In reply to


Joyanto K. Sen

I have read the review article by Nicolas Revire. I am happy he shares my enthusiasm for Pierre Dupont’s work. I thank him where he has given me credit though there are far too many occasions where he has erred on the side of indiscretion. He finds it difficult to appreciate the hard work, exercised with due respect and high regard, by others in making Prof. Dupont’s *L’archéologie mône de Dvāravatī* available to a wider readership.

My translation is for scholars as well as for the general readership. Mr. Revire appears to have misread the text and misunderstood my intent.

The translation is designed to make it easier, particularly for non-specialists, to follow Prof. Dupont’s descriptions so that they can locate the places cited; find the monuments, see them and trace their architectural details; and find the statues and delight in recognizing their iconographic features.

The names of places mentioned in the book have their current spellings as given by the tourism authority of the country.

The figures and plans are in a format familiar to English-speaking readers. For example, drawings are projected in the third quadrant instead of the first quadrant, while retaining Prof. Dupont’s originals.

Photographs of many statues from museums in India, Thailand, Indonesia and Vietnam have been added, some of which Prof. Dupont was unable to provide, to make it easier for the reader to understand his descriptions.

I am charged with being “problematic and confusing” because I correctly directed the readers to the “Phrapathom Chedi National Museum” (p. 199) when Prof. Dupont speaks of “le Musée du P’ra Pathom.” Since the Dvāravatī sculptures mentioned by Prof. Dupont are today in the Phrapathom Chedi National Museum, it is only prudent to refer the reader to this museum.

For the convenience of the reader, I have also added several appendices, including a glossary, an illustrated description of the draping of Buddhist monastic robes, and a table of the International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration (IAST), and made several practical modifications, all correctly annotated.

Each modification and each addition is clearly identified by the section number.
of the text, figure, map or plan. Furthermore, these changes are followed by my initials, (J.K.S.), to distinguish them from Prof. Dupont’s original in order that the reader knows whom to hold responsible for these changes.

I am fully responsible for the photographs of figures 543 to 600. None of the photographs was downloaded from the internet, including Fig. 571 to 573. All figures are from high resolution digital photographs taken by me on site or purchased from, or provided by, the original photographers.

In defending the “spirit of the original work by Pierre Dupont,” the reviewer has failed to consider that the original work was posthumously published. It reflects his spirit as well as those of the editors who prepared the book for publication. I believe a book is written to assist the reader and not written to be frozen in place and time on a pedestal.

For the record, I did correspond with the original publisher of Prof. Dupont’s L’Archéologie mône de Dvāravatī and let them know, at the very beginning, that I was translating the book. They were interested and wrote back to say, “… nous avions évoqué la possibilité d’une coédition” (“…we had discussed the possibility of co-publishing”). I also suggested that my translation be reviewed by one of their scholars. They agreed and suggested I speak with their resident scholar in Bangkok whose e-mail address I was given. I was encouraged by these developments and continued with the translation. When I was ready with the final version and offered to send them a copy, I received no reply. A second offer also went unanswered.