

Les études sur Nakhon Pathom
dans les documents français

Nakhon Pathom Studies
in French Documents

Laurent Hennequin
Université Silpakorn
Silpakorn University

Rapport de recherche, octobre 2005-octobre 2006
Research report, October 2005-October 2006

Table des matières / Tables of contents

Résumé / Abstract

Administrative report (in English) / Rapport administratif (en anglais)

Rapport scientifique (en français) / Academic report (in French)

I L'âge des explorations

II L'âge des classifications

III L'âge des fouilles et des typologies

Conclusions et recommandations

Bibliographie

Abstract : The report examines, in the chronological order, the writings of the first generations of French explorers and scholars who reported on Nakhon Pathom, mostly from the point of view of archaeology. To take into account here only the most important authors, the first account is due to Lucien Fournereau (architecture, † 1906), who made a general survey of the archaeology of Siam and who devoted a chapter to the antiquities of Nakhon Pathom, presenting for the first time to the western world in 1895 the most significant objects of Dvāravatī civilization. He was followed by an army officer, Étienne Edmond Lunet de Lajonquière (archaeological exploration, 1861-1933), who, between 1904 and 1912, wrote several documents relevant to our subject, in which he identified a rather vast area belonging to the same civilization in which Nakhon Pathom was not an isolated case and could state that it was original and not dependent on the Khmer sphere of influence. The next Frenchman working on the subject, George Cœdès (epigraphy, 1886-1969), established in the 1920's the periods of Thai art and history, in particular the Dvāravatī period to which he gave its name, establishing a precise absolute chronology and suggesting that its realizations were due to Mon people. The last French scholar whose work is considered in this report is Pierre Dupont (art history, 1908-1955), with a study of the history of his missions in Nakhon Pathom, in particular 1939 and 1940, when he excavated Wat Phra Men and Chula Prathon, and of his investigations of the archaeological sites in and around Nakhon Pathom.

Résumé : Le rapport examine, dans l'ordre chronologique, les écrits des premières générations d'explorateurs et savants français à propos de Nakhon Pathom, surtout du point de vue de l'archéologie. Pour ne mentionner ici que les principaux auteurs, le premier récit est redevable à Lucien Fournereau (architecture, † 1906), chargé de faire un inventaire général de l'archéologie du Siam, qui consacra un chapitre de son ouvrage aux antiquités de Nakhon Pathom en 1895, présentant pour la première fois au monde occidental les témoins les plus significatifs de la civilisation de Dvāravatī. Il fut suivi par un officier militaire, Étienne Edmond Lunet de Lajonquière (exploration archéologique, 1861-1933), qui, entre 1904 et 1912 produisit plusieurs documents intéressants notre sujet, dans lesquels il établit que Nakhon Pathom faisait partie d'une assez vaste aire de civilisation qui ne relevait pas de la sphère d'influence khmère. Le prochain Français à travailler sur la question, George Cœdès (épigraphie, 1886-1969), s'attacha dans les années 1920 à établir les périodes d'histoire et d'art de la Thaïlande, en particulier la période de Dvāravatī pour laquelle il proposa cette appellation, établissant une chronologie absolue et supposant que ses réalisations étaient dues au peuple môn. Le dernier savant français dont les travaux sont analysés dans ce rapport est Pierre Dupont (histoire de l'art, 1908-1955), avec une étude historique de ses missions au Siam, en particulier en 1939 et 1940, pour dégager les temples de Wat Phra Men and Chula Prathon, et de ses investigations des sites archéologiques dans Nakhon Pathom et les environs.

บทคัดย่อ รายงานชิ้นนี้ศึกษาผลงานที่เกี่ยวข้องกับนครปฐมศึกษา โดยเฉพาะในด้านโบราณคดีของบรรดานักสำรวจและนักวิชาการชาวฝรั่งเศสรุ่นแรกๆ ตามลำดับเวลา ที่ว่าด้วยผลงานของบุคคลสำคัญๆ เอกสารชิ้นแรกทีกล่าวถึงเป็นผลงานของ Lucien Fournereau (สถาปนิก, + พ.ศ.2449) ซึ่งได้ทำบัญชีโบราณสถานสำคัญๆ ในประเทศสยามไว้ และได้เขียนเกี่ยวกับนครปฐมบทหนึ่งในหนังสือรายงานเกี่ยวกับโบราณวัตถุ และร่องรอยโบราณสถานสมัยทวารวดีที่มีความสำคัญต่อการเผยแพร่ให้ชาวตะวันตกได้รับรู้เป็นครั้งแรกในปี พ.ศ. 2438 ผลงานลำดับต่อมาเป็นของนักสำรวจชื่อ Étienne Edmond Lunet de Lajonquière (นักสำรวจ, 2404-2476) ในช่วงปี พ.ศ. 2447 และ 2455 Lunet de Lajonquière เขียนไว้ว่านครปฐมเป็นส่วนหนึ่งของดินแดนอันค่อนข้างกว้างใหญ่ในเขตลุ่มแม่น้ำเจ้าพระยา และมีวัฒนธรรมที่แตกต่างจากวัฒนธรรมเขมร ผลงานอีกชุดหนึ่งเป็นของนักวิชาการชั้นครูคือ George Coëdès (นักจารึกศาสตร์, 2429-2512) นับแต่ปี พ.ศ. 2468 เป็นต้นมา George Coëdès แบ่งศิลปะและประวัติศาสตร์ของสยามออกเป็นหมวดหมู่ โดยเฉพาะบรรดากลุ่มสมัยโบราณ โดยกำหนดขอบเขตและตั้งชื่อสมัยทวารวดี และเสนอข้อสันนิษฐานไว้ว่า ชาวทวารวดีนั้นเป็นมอญ เอกสารชุดสุดท้ายเป็นผลงานของ Pierre Dupont (นักประวัติศาสตร์ศิลปะ, 2451-2498) ซึ่งในรายงานชิ้นนี้จะศึกษาส่วนที่เป็นประวัติศาสตร์ของการขุดค้นที่วัดพระเมรุ และจุลประโทนในปี พ.ศ. 2482 และ 2483 และการสำรวจโบราณสถานต่างๆ ที่นครปฐม

Administrative final report
Nakhon Pathom Studies in French Documents
October 2005-October 2006

Laurent HENNEQUIN

The purpose of this administrative final report is to inform the Research Committee of the results obtained by the research project at the end of the one year deadline, in particular concerning the academic report itself, which is written in French.

The objective of the project was to collect the French documents concerning Nakhon Pathom, mostly in the field of archaeology where they have special interest, make them available for the community in Thailand, study them from a historical and critical point of view and make their contents known for the scientific community and the local population of Nakhon Pathom. By documents, we do not mean only written but also pictorial testimonies.

The project was motivated by the fact that quite a few French scholars have studied the field, and have had some sort of monopoly on it, at least among Westerners, with Fournereau, Aymonier, Lunet de Lajonquière, Cœdès, Claeys, Dupont and Boisselier. Also sometimes, their works have no equivalent in the literature written in Thai, which occasionally relies on French literature on the question with a more or less thorough knowledge of it. Additionally, some sites or artefacts have never been described by others and are sometimes irremediably destroyed or have disappeared and thus can be studied only from the description or pictures that is left of them in French documents.

So far, I have collected all the relevant documents, either in Thailand or in France, with only one known exception, that I have reproduced in a way or another (photocopy or scanning). Some of these documents have been deposited in the Franco-Thai Document Research Centre library (CeDREFT) of the French Department of the Faculty of Arts of Silpakorn University, managed by the central library of Silpakorn University at Nakhon Pathom. The rest can be deposited in this library, if the conditions of the documents allow, in a near future, when I no longer need them or they can be available on request.

I have also collected a bank of pictures in the numeric form, either from the published documents where they were reproduced, from other documents or from pictures taken on the sites, to complement the written documents. I have also collected copies of pictures which, to my knowledge, have never been published, from French archives centres. I have made these documents available in the form of CD roms, which I used in my presentations at various forums or that I can provide under request. The problem met here was the quality of the copies.

I have also visited the relevant sites to provide further complements of information and got in touch with the relevant authorities, Phra Pathom Chedi National Museum and the Nakhon Pathom Studies Research project of Silpakorn University, in particular, in Thailand, and Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales (INALCO), École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO) and Musée Guimet, in France.

I have used the material collected so far in two sessions of the course « French scholars and Thai studies » for the master degree students in French studies of the French Department of

the Faculty of Arts, with a PowerPoint presentation, as an illustration of the French studies in archaeology in Thailand, taking the example of Nakhon Pathom as a case study, presenting an overview of the question.

I have produced a paper (in English) presented (in Thai) at the forum of presentation of works in progress at the Faculty of Arts of Silpakorn University on May 24th 2006, with a PowerPoint presentation, on the subject « The First Western Report on the Archaeology of Nakhon Pathom : Fournereau, 1895 ». A corrected version of this paper in English has been published in the proceedings of the meeting (เอกสารประกอบการประชุมทางวิชาการ เรื่องเวทีวิชาการเพื่อเสนอผลงาน และรายงานการวิจัย ประจำปี พ.ศ. 2549. คณะกรรมการส่งเสริมการวิจัย, คณะอักษรศาสตร์, มหาวิทยาลัย ศิลปากร, นครปฐม, 2549. หน้า 29-48).

I also published a historical and critical edition of the report of another explorer, Lunet de Lajonquière (« Une visite à Nakhon Pathom en 1908 ». *Aséanie*. n°17, Juin 2006. p. 151-168 ; LUNET de la JONQUIÈRE Étienne Edmond : « Essai d'inventaire archéologique du Siam ». *BCAI*. 1912. p. 105-113 ; *Aséanie*. n°17, Juin 2006. p. 169-191)

Moreover I have written other papers, still under progress : one in English examining the analysis of the same explorer on the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom. This paper is accompanied by a PowerPoint presentation, now ready. The second paper, in English, under progress, is an overview of French literature on the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom, something like a bibliographical guide. I am also preparing a short version in English of this report to be presented at the forum of presentation of the works of research of the Faculty of Arts of Silpakorn University in May 2007 (provisional), possibly with a publication.

I have taken parts in the various activities organized by the relevant institutions, in particular the meeting : « The Civilization and development of the Bang Keo-Bang Khem Rivers Basin », organized by Phra Pathom National Museum on August 26th 2006.

Concerning the final academic report, two main problems were encountered :

- The first one was that the mass of documents is quite considerable, as French scholars have contributed, sometimes abundantly, on the subject for three quarters of a century. Consequently not all the documents could be studied in the span of one year attributed to the project. Most of the documents have been treated but only a part of them have been thoroughly studied. The rest are still in the state of somewhat raw material with occasional notes, association with pictures, with little historical and less critical comments, and it was judged useless to include them in this report. The documents studied concern the first generation of explorers (Pallegoix, Fournereau, Aymonier, Lunet de Lajonquière), the second generation who established a classification of Thai arts, defining a style and period of Dvāravatī (Cœdès (taking into account only the first period of his career on the subject and not the second one when he read inscriptions and produced articles for the general public) and Claeys) and the period of excavations (Dupont, limiting the study to a historical point of view and to his general investigations in Nakhon Pathom). The material which is not studied is however available on request.

- The second one was that, depending on the authors considered, it proved difficult, and more often pointless, to dissociate Nakhon Pathom studies from Dvāravatī studies. In consequence, in some cases, in particular concerning Cœdès' works where he tried to identify the style of Dvāravatī as specific, the focus is not particularly centred on Nakhon Pathom.

The report considers, in the chronological order, the contribution of the first French authors on the subject.

- The first French author who came to Nakhon Pathom (Nakhon Chaisri) was Mgr Jean-Baptiste Pallegoix, who visited Christian communities in the region in 1843, thus before the reconstruction of Phra Pathom Chedi. He dedicated a few pages on the subject (PALLEGOIX Jean-Baptiste (Mgr.) : *Description du royaume thaï ou Siam comprenant la topographie, histoire naturelle, mœurs et coutumes, législation, commerce, industrie, langue, littérature, religion, annales des Thaï et précis historique de la mission avec cartes et gravures*. Paris, 1854, Vol. 1. p. 101-104). However his text is mostly devoted to the local Christians and is little informative, apart from a few remarks on the economy and the means of communication by waterway.

- The second French author to report on his visit to Nakhon Pathom was Lucien Fournereau, an architect, who was missioned to explore the archaeology of Siam. His visit was made at an unspecified time in 1891-1892. After his travels, he published two travel accounts for the general public, in which he does not mention Nakhon Pathom (FOURNEREAU Lucien : « Bangkok, par M. Lucien Fournereau ». *Le tour du monde. Nouveau journal des voyages*. Hachette, Paris, 2e semestre 1894. p. 1-64 ; FOURNEREAU Lucien : « Les villes mortes du Siam ». *Le tour du monde*. Tome III, nouvelle série, N°32, Juillet-août 1897. p. 349-396). He also published a collection of photographs with three pictures of Nakhon Pathom, including one of the market on Khlong Chedi Bucha, which have not yet been republished (FOURNEREAU Lucien : *Mission archéologique*. Ministère de l'Instruction publique et des Beaux-Arts, Paris, undated. [ca. 1895]. Bangkok-Siam. 53 ill. ; t.2 : Les anciennes villes de Thaïs. Siam. ill. 1, 2 and 3). More important, he published a report on the archaeology of Siam in two volumes, in which he devotes a complete chapter to what was then called 'Phra Pathom' in Nakhon Chaisri Province in the first volume (FOURNEREAU Lucien 1895 : *Le Siam ancien, archéologie, épigraphie, géographie*. Ernest Leroux, Paris. Première partie (Annales du Musée Guimet, t.27) : 1895. xi-321 p. + pl.). He could report nothing on architecture, as he only visited Phra Pathom Chedi, accurately noting that it was a modern monument built by Rama IV, covering two older ones of unspecified periods, though he gratuitously hypothesized that the monument was originally Brahmanical. He also mentions the legends concerning the monument, saying that it was reputedly founded by King Asoke's missionaries in the IIIrd century B.C., though lending no credit to them. He briefly relates the other legend too, in one of its many versions, that the temple was founded by a king who had unknowingly committed a parricide.

Fournereau also mentions other archaeological sites near Phra Pathom Chedi, though he does not seem to have visited them, and the indications are too vague for us to identify them.

The other interest of Fournereau's contribution is to mention the existence of a collection of archaeological artefacts, some of which he photographed and quickly described. The objects were two Wheels of the Law, the low-relief stele representing the Buddha seated in the European fashion giving his First Sermon in front of disciples (now in Phra Pathom Chedi National Museum), the huge sculpted block representing heads in kudu (now in Bangkok National

Museum), two abacus, a *somasutra* and a *linga* placed on the former. The document is important for the museography of the collection at Phra Pathom Chedi, as it is certainly the first testimony on the question. It gives quite a representative picture on the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom, in particular with the Wheels of the Law and the Buddha seated in the European fashion, probably still undocumented so far in Southeast Asian studies. It then informs about the location of the first 'museum' and its installment, which left much to be desired. Also, it reveals, when compared with later testimonies, the policy followed by the Thai authorities, namely that it had fundamentally a religious motivation, preserving in priority Theravada Buddhist objects. Also, as French documents have a long history of nearly one century of reports on the artefacts of the collection, it is possible to write the history of the individual objects. Whenever possible, the history of the artefacts mentioned in French documents is studied, examining their location, state of preservation, state of restauration and interpretation. For example, we understand that one of the Wheels of the Law illustrated by Fournereau is now broken and the remaining part is now preserved in the Museum of the temple of Phra Pathom Chedi. The picture of the other Wheel reveals a fissure, but the object was still complete. A picture taken in 1939 shows that the object was then exhibited in the exterior circular gallery around the central stupa, with the same fissure. The Wheel is now preserved in Phra Pathom Chedi National Museum, the piece shown with a cleft before having now disappeared. This approach can be used in quite a few cases of objects mentioned in French documents.

In the same manner, Fournereau reports on alterations in the general aspect of the temple, with works still under process, with the publication of a picture of a composition of sculptures already broken to pieces at his time, and with artefacts in bad state of preservation at his time now disappeared. In particular, he mentions a long rectangular (in fact square) gallery in Khmer style now disappeared, with a picture which offers other interests. It is possible to compare the general aspect of the monument with later visitors' descriptions and with the present state, revealing again some interesting tendencies.

Another important contribution of Fournereau's book is the publication of two *Ye thamma* inscriptions in Pali. The inscriptions were read by Auguste Barth, from the Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres, and they revealed a Buddhist civilization using Pali language written in Indian characters. Though no age evaluation was attempted for these particular inscriptions, the evaluation of comparable inscriptions showed by inference that they could date back to the 8th century, and a later evaluation by another author said 7th century. The history of the literature on these inscriptions is also related.

In other words, Fournereau's report provided the basic information for the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom and Dvāravatī in general. However, we must recognize that he did not report so much on the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom as on the efforts of the Siamese themselves to preserve their patrimony, who had restored Phra Pathom Chedi, making of it a significant religious place again, collecting artefacts for the ancestor of the museum and displaying inscriptions along with a first study on them.

There is still one thing to mention concerning Fournereau's book : he hypothesized that the name Dvāravatī, already reconstructed by the specialists of Chinese from the name 'To-po-lo-ti' of the Chinese pilgrims of the 7th century, applied to Ayutthaya, certainly because the full name of the then new capital contained the word 'Dvāravatī'. In reaction to this, Paul Pelliot, argued in 1904 that Ayutthaya was too new a town to have been known at that time, and he supposed, as for him, that 'To-po-lo-ti' may refer to Lopburi and that it could not be populated by Thai but by Khmer or Mon people.

- The next French explorer who reported on Nakhon Pathom was Etienne Aymonier. Actually, he had visited the place as early as 1884, but as he was interested in Khmer epigraphy and found nothing interesting there for him, he only reported on his visit in 1901 and in a very brief manner. He confirms some of Fournereau's assertions but also questions others. He confirms that the local population called the place 'Temple of the Lying Buddha', though he reported too that it was believed to be the place of introduction of Buddhism in Siam.

- The next one, Étienne Edmond Lunet de Lajonquière, made a significant contribution on the question. The report that is submitted here sketches a history of his explorations in Siam, though it is beyond its scope, as this is an episode which is little known and as we can present unpublished documents. An important fact appears from this history, namely that Lunet was directly hired by the Siamese authorities, apparently through the decision of Prince Damrong Rajanubhab himself, which thus took in charge the task of archaeological prospection in their own country by using foreign expertise.

Lunet wrote quite a few documents relating his visits in Siam in 1904 and 1908. The first one was published in 1909 « Rapport sommaire sur une mission archéologique au Cambodge, au Siam, dans la Presqu'île malaise et dans l'Inde (1907-1908) », in two nearly identical versions in two different reviews, which presents the diary of his travels and the sketch of his conclusions ; the second one « Le domaine archéologique du Siam » in the same year, which presents an overview of the archaeology of Siam, classified in groups ; the third one, « De Saïgon à Singapour par Angkor, autour du Golfe du Siam », is a travel account for the general public with little interest for our subject ; and the fourth one, dated 1912, « Essai d'inventaire archéologique du Siam », which publishes the raw notes of description that the explorer took on the spot during his travels. He also wrote a travel account which is of little interest for us (« De Saïgon à Singapour par Angkor, autour du Golfe du Siam ». *Le tour du monde. Journal des voyages et des voyageurs*. Nouvelle série, XVI, 1910. p. 385-396, p. 397-408, p. 409-420, p. 421-432, p. 433-444, p. 445-456).

The first thing to consider is that Lunet, who had extensively travelled around the country, was able to identify the connection between Nakhon Pathom and other sites of Siam, namely Prachinburi, Ratburi, Petburi, and also Petchabun, thus demonstrating that it was not an isolated site but was surrounded by a rather vast sphere sharing a common civilization.

He also established that it was not under the Khmer sphere of influence, as was more or less implied so far, because it had very distinctive features : Buddhist civilization, round town precincts, architectural layout unknown in Cambodia and a specific style in sculpture, though in the last two cases the description is not very precise. For this distinct civilization he suggested a purely negative naming of 'Non Thai-Non Cambodian-Hindu group', apparently believing that it was populated in part by immigrants from India.

In one of his texts, he gives a rather detailed description of Phra Pathom Chedi, believing that the present monument had preserved the outline of the original one. Anyway, he provides precious indications concerning the alterations undergone by the building between Fournereau's visit and his own, between his visit and those of his followers including those of our time. Apart from the destruction of the outer square gallery and the installment of the museum in the outer part of the inner circular gallery, no significant changes have been made since.

Lunet also describes the artefacts contained in the museum. He reports sometimes on the same objects as Fournereau, sometimes on other specimens of the same kind of objects, enabling us to study the evolution of the collection and in certain cases the alterations of individual objects. He complements Fournereau's description by reporting the presence of crouching deer, votive

tablets, pillars, the fragment of a throne of the Buddha with *makara*, and *panasbodi*, though in the latter case he only saw broken specimens and consequently described them imprecisely. Anyway, the picture of the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom was becoming gradually more complete in its main lines. He published in complement drawings of the objects which make their identification easy.

He published other *Ye thamma* inscriptions which were read by Louis Finot and later by George Cœdès, whose name thus appears in Nakhon Pathom studies as early as 1912, the former dating them to the 8th century, the latter suggesting no date. It was the first time that such inscriptions had been directly dated, not in inference from others.

Lunet's writings were to remain a long time a reference not only for the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom but also of Siam as a whole.

- The next French author, George Cœdès, was not an explorer but a scholar, a specialist in epigraphy, who eventually considerably enlarged his expertise when working in collaboration with Prince Damrong Rajanubhab. He wrote quite a few articles on Dvāravatī studies, occasionally with contradictory statements, sometimes different conclusions. Some of his texts were also published in approximate translations, and consequently his studies can be called upon for divergent assertions. The report tries to follow his various writings on the subject and identify their main interest.

His first contribution, published in 1925, was a monography devoted to votive tablets, in which he tried to identify various 'groups' with a tentative chronology, in particular concerning the more ancient periods of the history of Siam, entitled « Tablettes votives bouddhiques de Siam ». For the oldest specimens in the collection studied, he identified a 'Phra Pathom group', keeping the old administrative name of Nakhon Pathom used by the explorers. In this group, he identified a first sub-group with no specific name, which became later the Dvāravatī group, and another one showing Khmer influence which became later the Lopburi group, in the same way as the Malay Peninsula group became the Sri Vichay group in further writings. On the basis of paleography, with some tablets bearing *Ye thamma* inscriptions, Cœdès could evaluate these oldest specimens as dating back between the 5th to the 7th centuries. Their iconography, the Great Miracle and the Buddha seated in the European fashion, also enabled him to establish comparisons with other images, in particular those published by Fournereau and Lunet.

In a footnote, Cœdès draws a comparison with the Gupta school of art in India both on the grounds of iconography and style. He also states that the considered area, namely Nakhon Pathom, Ratburi and Suphanburi, might be identified with the « Kingdom of Dvāravatī of the Chinese pilgrims », giving no bibliographical reference and no further comments.

An English translation of this text was published as early as 1926, in which the chronology is altered for what we are interested in, and in which the hypothesis concerning the Kingdom of Dvāravatī disappears. A Thai translation was also published in 1926, probably due to Cœdès' himself. In fact, it is a rather different version of the same text, with no bibliographical references, in which the 'Phra Pathom group' is maintained in the introduction but in which the captions read 'Dvāravatī period' and in which simplifications are made up to the point that most of the objects of this group are assigned to 'Phra Pathom Chedi' as place of origin, even though the French text showed that it was not the case. We thus have to conclude that it is a different version, of a lower quality, though it is often considered the text of reference.

The next text by the same author, « Rapport sur les travaux archéologiques pour l'année 2467 (1924-1925) » also published in 1925, mentions the transfer of artefacts of Dvāravatī style to various places, with little interest as long as it is impossible to identify the objects. However,

we learn from this report that Cœdès was at the time regularly visiting Lopburi and that he made yet no connection between the archaeological material of Nakhon Pathom and that of Lopburi.

The line of thinking was different in the author's next publication relevant to our subject « Documents pour l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental » published in 1925 too, though posterior to the former two. In this text, he presents his discovery that the original population of Lopburi was Mon who sent a colony to found Haripunchay (Lamphun). In a footnote, he states that Lopburi (Lävò) did not necessarily mean the present city of Lopburi but « rather the whole region of the Lower Chao Phraya Basin, probably corresponding to T'o-lo-po-ti of the Chinese, with Lävò as a capital. » In another footnote, remarking that similar Buddhist artefacts had been found on a rather large area, he states : « Future archaeological research will undoubtedly reveal that Lõpburi, Sũphãnburi, Kanburi, Phrã Pãthõm belonged in a very ancient period to a Buddhist kingdom probably corresponding to the country of Dvãravatĩ, mentioned by the Chinese between Çriksetra (Burma) et Içanapura (Cambodia). » These notes, which seem to have been hastily written, thus tend to identify a rather vast kingdom with Lopburi at its capital and including Nakhon Pathom. Cœdès never developed the hypothesis, at least concerning Lopburi as a capital.

If we follow the chronological order of Cœdès' texts, we have to insert here the second collection of inscriptions which was announced under press in 1926 but was only published in 1929, with no modification except an addendum (*Recueil des inscriptions du Siam – 2. Inscriptions de Dvãravatĩ, Çrĩvijaya et de Lãvo*). In this collection, Cœdès can publish no new inscriptions from Nakhon Pathom and simply quotes *in extenso* Barth's interpretation of the two *Ye thamma* inscriptions published by Fournereau with no comments and without Barth's transcriptions either. However, in the introduction he devotes a full chapter to the 'Kingdom of Dvãravatĩ' in which he associates the archaeological material of Nakhon Pathom and Lopburi in a detailed manner. He identifies a kingdom of Dvãravatĩ with roughly the same extension as before, from Lopburi down to the South, but refrains this time from trying to identify a capital for this kingdom. Nevertheless, he establishes a connection between the name Dvãravatĩ and the full name of Ayutthaya, stating that the latter city had inherited from an older capital, U-Thong, which may have inherited the name from another older capital directly or not. Admittedly, the passage may be subject to various interpretations. Also, it is the first time in the author's writings that the terms 'Dvãravatĩ' and 'To-po-lo-ti' are associated and that Pelliot's text is referred to in the bibliography. Strangely enough, though, Pelliot's hypothesis that Dvãravatĩ country had its capital at Lopburi and was populated by Khmer or Mon is not mentioned. Cœdès then supposes too that the whole kingdom may have been populated by Mon, on the basis of texts found in Lopburi, but also of a possibly Mon word found on an inscription in Ratburi. Last, Cœdès supposes for the first time a link between the regions of Dvãravatĩ and Fou-nan, probably on the basis of Pelliot's assertions.

The booklet has to be mentioned too for publishing quite a few new pictures on the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom, which have some value for the history of the collection of artefacts and of the objects.

The study was published again in 1961 in a completely different version, in particular the introduction we have been examining was considerably reduced as a few books had been written on the subject by various authors since the first edition. Also the pictures which interest our subject are not reproduced. This new version was published in company with a Thai translation in the same volume which is quite approximate on some points. In particular, a good part of Barth's comment on the *Ye thamma* inscriptions is attributed to Cœdès, and on the contrary Cœdès'

remark that Mon inscriptions were found in Lopburi and elsewhere is attributed to Pelliot, at the origin of a legend among Thai scholars which is hard to die in spite of its absurdity.

If we skip the 1928 article on the excavations at Phong Tuk, which does not fall within the scope of our subject, though it documents the first example of Dvāravatī architecture ever studied (« The Excavations of P'ongtük and their Importance for the Ancient History of Siam »), we arrive at Cœdès' last contribution of his first period, in which he makes a synthesis of his previous works and defines a classification which could be called definitive, when establishing, so to speak, the catalogue of Bangkok National Museum (*Les collections archéologiques du Musée national de Bangkok*), dated 1929. The passages concerning Dvāravatī are not much different from those of the second collection of inscriptions, except for the identification of a few distinctive features of this school of sculpture, and we need not examine them again. The main significant difference is that the author explicitly discards for the first time the hypothesis that the Wheels of the Law were of a much further antiquity than the Buddha images in the Gupta style.

Again, a Thai version, established by Cœdès himself as it is explicitly stated this time, calls for comments. This version is on the whole different from the French one, as it was intended for the Thai visitors of the museum. Consequently the bibliographical references disappear and are replaced by mentions of objects in temples that the visitors are invited to go and see, and the introduction is complemented by administrative documents regarding the creation and history of the collection of the museum. More important for our subject, in the passage concerning the Kingdom of Dvāravatī, Cœdès remarks again that the name was included in the full name of the new capital, Ayutthaya, possibly inherited from an older capital, which could be located in the region of muang Suphanburi or Nakhon Pathom. This passage does not appear in this form in the French version. The hypothesis is not developed elsewhere either.

In short, Cœdès' authority can be called upon for conflicting assertions on some points, depending on the text or the version of the same text that one reads, and one should not pay too much attention to these hypotheses. It is preferable to remember, as Dupont remarked later, that Cœdès was the first scholar to put some order in the various schools of ancient Siamese arts and shed some light on the ancient history of Siam.

His readings of the inscription in Mon found in Nakhon Pathom and of the coins where the word 'Dvāravatī' appears are not considered in this report as they belong to a later period.

- Another French scholar has to be mentioned here, though his contribution to Nakhon Pathom studies is not so important as the former one, Jean-Yves Claeys, an architect from the *École française d'Extrême-Orient*. George Cœdès became director of this institution at the end of 1929 and he immediately organized a mission in Siam, with support from Prince Damrong, to investigate the whole archaeological domain of Siam, in the line of the new classification established by the National Museum. The mission was conducted by Claeys between October and December 1929 and had as a result the publication of an article entitled « L'archéologie au Siam » in 1931. If his findings are of some interest for regions up to then somehow neglected such as Lanna, one has to admit that the results are rather poor concerning the archaeology of Nakhon Pathom. Claeys went to the main known site, Phra Pathom Chedi, and could study no architectural vestiges and could only report on the museum collection, already described by other authors. In consequence, he could hardly do more than synthesize Cœdès' former works on the subject, with nothing much to add, except a couple of remarks on sculpture. One thing however which has to be distinguished in his report : he noted that the piece sculpted in relief representing a *makara* preserved in Phra Pathom Chedi Museum found exactly its place in the back of the

throne of the Buddha image seated in the European fashion enshrined in Wat Na Phra Men in Ayutthaya. The observation is now commonly accepted, mostly through the agency of a writing by Prince Damrong, in which he gives no circumstantial justification to his assertion.

- The last French author who will be mentioned here is Pierre Dupont, restricting the study, as was implied before, to the history of his missions to Siam and of his preliminary investigations in Siam. As a curator of the South East Asian section of Musée Guimet in Paris at the beginning of his career, he had published two studies on Dvāravatī sculpture, even before going to Asia, using the method developed by Philippe Stern who was then seriously questioning the admitted chronology of South East Asian art. Named member of the École française d'Extrême-Orient in 1936, Dupont paid his first visit to Siam in the same year, mostly to study the collection of Bangkok National Museum (« Siam. P. DUPONT. Rapport sur ses études iconographiques »). His main stated objective then was to establish a relative chronology in the five centuries or so of Dvāravatī sculpture which were then still considered globally. He paid a second visit in 1937, during which he studied again the collection of the National Museum, this time establishing a sketch of a typology as a first step for a chronology. Whatever the case may be, we note that his descriptions are far more accurate than Cœdès or Claeys could have done before him. He also prospected the sites of Nakhon Pathom and Prachinburi with a view to finding a convenient location for future excavations, giving brief descriptions of the vestiges and artefacts he had seen on the spot (« Mission au Siam (23 juillet-22 août 1937). Recherches archéologiques à Nak'ôn Pathom et à Kok Wat »).

These prospections were intended in preparation for a cooperation agreement between the École française d'Extrême-Orient and the Fine Arts Department of Thailand, signed by Cœdès, still playing an important role in the study of the ancient history of Siam for the French side, at the end of the same year 1937. The agreement provided a five year period, which could be renewed, of general cooperation between the two parties, with no restriction to the field of archaeology. In practical terms, it became a project consisting in making excavations on various sites in Siam of different periods so as to cover the whole history of the country, starting from Dvāravatī. The task quickly proved too ambitious, as only one monument could be excavated in the first year 1939, Wat Phra Men, and it proved necessary to organize an additional campaign in 1940 for the same monument, the excavation of which was not completed yet, and another monument, Chula Prathon, not to mention the others in Nakhon Pathom and Prachinburi which were considered for the near future. Anyway, Second World War put an end to the project.

The site of Nakhon Pathom was eventually chosen in preference to Prachinburi, mostly for practical reasons and for the collection of sculptures in the museum, and the choice of Wat Phra Men as a starting point was quite incidental. Dupont left a copious report on this 1939 campaign (« Rapport de M. Dupont sur sa mission archéologique (18 janvier-25 mai 1939) »), in which he relates the organization of his mission from an administrative point of view, the process of excavations mostly from a technical point of view and a brief description of the monument which was later revised and of the finds. Interestingly, there is a report from the Siamese side, allowing a comparison (ตรี อมาตยกุล 2482, การขุดแต่งซากโบราณสถาน (วัดพระเมรุ) ตำบลสวนนันทอุทยาน จังหวัดนครปฐม. กรมศิลปากร, กรุงเทพฯ ๒ 2482. 15 หน้า). One of the main interests in Dupont's 1939 report is the investigation of the other archaeological sites in Nakhon Pathom, his descriptions being of importance since these sites are now either destroyed or covered by buildings. He also gives a brief description of the museum. The present report pays

special attention to Dupont's description of what he calls Wat Yai, opposite Phra Pathom Chedi, and three statuettes of Kamphaeng Saen, as there is not much left to be seen of them and the only material available are these written or photographic testimonies.

This text could be translated in Thai in priority.

The second campaign of investigation in 1940 on the end of the works at Wat Phra Men and those at Prathon Chedi is the object of a much shorter report, certainly due to the circumstances, relating in a few lines the process of excavation and mentioning the finds (« Thaïlande. Deuxième mission archéologique »).

The report submitted here stops at this stage and does not consider Dupont's other writings.

As was the case for Dupont's first campaign, a one year time limit for the project proved not enough to examine the French documents relevant to Nakhon Pathom studies. Quite a few chapters remain to be considered, and not the least important ones :

- If we include the field of Dvāravatī, as judged preferable in the introduction, it is necessary to take into account some texts by Lunet de Lajonquière, Cœdès and Dupont relevant to the subject not considered here ;
- The studies subsequent to Dupont's investigations in Nakhon Pathom remain to be examined and could constitute three different full chapters : the monument and finds of Wat Phra Men, the monument and finds at Chula Prathon and the study of Dvāravatī Buddhist sculpture, an important contribution by Pierre Dupont which is often overlooked. These chapters require some level of technical analysis and in the latter case, it is necessary to broaden the scope to Dvāravatī studies ;
- The reading of inscriptions by George Cœdès in the 1950's and 1960's, along with other works of vulgarization ;
- The contribution of Jean Boisselier, mostly devoted to Dvāravatī studies, which could constitute no less than six full chapters : the excavations at U-Thong, the excavations at Khu Bua, the discovery of a pre-Dvāravatī period, the excavations at Chula Prathon, the syntheses on Dvāravatī art and the history of the reconstruction of Phra Pathom Chedi.
- More recent excavations by Pierre Dagens.

Nakhon Pathom, March 12th 2007