Stela from Mỹ Sơn A

Arlo Griffiths

Author of digital edition: Arlo Griffiths

Contributor: Arlo Griffiths

Identifier: DHARMA_INSCIC00072

Repository: Campā (tfc-campa-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSCIC00072.xml

Language: Sanskrit [Cam]

Commit: 2026-09-19 07:34 (e13d61a), last modified 2026-09-16 06:32 (d2f72d3)

Edition

〈Face A〉 〈A1〉 s[i]ddham· □ nam[o]

1. Anuṣṭubh

maheśvara(M) Umāñ ca Agn[i]ñ ca
〈A2〉 (bra)hmāṇaṁ viṣṇum eva ca
namo p¡ri!〈ṛ〉thiv(ī)〈ṁ〉 vāyur ākatham
apa(ḥ)〈A3〉 (jyo)tiś ca pañcamaM;

2. Anuṣṭubh

namaskṛtvāham icchāmi
sarvva-viśeṣair anudhyāta¿M?〈ḥ〉
(duṣkṛ)〈A4〉(taṁ) 〈me〉 vyapohan(tu)
sukṛtena yunantu ca

bhadreśvara-svāmi-pādānudhyātena c[āsm]āka[ṁ] mahārā[jñā]〈A5〉 [bha]dravar-mmaṇā manuṣyam adhruvaṁ jñā(tvā) bhadreśvarāya Akṣayī nīvī dattā yathā

pū(rvva)[taḥ]〈A6〉 (su)laha-parvvata dakṣiṇena mahā-parvvata paścimena kucoka-parvvata Uttareṇa ma[hānadī]〈A7〉 (pa)rimāṇābbhyantarā sa-kuṭumbi-janā bhūmi〈r〉 dattā ; janapada-maryyādā ṣa(ḍ)bhāge p(i) [ca. 3+]〈A8〉svāminā daśa-bhāgenānugṛhītā devasya dey¡a!〈ā〉 Iti tad eva yathābhilikhitam akurvva[to]〈A9〉 (de)vasya ; janma-prabhṛti dharmma-prasavo yaḥ ; tat-phalam bhadravarmmaṇaḥ ; yadi kaś cid ¿a?〈ā〉kramya hara(ti)〈A10〉 (vi)nāśayati vā ; mukta-doṣā〈ḥ〉 kuṭumbinaḥ ; tasy-oparī adharmma〈ḥ〉 syāT ; cāturvvaidyaṁ rājā(naṁ)〈A11〉 rājamātram ¿b?〈v〉ā saha kuṭumbibhiḥ ; vijñāpayāmi mamānukampārtthaṁ yan mayā dattaṁ mā vināśaya¿(tha)?〈ta〉〈Face B〉 〈B1〉 yadi vināśayatha janmani janmani vo yat sukṛtaṁ tan mama syāT〈B2〉 yac ca mama duṣk¡ri!〈ṛ〉taṁ tad yuṣmākaṁ syā(T) ; Atha samyak paripālayatha tad yuṣm¿a?〈ā〉kam ¿a?〈e〉va〈B3〉 dharmma〈ḥ〉 syād iti ; bhūyo vi-jñā〈pa〉yāmi; ya Iha prabhavati; Ete deva-m[u](ṣṭ)i-kārakāḥ [te]〈B4〉[ṣā]ṁ karmma na kārayitavyaṁ; syāc cora-bhaya(ṁ) skandhāvāra-¿tva?〈du〉ritaṁ vā rāja-kula-kāryyam anuṣṭheya[M] [2+]〈B5〉 (macaguro) 'smākaṁ rājānaM; yat kiñ cit puṣpa-phalaṅ gṛhyaṁ pādeṣu p¿a?〈ā〉ditavyam iti〈B6〉 me mahila-putra-nat(ṛ)ka-pana(tṛ)ka-jāmāduko vā vijñāpayāmi; ya¿ṁ?〈n〉 mayā kṛta〈B7〉[m a]nupālaye(ta) vaḥ; Iha paratra ca; ma(ma ka)rmma-(pha)laṁ bhaviṣyati; tubh(y)aṁ prabhāva〈B8〉[ca. 16+] Ahannisvāret(o); dharmmo bhaviṣyati〈B9〉 (ya Anu)pālayati tasyaiṣa dharmmo yo nānupāla〈ya〉ti; mā vināśayatu; Atha vināśayati〈B10〉 tasya bhadreśvarasvām¿i?〈ī〉 jānāti

Apparatus

〈A1〉 □ • sign in the form of a *triśūla*. — 〈A1〉 □ svasti • Finot omits the spiral-shaped fleuron and inserts after *svasti* the sign || which is not actually there.

〈I〉 s(a)sureśamukhyā • the reading with short *a* in *sa* is uncertain. Judging only by the estampage, one might be inclined to read *sā*, but this would be unmetrical. See the note to our translation.

〈A1〉 maheśvara(M) • Finot notes that "il y avait peut-être un *m* ascrit à la suite de ce mot." It seems more than likely that the sign is indeed to be read as *M*. — 〈A1〉 agn[i]ñ ca ◇ *pra ...* F.

〈A2〉 (bra)hmāṇaṁ viṣṇum ◇ *brahmāṇaṁ viṣṇum* F. — 〈A2〉 ākatham apa(ḥ) • understand *ākāśam āpaḥ* with Finot. The akṣaras *tha* and *śa* are sufficiently similar to be confused, but one cannot here read *śa* without emendation.

〈A3〉 (jyo)tiś • "Ce mot est peu distinct sur le fac-simile, mais il est à peu près sûr, d'après l'examen de la pierre" Finot. — 〈A3〉 (duṣkṛ)〈A4〉(taṁ) ◇ *duṣkṛ[tka]rmma* F.

〈A4〉 sukṛtena yunantu ca ◇ *sukṛto nayutantud(ā)* F • Finot comments: "Bien que les let-

tres principales de cette ligne soient assez distinctes, ¿le? lecture en est problématique, spécialement celle du mot que je lis, faute de mieux, *nayutantudā* (= *niyutaṁtudā*).”” The reading adopted here was proposed to me by Yuko Yokochi. — 〈A4〉 -pādānudhyātena ◇ *-pādānudhyā(ne)na* F. — 〈A4〉 mahārā[jñā] ◇ *mahārā(jena)* F.

〈A5〉 manuṣyam adhruvaṁ ◇ *mānuṣyam adhvānaṁ* F. — 〈A5〉 yathā pū(rvva)[taḥ] ◇ *yathājñānam* F • Correction to *pūrvveṇa* is implied in BEFEO 18 no. 10, p.~14. C. 147, line 1, indeed supports the latter reading, but there is no trace here of any *e* joined to *rvv*. So little is visible on stone and estampage that final the ending *-taḥ* proposed here is only a diagnostic conjecture, in place of which *-syām·* would be acceptable as well.

〈A6〉 (su)laha-parvvata ◇ *sulaha-parvvato* F. — 〈A6〉 mahā-parvvata ◇ *mahā-parvvataḥ* F. — 〈A6〉 kucoka- ◇ *kucaka-* F • Cf.~C.~147, and Finot observation in BEFEO 18 no 10, p.~14 n.~2: “J’avais lu précédemment *Kucaka*, mais la voyelle *o* est nettement indiquée sur la copie. Il s’agit sans doute d’un nom indigène, peut-être *Ku čok*, « l’auguste montagne ».” From Finot’s presentation of the matter, it is not clear whether this intends to correct his earlier reading of C.\ 72 or of C.\ 147, or both. — 〈A6〉 ma[hānadī] ◇ *ma[ryyādāḥ]* F • Cf.~C. 147, l.~4. Majumdar indeed reads *ma(hānadī)*, but without any text-critical note.

〈A7〉 (pa)rimāṇābbhyantarā ◇ *parimānābhyantarā* F. — 〈A7〉 bhūmi〈r〉 dattā F • Finot notes: “Lire *bhūmir*; mais ce doit être une faute du texte, car il n’y a pas du *d*.”

〈A8〉 dey¡a!〈ā〉 ◇ *dey(ā)* F • I see no mark of *ā*, but it must have been intended.

〈A9〉 tat-phalam bhadra° ◇ *tatphalaṁ bhadra°* F.

〈A10〉 rājā(naṁ)〈A11〉 rājamātram ¿b?〈v〉ā ◇ *rājā(naṁ) rājamātraṁ vā* F • Cf.~Vālmīki’s Rāmāyaṇa 2.94.19: *eko ’py amātyo medhāvī śūro dakṣo vicakṣaṇaḥ| rājānaṁ rājamātraṁ vā prāpayen mahatīṁ śriyam*.

〈A11〉 °nukampārtthaṁ ◇ *°nukampārthaṁ* F. — 〈A11〉 vināśaya¿(tha)?〈ta〉 ◇ *vin(āśa)ya(ta)* F • If the ending *-tha* is indeed what has been engraved, it must be emended to *-ta*.

〈B2〉 duṣk¡ri!〈r̥〉taṁ ◇ *duṣkṛtaṁ* F. — 〈B2〉 yuṣm¿a?〈ā〉kam ¿a?〈e〉va ◇ *yuṣmākam (eva)* F.

〈B3〉 Ete deva-m[u](ṣṭ)i-kārakāḥ ◇ *[...](deva-bali-kārakāḥ)* F.

〈B4〉 syāc cora-bhaya(ṁ) skandhāvāra-¿tva?〈du〉ritaṁ ◇ *syād . ora..... ratraratataṁ* F. — 〈B4〉 anuṣṭheya[M][2+] ◇ *anuṣṭheyam..* F.

〈B5〉 (macaguro) ◇ *atha guro* F. — 〈B5〉 rājānaM ◇ *rājān(o)..* F. — 〈B5〉 kiñ cit puṣpa-

phalaṅ gṛhyaṁ pādeṣu p¿a?〈ā〉ditavyam ◇ *kiñcit... phalāḍhyeṣu pādeṣu paditavyam* F. — 〈B5〉 iti〈B6〉 me ◇ *iti〈B6〉 [...]* F • Although no traces of lost akṣaras are visible at the end of line 5 or the beginning of 6, it seems that *ye* must possibly be restored between these two words.

〈B6〉 -nat(r̥)ka-pana(tr̥)ka-jāmāduko ◇ *[...]* F • This sequence is certainly corrupt. Yuko Yokochi has made the convincing suggestion to me of reading *naptr̥ka-pranaptr̥ka-jāmātr̥kān*. While what is readable on the stone cannot be read as such, it may be supposed that a reading such as that proposed by Yokochi stood in a source of which the composer of our inscription has access to an itself already corrupt copy.

〈B7〉 [m a]nupālaye(ta) vaḥ; Iha paratra ca ◇ *(kuśalāyatanāḥ ; vahularatnaca)* F • Understand *anupālyeta*?

〈B8〉 Ahannisvāret(o) ◇ *Ayan na svarato* F. — 〈B8〉 dharmmo bhaviṣyati ◇ *dharmmabhava.....* F.

〈B9〉 (ya Anu)pālayati ◇ *..... pālayati* F. — 〈B9〉 dharmmo ◇ *dharmma(ḥ)* F. — 〈B9〉 nānupāla〈ya〉ti ◇ *na tu pāla◇ti* F. — 〈B9〉 mā vināśayatu ◇ *Abhināśayatu* F.

Translation

〈A1–4〉 Success! [Having paid] homage to Maheśvara and to Umā and to Agni, to Brahmā and to Viṣṇu; homage to earth, to air, to ether, to water, and to fire as fifth; having paid homage (to all of them), blessed by all qualities,[1] do I wish that they repel [from me] any sin, and join [me] with virtue.

〈A4–5〉 And blessed by the feet of the Lord Bhadreśvara has our king Bhadravarman, realizing that human [existence] is impermanent,[2] given a permanent endowment (*akṣayī nīvī*) to Bhadeśvara.

〈A6–8〉 Namely, land has been given, along with the cultivators, within the boundaries: East mount Sulaha, South the great mountain, West mount Kucoka, North the great

[1] The translation is mechanical. The text is certainly corrupt here, and a more intrusive emendation that the modification to *anudhyātaḥ*, also involving the hypermetrical *sarvvaviśeṣair* (for which one imagines *saviśeṣair* or *sarvvadevair*), is probably required.

[2] A similar expression is a standard element in a formula in the corresponding portions of all charters of the Maitraka dynasty of present Gujarat in India, during the period of whose reign that of Bhadravarman in Campā must have fallen. The formula is as follows: *āgāminr̥patibhiś cānityāny aiśvaryyāṇy asthiraṁ mānuṣyaṁ sāmānyaṁ ca bhūmidānaphalam avagacchadbhir ...*. Very rarely, the element that concerns us is expressed in still more closely corresponding manner: *asthiram mānuṣyaṁ cāvekṣya*. I have not found anything comparable in other contemporary Indian epigraphical corpora.

river. Even though the standard is at one sixth share, [the land] has been supported by the Lord with [a lower standard, namely] a tenth share, to be given to the god.

〈A8–10〉 The production of merit from birth onwards by the one who does not act on behalf of the god in accordance with this written (edict), his fruits (of merit) belong to Bhadravarman. If some one encroaches and seizes (any part of the endowment), the cultivators are free of blame. The demerit would rest on him.

〈A10–B3〉 I request any member of the community of (Brahmins learned in) the four Vedas, any (future) king or claimant, together with the cultivators, out of sympathy with myself not to destroy that which I have given. If you destroy it, whatever merit is yours in every birth, that will belong to me, and what sin I have, that will belong to you. If you protect it properly, the merit will be yours alone.

〈B3–6〉 Furthermore I request him who holds power here (in the future): they are robbers of (what belongs to) the god. Their deed should not be encouraged to be done! Should there be danger of thieves, or misfortune of the army, the royal family's duty is to be carried out. \ldots\ our king. If some fruits or flowers are to be taken, they must (first) be dropped at (the Lord's) feet.

〈B6–9〉 I request my wife (or: wives), sons, grandsons, great-grandsons and (*vā*) sons-in-law: whatever I have done, may that be maintained by you, (so that) the fruit of action will accrue to me! For you … power … will accrue merit from this. He who maintains it, to him does the merit belong. He who does not maintain it, let him not destroy it. If he does destroy it, Lord Bhadreśvara knows it.

Translation into French by Finot 1902

TO BE SUPPLIED

Bibliography

First published, with French translation, in Finot 1902, pp. 187–191, based on an uninked estampage, photographs and personal inspection of the stone. The edition, with English translation, in Majumdar 1985, pp. 4–8 largely follows Finot, but contains a small number of original readings. The publication in English by Golzio 2004, pp. 2–4 as well as the one in Japanese by Takashima & Sawada 2006, № 1, pp. 3–7 seem to follow that of Majumdar. Majumdar's readings are not cited systematically in the edition below, which is based on inspection of the set of inked estampages EFEO and of the stone

itself, in December 2010. The signs C· render the subscript consonants that function as C-virāma in this inscription.

Primary

[F] Finot, Louis. 1902. "Notes d'épigraphie, I : deux nouvelles inscriptions de Bhadravarman I^{er}, roi de Champa." BEFEO 2, pp. 185–191. DOI: 10.3406/befeo.1902.1119. [URL]. Pages 187–191.

Secondary

Schweyer, Anne-Valérie. 2005. "Les sources épigraphiques." In: *Trésors d'art du Vietnam : La sculpture du Champa V^{e}-XV^{e} siècles*. Edited by Pierre Baptiste & Thierry Zéphir. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux & Musée des arts asiatiques Guimet, pp. 36–47. Page 40, figure 2.

Baptiste, Pierre & Thierry Zéphir. 2005. *Trésors d'art du Vietnam : La sculpture du Champa V^{e}-XV^{e} siècles*. Paris: Réunion des musées nationaux & Musée des arts asiatiques Guimet. Pages 180–182.

Schweyer, Anne-Valérie. 2008. "Kośa in Cham inscriptions: Political power and ritual practices." In: *Gold Treasures of the Cham Kingdoms*. Vol. 2. Budapest: JelNet Ltd, pp. 13–27. Pages 13–14.