Broken statue of Śiva from Chiêm Sơn

Arlo Griffiths and Salomé Pichon

Authors of digital edition: Arlo Griffiths, Salomé Pichon

Contributor: Salomé Pichon

Identifier: DHARMA_INSCIC00215

Repository: Campā (tfc-campa-epigraphy)

File path: xml/DHARMA_INSCIC00215.xml

Language: Old Cham [Cam]

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

Edition

o[m̆]

nama śivāya

〈1〉 [6+] yāṁ poṁ ku śrī śrīndraviṣṇukīrtti vīrabhadravarmmade〈2〉[va] [4+](r)mma pūra urāṁ ṅauk· glauṅ· vijaya pu poṁ ku nan· ticauvv· yāṁ〈3〉 [poṁ ku śrī] (ja)ya siṅhavarmmadeva ticauvv· pu poṁ vyā parameśvarī pu poṁ ku〈4〉 kumman· yāṁ poṁ ku śrī braṣu indravarmmadeva paramotbhava di yāṁ pu śrī〈5〉 rājaparamātmaja yāṁ pu yuvarāja yāṁ poṁ ku śrī śrīndraviṣṇukīrtti vīra〈6〉bhadravarmmadeva pu poṁ ku śivabhaktātireka tadyoṁ di dharmmopapāti jan·〈7〉 samastapunyadharmma makapun· (th)al(y)a (th)aṁkrammasatā(ka) dhūppa vada kā(la) [1+]〈8〉 [unknown number of illegible lines]

Apparatus

〈1〉 viṣṇukīrtti ◇ *viṣṇumūrtti* Schweyer2003_01.

〈2〉 [va][4+](r)mma pūra ◇ *[va ca]mpapūra* Schweyer2003_01. — 〈2〉 nan· ◇ *nagara* Schweyer2003_01.

〈3〉 [poṁ ku śrī](ja)ya siṅhavarmmadeva ◇ *[ja]ya siṅhavarmmadeva* Schweyer2003_01 • There is definitely place for several more syllables than Schweyer assumes, and comparison with other inscriptions shows that *poṁ ku śrī* is a fixed part of the royal title. — 〈3〉 vyā parameśvarī • this sequence was not read by Schweyer, although the letters are clear, and the same sequence figures in C. 11 A, l. 3 and C. 22 A, l. 3.

〈4〉 paramotbhava di ◇ *paramottara niy* Schweyer2003_01 • For *paramodbhava* (of which *paramotbhava* represents a sloppy spelling), see C. 11 A, l. 3 and C. 31 A1, l. 2 (a form *paramottara* is not attested, and the reading is clearly *°va*, not *°ra*).

〈5〉 rājaparamātmaja ◇ *rājaparamā. . .* Schweyer2003_01 • The letters unread by Schweyer are clear. — 〈5〉 pu yuvarāja ◇ *pov ku yubarāja* Schweyer2003_01. — 〈5〉 viṣṇukīrtti ◇ *viṣṇumūrtti* Schweyer2003_01.

〈6-7〉 śivabhaktātireka • Schweyer does not transliterate any further akṣaras after *śiva°*.

Translation

Om. Homage to Śiva! ... Y.P.K. Śrī Śrīndra Viṣṇukīrti Vīrabhadravarmadeva ... [who hails from] the capital, man Ṅauk Glauṅ Vijaya. That P.P.K. was the grandson of Y.P.K. Śrī Jaya Siṁhavarmadeva, the grandson of P.P.V. Parameśvarī P.P.K, the nephew of Y.P.K. Śrī Vṛṣu Indravarmadeva, of supreme birth among the illustrious lords supreme princes. [He was] milord the heir apparent. Y.P.K. Śrī Śrīndra Viṣṇukīrti Vīrabhadravarmadeva P.P.K., of unsurpassed devotion to Śiva, faithful to the production of *dharma*, carried out all meritorious gifts (*dharma*), such as: ... incense ...

Commentary

The iconography of what remains of the sculpture seems somewhat comparable with that seen in the sculpture whose back bears the inscription C. 42 from Drang Lai, which dates to the same period. Another inscription (C. 161) is engraved on the back of the lower part of a broken statue of Śiva. The god's torso is there not preserved, but what is preserved of the lap of the deity and of his mount is very comparable to the Śiva from Drang Lai, bearing on its back C. 42, and so this piece may be considered to have been a comparable statue of Śiva. Moreover, this fragment of a Śiva was found in the valley Chiêm Sơn near Trà Kiệu.

In other words, we have two contemporary fragments of inscriptions, one engraved on the upper back, the other on the lower back of a sculpture, both of these fragments found in Chiêm Sơn; the one fragment shows the torso of a possible Śiva, the other the lap of a deity sitting on a bull, i.e. almost certainly Śiva. We are very tempted to consider that these two inscriptions, C. 161 and C. 215, originally belonged together as top and bottom. The measurements of the stones would seem to allow this hypothesis, although both fragments have suffered a lot precisely in the place where the pieces would have been joined, so it is hard to get any certainty from measurement, and it is not likely that physically trying to join the two pieces would yield clear confirmation either. We have measured the size of the letters of the two inscriptions, and the result was some dissimilarity in size, so that we remain in doubt about this hypothesis.