Review Article

Pierre Dupont's *L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī* and Its English Translation by Joyanto K. Sen, In Relation with Continuing Research

Nicolas Revire

L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī was published in 1959 by the École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO; Dupont 1959), based on a draft left by the French archeologist Pierre Dupont who died in 1955 at the age of 47. It remains unrivalled in importance for all students of pre-Thai art and archeology[1]; that is, the period before the Tai kingdoms in Sukhothai, Chiang Mai, Lang Xang or Ayutthaya were established (ca. 13th–15th centuries). This magnificent overview of Mon archeology is presented in two volumes, the first of text (see figure 1) and the second of plates. After a general introduction to the Mons in chapter 1, the text describes in detail excavated sites in ancient Nakhon Pathom and neighboring regions in chapters 2 to 5. Chapters 6 to 8 offer a precise typology of standing and seated buddha images that were found in Thailand and that the author attributes to Mon art. Chapter 9 gives the author's final conclusions. This class of scholarship, for its comprehensiveness, is rare nowadays because scholars have become increasingly constrained to narrow their focus in a single discipline or area of research.

For the scholarly significance of Dupont's work and because the publication has long been out of print in the original French, the recent English translation by Joyanto K. Sen (Dupont 2006)[2] was long overdue. Its announcement was particularly welcome during the commemorations of the 50th anniversary of Dupont's death. Yet, because of the long span between the French and the English editions, we need to consider the present role of the translation, half a century after the original, in the light of all the developments in Dvāravatī research. This first raises the issue of Dupont's work in its contemporary academic context and its continuing relevance in the context of modern scholarship. It also involves the translator's intention to update the original work; at the same time the question arises how easily indeed does *L'archéologie mône* lend itself to updating. A critical assessment of the English translation is therefore essential. Moreover, we may foresee that the translation will

[1] The original text (Dupont 1959) was reviewed by Cœdès (1960) and Subhadradis (1966).
[2] Sen's English edition has been reviewed by Woodward (2008).

sooner or later replace the original French text in university libraries, since the use of English is overwhelmingly preferred to French among scholars, especially in Thailand.

Given the above challenges, the new English edition is rather disappointing, if not upsetting, as it falls short of its promise. The present review is intended to show, for the record, the extent to which the translation does not follow the content of the original work. First of all, the translation presents factual errors to new scholars who may be unable to check or read the text in French. Secondly, not only are there problems with the translation itself, but as well with the additional and partial updates meant to highlight the tremendous amount of work and extent of excavations conducted in central Thailand over the past 50 years. Hence this review addresses the concerns in two parts: one deals intrinsically with basic problems of translation, and the other with the notion of "updates".

"Traduttore, traditore"![3]

In the preface to his English translation, Sen includes a conventional disclaimer: "I am solely responsible for this translation and any errors present are my own".

Regrettably, a problem figures right from the beginning with the mistranslation of his title: *The Archaeology of the Mons of Dvāravatī*. The title is properly translated as "Mon archeology of Dvāravatī". In his original choice of words, Dupont had clearly distinguished Mon archeology—which he felt had been very "indianized"—from Khmer and Thai archeology. Indeed, the original title of his doctoral dissertation at Université de Paris in 1953, *L'archéologie bouddhique de Dvāravatī : l'archéologie indo-mône et les fouilles de Nak'on Pathom*, from which his masterwork was drawn, specifically referred to the Indo-Mon archeology of Nakhon Pathom. The adjectival term "Indo-Mon"[4] (p. 89 [122])[5] was at the time quite in vogue; it appears in an earlier publication by Reginald Le May (1977 [1938], 21–34). Later, Dupont's dissertation title was changed to its present form for the posthumous publication of his work in 1959. It is quite plausible that this slight alteration in the terminology from "Indo-Mon" to "Mon" occurred at the suggestion of George Cœdès, a preeminent figure within the EFEO and a close collaborator of Dupont. Indeed, Cœdès first deciphered the old fragments of a Mon inscription from Nakhon Pathom (1952); he was also a great proponent of the importance of the Mon role in Dvāravatī (1966) within the larger framework of the "indianization" of Southeast Asia.

---

[3] A literal English translation of this Italian adage would be "*translator, traitor*" or "*traduire, c'est trahir*" in French.

[4] Some close parallels to "Indo-Mon" would be "Indo-Javanese" or "Indo-Tibetan".

[5] References to the English translation are given in parentheses and to the French original in brackets.

In the English edition of *L'archéologie mône*, Sen decided to "modernize" the spelling of various places and proper names in a rather inconsistent way. For example, the name "Siam" in the French original is rendered as "Thailand" throughout the English text; "Burma", however, is not changed to "Myanmar". This is problematic for several reasons. Although the name of the country initially changed in 1939 during the first régime of Phibun Songkram (1939–1945), "Siam" was still universally used through the 1950s by laymen and scholars, and Dupont was no exception.[6] In another instance, when referring to the inscriptions of Shwezayan, Sen goes even so far as to mix up ethnic groups and country names. He thus confuses the words found in the aforementioned inscriptions such as "Syam" [the people] with "Thailand" [the country] and "Jaba" or "Javanais/Javanese" with "Java" (p. 5 [8]). As we all know, the Kingdom of Thailand is a modern creation and has no archeological or historical reality before the 20th century. Admittedly, as Sen echoes Gordon H. Luce's observation in an endnote, before the 13th century part of the territory today called Thailand might be better rendered as "Monland" (p. 213 n. 51). "Monland" is generically referred to by Dupont as "*rāmañña̍desa*" in Pāli or "*rāmaṇya[deśa]*" in Sanskrit, but not "*rāmañña̍deśa*" as Sen persistently wants to spell it (pp. 2, 6, 8 [2–3] and passim).

In the same vein, the translator systematically chooses to change some proper names in the text without due acknowledgment in the footnotes. Thus, the more popular name of "Chulalongkorn" is favored over the title "Rāma V", which is nevertheless cited in the French version (p. 17 [25]). We also find the name of King "Anoratha" spelt as "Anawrahta" (p. 4 [5] and passim). Similarly, the translator often favors Sanskrit names over Pāli ones, such as for "Gautama" or "Maitreya", whereas Dupont's original text reads "Gotama" and "Metteyya". Yet Sen retains the Pāli spellings of the buddhas of the past: Kakusandha, Koṇāgamana, Kassapa (pp. 38–39, 47 [58, 64]). In other instances, Sen decides to render some French technical terms used by Dupont into Sanskrit. It is sometimes done with good reason, such as "*tribhaṅga*" for "*hanché*", with explanation provided on p. 212, n. 37. At other times, the translator seems to have done this for no particular reason; i.e., *"vidyadhāra"* for "*génies volants*" (p. 33 [48]) or "*stūpika*" for "*petits stūpas*" (p. 37 [55] and passim).

In addition, the translator often chooses to apply Indian architectural vocabulary, for example, to the Ānanda temple in Pagān, or to Wat Phra Men and Chedi Chula Prathon[7] in Nakhon Pathom. He prefers to speak of "miniature

[6] The name of the country was definitively changed to Thailand in 1949 after the brief period from 1945 to 1949 when "Siam" was restored. Notably, the *Journal of the Siam Society* did not follow suit. It had, however, changed its name to *Journal of the Thailand Research Society* during World War II (1940–1944; vols. 32–35) before reverting to its original name.

[7] Different names and spellings have been used for this site (e.g., Wat P'ra Pat'on by Dupont or Chula Pathon Cedi by Piriya Krairiksh), adding to the confusion. I am using here the current name given by the Fine Arts Department of Thailand.

śikhara" instead of "*réductions d'édifice*" (p. 39 [58]) and "*maṇḍapa*" alternatively for "*salle longue*" (p. 41 [60]) and "*hall de projection*" (p. 47 [64]). Likewise, when Dupont describes the superstructure of the monument at Wat Pa Daeng, near Chiang Mai, Sen feels obliged to add the terms "*aṇḍa*", "*medhi*" and "*chatrāvali*" to the description even though they are not present in the original version (p. 69 [96–97]). Yet, rather inconsistently, the translator decides to change the Sanskrit term "*caitya*" used by Dupont for the Pāli "*cetiya*" (pp. 93, 99–101 [124, 132–136]). His explanations for such changes are ambiguous—he admits that "*caitya*" and "*cetiya*" are interchangeable (p. 224 n. 29). So why bother?

Equally problematic and confusing in the English text is the translator's choice to persist in labeling as the "Phrapathom Chedi National Museum" what Dupont actually called "le Musée du P'ra Pathom" (pp. 18, 19, 34 [25, 27, 51] and passim). To clarify, the "Phra Pathom Chedi National Museum" as we know it today at its current location was opened only in 1971, some 30 years after Dupont's survey of 1939–1940 (Fine Arts Department, 2548 [2005], 7). Until that time, as Lucien Fournereau and Edmond Lunet de Lajonquière have already observed (Hennequin 2010, 3–11), most of the artifacts that had been discovered around Phra Pathom Chedi or elsewhere in Nakhon Pathom were first kept around the gallery and afterward in a small building called the "Museum of the Temple". Many objects were later transferred to different branches of the Fine Arts Department national museums, in either Nakhon Pathom or Bangkok, such as in the case of the so-called "carved block" (pp. 88–90 [120–123]; figs. 323–327, vol. II).[8]

Furthermore, the English translation also fails to identify some of the geographical locations under discussion in the French text. Although Sen connects "Malaisie centrale" with "Peninsular Thailand" (p. 1 [2], p. 210 n.1), he does not associate the "Menam River" of the Central Plains specifically with the Chao Phraya River (p. 1 [1] and passim). In addition, confusing the meaning of the text even more, Sen wrongly identifies "*le Siam méridional*" with "Southern Thailand" (pp. 7–8 [12–13], passim), which shows that he has fallen clearly into the trap of translating word by word, paying too much attention to the letters but not to the content or the context of the passage. Since the casual reader might be confused by references to southern Thailand and Peninsular Thailand, a fair explanation is needed here. During the French colonial era in the Indochina of Dupont's days, most French residents considered the geographical territory of Siam to be restricted to the Central and Lower Plains of the Chao Phraya River. In other words, when Dupont wrote about "*le Siam méridional*", he was not referring to the southern provinces of Songkla, Pattani and the like, but to the western provinces of Nakhon Chai Si (today Nakhon Pathom), Phetchaburi, etc. as he unambiguously clarifies in one instance (p. 10 [16]). The reader can easily grasp the magnitude of the problem with this kind of

[8] This "carved block" has been studied in detail by Brown (1984a).

rendition from the translation of the following paragraph: "The inscriptions from **Southern Thailand** on the kingdom of Dvāravatī are rare and not very explicit. Four are known, all in Old Mon, and are ascribed paleographically between the 7th and 9th centuries. Some Pāli documents were also found" (sect. 1.3.1, p. 10 [16]; my own emphasis). Readers new to the subject might be misled into thinking that both Mon and Pāli were common languages of the people in "southern" or actually Peninsular Thailand during the second half of the first millennium. That is wrong and of course not at all what Dupont wrote.

There are other instances where the translation is, at best, awkward, if not confusing. One example of clumsiness occurs on page 3 [5], where Sen translates into English the title *"Book of Gavampati*" [*Livre de Gavampati*] but not "*l'Histoire de Thaton*" which appear side by side in the same sentence. Another problem arises in discussing the topography and water system of Nakhon Pathom, when Sen confuses the French word "*digue*" and uses "dam" in English (pp. 12–13 [19–21]), instead of "dike", "canal", "waterway" or the like. In chapters 2 and 3, which describe the monuments of Wat Phra Men and Chedi Chula Prathon, it is surprising to see left untranslated what Dupont calls the *"massif central"* (pp. 18–19, 50–54 [27–27, 66–72], passim). For the sake of clarity, "*massif central"*—not to be confounded with the mountain range in France of the same name—could have been easily replaced by "central elevation", "central structure" or "core" in English. On the other hand, the translator shows a great deal of imagination in the case of Dupont's formulation of a step "*en forme d'accolade*" which he renders in English as "ogee-shaped arch with volutes at the ends curling back on themselves" (p. 23 [34]).

A key reason why Dupont's publication is invaluable to archeologists and art historians is its trove of information regarding the description and the provenance of objects found during the 1939–1940 excavations of Nakhon Pathom that he conducted himself with a Thai team from the Fine Arts Department. With regard to the excavated items from Wat Phra Men, Sen may be insufficiently careful with plurals relating to images of "buddha(s)". He seems to be mistaken at least on page 18 [25] where Dupont intentionally refers to the fragments of different large, seated buddhas with legs pendant that were found *in situ* prior to the excavations. The translator, however, merely mentions "a large statue of the Buddha" which the casual reader might understand as referring to a **single** image. The reference is problematic because **four** buddha images are generally thought to have originally been placed there, although they are today displayed in different sites or museums (Fine Arts Department 2548 [2005], 106–107).[9] Dupont also thought with good

[9] Elsewhere I have presented a thorough study of these images (2008, 2010). The history of their discoveries and restorations has also been reviewed by Dhanit Yupho (1967). As regards the fine buddha icon from Wat Na Phra Men, Ayutthaya, (figs. 500 and 596, vol. II) which does not belong to the actual set of four, see also Luang Boribal 2490 [1947].

reason that those four images were seated originally against the central elevation (pp. 29–31 [43–46]). One of them (fig. 33, vol. II) now rests in the *ubosot* (ordination hall) of Wat Phra Pathom Chedi and not in the "*vihāra*" (assembly hall). Sen—notwithstanding Dupont's confusion on this point—could have easily corrected the mistake had he verified its actual location (Fine Arts Department 2548 [2005], 107).[10] Additional plural forms are also missing here and there throughout the English text; for example, in chapter 3, section 3.2.1.5 on 'Torso[s]" and section 3.2.1.7 on "Feet and Base[s]" (p. 56 [76–77]); and in section 3.4.4 on "Comparison[s] with Wat Phra Pathon" (p. 70 [97]).

Other objects such as terracotta tablets have been excavated at Wat Phra Men. Tablets which are referred to as the "first type" represent the Buddha seated in the so-called "Indian style", with legs crossed (figs. 34–40, vol. II) but not pendant ("*à l'européenne*") as erroneously stated once by Dupont and rightly corrected by Sen—although he did not acknowledge his correction for the reader's benefit in a footnote (p. 20 [28]). It could be added, however, that this type of tablet is described by Dupont as a well-known "Mon type" found in Nakhon Pathom (after Cœdès 1927) and neighboring provinces and certainly not a "Thai type" as the translator misinterprets it (p. 32 [47]).

The arbitrariness of the English translation is also apparent in referring to the *Ye dhammā* verse—inscribed on the aforementioned tablets—as a "Buddhist creed" despite the fact that Dupont uses the word "*formula*" (pp. 20, 32–33 [28, 47, 49]). An alternative translation would be "verse" or "stanza" (*gāthā*) which represents the essence of the Buddha's teaching and nothing else, certainly not a "creed" or credo.[11]

The translator again displays a questionable grasp of the original text on page 33 [49], where Sen feels obliged to give a long, involved and incorrect explanation of Dupont's meaning of "signifiers" and "abbreviations" in Mon epigraphy (p. 216 n. 17). Such signifiers and abbreviations, however, are not at all a reference to the consonants and vowel characters, as Sen would have us believe, but simply a more condensed way to engrave the signs on the material available. Similarly, although it has already been alluded to in the first chapter (p. 10 [16]), Sen fails to identify the reference in the French text to the well-known engraved pillar in old Mon script from Sal Sung, Lopburi, referred to for the sake of comparison with figure 316 of the second volume of plates. Misunderstanding this passage, Sen prefers to displace the information in the preceding paragraph and render it like this: "Other objects

[10] Throughout the translation, some of Dupont's minor errors or misprints were discovered by Sen but they are not always explained to the reader.

[11] By the same token, it should be stressed that such molded tablets should no longer be called "votive" in the literature because they are not perceived as *memento* or *ex-voto* by Buddhist practitioners, but merely the product of the ideology of merit (Skilling 2009, 107–108).

were also found [in Nern Phra], in particular a **Mon text written in the beginning of this century from Sal Sung** (…)" (my emphasis). No reference is made at all to the aforementioned pillar and, moreover, Sen is entirely wrong about the date of this important early Mon inscription from ca. the 8th or 9th century (p. 86 [117]).[12]

Apart from the flaws in translation, the English volumes are full of typographical errors. Here, the publisher, White Lotus, is to be blamed for its editorial omissions.

Even more serious than the mistranslations and typos are the copyright issues. French copyright law states that the proprietary rights of the author last for 70 years after a person's death (Art. L123-1). Since Pierre Dupont died in 1955, we are compelled to wait until 2015 before his work enters the public domain and can be used without charge. Moreover, the author is also protected by a certain number of moral rights that are inalienable, perpetual and inviolable such as a "right to the respect and the integrity of the original work" (*"droit au respect de l'intégrité de l'œuvre*", Art. L121-1). Every author's work is thus protected against posthumous modification since those rights pass to the author's heirs or executors upon the author's death. So not only can this translation not be relied upon, but it also betrays Dupont's memory.

In spite of all this, we turn to the substance of the updates proposed by Sen to examine what issues might be amendable or whether a few more recent observations may be added to the discussion on Mon archeology and Dvāravatī studies.

Updating the "updates"

In general, a translation may be expected to be devoid of theoretical accretions and interpretations. Any changes in layout and content or additions should be systematically annotated. If many changes or additions are made, dividing lines between translator and author can become blurred. After detailed review, the reader cannot be blamed for feeling that *The Archaeology of the Mons of Dvāravatī* no longer belongs to Pierre Dupont but to Joyanto K. Sen instead.

First of all, in his published translation Sen has considerably modified the layout and format of the original publication. The English text, for example, is displayed on two columns per page whereas the French text is organized in one column. The original footnotes have been displaced as endnotes. In addition, the detailed French "*Table des matières*" (table of contents), originally put at the back of the volume of text, is now placed up front as "Contents". Furthermore, the entries in English do not follow the same system of classification; they are now sorted by "sections", up to five digits (e.g., sections "3.1.1.1.1" or "6.3.2.3.14"). Some entries

[12] The inscription has also been studied and published by Cœdès (1961, 7–9; pls. III–IV). For a reproduction of Cœdès's plate III, see Hennequin (2010, fig. 7).

are also new to the English edition and are not systematically annotated. (Figure 1 of the present Review Article affords comparison of the two sets of contents.)

Sen dominates the English edition throughout—in the body of the text, the preface, acknowledgements, notes and endnotes, the amended bibliography, new appendices, plans and maps. The additional plates of the second volume even bear his initials (J.K.S.). Given the situation, perhaps Sen should have taken the liberty to write a book on his own and publish it separately. That would certainly have been a more appropriate form for propounding his own ideas and comments on Dupont's work.

Realistically speaking, how could Sen do justice to the original work, including updates, considering that he is not an authority[13] in archeology or art history; while half a century of scholarship has passed since the original work was published. With such considerations in mind I attempt here to review a few aspects, originally made by Dupont and thereafter raised by Sen in his updated sections. The purpose of this discussion is to contribute balance and more recent findings relevant to Dvāravatī studies, in addition to the partial studies or opinions of Sen.[14]

To begin with, in his additional section 1.3.2 of chapter 1, Sen queries the actuality of Dvāravatī (pp. 10–11). Perhaps drawing overmuch on Boeles (1964) and Thai scholars following the discovery of a few "silver coins" or "medals" bearing the name "*śrīdvāravatī*", Sen confidently refers to it as a "kingdom".[15] Be that as it may, Dupont seemed more cautious about Dvāravatī's political organization, although Sen may have misinterpreted Dupont's original thought (sect. 1.1.4, p. 3 [4]). At any rate, I believe it is best not to continue calling Dvāravatī a "kingdom" since it probably consisted of a group of moated cities loosely linked by cultural and economic ties around the ancient coastline of the Gulf of Thailand (Mudar 1999). Adding to Sen's reasonable statement that "Dvāravatī was probably associated with settlements where Hinduism was practiced" (p. 11), in a recent essay

[13] Sen is described on the front cover flap as holding a doctorate in engineering and in the "Preface to the English Edition" as residing in Scottsdale (Arizona, USA) in July 2006. Other than that, we have no information about him or his background in South and Southeast Asian archeology. He has only published a short note, in a recent Marg publication (2007), after publishing his translation of Dupont (2006).

[14] Many authors who have contributed a great deal in the field of Dvāravatī studies during past decades were left out of Sen's attempt to update Dupont's bibliography. For the most recent overviews, see Phasook Indrawooth 2542 [1999], Skilling 2003, Sakchai Saising 2547 [2004] and Baptiste and Zéphir 2009.

[15] The two first "coins" were discovered in 1943 in Nakhon Pathom but were unremarked by scholars, including Dupont, until the 1960s. Boeles was evidently following Cœdès's rendition of the inscriptions as: "meritorious deed of the king of Dvāravatī" (Cœdès 1963, 1964). For another reading and interpretation, see Cha-ame Kaewglai 2534 [1991a] and [1991b]; also Phuthon Phumathon 2533 [1990]. For a recent study of these ritual coins and medals, see Wicks 1999.

Jacques postulates that Dvāravatī could in fact be identified with the ancient city of Si Thep, partly because of its well-known acquaintance with the cult of Viṣṇu/Kṛṣṇa, which in Indian mythology is clearly related to the foundation of the city of Dvārakā/Dvāravatī (2009, 27–29).[16] This new hypothesis is rather challenging since Dvāravatī is often perceived by scholars to have been almost exclusively a "Buddhist kingdom".[17] Judging from the artifacts and Pāli inscriptions from central Thailand, it looks as if the main religious persuasion was probably an early form of Buddhism.[18] Nonetheless, some form of Mahāyāna practice cannot be ruled out, just as some finds of Brahmanical sculptures indicate that Brahmanism was also followed (Nandana Chutiwongs 2009, 59–60; Phasook Indrawooth 2009, 42). In this regard, the bas-relief from the Photisat cave in Saraburi province, discovered in 1965, is hard to interpret because it shows the enthroned Buddha preaching to Śiva and Viṣṇu and worshipped by a hermit or *ṛṣi* (Boisselier 1993; Brown 1996, 30–31; fig. 43).[19]

Chapter 1 also addresses the issues of who inhabited pre-modern Thailand and what language(s) they used. Based on epigraphic evidence, Dupont clearly expressed that the majority of the "people of Dvāravatī" were Mons, hence the title of his work. No one would really argue with that today except perhaps a few Thai

[16] The site of Si Thep has long been perceived as intriguing and mysterious. Dhida Saraya (1985) has attempted to identify it with Śrī Cānāśā, another ancient polity of the Khorat plateau, but her hypothesis has been refuted by others (e.g., Mayurie Veraprasert 2545 [2002]). Other scholars, using the Bo Ika inscription, have suggested that Śrī Cānāśa was instead located at Muang Sema. See Brown for a summary of the arguments and a new opinion about the identification of Śrī Cānāśa vs. Muang Sema or Si Thep (1996, 25–27, 29, 36). For another study of Si Thep, see Skilling 2009. Woodward recently suggested a connection between Si Thep and "Wendan" or "Land Zhenla" (2010).

[17] Along these lines, it is perhaps not surprising that the recent Dvāravatī exhibition held in the Musée Guimet, Paris, was called "*aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*" (February 11 – June 22, 2009); see Baptiste and Zéphir 2009. Similarly, the exhibition came back to Thailand at the Bangkok National Museum under the designation: "Dvāravatī Art: The Early Buddhist Art of Thailand" (August 14 – October 09, 2009); see Fine Arts Department 2552 [2009].

[18] So-called "Hīnayāna" by Dupont (passim) or "Śrāvakayāna" in more recent Buddhist scholarship (e.g., Skilling 2005). Sen confused both "Hīnayāna" and "Sthavira/Theravāda" (appendix V, A. 32; also p. 233 n.1). In fact "Hīnayāna" implies different ancient monastic lineages (*nikāya*) of Sanskrit, Prākrit or Pāli traditions, of which the Theravāda is only one surviving example. It seems that Dupont was quite open to the various possibilities of the presence of different schools in pre-modern Thailand (p. 208 [290]). Yet Cœdès, after the Pāli epigraphic evidence, thought that Theravāda was predominant in Dvāravatī (e.g., 1956). For a general overview of the early introduction of Theravāda Buddhism in Southeast Asia, see Skilling 1997 and Prapod Assavavirulhakarn 2010.

[19] No Buddhist scriptures have thus far satisfactorily explained this peculiar iconography in the cave although the *Pratītyasamutpāda-nāma-mahāyāna-sūtra* makes a reference to the Buddha preaching in Trāyastriṃśa heaven to the gods (Mahābrahmā [Brahmā], Nārāyaṇa [Viṣṇu], Maheśvara [Śiva], among others) as well as other bodhisattvas and Pañcaśikha, king of the *gandharva*; see Skilling 2008, 46–47.

historians such as Dhida Saraya who, in a publication to which Sen refers in his amended bibliography (p. 238), wrote that: "**The people of Dvaravati were mainly a mixture of races, i.e. the Mon–Tai–Sam–Siam**" (1999, 152, her emphasis).[20] The evidence she puts forward for the early presence of the Tais in the region during the first millennium, however, is rather sparse and not convincing. On the other hand, the old Mon language that the people used, it has been argued, was similar to the Nyah Kur dialect still spoken by a few people in northeastern Thailand today (Diffloth 1984).[21] Moreover, Sen emphasizes, following Dupont, that the so-called disparity between Mon archeological and literary records in Thailand and those in Burma often suggests that the Mons of Dvāravatī preceded those of Lower Burma. The evident discrepancy has been questioned by various authors, as Sen notes (sect. 1.4.6, p. 15). Cœdès (1966), for instance, opted for a migration of the Mons of Haripuñjaya (modern Lamphun) to Thaton, escaping an outbreak of cholera in the 11th century. In the same vein, one historian of Burma even attempted recently to deny any role to the Mons in Lower Burma during the first millennium (Aung-Thwin 2005), but other researchers have reacted strongly against this attempt to rewrite Burmese history (e.g., Pichard 2006; Stadtner 2008).[22]

Ethnic issues also relate to questions about the decline of Dvāravatī. Dupont and Sen attributed it to a Khmer invasion by Sūryavarman I (pp. 5, 201 [281–282]) during the first half of the 11th century, although Boisselier favored another conquest that took place during the reign of Jayavarman VII, towards the late 12th or early 13th century (1968, 35). More recently, Woodward mentioned a previous invasion of "Rāmaṇya", that is "Monland", during the reign of Rājendravarman (944–968). He has also invoked the possibility of earlier Javanese raids towards the end of the 8th century or even an attack from the armies of Nanzhao in the 9th century (2003, 98, 137). At any rate, the "Dvāravatī entity" seems to have had a minor existence in historical records after the 7th century. For this reason, the convenience of the label "Dvāravatī" seems increasingly questionable in reference to the time period

[20] The Thai exception would be Piriya Krairiksh with *Art Styles in Thailand* where the author identifies the terminology of "Mon Art style" because "it was the Mon people who gave uniformity and cohesiveness to an *œuvre* created in different geographical locations" (2520 [1977], 38). To which Subhadradis Diskul replied: "The use of ethnic names for the art style might be easily misleading, and the most important thought to consider is whether it is worthwhile to change the name that has been used for a long time [Dvāravatī]. Will it create better understanding or confusion?" (1978, 255). Such a terminological debate goes far beyond specific specialists for, as Guillon has well observed, "it brings history itself into the argument, perhaps with nationalistic motivations in the background" (1999, 75).

[21] Guillon, however, rejects this affiliation with the Nyah Kur people (2009, 47).

[22] For a general overview and a recent history of the Mons and their contributions in Southeast Asia, see Nai Pan Hla 1991 and Guillon 1999.

(which for some extends up to the 11th or 13th century), a geographical entity, an art style[23] or a material culture in pre-modern Thailand.[24]

Chapter 2 describes Wat Phra Men and raises different questions about the original appearance of the monument. Distinct features were reported by Dupont: a somewhat "cruciform" aspect and, in addition, an enclosed gallery around the central elevation probably used in the rite of circumambulation (pp. 96–97, 100–101 [129, 135]). That gallery appears to have been intersected on its four sides by axial passages that were probably meant to take ascending devotees from the external stairways to the central elevation, against which were presumably installed four colossal buddhas (not just "one" as mistakenly interpreted—see *supra*) seated with legs pendant.

On this basis, Dupont attempted comparisons with other monuments that were known to him at the time, such as the Ānanda temple in Pagān or Pahāṛpur in present-day Bangladesh. It is probably here that the translator-commentator Sen has his largest personal input. First, he recalls in a lengthy explanation (sect. 2.5.2, pp. 42–44) that several other contemporaneous monuments (ca. late 8th century) of the same type as Pahāṛpur—i.e., a "cruciform temple"—were also current in Bengal, particularly at Śālban or Antichak.[25] Sen also refers to the *stūpa* at Nandangarh, in the Indian province of Bihār, as a possible architectural prototype for all the subsequent "cruciform monuments" in South and Southeast Asia,[26] including Pahāṛpur, Wat Phra Men and the Ānanda temple (sect. 2.5.3, pp. 44–47; pl. 19; figs. 543–544, vol. II).

Sen's long additional discourse may be perceived as futile, however, and perhaps even misleading because it focuses solely on the origin of the so-called "cruciform" plan in Indian architecture.[27] The important question of how and when such a cruciform or star-shaped plan developed in Asia would go far beyond the scope of this publication. In any case there would be no need, as Sen suggests, to look only

[23] As Piriya Krairiksh once wrote: "There is no doubt that the term "Dvāravatī" is misleading, tending to confuse an art style with an historical period. It is both historically inaccurate and stylistically vague". (2520 [1977], 38).

[24] In contrast with the question of the disappearance of Dvāravatī culture, field archeology with its absolute dating techniques using scientific approaches has revealed an earlier phase of proto-history in many so-called "Dvāravatī sites", especially in U-Thong. The notion of an "early" or "proto-Dvāravatī culture" has gradually taken hold among archeologists (e.g., Glover and Barram 2008). Earlier on, Boisselier (1965) had already found some affinity between the early material cultures of U-Thong and Funan.

[25] Some authors have attempted to associate this type of "cruciform" temple or *stūpa* that develops ever greater complexity with the development of tantric Buddhism. For the case of Central Asia, see Maillard (1983, 170); for Bengal, see Samuel (2002).

[26] For other examples of such "cruciform" temples in Peninsular Southeast Asia, see Jacq-Hergoualc'h (2002, 171–173, 204; docs. 18, 23, 24; figs. 63, 87).

[27] The term "cruciform" often found in descriptions of Wat Phra Men, among others, is rather misleading and exaggerated in this case. The base of the monument is roughly square with four lateral projections. Sen rightly refers to it as the typical s*arvotabhadra* temple in Indian architecture (p. 95).

"inside" India to find such prototypes. The cruciform structure was quite common in greater Gandhāra, Central Asia and along the Silk Road where it may have first originated (Gerhard Franz 1980, 40–44; Buffler 2009). Its subsequent diffusion in India remained limited to the north and northeast, the architecture of southern India being more conservative and opting solely for *stūpa* with circular plans.

Sen could have shown perspicacity had he attached greater importance to the presence of a circumambulation gallery around other early Buddhist monuments in Southeast Asia. From this supposition, Woodward has proposed an analogy between Wat Phra Men and the structure called BJ3, near Yarang (2003, 82 and 2008, 80). An even more significant resemblance was recently suggested with the temple of Blandongan, a Buddhist monument of the first millennium excavated at Batujaya, Western Java, because it shows striking similarities with the ground plan of Wat Phra Men. Fruitful stylistic comparisons may also be made between the archeological material found at the two sites (Manguin and Indrajaya 2006, 247–250; figs. 23.3, 23.6; Revire 2010, 79).[28] This apparent connection between Nakhon Pathom and Java is very promising and should be further explored.

Chapter 3 introduces the neighboring Chedi Chula Prathon (which Sen misspells "Chulapthon Cedi" on p. 49 and in the chapter heading), located almost at the heart of ancient Nakhon Pathom and which was also excavated by Dupont and his team in 1940. Like that of Wat Phra Men, the original appearance of the complete monument remains something of a mystery, since it was missing its superstructure and there are no similar complete structures from this period to allow satisfactory comparison,[29] although Dupont made such an attempt with Wat Kukut in Lamphun, or its variant types in northern Thailand (pp. 66–69 [92–97]). As in the preceding chapter, Sen independently proposes comparing the monument with others in India; more precisely, he attempts to compare "stage III" of Chedi Chula Prathon with the Hindu sanctuaries at Gop in Gujarat or the Gupta temple at Deogarh in Uttar Pradesh (sect. 3.4.3, pp. 69–70 n. 51; pl. 20; fig. 555, vol. II). Such speculative comparisons go against the spirit of Dupont's work. On the other hand, Sen is certainly right to recall the long dispute about the chance discovery made in 1968, at the base of the monument, of the terracotta and stucco panels depicting *jātaka* or *avadāna*. Different iconographic studies of the latter and disputes over their interpretation have divided the scholarly community with no consensus yet to be found (sect. 3.5, pp. 71–74).[30]

[28] See also Manguin (2010, 176–177; figs. 6–7). This author, however, is mistaken with regard to the location of Wat Phra Men, which he assigns to U-Thong instead of Nakhon Pathom.

[29] Various conjectural three-dimensional reconstructions were recently proposed by Santi Leksukhum (2010) for both Wat Phra Men and Chedi Chula Prathon.

[30] The panels were first studied by Boisselier (1970) and later by Piriya Krairiksh (1974a, 1975) to which Sen refers extensively in his additional section. Nandana Chutiwongs has indicated, however, that Piriya Krairiksh's deductions are inadequate (1978).

There may be other ways, however, to understand Chedi Chula Prathon, notably by re-examining the diverse material found in the monument's deposits. Bronze objects, such as small bells, cymbals, a candelabrum, a goblet and fragments of one mirror were deliberately buried together beneath the central structure and were excavated by Dupont (sect. 3.2, p. 63 [87–88]; figs. 257, 259–261, 263, vol. II).[31] They seem to be remnants of one or more ritual deposits, although no stone or metal deposit box was exhumed. These important objects have been neglected in the scholarly literature. Of particular interest for Buddhist scholars, found among the deposited objects was a bronze finial for a *khakkhara* (fig. 262, vol. II)—a wooden staff topped by a metal loop to which smaller rings are attached.[32] In ancient times, such staffs may have been used by some pilgrim monks during their travels to steady their way, as a ritual implement, or even perhaps as a marker of monastic identities. Their exact use in the ancient period has yet to be determined (Revire 2009 and 2011a).

In chapter 4, an additional section by Sen refers to other Dvāravatī-related sites excavated decades after Dupont's campaigns, namely in Dong Si Mahaphot, Muang Fa Dæd, Kok Mai Den, U-Thong and Khu Bua (sect. 4.7, pp. 90–91). Earlier, Boisselier played a major role in those campaigns and published most of their results (1965, 1969, 1972). A more up-to-date survey would have also included such sites as Phra That Nadun, in Mahasarakham province, where molded tablets have been found in great quantities (Mayurie Veraprasert 1995; Baptiste and Zéphir 2009, 114–115; figs. 31–37), or Thung Setthi in Phetchaburi province (Fine Arts Department 2543[2000]). Closer to Bangkok, almost at the center of ancient Nakhon Pathom and just a few hundred meters away from Chedi Chula Prathon, a new restoration campaign has unveiled different stages of construction at Phra Prathon Chedi going back to the 7th or 8th centuries (Usa Nguanphienphak 2009; Hennequin 2009). More recently, archeological campaigns have also been conducted in the Central Plains, first in Kamphaeng Saen (Gallon, forthcoming) and in Dong Mae Nang Muang, Nakhon Sawan province (Murphy and Pimchanok Pongkasetkan 2010). The latter campaign was very fruitful as it revealed a great number of human burials found at the foundation level of laterite *stūpa*. Those burials may reflect a religious phenomenon of the first millennium rarely documented before; although it has also been observed at Phong Tuk, for instance (Clarke 2009). By far the most

[31] These objects were precisely found "near the fourth niche of the Buddha on the southwest side [of the central structure]" (p. 63 [88]), not on the "southeast side" as erroneously affirmed in the second volume of plates (p. 70 [67]). Ironically, the labels at the Bangkok National Museum where the objects are today on display, have long given the wrong provenance of Wat Phra Men; some corrections have been made lately after the present author's enquiry.

[32] Dupont, who excavated the piece at Chedi Chula Prathon, was unable to describe it as such. Piriya Krairiksh first identified it as a *khakkhara* finial (1974b, 47 n. 45). A decade earlier, Subhadradis Diskul vaguely identified the object as a "*couronnement de sceptre*" (1966, 167 n. 3).

impressive achievement, however, was the recent excavation of Khao Klang Nok, a gigantic terraced structure nearly the size of Borobudur in Java, with four axial passages in the outskirts of Si Thep (Santi Leksukhum 2009, 130–131; fig. on p. 116 and 128). All these new sites uncovered in the last few decades bear witness to the development of complex polities, religious centers and settlement networks in pre-modern Thailand on a scale previously unsuspected by Dupont.

Turning to sculptural matters, chapters 6 to 8 reveal that the Mons were highly skilled artists who excelled in stone sculpture, stucco and terracotta architectural decoration, and, to a lesser degree, in bronze work.[33] Dupont has shown in a systematic way that their art style—at least initially—was similar to that of the Amarāvatī, Gupta and Post-Gupta schools (pp. 118–123 [163–171]). The facial features of Mon buddha images, however, often exhibit pronounced "native" elements—a large face, curved eyebrows joined at the bridge of the nose, prominent eyes partly closed, a broad nose and thick and well-defined lips. The hair is usually dressed in large spiral curls with a cylindrical *uṣṇīṣa* or cranial protuberance. Moreover, in contrast with the Gupta style which displays a *tribhaṅga* or triple flexion curve of the body, standing Mon images commonly exhibit rigid symmetry that seems more reminiscent of Pāla art, or, as Piriya Krairiksh once suggested, "Chinese art" because it is an "antithesis to the Indian aesthetic sensibility" (1982, 22).[34] The body usually stands erectly with feet firmly planted on a lotus pedestal; both hands generally perform the same gesture; the outer robe covers both shoulders and clings closely to the body, giving an impression of "naked asexuality".[35] It is interesting to note that similar little standing buddha images in bronze have also been found in neighboring countries (figs. 468–471, vol. II).[36]

---

[33] That is, leaving aside the fine tradition of bronze casting from the Khorat plateau, such as the so-called "Prakhon Chai" group of images exemplifies; see Boisselier and Beurdeley (1974, 111–112).

[34] For another and somewhat different stylistic and iconographic treatment, see Chedha Tingsanchali 2009.

[35] Once more, Sen gives a long exposition on "naked asexuality in Pāla art" (section 6.3.2.2.4, pp. 132–134), as seen in the additional plate depicting the stone slabs from the Indian Museum in Calcutta (figs. 576a–e, vol. II). For the sake of clarity, the following amendments need to be made for figures 576d and 576e: the Buddha subdues the mad elephant "Dhanapāla" (called Nālāgiri in the Pāli recension) and, on the Buddha's left, his disciple Ānanda, not quite a "Mahut" as stated by Sen (p. 134), is holding a *khakkhara* or a kind of monk's staff.

[36] A recent find of bronze Buddhist icons in Kampong Cham province, Cambodia, may shed new light on the complexity and diversity in the distribution of this material throughout Southeast Asia. The group of images consisted of three small standing buddhas in *vitarkamudrā*, characteristic of Mon art, two Khmer bodhisattvas, reminiscent of those found around Prakhon Chai in Buriram province, and two Chinese icons of unusual interest with traces of gilding. The images are stylistically dated to the late 6th (Chinese icons) or the second half of the 7th century. Jett speculates that the arrival of such Chinese gilt-bronze figures in Cambodia might have led to the use of gilding on local bronze religious sculpture (2010, 86).

The iconographic significance and identification of standing buddhas that display the same argumentation gestures with both hands (*vitarkamudrā*)—being peculiar to the Dvāravatī culture only (sect. 6.3.2.2.3, pp. 130–132 [181–185]), especially those standing on a hybrid monster sometimes called "Banaspati"—are difficult to ascertain and have raised much speculation among scholars since Dupont. For instance, Piriya Krairiksh interprets such standing buddhas to represent the descent of the Buddha Amitābha to welcome the soul of the dead to the Pure Land of Sukhāvatī (1982, 23). The more common explanation, given by Sen in the captions to figures 578–579 (volume II), is "the Buddha's descent from Tavatisma heaven" [sic (Tāvatiṃsa in Pāli; Trāyastriṃśa in Sanskrit)].[37] Both interpretations are purely speculative. The latter is based on Thai nomenclature of the 19th century. It is not supported by inscriptions and its significance is clearly lost, as Dupont confessed (p. 132 [183]). More recently, an unsatisfactory attempt was made to link the iconography of the "buddhas on monsters" to political goals (Stuart-Fox and Tiffin 2002). Conversely, Brown (2011) has made the fresh proposal that this unique imagery, which he associates with the Wheels of the Law symbolizing the Dharma, is merely the Buddha performing a "sky-lecture".

Besides the numerous standing images (chap. 6), there is also a wide range of seated buddhas (chap. 7) in Mon sculpture although the latter are few compared with those standing.[38] That is true at least for stone and bronze statues, because the number of stucco or terracotta images is not really known. As reported by Dupont, the seated buddha images were either crossed-legged ("*à l'indienne*" is rendered by Sen as "Indian style") or had both legs pendant ("*à l'européenne*", which Sen translates as "European style"). Among those seated crossed-legged (*paryaṅkāsana*) is the category "buddhas on *nāga*" (sect. 7.2, pp. 179–190 [251–265]) also ubiquitous in Khmer art during the Angkorian period on which Dupont wrote a separate article (1950). Since Dupont's publications, however, other images of the Buddha on *nāga* have been discovered in Thailand,[39] such as one stucco fragment from U-Thong (Fine Arts Department 2550/2007, 34), as well as supplementary examples from northeastern Thailand carved on *sema* stones (Murphy 2010, 274–275, figs. 577–579; also Pal 2007, 54–55) or illustrated on a few molded tablets found in Nadun district (Mayurie Veraprasert 1995, 223; figs. 8, 9, 11). Overall, the continuous presence of the Buddha on *nāga* in Thailand's northeastern region from the 7th–8th

[37] Along these lines, see also Boisselier and Beurdeley (1974, 88–89); other interpretations are equally reviewed in Rungrot Thamrungrueang (2009, 83–84).

[38] In addition to the obvious standing or seated images of the Buddha as Dupont refers to here, a few other reclining buddha images from this period ought to be mentioned. They are located mainly in Ratchaburi province or northeastern Thailand and are often carved in bas-reliefs on rock walls (e.g., Piriya Krairiksh 2518 [1975b]; Boisselier 1993; and Woodward 2003, pl. 28).

[39] Despite Sen's assumption, figure 496 is the same sculpture as figure 588 (volume II) and not a "very similar" type (p. 183).

century onwards suggests the possibility of retracing the origin of the Khmer icons to Mon prototypes. These regional models may then be considered the "missing link" between Mon and Khmer imagery long sought by Dupont (pp. 187–188 [261, 263]) and further established by Sen (sect. 7.2.3.2.3, pp. 190–191; 2007, 67–68) and Pal (2007) on the basis of consideration of the statue from the Norton Simon Museum in California, also believed to be from northeastern Thailand (fig. 600, vol. II).[40]

As for buddhas seated in the so-called "European style" (sect. 7.3, pp. 191–200 [266–280]), two general remarks may be made about Sen's inaccurate use of terminology. Firstly, in Indian iconography, it is inappropriate to call a posture (*āsana*) a "style". In such a context, a style can only relate to an artistic school or tradition within which the buddha image (or a Brahmanical god) was cast. As Dupont described Mon sculpture and discussed its possible origin(s) and affiliation(s) with Indian art, he referred mostly to the Amarāvatī style and the Gupta or Post-Gupta styles. He never, of course, made any allusion to an "Indian style" as opposed to a "European style" in his examinations of Mon statuary. Secondly, the modern terms for describing such seated buddhas with legs pendant have come under criticism. As I have suggested elsewhere, the term "*à l'européenne*" or "European pose/manner/fashion [but not style]" is out of date.[41] It first appeared at the end of the 19th century in European circles of Orientalists and gained popular credence throughout the 20th century. It should be avoided, however, in modern scholarship. Several Sanskrit terms are regularly given as equivalent for this sitting posture—as Sen has conveniently added in his glossary (appendix V, A-31, 32)—such as *pralambapādāsana* or *bhadrāsana*. In my own view, the term *bhadrāsana* is preferable to *pralambapādāsana*, since it has a textual basis in ancient iconographic treatises that the former does not have. In addition, it may also reflect the royal symbolism that is strongly suggested by this posture. Consequently, such pendant-legged buddhas may be better described as seated in *bhadrāsana*, "in majesty" or "royally" but no longer "*à l'européenne*" (Revire 2011b).

In *L'archéologie mône*, Dupont was primarily concerned with the typology of the buddha images, not their chronology. Furthermore, reconstructing a chronology of "Mon-Dvāravatī" sculpture is often regarded as difficult or problematic because, to the best of my own knowledge, there are no securely dated images, while very few images of any type bear inscriptions from that period, not only in Thailand but in most of Southeast Asia.[42] Consequently, dating often remains elusive. That

[40] In the same vein, see Gaston-Aubert (2010, 131–133, 138–140).

[41] A pioneering article on this iconography is by M-G. Bourda (1949), not "H-G." Bourda, as wrongly indicated on p. 232 n. 63.

[42] Epigraphy may help with dating but it is often subjected to paleographic interpretation. Although important Pāli and Mon inscriptions have been found in central Thailand, they are mainly religious (Buddhist) in character and rarely bear dates. See Cœdès 1961.

said, art historians have often turned to Indian art for comparisons with Southeast Asian objects and attempted to offer stylistic evidence or, even better, find possible prototypes. But that method has not proved to be very successful in relation with chronology. In contrast, I am inclined to think that the material from China, with many images firmly dated by inscriptions from the first millennium, offers alternative guidelines for dating similar Buddhist imagery in Southeast Asia.

Last but not least, we ought to temper Dupont's assumptions in his concluding words of chapter 9 that Sen followed, regarding a so-called "*hīnayāna* iconography" or a "*hīnayāna* Buddhist architecture" that would have spread throughout Southeast Asia and would have widely influenced Mon iconography (pp. 207–210 [289–293]). Such suppositions are very unlikely because, firstly, the categories "*hīnayāna*", "*mahāyāna*" and the like do no justice to the huge diversity and multiplicity in Buddhism of *nikāya* and sub-*nikāya* and of their practitioners (e.g., Skilling 2005); secondly, there could well be a multivalent symbolism attached to one place or one icon. Taking the famous example of the most popular Buddhist temple, the Mahābodhi in Bodhgayā, obviously the numerous images found there may be interpreted in different ways according to the various Buddhist traditions and backgrounds of the pilgrims visiting the Indian site. Similarly, other Buddhist sites in Nakhon Pathom (e.g., Chedi Chula Prathon or Wat Phra Men) and in neighboring provinces should be viewed in the same light.[43] Thus, questioning whether any widespread art style could be directly linked to a single *nikāya* would seem to be a non-starter.[44]

If we now turn to the second volume of plates, in the English edition, only the reproductions of Dupont's original collections of black and white photographs are satisfactory (figs. 1–542).[45] The color plates that Sen has added are often of poor quality. Some are downloads direct from the Internet (e.g., figs. 571–573), while others have been retouched with a non-professional photo corrector (e.g., figs. 560, 564–566, 580–583, 594–596, 600). A beneficial task for the translator in "updating" the original plates for the modern reader could have been to supplement the initial captions with information on current location, attribution and condition

[43] I have recently suggested that Wat Phra Men may be interpreted in such a fashion; i.e., reflecting both exoteric and esoteric practices (Revire 2010, 97).

[44] Piriya Krairiksh has recently attempted to trace art styles in Thailand with "sectarian affiliations" (2542 [1999], 37–38). For reasons I state earlier, his arguments are not convincing. Likewise, Dowling, probably drawing too much on Yijing's account, which is none too clear (Takakusu, 1998 [1896], 66), has interpreted the undercloth style on the Angkor Borei buddha images as an indication of such "sectarian affiliation" (2000, 129). Countering such assertions, see Skilling (2009a, 112–113) and Revire (2009, 121–123).

[45] The numbering of the figures (up to 542) is the same in both the original and reprinted volumes of plates. Figures 543–600 were added by Sen.

of the objects and statues. Dupont's original captions are indeed often out of date but, unfortunately, Sen provides either erroneous or no information.[46]

Many Thai collections have evolved considerably since Dupont's time. The scope of such changes is evident from comparison of the original illustrations and provenances of objects in the second volume with the current location of the relevant objects, as illustrated by the following examples.

1. The buddha head in figure 353 is no longer in Ayutthaya; it is currently on display in the Bangkok National Museum and was recently in Paris for the Dvāravatī exhibition (Baptiste and Zéphir 2009, 240; fig. 115).
2. The head in figure 377 is no longer kept in Bangkok, but displayed at the Ratchaburi National Museum (Baptiste and Zéphir 2009, 236; fig. 112).
3. The seated buddha image on figure 478, reportedly from Chaiya, is now in the Chao Sam Phraya National Museum, Ayutthaya.
4. The buddha image said to be in Bangkok on figure 479 is nowadays on display in Prachinburi province (Baptiste and Zéphir 2009, 245; fig. 125).
5. The boundary stone shown twice, in figures 515 and 516, said by Dupont (and Sen) to be from (Muang) Kanok Nakhon, was still *in situ* in 1950s and in fairly good condition, as revealed in old photographs. It has long been moved to the Bangkok National Museum and currently, sadly enough, is in a much worse state of preservation, broken in two. The modern caption at the Museum says that it comes from Muang Fa Dæd, Kalasin province, which is the present name for Kanok Nakhon.[47]
6. The well-known radiating Avalokiteśvara from Muang Singh, Kanchanaburi, which has nothing to do with Mon art, is currently located in the Bangkok National Museum. The statue we see illustrated by Sen on figure 561 (lower right) is only a wax copy found *in situ*.

In the same vein, it must be added that the collections of most French Indochinese museums have shared a similar fate of relocation; the seated buddha

[46] For example the important **stone slab** from Wat Suthat in Bangkok, magnificently illustrated in color on the back cover of the English edition (also in figs. 597–598), is wrongly designated herein as a "**bronze slab**" on the front cover flap. The lower register depicts the Great Miracle of Śrāvastī, a subject that is often depicted in Dvāravatī art; see Brown 1984b.

[47] Kanok Nakhon was a name given by the inhabitants of Muang Fa Dæd in the 1950s after a local myth attached to the site. Seidenfaden refers to Kanok Nakhon in an article (1954) that perhaps is the origin of Dupont's term. Subhadradis Diskul (1956) was the first to refer to the site by its actual name—Muang Fa Dæd—which has been in use ever since. I wish to thank Stephen Murphy for providing this bit of information from his unpublished doctoral dissertation on *sema* stones (2010, 109–112). For an earlier study of these *sema* stones, see also Piriya Krairiksh 1974b.

sculpture with legs pendant, shown in Sen's additional figure 575, is a good demonstration of the trend. This image was first discovered in the Mekong Delta village of Son Tho, in southern Vietnam, early in the 20th century (pp. 199–200 [279–280]; Dupont 1955, 192). It was transferred and kept for many years in Phnom Penh, first briefly in the old "Khmer Museum" created by Henri Parmentier (inv. no. S 20, 9), before reaching the collection of the Albert Sarrault Museum (inv. no. B. 54), the former National Museum of Cambodia (Groslier 1931, 34; pl. IV). It was later returned to Vietnam and kept in the Musée Blanchard de la Brosse, Saigon, now the Museum of History in Ho Chi Min City, where it is currently located (inv. no. BTLS. 5517).[48] In other words, the image has not been in Phnom Penh since 1941 and, strictly speaking, was never in the possession of the National Museum of Cambodia, as Sen's caption erroneously claims.

A last problem of provenance arises with figure 338, although Sen is not to be held responsible here. The little standing buddha in bronze (inv. no. TP 56) is labeled by Dupont (and Sen) as coming from Nakhon Pathom, but almost certainly has nothing to do with either that place or Mon archeology. It is now accepted as one of the three buddhas that were found in the ruins of Dhanesar Khera, India (Piriya Krairiksh 2009, 53) and acquired by Dr William Hoey, a British Commissioner in Gorakhpur, in the late 19th century. His granddaughter, Sheila E. Hoey Middleton, has written two articles (2002, 2010) reporting that the statuette in figure 338 appears identical to the smallest of the three buddhas formerly belonging to Dr Hoey. In her second article (2010), she presents new information that strengthens the theories put forward in 2002. The *stūpa* at Piprahwa (or Kapilavastu II) was excavated in 1898 and inside it an urn was found that was believed to have contained relics of the Buddha. In 1899 at a formal ceremony in Gorakhpur, Dr Hoey presented a share of those relics to the envoy of King Chulalongkorn of Siam. On this occasion, therefore, Hoey could quite possibly have given the buddha image in bronze to the King's envoy, thus explaining how the statuette reached Bangkok and entered the Thai royal collection. It is recorded in Bangkok as having been given by King Prajadhipok (Rāma VII) on 9 February 2471 BE [1928] to the new collection of the Bangkok National Museum; it may be assumed that the King at the time took it from his father King Chulalongkorn's collection. At some stage, confusion could have arisen with regard to the exact provenance and location of discovery of this bronze buddha image, because the publication on the gifts given by King Rāma

[48] The image was recently on display at a special exhibition in North America (Tingley 2009, 148–149). Prior to this US exhibition, the piece was on loan to the Fine Arts Museum in Ho Chi Min City with yet a different inventory number (BTMT 186). I wish to thank Brice Vincent and Bertrand Porte for checking the archival data and confirming the past and current locations of this important and unique Pre-Angkorian buddha image in *bhadrāsana*.

VII to the Bangkok National Museum also reports that it had been "excavated at Phra Pathom Chedi" (Songsri Praphatthong 2536 [1993], 101). The information is probably erroneous and Dupont, who saw very strong similarities with Gupta style images, thought it was "a local imitation of an imported model" (p. 121 [167]).[49]

Old scholarship, new translations?

In the foregoing pages I have discussed the kinds of problems that characterize Joyanto K. Sen's English translation and attempts at updating *L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī*. I have highlighted some of the most important technical errors, approximations or biased interpretations that are made throughout and which cause much damage to the letter and spirit of the original work by Pierre Dupont. The problems are so extensive that Sen's English edition cannot be completely trusted as a scholarly resource. The skeptical reader might retort that such difficulties are to be expected, given the span of about 50 years between Dupont's original publication in French (1959) and the first-ever English translation by Sen (Dupont 2006). The reader might legitimately ask as well how to interpret Dupont's masterpiece in the 21st century, in the light of modern scholarship and new archeological discoveries. The language, the terminology as well as the historical context or conceptual framework of what is called Dvāravatī have changed a great deal since Dupont's time.

Were the shortcomings and difficulties I have cited, however, really insurmountable? Surely, several technical problems and misinterpretations could easily have been avoided if a French native speaker and several scholars in the field had been involved at any stage of this translation project.

The community of Dvāravatī scholars would be well served if a qualified person would properly attempt the translation anew, in order to right the wrongs committed here. Moreover, it is well understood that, today, students and scholars newly involved in "Thai art history" are increasingly less apt to be able to use French in their work. Appropriate English or even Thai translations are therefore increasingly needed in the study of Thai or pre-Thai art and archeology—not only of Dupont's masterwork at hand, but of old classics by other French authors.[50]

[49] On the contrary, Sen recalls that Griswold thought the statuette was "distinctly Gandhāran or Guptan and unlike Dvāravatī" and so concluded that it was probably made in India ca. the 5th century (p. 227 n. 47; Griswold 1966, 61).

[50] French scholars—Cœdès or Boisselier being the most prominent—have been leaders in the field of Thai archeology. For their contributions to the study of Dvāravatī, see Hennequin (2010). Possibly initiating a new trend in Thai translations is a publication by Hennequin and Kannika Chansang 2552 [2009]. The same naturally holds true for the study of Khmer art. Bridging the gap, see Brown and Eilenberg (2008).

Figure 1. Dupont and Sen: synoptic tables of contents

Chapters and major subsections in the original French and translated English editions (vol. I), with additions (major and minor subsections, *in italics*) by the translator in the English edition

L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī PIERRE DUPONT; publ.1959	*The Archaeology of the Mons of Dvāravatī* JOYANTO K. SEN, trans.; publ. 2006
Chapitre Premier. Les Môns	Chapter 1. The Mons
1. Môns de Basse-Birmanie et Môns du Siam 2. Môns de Basse-Birmanie 3. Môns du Siam : l'épigraphie de Dvāravatī 4. Môns du Siam : l'archéologie de Dvāravatī	1.1 The Mons of Lower Burma and Thailand 1.2 The Mons of Lower Burma 1.3 The Mons of Thailand: The Epigraphy of Dvāravatī *1.3.2 The Reality of Dvāravatī* 1.4 The Mons of Thailand: The Archaeology of Dvāravatī *1.4.6 On the Disparity Between Archaeological and Literary Records*
Chapitre II. Le Wat P'ra Men 1. Composition générale du monument 2. Objets de fouilles 3. Restitution du monument 4. Comparaisons architecturales – Éléments de datation	Chapter 2. Wat Phra Men *2.1 Overview* 2.2 General Description of the Monument 2.3 Excavated Objects 2.4 Restoration of the Monument 2.5 Comparison with Other Monuments as a Basis for Dating *2.5.3* Stūpa *at Nandangarh*
Chapitre III. Le Wat P'ra Pat'on 1. Composition générale du monument 2. Objets de fouilles 3. Restitution du monument 4. Comparaisons architecturales	Chapter 3. Wat Phra Pathon 3.1 General Description of the Monument 3.2 Excavated Objects 3.3 Restoration of the Monument 3.4 Comparison of Architectures *3.4.3 The Temple at Gop in Gujarat* *3.5 Revised Restoration Following Excavations in 1968 and Later* *3.5.1 Revised Restoration of Stage I* *3.5.2 Revised Restoration of Stage II* *3.5.3 Revised Restoration of Stage III* *3.5.4 An Alternate Reconstruction of the Massif Central*
Chapitre IV. Autres sites archéologiques 1. Le soubassement de Wat Yai 2. P'ong Tuk 3. Camp militaire de Lop'buri 4. No'n P'ra 5. Muang P'ra Rot (Dong Si Maha P'ot) 6. Le bloc sculpté du P'ra Pathom	Chapter 4. Other Archaeological Sites 4.1 The Basement of Wat Yai 4.2 Pong Tuk 4.3 The Military Camp of Lopburi 4.4 Nern Phra 4.5 Muang Phra Rot (Dong Si Maha Pot) 4.6 The Carved Block from Phrapathom Chedi *4.7 Dvāravatī Sites Excavated After 1961*

Chapitre V. Généralités sur l'architecture de Dvāravatī 1. Les terrasses 2. Les édifices centraux 3. Essai de classement des monuments	Chapter 5. Overview of Dvāravatī Architecture *5.1 Architectural Types* 5.2 The Terraces *5.2.4 The Khmer Monument of Muang Singh* 5.3 The Central Structures 5.4 An Attempt at a Chronology of the Monuments
Chapitre VI. Statuaire et iconographie : les images du Buddha debout 1. La tradition indienne 2. Les images mônes 3. Les images similaires en Asie du Sud-Est	Chapter 6. Statuary and Iconography of the Standing Buddha *6.1 Overview* *6.1.1 General* *6.1.2 On Classification and Dating* *6.1.3 Characteristics of the Standing Buddha* 6.2 The Indian Tradition 6.3 The Mon Statues *6.3.2.2.4 Naked Asexuality in Pāla Art* 6.4 Similar Statues from Southeast Asia
Chapitre VII. Statuaire et iconographie : les images du Buddha assis 1. Les images assises à l'indienne 2. Les images du Buddha sur *Nāga* 3. Les images du Buddha assis à l'européenne	Chapter 7. Statuary and Iconography of the Seated Buddha 7.1 Statues of the Buddha Seated in the Indian Style 7.2 Statues of the Buddha on *Nāga* *7.2.1.3 A Pre-Pāla Buddha on* Nāga *7.2.3.1.1 Buddha Flanked by* Stūpa *in Pāla Art* *7.2.3.2.3 The Buddha Protected by* Nāga *in The Norton Simon Museum* 7.3 Statues of the Buddha Seated in the European Style *7.3.3.1 The Median Strip of the Anataravāsaka* [sic; for *Antaravāsaka*]
Chapitre VIII. La propagation de l'image mône du Buddha 1. Le Phra Palilai 2. Les images khmères du Buddha debout 3. Les images thaïes du Buddha debout	Chapter 8. The Dissemination of the Mon Statue of the Buddha *8.1 Overview* 8.2 Preah Palilay 8.3 Khmer Statues of the Standing Buddha 8.4 Thai Statues of the Standing Buddha
Chapitre IX. Conclusions	Chapter 9. Conclusions

That said, I sincerely hope that *L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī* by Dupont will still circulate and be consulted within the academic community, for it offers primary information about the archeology of Nakhon Pathom and pre-modern Thailand. By the same token, I am not saying that early scholarship ought not to be carefully reexamined. The pioneering works of Dupont, Cœdès and Boisselier, to name just a few, are no exception, however important they might have been in defining Dvāravatī and sketching a coherent picture of Mon archeology in Thailand.

Ideally a new generation of scholars will re-evaluate the evidence and add new ideas to the debate. This Review Article has stressed that reconsideration of Dupont's and other classic works on Dvāravatī would be most effectively realized through original authorship and not simply in translation. In this sense, the English edition by White Lotus does not do justice to the original. Generally speaking, it is not the place of a translator to attempt to "update" original content of a work at hand. Anyone seriously engaged in Mon archeology should be encouraged to write his or her own contribution.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Robert Brown, Wesley Clarke, Arlo Griffiths, Laurent Hennequin, Pinna Indorf, Leedom Lefferts, Sheila Middleton, Peter Skilling and Hiram Woodward for offering their valuable comments or assistance in editing the manuscript of this Review Article as it evolved. Special thanks are due to Kim Atkinson for encouraging me from the inception to write this Review Article and for editing the results.

References

Aung-Thwin, Mickael A. 2005. *The Mists of Rāmañña: The Legend That Was Lower Burma*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Baptiste, Pierre and Thierry Zéphir, eds. 2009. *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Boeles, Jan J. 1964. "The King of Śrī Dvāravatī and his regalia", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 52, No. 1, pp. 99–114.

Boisselier, Jean. 1965. "Récentes recherches archéologiques en Thaïlande. Rapport préliminaires de mission (25 juillet–28 novembre 1964)", *Arts Asiatiques*, Vol. 12, pp. 125–174.

_____. 1968. "L'art de Dvāravatī", *Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 6, pp. 34–56.

_____. 1969. "Recherches archéologiques en Thaïlande II. Rapport sommaire de la mission 1965 (26 juillet–28 novembre)", *Arts Asiatiques*, Vol. 20, pp. 47–98.

_____. 1970. "Récentes recherches à Nakhon Pathom", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 55–65 + ills.

_____. 1972. "Travaux de la mission archéologique française en Thaïlande (juillet–novembre 1966)", *Arts Asiatiques*, Vol. 25, pp. 27–90.

_____. 1993. "Propos sur Tham Phra Photisat et les cavernes bouddhiques de Thaïlande", *Arts Asiatiques*, Vol. 48, pp. 127–135.

Boisselier, Jean and Jean-Michel Beurdeley. 1974. *La sculpture en Thaïlande*. Fribourg: Office du livre.

Bourda, Maria-George. 1949. "Quelques réflexions sur la pose assise à l'européenne dans l'art bouddhique", *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 12, pp. 302–313.

Brown, Robert L. 1984a. "Indra's heaven: A *dharmacakrastambha* socle in the Bangkok National Museum", *Ars Orientalis*, Vol. 14, pp. 115–30.

_____. 1984b. "The Śrāvastī Miracles in the art of India and Dvāravatī", *Archives of Asian Art*, Vol. 37, pp. 79–95.

_____. 1996. *The Dvāravatī Wheels of the Law and the Indianization of South East Asia*. Leiden: Brill.

_____. 2011. "A sky-lecture by the Buddha", *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association*, Vol. 31. [In press.]

Brown, Robert L. and Natasha Eilenberg, tr. and eds. 2008. *Studies on the Art of Ancient Cambodia: Ten Articles by Jean Boisselier*. Phnom Penh: Reyum Publishing.

Buffler, Eléonore. 2009. "Spreading of some Buddhist architectural designs between Afghanistan and China: The case of the cruciform stupa". Paper presented at the

conference *Buddhism across Asia: Networks of Material, Intellectual and Cultural Exchange*, 16–18 February 2009. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Cha-ame Kaewglai. 2534 BE [1991a]. "Charuek rian ngoen thawarawadi: lakthan mai. Akson kharosthi phasa sansakrit [Inscription on a Dvaravati silver coin: recent evidence]", *Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 51–57. [In Thai with English abstract.]

_____. 2534 BE [1991b]. "Srithawarawadi [Śrī Dvāravatī: a new interpretation]", *Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 58–68. [In Thai with English abstract.]

Chedha Tingsanchali. 2009. "Les représentations du Buddha en double *vitarka mudrā*", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 225–227. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Clarke, Wesley. 2009. "The skeletons of Phong Tuk: A preliminary consideration of human remains in Dvāravatī ritual contexts". Paper presented at the 19th Congress of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association, Hanoi, 29 Nov.–5 Dec. 2009. [Unpublished.]

Cœdès, George. 1927. "Siamese votive tablets", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 20, pp.1–23 + 15 pls.

_____. 1952. "Deux fragments d'inscription récemment découverts à P'ră Păthŏm", *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*, pp. 27–31.

_____. 1956. "Une roue de la loi avec inscriptions en pāli provenant du site de P'ră Păthŏm", *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 19, pp. 221–226.

_____. 1960. "Compte rendu de Pierre Dupont, *L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī*", *Arts Asiatiques*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 235–239.

_____. 2504 BE [1961]. *Phrachum sila charuek (phak thi song) – charuek thawarawadi sriwichai lawo/Recueil des inscriptions du Siam – 2. Inscriptions de Dvāravatī, Çrīvijaya et Lăvo*. Second printing, updated; first printing 1924. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. [In Thai and French.]

_____. 1963. "Découverte numismatique au Siam intéressant le royaume de Dvāravatī", *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*, pp. 285–291.

_____. 1964. "À la recherche du royaume de Dvāravatī", *Archéologia*, No. 1, pp. 58–63.

_____. 1966. "Les Môns de Dvāravatī", in Ba Shin, Jean Boisselier and A. B. Griswold, eds., *Essays Offered to G. H. Luce by His Colleagues and Friends in Honour of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday. Volume 1: Papers on Asian History, Religion, Languages, Literature, Music Folklore, and Anthropology*, Artibus Asiae Supplementum, Vol. 23, pp. 112–116.

Dhanit Yupho. 1967. *Quartzite Buddha Images of the Dvāravatī Period*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department.

Dhida Saraya. 1985. "Srithep khue Srichanasa/Si Thep was Sricanasa", *Muang Boran Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 63–76. [In Thai with English abstract.]

_____. 1999. *(Sri) Dvaravati. The Initial Phase of Siam's History*. Bangkok: Muang Boran Publishing House.

Diffloth, Gérard D. 1984. *The Dvaravati Old Mon Language and Nyah Kur*. Monic Language Studies No. 1. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.

Dowling, Nancy. 2000. "New light on early Cambodian Buddhism", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 88, pp. 122–155.

Dupont, Pierre. 1950. "Les Buddha sur *nāga* dans l'art khmèr", *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 13, No. 1/2, pp. 39–62.

_____. 1953. *L'archéologie bouddhique de Dvāravatī : l'archéologie indo-mône et les fouilles de Nak'on Pathom*. Doctoral dissertation. Université de Paris.

_____. 1955. *La statuaire préangkorienne*. Artibus Asiae Supplementum, Vol. 15.

_____. 1959. *L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī*. Two vols. Paris: Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, Vol. 41.

_____; tr. by Joyanto K. Sen. 2006. *The Archaeology of the Mons of Dvāravatī*. Translated from the French with updates and additional appendices, figures and plans. Two vols. Bangkok: White Lotus Press.

Fine Arts Department. 2543 BE [2000]. *Thung setthi boransathan thawarawadi chaifang thale phetchaburi* [Thung Setthi, a Dvāravatī monument near the Phetchaburi coast]. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. [In Thai.]

_____. 2548 BE [2005]. *Phiphithaphan sathan haeng chat phra pathom chedi/Phra Pathom Chedi National Museum*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. [In Thai and English.]

_____. 2550 BE [2007]. *Namchom phiphithaphan sathan haeng chat U-thong lae rueang rao Suwannaphum/Guide to the U-Thong National Museum and Suvarṇabhūmi*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. [In Thai and English.]

_____. 2552 BE [2009]. *Silapa thawarawadi tonkamnoet phutthasin nai prathet thai/ Dvāravatī Art: The Early Buddhist Art of Thailand*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. [In Thai and English.]

Gallon, Matthew. Forthcoming. *The political economy of a protohistoric town in central Thailand: Archeological survey and excavation at Kamphaeng Saen, Nakhon Pathom province, Thailand*. Doctoral dissertation. Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan.

Gaston-Aubert, Jean-Pierre. 2010. "Nāga-Buddhas of the Dvāravatī period: A possible link between Dvāravatī and Angkor", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 98, pp. 116–150.

Gerhard Franz, Heinrich. 1980. "Stūpa and stūpa-temple in the Gandhāran regions and in Central Asia", in Anna Libera Dallapiccola and S. Zinghel-Ave Lallemant, eds., *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, pp. 39–58. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Glover, Ian and Andrew Barram. 2008. "Re-thinking Dvaravati", in Jean-Paul Pautreau et al., eds., *Archaeology in Southeast Asia: From* Homo Erectus *to the Living Traditions*, pp. 175–182. Choice of Papers from the 11th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists. Chiang Mai: Siam Ratana Ltd.

Griswold, Alexander B. 1966. "Imported images and the nature of copying in the art of Siam", in Ba Shin, Jean Boisselier and A. B. Griswold, eds., *Essays Offered to G. H. Luce by His Colleagues and Friends in Honour of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday. Volume 2: Papers on Asian Art and Archaeology,* Artibus Asiae Supplementum, Vol. 23, pp. 37–73.

Groslier, George. 1931. *Collections khmères du musée Albert Sarraut à Phnom-Penh*. Paris: Van Oest.

Guillon, Emmanuel. 1999. *The Mons: A Civilization of South East Asia*. Bangkok: The Siam Society.

_____. 2009. "Mōn anciens – Mōn actuels", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 47–51. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Hennequin, Laurent. 2009. "Phra Prathon Chedi de Nakhon Pathom : description du monument et comparaisons", *Warasan Aksonsat* [Journal of the Faculty of Arts: Silpakorn University], Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 136–177.

_____. 2010. "The French contribution to the discovery of Dvāravatī archeology", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 98, pp. 1–48.

Hennequin, Laurent and Kannika Chansang, trs. and eds. 2552 BE [2009]. *Nakhon Pathom sueksa nai ekasan farangset ruambot khwam plae* [Nakhon Pathom studies in French texts: a collection of translations]. Nakhon Pathom: Silpakorn University, CEDREFT [French–Thai Research Center]. [In Thai.]

Jacq-Hergoualc'h, Michel. 2002. *The Malay Peninsula: Crossroads of the Maritime Silk Road (100 BC–1300 AD)*. Leiden: Brill.

Jacques, Claude. 2009. "Dvāravatī, un royaume sans histoire", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 27–29. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Jett, Paul. 2010. "A technical study of the Kampong Cham figure group", in Louise Allison Cort and Paul Jett, eds., *Gods of Angkor: Bronzes from the National Museum of Cambodia*, pp. 78–87. Washington DC: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution.

Le May, Reginald. 1977. *A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam*. Third edition; first edition 1938. Rutland & Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co.

Luang Boribal Buribhand. 2490 BE [1947]. "Wichan phra phuttharup sila nai viharn noi wat na phramen changwat phranakon sri ayutthaya [Criticism regarding the stone Buddha from the Vihāra at Wat Na Phra Men, Ayutthaya]", *Silpakorn Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 41–52. [In Thai.]

Maillard, Monique. 1983. *Grottes et monuments d'Asie Centrale. Essai sur l'architecture des monuments civils et religieux dans l'Asie centrale sédentaire depuis l'ère chrétienne jusqu'à la conquête musulmane, suivi d'un tableau de concordance des grottes de la région de Kutcha (mission Grünwedel et Le Coq)*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Manguin, Pierre-Yves. 2010. "Pan-regional responses to South Asian inputs in early Southeast Asia", in Bérénice Bellina et al., eds., *50 Years of Archaeology in Southeast Asia: Essays in Honour of Ian Glover*, pp. 171–182. Bangkok: River Books.

Manguin, Pierre-Yves and Agustijanto Indrajaya. 2006. "The archaeology of Batujaya (West Java, Indonesia): An interim report", in Elisabeth A. Bacus, Ian C. Glover and Vincent C. Pigott, eds., *Uncovering Southeast Asia's Past*. Selected papers from the 10th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists, pp. 245–257. Singapore: National University of Singapore Press.

Mayurie Veraprasert. 1995. "Tablettes votives bouddhiques contemporaines de la période de Dvāravatī découvertes à Nadun, Mahasarakham", in Premier Symposium Franco-Thai, *La Thaïlande des débuts de son histoire jusqu'au XVe siècle*, pp. 222–235. Bangkok: Silpakorn University.

_____. 2545 BE [2002]. "Srichanasa rue chanasapura kho sannitthan kao-mai [Śrī Canasā or Canasā Pura: old and new interpretations]", in Suchit Wongthet, ed., *Srichanasa rat isara thi rapsung* [Śrī Canasā: independent state in (the Khorat) Plateau], pp. 87–122. Bangkok: Matichon Publishing Co. [In Thai.]

Middleton, Sheila E. Hoey. 2002. "The Third Buddha", *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 18, pp. 67–72.

_____. 2010. "The quest for the 'Third Buddha': A sequel", *South Asian Studies*, Vol. 26, No.2, pp. 119–124.

Mudar, Karen M. 1999. "How many Dvaravati kingdoms? Locational analysis of first millennium A. D. moated settlements in central Thailand", *Journal of the Anthropological Archaeology*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 1–28.

Murphy, Stephen A. 2010. *The Buddhist boundary markers of northeast Thailand and central*

Laos, 7th–12th centuries CE: Towards an understanding of the archaeological, religious and artistic landscapes of the Khorat Plateau. Doctoral dissertation. School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Murphy, Stephen A. and Pimchanok Pongkasetkan. 2010. "Fifty years of archaeological research at Dong Mae Nang Muang, an ancient gateway to the Upper Chao Phraya Basin", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 98, pp. 49–74.

Na Pan Hla. 1991. "The major role of the Mons in Southeast Asia", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 79, No. 1, pp. 13–21.

Nandana Chutiwongs. 1978. "Review article on the Jātaka reliefs at Cula Pathon Cetiya", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 133–151.

_____. 2009. "Le bouddhisme à Dvāravatī et à Hariphunchai", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 59–73. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Pal, Pratapaditya. 2007. "Unusual nāga-protected Buddha from Thailand", in Pratapaditya Pal, ed., *Buddhist Art: Form & Meaning*. Mumbai: Marg Publications, pp. 53–63.

Phasook Indrawooth. 2542 BE [1999]. *Thawarawadi kan sueksa choeng wikhro chak lakthan thang borannakhadi/Dvaravati: A Critical Study Based on Archeological Evidence*. Bangkok: Silpakorn University Press. [In Thai and English.]

_____. 2009. "Un antique royaume urbanisé de Thaïlande", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 31–45. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Phuthon Phumathon. 2533 [1990]. "Thawarawadi chue kasat rue chue mueang? [Dvāravatī, name of a king or a kingdom?]". *Sinlapa Wathanatham*, Vol. 7, pp. 104–113. [In Thai with English abstract.]

Pichard, Pierre. 2006. "Remarques sur le chapitre IX 'The Mon paradigm and the evolution of the Pagan temple'", *Aséanie*, No. 18, pp. 203–206.

Piriya Krairiksh. 2517 BE [1974a]. *Phuttha sasana nithan thi chedi chula pathon/Buddhist Folk Tales Depicted at Chula Pathon Cedi*. Bangkok. [In Thai and English.]

_____. 1974b. "Semas with scenes from the *Mahānipāta-Jātaka* in the National Museum at Khon Kaen", in Fine Arts Department, *Art and Archeology in Thailand*, pp. 35–65. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department.

_____. 1975a. *The Chula Pathon Cedi: Architecture and sculpture of Dvāravatī*. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

_____. 2518 BE [1975b]. "Pratimakam samai thawarawadi thi boriwen tham khao ngu changwat ratchaburi/Dvāravatī period sculpture in the Khao Ngu Caves, Ratchaburi". In Fine Arts Department, *Art and Archeology in Thailand II*, pp. 77–99 + pls. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. [In Thai with English abstract.]

_____. 2520 BE [1977]. *Beb silapa nai prathet thai: khat lueak chak phiphithaphan sathan haeng chat sakha suan phumiphak/Art Styles in Thailand. A Selection from National Provincial Museums, and an Essay in Conceptualization*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department. [In Thai and English.]

_____. 1982. *Sculptures from Thailand*. Exhibition catalogue. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Museum of Art. [In English and Chinese.]

_____. 2542 BE [1999]. "Kan prap plian yuk samai khong phutthasin nai prathet thai/A new chronology of Buddhist art in Thailand", *Muang Boran Journal*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 10–43. [In Thai and English.]

_____. 2553 BE [2010]. *Rakngao haeng sinlapa thai* [The roots of Thai art]. Bangkok: River Books. [In Thai.]

Prapod Assavavirulhakarn. 2010. *The Ascendancy of Theravāda Buddhism in Southeast Asia*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.

Revire, Nicolas. 2008. *Introduction à l'étude des bouddhas en* pralambapādāsana *dans l'art de Dvāravatī : le cas du Wat Phra Men – Nakhon Pathom*. Master's degree thesis. Two vols. Université Paris 3–Sorbonne nouvelle.

_____. 2009. "À propos d'une 'tête' de *khakkhara* conservée au Musée national de Bangkok", *Aséanie*, No. 24, pp. 111–134.

_____. 2010. "Iconographical issues in the archeology of Wat Phra Men, Nakhon Pathom", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 98, pp. 75–115.

_____. 2011a. "Re-exploring the Buddhist 'foundation deposits' at Chedi Chula Prathon, Nakhon Pathom". Paper submitted at the conference *Buddhist Dynamics in Premodern Southeast Asia*, Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, 10–11 March 2011.

_____. 2011b. "Some reconsiderations on pendant-legged buddha images in the Dvāravatī artistic tradition", *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association*, Vol. 31. [In press.]

Rungrot Thamrungrueang. 2009. "L'image du Buddha sur Phanasbodi", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 83–87. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Sakchai Saising. 2547 [2004]. *Sinlapa thawarawadi wathanatham phutthasasana yuk raek nai din daen thai* [Dvāravatī art: the first Buddhist civilization in Thailand]. Bangkok: Muang Boran Publishing House. [In Thai.]

Samuel, Geoffrey. 2002. "Ritual technologies and the state: The *Mandala*-form Buddhist temples of Bangladesh", *Journal of Bengal Art*, Vol. 7, pp. 39–56.

Santi Leksukhum. 2009. "Les *chedi* de Dvāravatī", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 129–135. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

_____. 2010. "Conjectural reconstructions of three ancient stupas at Nakon Pathom", in Leelananda Prematilleke, ed., *Abhinandanamālā: Nandana Chutiwongs Felicitation Volume Supplementum*, pp. 3–32. Bangkok and Colombo: The Abhinandanamala Committee. [In English and Thai.]

Seidenfaden, Erik. 1954. "Kanok Nakhon, an ancient Mon settlement in northeast Siam (Thailand) and its treasures of art", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*, Vol. 44, pp. 643–648.

Sen, Joyanto K. 2007. "The nāga-protected Buddha in the Norton Simon Museum: Further comments", in Pratapaditya Pal, ed., *Buddhist Art: Form & Meaning*. Mumbai: Marg Publications.

Skilling, Peter. 1997. "The advent of Theravāda Buddhism to mainland South-East Asia", *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 93–107.

_____. 2003. "Dvāravatī: Recent revelations and research", *Dedications to Her Royal Highness Princess Galyani Vadhana Krom Luang Naradhiwas Rajanagarindra on Her 80th Birthday*, pp. 87–112. Bangkok: The Siam Society.

_____. 2005. "Unsettling boundaries: Verses shared by Śrāvaka and Mahāyāna texts", *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 9, pp. 99–112.

_____. 2008. "Dharma, Dhāraṇī, Abhidharma, Avadāna: What was taught in Trāyastriṃśa?", *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2007*, Vol. 11, pp. 37–60.

_____. 2009a. "Des images moulées au service de l'idéologie du mérite", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 107–113. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

_____. 2009b. "L'énigme de Si Thep", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 117–125. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Songsri Praphatthong. 2536 BE [1993]. *Phrabat somdet phrapok klao chao yu hua kap kan phiphitthaphan thai* [King Rāma VII and the Thai museums]. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department, Museum Division. [In Thai.]

Stadtner, Donald M. 2008. "The Mon of Lower Burma", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 96, pp. 193–215.

Stuart-Fox, Martin and Sarah Tiffin. 2002. "The Dvaravati 'Buddha on a Monster' stelae: A possible interpretation", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 47–65.

Subhadradis Diskul, M. C. 1956. "Mueng Fa Dæd: An ancient town in northeast Thailand", *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. 19, No. 3/4, pp. 362–367.

_____. 1966. "Pierre Dupont: *L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī*. A review", in Ba Shin, Jean Boisselier and A. B. Griswold, eds., *Essays Offered to G. H. Luce by His Colleagues and Friends in Honour of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday. Volume 2: Papers on Asian Art and Archaeology.* Artibus Asiae Supplementum, Vol. 23, pp. 166–174.

_____. 1978. "Review of Krairiksh, Piriya, *Art Styles in Thailand. A Selection from National Provincial Museums, and an Essay in Conceptualization*", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 66, No. 2, pp. 252–259.

Takakusu, Junjirō, tr. 1998. *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malaya Archipelago*. Reprint; first edition. Clarendon Press, 1896. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Tingley, Nancy, ed. 2009. *Arts of Ancient Viet Nam: From River Plain to Open Sea*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Usa Nguanphienphak. 2009. "Fouilles récentes au Phra Pathon Chedi", in Pierre Baptiste and Thierry Zéphir, eds., *Dvāravatī : aux sources du bouddhisme en Thaïlande*, pp. 145–149. Exhibition catalogue. Paris: Réunion des Musées nationaux.

Wicks, Robert S. 1999. "Indian symbols in a Southeast Asian setting: Coins and medals of ancient Dvaravati", in Robert L. Brown, ed., *Art from Thailand*, pp. 8–18. Mumbai: Marg Publications.

Woodward, Hiram W., Jr. 2003. *The Art and Architecture of Thailand from Prehistoric Times through the Thirteenth Century*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

_____. 2008. "Book review: *The Archaeology of the Mons of Dvāravatī*, by Pierre Dupont; translated with updates, additional figures and plans by Joyanto K. Sen", *Marg*, Vol. 60, No. 2, pp. 79–81.

_____. 2010. "Dvāravatī, Si Thep and Wendan", *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association*, Vol. 30, pp. 87–97.