Đại Hữu pedestal fragment (C. 171)

Arlo Griffiths and Dániel Balogh

Authors of digital edition: Arlo Griffiths, Dániel Balogh

Contributor: Arlo Griffiths

Identifier: DHARMA_INSCIC00171

Repository: Campā (tfc-campa-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSCIC00171.xml

Languages: Old Cham [Script (unspecified)], Sanskrit [Cam]

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

Edition

〈A1〉

[ca. 5+]

1. Āryā(?)

[4|4|4|4|4|4|꩜]
[4|4|4|4|꩜](ca)ñcalā buddhiḥ_

2. Vasantatilakā

yasya prajāsu sutarāṁ kṛ〈A2〉[˘–˘–꩜]
[––˘–˘˘˘–˘˘–˘–꩜]
[––˘–˘˘˘–˘˘–˘–꩜]
[––˘–˘˘˘–˘˘–˘–꩜]

3. Anuṣṭubh

[bhā]ṇḍāgārādhikāro ’yaṁ_
tasya bhṛtyaḥ prasā〈A3〉[–˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]

4. Anuṣṭubh

[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
[˘]nt(aṁ) yat puṇyavarddhanam·◎

5. Anuṣṭubh

ratnalokeśvaro yena
〈B1〉 sthāpito rajatātmakaḥ_
vṛddhe ratnapure śā[˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]

6. Anuṣṭubh

[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]

7. Anuṣṭubh

[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
〈B2〉 *hjai-traṁ*·kṣetraṁ *juṁā*-pure_
*cvaḥ-sirā*la(ya)[––˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]

8. Anuṣṭubh

[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘––˽]
[˽˽˽˽˘–˘˽]

〈B3〉 〈〈◎〉〉m an-upama-matiḥ _ śrīmāñ jayasiṁhavarmmadevo (’ya)[...]

Apparatus

〈A2〉 tasya ◇ *tasyā* FG.

〈A3〉 nt(aṁ) yat ◇ *ntayat* FG • It seems the stone has suffered a little bit of damage at the left extremity, so that the akṣara *ntaṁ* is now entirely lost, and can be read only from the estampage.

〈B2〉 cvaḥ ◇ *(dvaḥ?)* FG.

〈B3〉 ⟨⟨◎⟩⟩m anupama- ◇ *manupāma-* FG • A symbol, ignored by Finot & Goloubew, seems to be squashed below the *ma* at line opening.

Commentary

Finot & Goloubew observe that "Le texte subsistant ne doit guère représenter que le quart de l'inscription totale" and that "Il paraît être rédigé en çlokas" (1925, p. 472). The second claim is not confirmed by the more precise metrical analysis presented here. Our reconstruction of the lost text is based on the assumption that the text would have been more or less symmetrically distributed over the two sides of a pedestal, the conduit for libation fluids marking the transition from the first part (A) to the second (B). Part A of the text would have begun on either near the middle of the vertical face straight across the pedestal from the conduit, or in the far left corner viewed from the conduit; part B would have ended on back at the same point on the vertical face across the conduit, or in the far right corner. One line of text would, in each part, have extended over about 65 akṣaras.]

Bibliography

First edited by Finot & Goloubew (1925). Re-edited and here by Dániel Balogh & Arlo Griffiths from the estampages EFEO n. 507 and photographs of the stone.

Primary

[FG] Finot, Louis & Victor Goloubew. 1925. "Fouilles de Đại-hưu." BEFEO 25, pp. 469–475. DOI: 10.3406/befeo.1925.3065. [URL]. Pages 472–474.

Secondary

Golzio, Karl-Heinz. 2004. *Inscriptions of Campā: Based on the editions and translations of Abel Bergaigne, Étienne Aymonier, Louis Finot, Édouard Huber and other French scholars and of the work of R. C. Majumdar; newly presented, with minor corrections of texts and translations, together with calculations of given dates*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag. Page 93.