance' and that certain 'preoccupation' simply reflects inadequate profits? That 'extracts' from Southeast Asia were siphoned off to aid the relatively

rapid development of certain European nations is not denied, but these alone would not have allowed that progress. 'European capitalistic enterprise' acted to allow a certain concentration of wealth sufficient to a development greater than that which would have accrued from a mere adding together of profits. Such progress was not accomplished easily; and I submit that no area was more 'dislocated' than was Europe in the process. Further, I am inclined to suggest that that already 'put back' into Southeast Asia is infinitely greater than that which has been extracted; that the condition being 'treated' by the West, and in some measure (I would hope in large measure) due to its interfering, is symptomatic of healthy change.

Regrettably, to the detriment of the ideas here presented, though detracting not one whit from their stimulating effect, there are dispersed throughout remarks which, having no basis other than in 'common knowledge', are the more insidious for being made off-handedly. For example, when discussing the essentially subsistence peasant economy in 1940, that the peasant lived 'on his own lands' is imparted in a modifying phrase. Now, in truth, this idea, which has waxed axiomatic by dint of repetition, has never been critically evaluated. Certainly, at present, no one having even a nodding acquaintance with the entangled systems of land tenure and land ownership in Southeast Asia would hold this to be a valid generalization. On the basis of a limited experience I would, in fact, be inclined to dispute it. But why must such information be introduced so baldly; particularly in that here, as elsewhere, Dr. Du Bois' argument would be enhanced through indecisiveness.

I find the third lecture—'Potentialities of These Factors', that is, the factors discernible in 1940—prosaic; a series of commonplaces concerning attitudes engendered by World War II, anticipated changes resulting from great population increases, anticipated intellectual, political and economic forces, possible future leader-nations within Southeast Asia, and the probable role of Southeast Asia nations in the new international scene. And, therein lies its strength; for it is now almost two decades—two decades of unprecedented change—since Dr. Du Bois' prognostications, yet I may regard them with dispassion.

We may argue with her immediate post-bellum denunciation of the Japanese (such characterizations as boastful, deceitful, violent and hateful are difficult of apprehension) and the almost complete disregard for Japanese potential in Southeast Asia; we may even go so far as to deplore the projection of India as the 'best bet' for future leadership in the area (in this regard Dr. Du Bois, in assessing her forecasts in the preface written ten years later, believes her prediction of India's role in Southeast Asia to have been 'cautious' and to warrant no revision); we may balk at the thesis which suggests Thai 'uneasiness about her Burman neighbor' was directed 'more toward the British in Burma than toward the Burmans', and wonder at 'Thai Irredentism used to be a matter of some concern to certain British officials'; we may puzzle over an assessment of cultural forces which accounts science and the arts 'genuine social indicators', while rejecting 'radicals and reactionaries' as muddiers of 'the waters of current life'; we may, in fact, suspect that the theses qualified might as easily have qualified hypotheses opposite; but we must conclude that this was an awfully good throw.

Purcell, V., *South and East Asia Since 1800*, Cambridge University Press, 1965.

The professed aim of this small book (some 230 pages) is to provide a history of South, East and Southeast Asia for 'persons living in Southeast Asia, and more particularly in Malaysia'; the 'appropriate' means to this end is seen to involve a 'history written from this centre'.

Dr. Purcell has successfully provided. His abbreviated history of this vast area, couched in simple terms, is remarkably free from printing errors, liberally sprinkled with maps (generally easily read), without cumbersome explanatory footnotes and almost entirely devoid of references, and provided with 'A Note on Books for Further Reading' which could only be improved upon through the inclusion of books in languages other than English. In short, Southeast Asian students will find this an admirable summarization; and only occasionally puzzling: as, for example, when the practice of execution-

by-elephant is termed 'barbarous' or when a former king is described as a 'ruffian'. Again, some may instinctively wonder at protestations of Southeast Asian unity, but they will not fail to evince conviction in an argument that appeals to the savants Coedès, Winstedt, Krom and Hall.

Cambridge, where Dr. Purcell is ensconced, may, indeed, be termed the 'Malaysian centre', being but a stone's throw from London; and, so, here again, he has successfully concluded a most difficult but most 'appropriate' task: American effort in the Philippines, latterly in Thailand and its eastern neighbors, is regarded superciliously; *Indochine* is yet another French fiasco; the Dutch mismanage the *Insulinde* business; and Burma, Malaya, Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak (as India and Pakistan) proceed to independence under the stalwart guardianship of Great Britain.

Though the 'advanced student' must be referred elsewhere, *South and East Asia Since 1800* is a most readable memorandum.

Larry Sternstein

RECENT SIAMESE PUBLICATIONS

338. *Samantapāsādikā*, สมณุตปาสาทิกา Commentary of the Vinaya, part I, tr. into Siamese by the faculty of the King Mongkut University, University Press, Bangkok, pp. 429 octo, 2508.

This volume was published as a memento of the attainment of his father's age by His Majesty the King in August 1965.

From the University's preface we are told that the Vinaya consists of five sections, namely the *Mahāvibhaṅga*, the *Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga*, the *Mahāvagga*, the *Cullavagga*, and the *Parivāra*. The Indian scholar, Buddhaghosa (B.C. 1,000) translated the whole work from the Sinhalese into Pāli. The volume under review is the first of three of this Siamese translation from the Pāli by the Ven. Āra Debavarābhorn, deputy abbot of Wat Padumavarārām, who has since died.

The *Samantapāsādikā* is a set-book in the syllabus of the University of King Mongkut. Its sources are stated in the original work of Buddhaghosa to have been the *Mahā-atthakathā*, coupled with the commentary called the *Mahāpaccari* and the commentary called the *Mahānadi*, of which no information is given here.

The gist commences with the First Synod of the Buddhist Hierarchy summoned immediately after the Master's death under the presidency of the senior disciple Kassapa, when a thorough revision of the Vinaya and Sutta sections of the Canon were discussed and agreed upon for acceptance, 'never to be tampered with' in future.

The Second Synod, when the Canon was confirmed as hitherto handed down, is described in the usually accepted mode.

The account under the heading of the Third Synod gives prominence to the Emperor Asoka. Interesting, if hardly acceptable in view of the history of the development of Buddhist art, is the incident of Asoka's request to the Nāga-King to fashion an image of the Master. It is worthy of comparison with our story of the Siṅga Image, mentioned in our review of Recent Siamese Publications no 321 (JSS LIII, 2, 1965).

Our narrative now switches to the missionary movement to neighbouring lands at the time of Prince Mahinda, son of Asoka, paying special attention to the Buddhist movement in Sihala, which led to the summoning of the Fourth Synod by Tissa, the Beloved of the Gods, King of Sihala. From this synod on the Mahāyāna Church ignores our enumeration of these Synod Councils; whilst the Burmese Church accepted this one and the next only. Here the historical narrative ends.

What follows in great bulk is largely didactic: such things as the virtue of the Master, as summed up in the *credo* 'Namo tassa . . .', discussions of the *jhāna*, and, finally, the incidents occurring in Veranjā so popular with mediaeval Buddhist scholarship.

The *Samantapāsādikā* is, in fact, regarded by mediaeval Sinhalese scholars as a sort of bible. Our great respect for it can be traced no doubt from the Sinhalese influence on our Church since the time of Sukhodaya down through the era of Ayudhyā and the earlier Bangkok era up to the time of Prince Moṅkut's reform of the Church. Even now it has a considerable hold on Church education.

The same portion of the *Samantapāsādikā* translated by faculty of the King Moṅkut University had previously been translated into Siamese by the Ven. Dr. Sthiraboṅs. It was reviewed in JSS LII, 1, 1964.

339. *Samantapāsādikā*, สมณคปาสาทิกกา • Commentary of the Vinaya, part I, tr. into the Siamese by a commission of abbots of Wat Srakeś and three other doctors of Buddhist literature, Prayurawoṅs Press, Dhonburi, pp. 576 octo, 2508.

This is another version of the *Samantapāsādikā*, part I, mentioned in the review above. The translation seems quite independent; and is, in fact, longer, going on to actual commentary, word for word, of the *Samantapāsādikā* dealing with the four *Pārājika*, the extreme penalty of a monk's offenses against disciple necessitating expulsion and disrobing from the Saṅgha Brotherhood. The nature and method of its commitment is dealt with in detail, occupying pp. 294-576. The material is quite technical and does not hesitate to state facts plainly.

For the general public it hardly deserves much attention but of course for monastic practice and the interpreters of the Vinaya one could presume it invaluable. The Pārājika offenses are four in number: the first, sexual intercourse; the second, theft; the third, manslaughter; and the fourth, claims to possess supernatural powers.

340. *Sammohavinodanī*, สมโหมทธิโนทนี ๑. Commentary of the Vibhaṅga section of the Vinaya, part I, tr. into the Siamese by the Ven. Pra Debagunābhorn of Wat Srakes, one of the scholars in the Commission for the translation of the above work, *Samantapāsādikā* part I, also a ninth grade scholar of the Ecclesiastical Syllabus, Rajadāromya Press, Bangkok, pp. 316 octo, 2508.

The *Vibhaṅga* is the second of the books of the *Abhidhamma-pitaka*, continuing an analysis of the 'factors of Existence', or *dhamma*, as enumerated in the first book called the *Dhammasaṅgani*. The reviewer admits his incompetence to pass a judgment on the publication since the *Abhidhamma* has never appealed to him as reading material. It is merely hoped that this notice will place those interested in a position from which the standing of this part of the philosophical ensemble of the Abhidhamma may be realized.

Nos. 339 and 340, as well as further items hereafter were published in dedication to His late Holiness the Patriarch of Wat Srakes on the occasion of the cremation of his remains in November 1965.

341. *Royal Interrogations*: Miscellaneous Section พระราชบัญญัติการทบทวนพระกรรมคุณ A Fine Arts Department publication, sponsored by the Buddhist hierarchy of Dhonburi in honour of the late Patriarch of the Kingdom on the occasion of his cremation in November 1965. Damrodharm Press, Dhonburi. pp. 124 octo, 2508.

In the preface the Fine Arts Department points out that the custom of the Sovereign submitting interrogations to the Church from time to time has existed since the days of Ayudhyā; the earliest date from the reign of King Nārāi. It has not been possible to ascertain how many interrogations have been put to the Clergy, but thus far the

Department has collected from various sources some 71 of them. Three of these, together with a summary for reference of those published formerly, are the subject of the volume under review. None of these publications have as yet been reviewed here since they were published prior to our notices or reviews of Siamese publications; the first of which appeared in JSS, XXXVI, 2, 1947.

In the volume under review the first of the three interrogations was put to the Clergy by King Rāma II, not so much in the usual form of an interrogation but for advice and comment on the proposal of His Majesty to revive the celebration of the *Viśākha*, the anniversary of the birth, enlightenment and death of the Buddha, traditionally reckoned as having occurred on the same date, the 15th of the waxing moon of the month of Viśākha of the lunar calendar. The custom has been kept up to these days and forms an important date in the Court calendar. His present Majesty has added to it a similar celebration on the same day in the more important centres of Buddhism in the Kingdom; and in attending these personally, he allows his subjects to participate with their sovereign in this religious dedication.

The second interrogation originated from King Rāma III, who wanted an explanation as to what kind of merit had resulted in his succeeding to the throne and what had been the cause of the many deaths occurring since in the rank of the Royal Family and the officials in his service. The interrogation, separately replied to by individual abbots, bore a gist of the usual scope of interpretation that all good or bad action was due to individual conduct the result of which might regulate the span of individual life and the amount of individual success in life.

The third interrogation is as late as 1923, when, at the news of the murder of Emperor Nicolas of Russia, King Rāma VI consulted the Clergy as to how he could give expression to his sense of gratitude to the dead monarch who had been personally kind to him in the days when as a young Hereditary Prince he was often sent to represent his father at various court functions in the capitals of Europe. The usual practice resorted to by the average Siamese Buddhist in the case of the dead of his own faith would have been a memorial service of chants

and sermons. The Clergy, headed by His late Royal Highness Prince Vajirañāna Varoros, then Supreme Patriarch of the Kingdom, replied that in the light of the wide tolerance of the Buddhism practiced here it would have been just as legitimate to celebrate a similar service in dedication to a non-Buddhist. Such a procedure was actually adopted in the chapel of Wat Beñcamabopit with the Supreme Patriarch himself delivering the sermon.

Appended to the main part of the text under review is a summary of the five volumes of Royal Interrogations published on former occasions. In the first volume some of King Nārāi's interrogations are quite interesting. Two may be cited here as being of possible interest to the historian or the general public. In one of these King Nārāi asked whether the ejection of a monk from a monastery on being accused of having criticised the King for favouring foreigners more than his own subjects was justifiable. A certain P̄ra P̄rom, possibly an abbot by the name of P̄ra P̄romamuni, replied that a monk who criticised the King acted wrongly; but, the abbot asked the King's messenger, whether the King had heard the criticism himself. The answer was that he had heard it from a reporter. The abbot answered "In that case I do not reply because neither the King nor myself heard the remark to be objected to". The King further sent a messenger to the same monk with a question on a similar topic, thus:

"Nowadays many foreigners come into the country. What would the abbot feel about this problem?"

P̄ra P̄rom answered:

"His Majesty's good name is widely known. It is the result of his good name that they come in in such large numbers."

The messenger asked further:

"But if a great many more come in, what is your opinion thereon?"

The monk's answer was:

"The problem of the large influx of foreigners is already within the King's judgment."

The historian cannot but be tempted to identify this problem with the influx of Dutchmen and the French at the time. In fact, it is recorded that when King Nārāi was on his deathbed Pēdrājā used the identical argument to rid the country of the French soldiers and Constance Phaulcon, responsible for their introduction, who had acted to deprive the King of power.

It should be noted also that most of the interrogations attributed to the three Kings mentioned in this first volume were answered by Somdeçpra Buddhakośācārya. We have no means of knowing whether it was the same monk throughout, though the period covered was not after all too long for one man's life-span, but the answers are intelligent and must have been from a renowned intellectual or intellectuals.

The bulk of the Interrogations are from King Rāma I. Occupying Volumes II and III, they treat of religious and traditional questions. We have been accustomed to look upon this King as a soldier who when entrusted with the responsibility of Kingship adapted himself to the civil and juridical side of the administration with great success, though without neglecting the intellectual side of life which he made efforts to restore to the level of the last days of Ayudhyā. The contents of these two volumes show how deep an interest he took in intellectual pursuits.

The fourth volume consists of King Rāma III's interrogations, which clearly indicate the King's practical intelligence. Some of these interrogations have been translated into English elsewhere; see, for example, the reviewer's *Monarchical Protection of the Buddhist Church*.

The fifth volume contains many of King Monjukut's interrogations, a great number of which are concerned with linguistic matters in connection with ecclesiastical usage. King Chulalongkorn put two interesting interrogations to the Clergy. For the first of these there is found only answers; the interrogation being seemingly lost. It concerns the nature of the *nibbāna* and is replied to by no less than 18 high monks; monks renowned even today for their scholarship. The gist of their answers may be summed up to be that the *nibbāna* is the

cessation of evil. None says it is the cessation of life. The second interrogation inquires into the origin of the custom of raising the sand *zedi*, usually moulded to celebrate the former new year of the Songkrānt.

342. Yūpō, Dh.: *Dharmacakra*, 'the wheel of the Law' ธรรมจักร
Śivapōn Press, Bangkok, pp. 44 sexa, 2508.

This is the present year's publication in the Lenten series which the Fine Arts Department issues as a complimentary gift to members of the Clergy who visit the Museum during the Lenten holidays. As the author points out, the young Sakya prince who later became the Buddha was attributed with marks of the superman and as such should grow up to be a universal sovereign or a saviour of of the world in the person of the Buddha. As a universal sovereign he would be expected to possess the seven jewels of power one of which was the jewel wheel or discus, the 'cakra'. The tradition is told at length in the Mahā-Sudassana-sutta of the *Mahāvagga* in the *Digha Nikāya*.

Now, the young prince had no worldly ambition but chose instead the life of a recluse in order to be able the better to pursue what in modern terminology would be called individual research to find salvation for mankind. The solution, when discovered, he referred to as an accession to spiritual domination in which he wielded the *cakra* of righteousness—in other words the *Dharmacakra*. It was a wheel not capable of being "turned by any recluse or brahman, or a celestial, or māra or the god Brahma or any one whomsoever".

The book goes on to describe the historically successive representations in art of this wondrous wheel or *dharmacakra*, with profuse illustrations. These, in fact, form the bulk of the volume under review; specimens from various Buddhist centres in India and south-east and north Asia being depicted. It is perhaps the only book in Siamese dealing with this aspect of Buddhist art throughout the world.

343. *Wat Srales, Its History with an appendix on the Kapilavastu Relics* ประวัติวัดสระเกศและจดหมายเหตุเรื่องพระสาวรีกษาทูเมืองกบิลพัสดุ์ publ. in dedication to the memory of His late Holiness the Patriarch of the Kingdom and incumbent of the monastery, sponsored by the Council of Ministers, Government Press, pp.129 octo, 2508.

As stated in the preface, the publication contains (a) a biography of the deceased with a list of the 15 former Patriarchs since the establishment of the new capital after Ayudhyā; (b) a history of the monastery itself; and (c) an account of the Kapilavastu Relics believed to have been genuine remains of the Master. The book contains excerpts from state papers dealing with the Kapilavastu Relics which were presented to King Chulalongkorn by the Indian Government.

Wat Srales, originally Wat Sakē, derived its name from the fact that King Rāma I, on his return from the campaign in Cambodia from which he was recalled by an invitation to reign over the Kingdom, received an anointment from the waters there by way of a purification. Like Wat Pra Jetubon, it was built on an old site by King Rāma I and renovated on an extensive scale by his grandson, Rāma III, who was also responsible for the erection of a gigantic stupa. The latter however succumbed in the next reign on account of the low-lying nature of its ground. It was left to remain as an artificial hill of debris. A shrine on top of it was later made use of as a depository.

In 1897 the Archeological Service of India discovered the relics beneath the Piprahva Tope. They were enclosed in two caskets placed one atop the other; but the officer in charge emptied the contents of the upper casket into the lower, thereby making suspect any differentiation of the relics of the Buddha from those thought to belong to his relatives. At any rate the contents could be taken to include those of the Master as stated in the inscriptions.

King Chulalongkorn decided to accept the relics, and to distribute portions to other Buddhist communities from Ceylon, Burma and Japan, whose governments had requested them. The distribution was carried out with pomp and ceremony, and the remaining portion was enshrined in the depository on top of the Boromabanpot, popularly referred to as the Phukhaotōṅ—the Golden Mount.

The book was written by Mr. Vichien Bamruṅṅhol of the Ecclesiastical Department of the Ministry of Education, who deserves credit for his lucid presentation.

344. Amarābhirakkhit, the Ven. Pra: *Pubbasiṅkhāvamanā* บุพพสิกขากรรมนิพนธ์ A Treatise on Monastic Discipline. Pračand Press, Bangkok, pp. 545 octo, 2508.

Published under His Majesty's sponsorship in dedication to His late Holiness the Patriarch of the Kingdom on the occasion of the cremation of his remains in November, this is a new edition of an old text book for advanced study in the Church curriculum. It is hoped that this new edition will be useful for reference.

It consists of 88 pages of an elucidation of the virtues of the Triple Gems of Buddhism—the person of the Master, his teaching and the *saṅgha* or hierarchy of monks. The bulk of the treatise is naturally an *exposé* of the various monastic offences as ordained by the Vinaya. The style of writing belongs to that of the later XIXth century, when the 'King's Siamese' began to be standardised. It does not suffer too much from the pedantic phraseology of monastic writing.

345. Sukhabānij, K.: *The Initial Steps of Thai Journalism* ก้าวแรกของหนังสือพิมพ์ในประเทศไทย published in dedication to the memory of the late Luang Bunyamānob, Thaibanijyakār Press Ltd. Bangkok, ill. pp. 72 quarto, 2508.

In dedicating the book the author sketches the initial steps of Thai journalism from the third reign when the *Bangkok Recorder* made its appearance in Siamese under the editorship of Rev. Dr. Dan Beach Bradley. To this pioneer, the Siamese public owed not only the idea of a Thai newspaper but also the invention of types and printing machinery. Journalism progressed in the fourth reign when the Rev. S.J. Smith and Rev. J.H. Chandler were champions of the venture. Under King Chulalongkorn the first newspaper owned and managed by Siamese nationals, *Darunovād*, appeared under the management of the King's brother, Prince Kshemsant ancestor of the now large family

of a similar name. The Prince is better known to the present generation by the title to which he was elevated of Kromamun Prohm and later Kromaluan Prohm. This was succeeded by the *Court*, devoted principally to news of the Court and the Government and was edited by some ten of the younger princes of the Royal Family with the sixteen year old Prince Bhanurangsi as editor-in-chief. The *Siam Samai* was the last of these journalistic pioneers, again an American effort. Most of the newspapers mentioned are quoted in the book and some of their illustrations reproduced.

Bangkok, 22 December 1965