

PIERRE DUPONT: *L'archéologie mône de Dvāravatī*¹

A Review

The late Professor Dupont's great book has been warmly welcomed not only by specialists in Southeast Asian art and archeology throughout the world, but also by many members of the general public in Thailand, among whom the interest in archaeology is steadily growing.

The book is dedicated by the author to his distinguished teacher, Alfred Foucher. A note by Madame Dupont thanks those who helped to prepare the work for publication after her husband's death. Then, after a short preface by the author, comes the text itself, consisting of 9 chapters (almost 300 pages). Finally there are inventories of the objects discovered in the excavations of *Dvāravatī* sites conducted by the author; indexes; bibliography; etc. There are 24 pages of drawings, plans and maps, and 541 photographs.

In Chapter I the author discusses the Mons in general, touching on their geographical location, the names by which they are known², their language and their history. He distinguishes the two great groups of Mons, those of *Dvāravatī* in central Thailand and those of Lower Burma, but adds that the present-day Mon population in central Thailand are thought to be descended from refugees from Lower Burma who settled in Thailand between the 16th and 19th centuries. Central Thailand has yielded an abundance of antiquities dating from the first millennium A. D. Lower Burma comparatively few. On the other hand the historical traditions that survive regarding the Mons in Thailand are very meagre, whereas those purporting to deal with the history of the Mons of Lower Burma are much more abundant. The chronicles indicate that the great flowering of art and letters at Pagan from the mid-11th century was inspired by the Mons captured by King *Aniruddha* at Thaton in Lower Burma in the mid-11th century. This tradition is difficult to reconcile with the paucity of archaeological remains discovered in the area of Thaton. The late Prince Damrong suggested that the dilemma could best be resolved by identifying the city conquered by Aniruddha with *Nagara Paṭhama* rather than with Thaton. Professor Dupont discusses the hypothesis but seems unwilling to accept it.

He devotes the rest of the chapter to the Mons of Thailand. First he discusses the epigraphy of *Dvāravatī*, which is unfortunately limited to a handful of brief texts. Since his death it has been enlarged by a few further discoveries, discussed by Mr Cœdès in the present Felicitation Volume I. Professor Dupont then sums up the known facts regarding the archaeology of *Dvāravatī*, which he divides into four geographical zones. One cannot help wondering why

¹ Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Vol. XLI, Paris, 1959.

² He quotes (p. 2) Blagden to the effect that the Mons today write the name *Mon*, but up to the 19th century wrote it *Man*. In Siamese it is written *Môn* and pronounced to rhyme with the English word *dawn*. One wonders why the author writes *Môn*, which seems to result in the word being pronounced almost like English *moan*.

he incorporates into the same Dvāravatī style a number of Brahmanical images, mostly of the god Viṣṇu, which, though admittedly contemporary with Dvāravatī, have nothing in common with the Buddha images and indeed differ markedly from them in such things as facial features. There is a corresponding contrast between the Brahmanical and Buddhist architecture.

A number of Dvāravatī sites, discovered since Professor Dupont's death, could today be added to the list. Two of the most important are: Kû Bua in the province of *Rājapurī* and Ū Tòng in the province of *Subarṇapurī*. Excavations at both places have disclosed a number of stupa bases. Associated with those at Kû Bua was a quantity of remarkable sculpture and ornament made of terra cotta and stucco; Ū Tòng has yielded bronze images and miscellaneous antiquities.

In 1939–40, the site of Wat Pra Meru (Mén) in the province of Nagara Paṭhama was excavated under the direction of Professor Dupont by the École Française d'Extrême-Orient jointly with the Thai Department of Fine Arts. In Chapter II he gives a detailed account of the operations, which indicated that the monument had twice been enlarged and modified. The comparison he makes between Wat Pra Meru and several monuments in Burma and East Bengal reveals his thorough knowledge of Southeast Asian archaeology. By comparing the plans he convincingly dates the original construction of Wat Pra Meru before the Ananda Temple at Pagan (c. 1090) and before Paharpur. His hypothetical reconstruction of the three successive stages of Wat Pra Meru is admirably scientific.

A colossal quartzite image of the Buddha seated in the "European fashion" (*pralambapādāsana*) had been discovered at this site in the late 19th century. A very similar image had been unearthed earlier at Wat Mahādhātu, Ayudhyā. Professor Dupont's excavations revealed the fragments of others. He suggests that four statues were placed around the "central pillar" of Wat Pra Meru, as at the Ananda temple, and that they represent the four past Buddhas of the present *kappa*. I should here mention a more recent development; the heads and several more fragments of statues, corresponding to the fragments unearthed by Professor Dupont, have recently been discovered at Ayudhyā. The Fine Arts Department have been able to reassemble them, and one of the statues is now on display at the Ayudhyā Museum.

Several votive tablets of a particular type discovered at Wat Pra Meru are illustrated in Figs. 34–40 and discussed on page 48. At the upper left and right corners are a pair of disks containing figures which the author was not able to decipher: a comparison with certain Dvāravatī bas-reliefs makes it evident that they represent the sun and moon gods.

Wat Pra Padona, a monument of a very different character from Wat Pra Meru, but located only a few kilometers away, was excavated by Professor Dupont in 1940 in his usual scrupulously scientific manner³. The operation, described in Chapter III, showed that this monument had also twice been modified.

The author's comparison of Wat Pra Padona with several monuments in northern Thailand,

³ The monument is not the main stupa in the modern monastery of Wat Pra Padona, but a ruin in the same precinct, more particularly known as *Cūlapadona* ("little Padona"); see p. 65, note 2. "Thanon Khab" (p. 65) and "Thanon Kad" on Map C, should be, in the system of spelling used by Professor Dupont, "Thanon Khat". The "objet mal identifiable" (p. 88 and Fig. 262) discovered at this site perhaps belonged to a piece like that illustrated by N. J. Krom in *L'art javanais dans les musées de Hollande et de Java* (Ars Asiatica, VIII), Pl. XXII-c ("couronnement de sceptre").

including the larger of the two cetiyas at Wat Kūkuta, Lampūn⁴, is absolutely justified. We might add that there are others of the same type at Nān (Wat Pyā Wat) and at Sukhodaya (in the precinct of Wat Mahādhātu).

In discussing that at Wat Kūkuta, the author says (p. 93): “Cet édifice, appelé autrefois Mahābalacetiya, a été construit par le roi mōn de Lamp’un Adiccarāja (1120—1150)...”, adding in a footnote a reference to Mr Cœdès’s translation of Jinakālamālī (*Documents sur l’histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental*, BEFEO XXV, p. 83). Mr Cœdès is in fact less affirmative, saying only: “Je suis tenté d’identifier [les ruines de Vat Kukut] ... avec le Mahābalacetiya” (ibid., note 2). It seems more likely to us that the Mahābalacetiya is to be identified with a structure in a monastery not far away that still bears the name Wat Tung Mahābala (Mahapon).

Wat Kūkuta, on the other hand, is believed by the Thai to have been founded quite early in the Haripuñjaya period (8th century A.D.?). The larger of the two cetiyas in its present form dates from 1218, when it was restored by King Sabbāhisiddhi.

As Professor Dupont remarks (p. 136), the traditional method of restoring an old cetiya — especially when it was desired to make it larger and more splendid—was to build a new one “encasing” it, so as to safeguard the sanctity of the old one. Often at the same time a “monument-maquette” would be built nearby in exactly the same form as the old monument, so that even though the latter was hidden by encasement its appearance would be preserved for future generations⁵. It is rather tempting to think that the smaller cetiya at Wat Kūkuta, which is of octagonal form, is a copy of the original cetiya now hidden inside the larger one.

Professor Dupont also compares Pra Padona with a small tower in the precinct of the Mahādhātucetiya at Lampūn (p. 94). Now the Mahādhātucetiya itself, founded by Adiccarāja was “un stūpa en forme de prāsāda, haut de douze coudées, avec quatre piliers et quatre portes” (Cœdès, loc. cit., p. 85). At the same time his chief queen built another monument, the Suvannacetiya. The Mahādhātucetiya has been encased at least three times: by Sabbāsiddhi, who raised it to a height of 24 cubits (ibid., p. 86); by Tilokarāja, who raised it to a height of 92 cubits in 1447 (ibid.); and again in modern times: it has completely lost its original character and is now a huge campaniform stupa. The smaller tower, with which Professor Dupont compares Pra Padona, is of the same type as the main cetiya of Wat Kūkuta. The Thai identify it with the Suvannacetiya (1063) and believe it probably preserves the same form as the original Mahādhātucetiya. The description “stūpa en forme de prāsāda” fits it well enough, but “avec quatre piliers et quatre portes” does not. Professor Dupont (p. 94), on the other hand, believes this tower was a monument-maquette built at the time of the encasement of 1447, and adds: “Si elle est fidèle—et elle semble l’être dans les grandes lignes—elle reproduit la construction due aux

๕๓๖.

๕๓๖.

⁴ In the present article, names which are manifestly borrowed from Sanskrit or Pali, are Romanized in accord with the usual rules for those languages, and are printed in italics at their first appearance. Ordinary Siamese words are Romanized in a phonetic system, in which consonants are to be pronounced as in English (G as in *get*; B as in *scrapbook*; D as in *postdate*), Ü and Ö approximately as in German, and other vowels as in Italian (accents indicate long vowels; È and Ò, open; É and Ó, closed).

⁵ An example the author cites is the Paṭhamacetiya at Nagara Paṭhama. It was begun by King Rāma IV (and not his successor, King Chulalongkorn, as stated on p. 93), and finished in the 20th century. It encases a much older monument, a copy of which was built in the precinct at the time of the encasement. This has the form of a more or less hemispherical stupa with a slender *prāṅg* on top. The stupa may well preserve a form that goes back to Dvāravatī times, or even further, while the *prāṅg* doubtless reproduces an element added around the 15th century. (Professor Dupont is wrong in saying that the *prāṅg* is believed to encase the stupa; it was built on top of the stupa, like a finial.)

rois Ādiccarāja et Sabbādhisiddhi, donc remontant aux XII^e–XIII^e siècles.” For the reason just noted, it is hard to believe that it reproduces the form of Ādiccarāja’s monument; but it can be plausibly argued that it reproduces that of Sabbādhisiddhi, especially as the latter was also the builder of the similar monument at Wat Kūkuta. The comparison with Pra Padona is in any case appropriate.

In Chapter IV Professor Dupont discusses several other vestiges of Dvāravatī architecture: a stupa base he excavated at Wat Yai, Nagara Paṭhama; some remains at Pong Dūk, excavated by Messrs Cœdès and Manfredi, and later by Mr Quaritch Wales; the chance finds at the military camp at Lopburi; Nön Pra, briefly excavated in 1937; Müang Pra Rot, summarily described by Lajonquière and visited by the author in 1937; and finally an important architectural fragment from Nagara Paṭhama, now in the Bangkok Museum. His conclusions on Pong Dūk are indeed the work of a careful scholar. Some recent discoveries at Ū Tòng, and especially an octagonal stupa base, may ultimately throw further light on the problems of Pong Dūk. Personally we should prefer to keep the Brahmanical shrines and images of Müang Pra Rot separate from the art of Dvāravatī, just as the author (p. 99) has done with those of *Śrī Deb* (Sî Tép) and the Malay Peninsula.

The architectural fragment (Figs. 323–7) is a large block of stone carved to represent an aerial palace. “L’identification de cet object est tout à fait incertaine”, says Professor Dupont. On its top are the remains of two square bases, and their location suggests that there were originally five of them, one in the center and one at each corner. It is believed in Thailand that they supported small stupas, in other words that the whole composition is to be regarded as the base of a quincunx of stupas. Another piece of stone, which was evidently part of the same composition, seems to have escaped the author’s notice (not illustrated). It is decorated with floral patterns and inscribed with the Buddhist formula “*ye dhammā...*” in characters which according to Mr Cœdès would date from the late 6th or the 7th century. This piece, therefore, not only provides an approximate date for the architectural composition, but also proves it to be part of a Buddhist monument.

The next chapter sums up the chief features of Dvāravatī architecture⁶. The buildings stood on terraced bases, which the author attributes to an Austro-Asiatic heritage, and which he describes in detail.

The structures themselves were of two sorts, which are so different that they have almost nothing in common with each other. One sort, such as the *vihāra* or assembly-hall, had a usable interior and corresponds more or less to the usual European conception of architecture. The other sort consisted of commemorative monuments which were to all intents solid masses of masonry, such as caityas and stupas.

At the end of this chapter Professor Dupont applies an ingenious method of analyzing the evolution of the mouldings at three monuments, by which he arrives at a relative dating for their original construction and their successive modifications. According to him the succession was as follows: (1) Pra Padona; (2) Pra Meru; (3) the first modifications of Pra Padona and Wat Pra Meru; (4) the terrace of Sān Jao at Pong Dūk; (5) the final modifications of Pra Padona and Pra Meru.

⁶ There is a brief reference to Brahmanical architecture of the same period. This, like the Brahmanical sculpture, we should prefer to eliminate from the stylistic category of “Dvāravatī”.

This useful method of research, it is hoped, will provide clues to the chronology of the stupa bases recently unearthed at Kû Bua and Û Tòng.

Having completed his discussion of the architecture, Professor Dupont now turns to the sculpture. The material most widely used was stucco; the most important cult statues were made of stone; bronze was used for small Buddha images.

Chapters VI and VII are devoted to a detailed study of the antecedents and evolution of Dvāravatī images of the Buddha. Chapter VI, which is the longest in the book (nearly 90 pages), deals with standing figures, Chapter VII (50 pages) with seated ones. The author believes that of all the Indian schools the Post-Gupta exercised the strongest influence on Dvāravatī art, but that this influence was superimposed on earlier ones from Amarāvati, Ceylon, and the Gupta, traces of which reappear in the Dvāravatī images. He remarks twice (pp. 54, 244) that Pāla art too may have had an influence on the Dvāravatī style, but unfortunately he does not enlarge further on the subject. Perhaps if he had lived longer he might have done so, which would have been a great help to the study of Southeast Asian archaeology.

The finest productions of Dvāravatī sculpture are the standing images of the Buddha (Chapter VI). Before studying them Professor Dupont gives a long and detailed analysis (18 pages) of the evolution of the standing Buddha image in India and Ceylon, from Gandhāra and Mathurā down to the Post-Gupta, with particular emphasis on the rendering of the monastic robe. This might seem disproportionate in a book on Dvāravatī; but in fact it is essential, since no other author had given so complete and pertinent study to the subject before⁷. He then notices five images found in Thailand which may be attributed to the pre-Dvāravatī period. Two of these, in the Sinhalese tradition, belong to a stage of Indian influence in Southeast Asia when “les productions importées et les productions locales étaient encore peu différenciées et où l’origine d’une image ne peut être avancée qu’avec beaucoup de réserves” (p. 164). Two others he attributes to the Gupta style, and one to the Post-Gupta, adding: “Pour chacune d’entre elles, d’ailleurs, l’éventualité d’une fabrication locale est à envisager avec des degrés de probabilité inégaux” (p. 167). He suggests that when various Buddhist sects were established in Thailand each may have brought with it from India its characteristic art forms.

The greatest number of standing Buddha images of the Dvāravatī school in stone and stucco wear a monastic robe covering both shoulders and have the forearms projecting symmetrically in front of the chest. In contrast to the Indian schools, in which the left hand holds a flap of the garment while the right hand alone performs a gesture, both hands are empty and both perform the same gesture. The tightly-clinging monastic robe reveals the contours of a seemingly sexless body, and the eyebrows generally join above the bridge of the nose. After noting these three non-Indian characteristics, Professor Dupont examines the process by which they came into being.

The first step in establishing a chronology for the Dvāravatī images is to divide them into groups in such a manner that useful comparisons can be made between the different members of any one group. This Professor Dupont does with great skill. His principal criteria are: the

⁷ The reference to Fig. 332, an image at the Ruvanvāli Pagoda, is wrongly inserted on p. 157; it really belongs in paragraph 3, p. 158, and is identical with that mentioned in Footnote 1, p. 158. In Footnote 2 on the same page, “fig. 47 pl. XVI” should read: “pl. XVII fig. 46”.

evolution of their monastic dress; the lotus pedestal; the facial features; the arrangement of the curls of hair; the ushnisha, and the appearance of the lotus bud on top of it.

Groups A and B are thought to be the earliest (late 6th and 7th century). The groups from C to I begin later and last longer. The earliest image in group E, in Professor Dupont's opinion, is a stone statue in the Bangkok Museum (Fig. 392) with the right hand performing the *varamudrā* and the left hand broken off. The author thinks the left hand may have been performing the *vitarka* or the *abhayamudrā*. In fact the left profile (not illustrated) has a group of diverging folds below the forearm, which shows that the hand was, by way of exception for Dvāravatī, holding a flap of the robe and may consequently indicate a particularly early date.

Standing images in stone or stucco wearing the monastic robe with the right shoulder exposed (Group J) are rare in Dvāravatī art. Since the author's death a few more examples have come to light, notably a beautiful stone image, unfortunately headless, discovered at Wat Sapan Hin, Sukhodaya, and now preserved in the Sukhodaya Museum.

An interesting series of bas-reliefs represent the Buddha, flanked by the gods Indra and Brahmā, standing on a fabulous bird (*Vanaspati?*) (e.g. R. S. leMay, *Buddhist Art in Siam*, Fig. 28). Professor Dupont mentions them (p. 143), but only in passing. We regret that he does not discuss them in detail.

We regret, too, that he was unable to include a discussion of the art of Haripuñjaya (Lampūn), which includes some beautiful stuccos and terra cottas. And we are rather surprised that he omits to mention the beautiful terra cotta head from Wat Pra Ngām, Nagara Paṭhama, which is one of the chief masterpieces in the Bangkok Museum (illustrated in R. S. leMay, op. cit., Fig. 31).

The production of Dvāravatī images in bronze, in the author's opinion, began later and lasted longer than in stone. The majority of the standing figures have the robe covering both shoulders and the other general characteristics of the stone statues; but only a few (Figs. 423–5) bear a really close resemblance to their stone counterparts⁸. The others (groups K to O) belong to somewhat different series. A fairly constant characteristic is a more or less conical ushnisha, not distinctly separated from the hair, and topped with a lotus bud. A similar tendency appears among the stone statues only towards the end of the various series, i. e. at a relatively late date. Some bronzes discovered recently at Ū Tòng could be fitted into Groups K to O.

Professor Dupont illustrates 10 standing bronzes that have the right shoulder exposed (Group P, Figs. 456–461, and Q, Figs. 462–467). It may be questioned whether Figs. 466 and 467 should not be attributed to the early Ayudhyā style rather than to late Dvāravatī.

The chapter concludes with an interesting discussion of the relationships between Dvāravatī standing images and their counterparts in the other schools of Southeast Asia.

Chapter VII deals with the seated images, which are much less numerous than the standing ones and form less coherent series; and, as the author says, there is no need to treat those in stone and stucco separately from those in bronze. He discusses them under three main headings: images seated in the "Indian manner", first those without the Nāga and second those seated on the Nāga; third, images sitting in the "European manner". In each case he begins with the

⁸ I notice one or two misprints on p. 211. In lines 6 and 7, "fig. 413–415" should read: "fig. 423–425"; and "fig. 414" should read: "fig. 424".

Indian antecedents, continues with a description of the various Dvāravatī examples, and concludes with a comparison with their counterparts elsewhere in Southeast Asia.

Twenty-two images seated in the “Indian manner” (without the Nāga) are illustrated. Professor Dupont notes that they have little visible relation to the standing stone statues, though some have affinities with the standing bronzes⁹. In contrast to the standing images, the majority have the right shoulder exposed. Nearly all of them appear to be of late date, corresponding to the last phases of Dvāravatī art. Yet paradoxically, and although the rest of the iconography derives from the Post-Gupta, many of them retain an archaic feature — the legs folded as in *paryāṅkāśana*, but crossed at the ankles, a feature characteristic of Amarāvati art (Figs. 473, 478—80, 486, 489). Others have the classic *paryāṅkāśana* like that of Ceylon (e.g. Figs. 472, 474, 477, 481), and still others the *vajrāsana* recalling the Post-Gupta (e.g. Figs. 475—6)¹⁰. There are three distinct hand-positions. As in Ceylon, the *dhyānamudrā* predominates (groups R-1, R-2, and R-3, as well as Figs. 474—5). Group R-4 have the right hand in *vitarkamudrā*; a few bronzes recently discovered at Û Tòng would fit into this group. Three images have what the author describes as *varamudrā* with the right hand (but is it not really the *bhūmisparśamudrā*?) while the left hand rests in the lap. In a few cases the hand-position is difficult to discern; in one, it appears to be *bhūmisparśamudrā* with the left hand (Fig. 493), which in fact occurs in a few other Dvāravatī images not discussed by the author.

Professor Dupont next discusses the images of the Buddha with the Nāga. As he says, these are supposed to illustrate the episode in which the Nāga Mucalinda protected the Buddha from the rain by coiling his body around him and spreading his hood over his head; but in fact they show the Buddha seated on top of the coiled body of the Nāga. The author wonders, therefore, whether the images are not supposed to illustrate some other incident, or whether the discrepancy is due to the fact that it would be awkward to represent the Buddha almost completely hidden by the serpent’s coils. The second hypothesis is surely right; and we might add that such rearrangements of a composition, in the interest of greater clarity, are a fundamental and normal element of Indian art (cf. the use of anamorphosis and “explanatory perspective” in bas-reliefs).

Images of the Buddha on the Nāga are rare in Indian art except in the school of Amarāvati and Ceylon. They are not very numerous in Dvāravatī art, but they are important for their probable influence on Khmer sculpture, in which this theme became extremely popular. The author suggests that the Khmer adopted it from Dvāravatī about the 10th century, and though it had been associated with the Theravāda in Dvāravatī it was associated with the Mahāyāna in Cambodia. The school of Lopburi, in turn, though presumably serving the Theravāda, adopted the Khmer version of the theme rather than the Mon.

Images of the Buddha seated in the “European fashion” (*pralambapādāsana*), says Professor Dupont, began rather late in Indian art, appearing sporadically at Sārnāth and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, and reaching their highest development in the Post-Gupta¹¹. As for the Dvāravatī images in

⁹ One of them (Fig. 472) is “une image debout adaptée à un type de Buddha assis à l’indienne”, with echoes of Groups D and I-2. The robe covers both shoulders, but as the author notes there is an oblique line across the chest as if the robe left the right shoulder exposed: I wonder whether the line is not due to later retouching. Two other images, which are not illustrated but are discussed on pp. 242-3-5, are similar.

¹⁰ In the middle of page 240, for “le *paryāṅkāśana* post-gupta”, read: “le *vajrāsana* post-Gupta”.

¹¹ One might add that a few examples occur in Gandhāran art (e.g., Foucher, *Art gréco-bouddhique du Gandhara*, fig. 485; Ingholt, *Gandhāran Art in Pakistan*, Fig. 226).

this posture, he shows that they stem mainly from the Post-Gupta tradition, but with some elements inherited from the Gupta and from Amarāvati. As in the Post-Gupta, all except one wear the robe leaving the right shoulder exposed; but instead of performing the dharmacakramudrā (with both hands) as in the Post-Gupta, they perform the vitarkamudrā with the right hand alone. The author divides them into three groups.

In the first, which are all bas-reliefs, the left hand rests in the lap; one may ask whether this is not due, at least in part, to the exigencies of the relief technique.

In the second (Figs. 31–33, 502–507), which are *en ronde bosse*, some in stone and some in bronze, the left forearm either rests on the left thigh or is raised slightly above it (as in certain Dvāravatī images seated in the “Indian fashion”, such as Figs. 486–488). The most important is the colossal quartzite statue from Wat Pra Meru, now in a small vihāra at the Pra Paṭhamacetiya (Figs. 33), dating, according to the author, from the 6th or 7th century (with some modern alterations)¹². The other images in this group (apart from the fragments in Figs. 31 and 32) are bronzes. We can now add to them some terra cottas discovered at Kû Bua.

As to the third group¹³, the outstanding example is an enthroned statue unearthed in the ruins of Wat Mahādhātu, Ayudhyā, in the reign of King Rāma III (1824–51), and installed in a *vihāra* at Wat Na Pra Meru, Ayudhyā (Fig. 500)¹⁴. It has been much restored; but Professor Dupont has been able to isolate the alterations and give an approximate idea of its original condition¹⁵.

In Chapter VIII the author traces the enduring influence of Dvāravatī sculpture on the Buddha images of Cambodia and Siam. Most influential was the dominant type of standing image, with both forearms projected forward symmetrically and both hands performing the same gesture. The south lintel of the main sanctuary of Prah Palilai at Angkor (Fig. 535), has an image of this type, the details of which prove it to be derived from a Dvāravatī model. In contrast to the other Khmer temples of the classic period, which were dedicated either to the Brahmanical religions or to the Mahāyāna, Prah Palilai was dedicated to the Theravāda; and the author suggests that the adoption of the particular type of Buddha image so long associated with the Theravāda in Dvāravatī was connected with the expansion of that form of Buddhism, which finally triumphed in Cambodia around the 14th century. He then shows how the sculpture of Ayudhyā is indebted to that of Dvāravatī and to its Khmer derivatives. As to the formation of the Sukhodaya style, he is inclined to discount the influence of Dvāravatī and to give more credit to Ceylon; but certain discoveries made in recent years would very likely have induced him to change his mind if he had lived long enough.

The author's *Conclusions* in the final chapter are worth careful study.

¹² In the first line of the last paragraph on p. 277, “fig. 35” is a misprint for fig. 33.

¹³ There seems to be a misprint here, as Fig. 498, which the author has already placed in the first group, reappears in this one.

¹⁴ Later on, during the reign of Rāma V (1868–1910), part of the throne was dug up in the ruins of Wat Pra Meru, Nagara Paṭhama, indicating that the statue itself had originally come from there. If so, it was brought from there to Wat Mahādhātu, Ayudhyā, some time between 1350 and 1767. It is a curious coincidence that the monastery where it is now installed should have so similar a name.

¹⁵ The four fingers of the hands are of equal length, “particularité de l’art thaï qui n’est probablement pas antérieure au XVI^e ou au XVII^e siècle”, says the author (p. 276). It should be noted that this peculiarity first appears in Thai sculpture as early as the 14th century but only sporadically; it becomes fairly frequent in the 15th, and progressively more so later on. The arms and hands of this statue almost certainly date from the reign of Rāma III.

He points to indirect evidence that a school of image-makers, stemming from Amarāvati or Ceylon, existed in Fu-nan as early as the 4th or 5th century. It left traces in the art of Dvāravatī, such as the frequent representation of the *vitarkamudrā* and the occurrence of the special form of *paryāṅkāśana* that is characteristic of Amarāvati. The classic *paryāṅkāśana* must have been introduced from Ceylon in the 5th or 6th century. By this time, it can be inferred, there were schools of image-makers in Thailand serving the Theravāda and working in the Funanese art tradition. Towards the end of the 6th century they were subjected to an intense influence from the Post-Gupta, as a result of which the characteristic Dvāravatī image came into being. In the dominant type of standing image, the forearms project forward symmetrically and both hands perform the same gesture; the robe covers both shoulders, and its right and left sides are rendered identically, or very nearly so, though in the real robe there is a corner at the bottom on the left side and only a “turn” of cloth at the right, and Indian sculpture for the most part had clearly indicated the difference. The tendency of Dvāravatī art toward symmetry and frontality goes on progressively, and finally it becomes dry and mechanical.

As Professor Dupont remarks, the enduring influence of Dvāravatī art on the Khmer and Thai schools from the 14th century on—and particularly the influence of those elements in it that are not to be found in India—is an eloquent reminder of the prestige of Mon Buddhism and its reputation for orthodoxy.

He ends with a briefer summary of the enduring influence of certain other types of Dvāravatī image, and of Dvāravatī architecture associated with the Theravāda. The discoveries made since his death confirm and amplify his conclusions.

This memorable posthumous work of Professor Dupont marks a great step forward in the study of Dvāravatī art and archaeology. His death was an irreparable loss to the scholarly world. Had he lived to see the new discoveries that are constantly being made we can be sure that he would have studied them in his usual illuminating manner.