

C. 138

Stela of An Thái

BTLS Hanoi LSb 21155 (**B 2**, 27)

EFEO estampages: n. 155a, 155b. Reproduced in Huber's edition, figures 30 et 31.

References: Edouard Huber, "L'épigraphie de la dynastie de Dong-duong. 2). L'inscription de An-thai", BEFEO XI (1911), p. 277-282 [EEPC, pp. 251-256]; Majumdar, pp. 105-109; Golzio, pp. 89-92.

Text (Arlo Griffiths & Amandine Lepoutre)

Read from stone and inked EFEO estampage, first by AL in December 2010, then by AG in March 2012. Improved by AG in 2019 thanks to suggestions received from Francesco Bianchini. Huber has not recorded the • punctuation except in the concluding list of fields. The stone carver's use of this punctuation mark seems to be somewhat erratic.

Face A.

[fleuron] (namo lo)kanāthā(ya) [fleuron]

Except for the two fleurons, which he ignored, this is how Huber read the invocation. The text was too damaged here already at the time the estampage was made to retrieve any part of the invocation with confidence, except the second fleuron.

(1) svasti ||

I. [indravajrā]

yena ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ mūrttir

vyaktaika - - ~ ~ - - =

- - ~ - - śura - ~ bhaugrais

tasmai namaḥ (2) kārūṇikāya nityam· |

c. śuretipautrais?

II. [sragdharā — scansion still incorrect]

- - - - ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ - - - - -

- - - - ~ ~ ~ pyamātra vālabhito (3) rakaivākrandamānā

- - - - **parāvā** ~ ~ vigatasukhā lohadaṇḍābhighātāḥ
smṛtvā lokeśvaran tvām pra(**ma**)(**4**)(**thita**)duritaṁ kevalaṁ mokṣam āpuḥ
||

d. lokeśvaran tvām pra(**mathita**)duritaṁ kevalaṁ mokṣam:
lokeśvara ... kevalamokṣam Huber.

or better: *praśamitaduritaṁ*? cf. *praśamita* in l. 6.

there seems to be an unwanted anusvāra inside *lokeśvaran*,
i.e. *lokeśvanran*. check the stone.

----- from here onward the edition is virtually finalized, some remaining
problems indicated in red ----

III. [sragdharā]

mārair ugraiḥ parītās ciram api manujāḥ pūrvvakarmmānuraktā
niṣtrāṇā ni(**5**)(tyaduḥkhā)ḥ paramakaluṣitāḥ kṣutpipāsābhibhūtāḥ
pūrvvañ cādānadoṣāt sugatavimukhataḥ prāptakāpālahaste

(**6**) - - - **C**vajrapāṇipraśamitanirayaṁ (b)uddhamārggaṁ samāpuḥ ||

a+b. If • signs were written at the end of these two pādas, they can
only be read now with much good will. It seems quite likely that none
were written at all.

b. niṣtrāṇā ni(tyaduḥkhā)ḥ parama°: niṣtrāṇā - ~ - parama° Huber.
The stone is quite worn here, but the proposed restitution seems to agree
unproblematically with whatever traces remain visible.

c. prāptakāpālahaste: prāpta - ~ - Huber (whose scansion is
deficient by two syllables).

IV. [āryā]

śrībhadravarmmanṛpates tasya mato tyantaballabhatva(**7**)matih
sujanāṅghriyugalasevī ca (nāga)puṣpasthaviranāmā ||

a. °nṛpates: °nṛpateḥ Huber.

a. °ballabha°: read °vallabha°.

b. °sevī ca (nāga)puṣpasthavira°: °sevī nāgapuṣpasthāvira° Huber
(unmetrical, presumably in part due to influence from st. XI).

V. [anuṣṭubh]

lokeśvaraṇ jagadvyāptaṁ śraddhābhāvair atiṣṭhi(**8**)pat•
pṛthivīkīrttaye so smai dharmmadeśanayā hitaḥ ||

VI. [indravajrā]

lokapra - - ntrayaśomśuśuddha-
campādhipas sa(9)rvvasukhapradātā •
śrī°indravarmma sa surendravarmma
tadvattṛdhameva cakāra tasmin• ||

a. lokapra - - ntrayaśo-: loka ~ - ~ yaśo- Huber. Huber's scansion is deficient by one syllable. *There seems to be another subscript r between pra and ntra.*

a. -śuddha-: -śuddhaḥ Huber.

d. tadvattṛdhameva: tadvatkṛtam eva Huber. For Huber's second *ta*, the actual reading quite clearly cannot be *ta*. The options seem to be *dha* or *ca*. Either way, the text is unmetrical, for a long syllable is required here. *One could also read ttṛ with subscript t instead of k. On this basis, I accept a conjecture proposed by Yuko Yokochi: tadvattṛdhāmeva, substandard spelling for tadvattridhāmaiva.*

VII. [āryā]

karuṇāmṛtarasa(10)rasikaḥ kevalam eva prajāhitāspadakṛt•
yo muktiṁ sa ca nikhilāṁ pramuditalokeśvarā(11)yādāt• ||

VIII. [anuṣṭubh]

vajradhātur asau pūrvvaṁ śrīśākyamuniśāsanāt•
śūnyo pi vajradhṛddhetuḥ buddhānām āla(12)yo bhavat• ||
c. śūnyo: sūnyo Huber. Corr. sūnyo.

IX. [anuṣṭubh]

padmadhātur ato lokaśvarahetur jjinālayaḥ •
°amitābhavacoyuktyā (13) @ @ mahāśūnyo babhūva ha || @ @
d. mahāśūnyo: mahāśūnyo Huber. Corr. °sūnyo.
@@ ... @@: fleurons filling the space on both sides of the centered pāda d.

Face B.

X. [anuṣṭubh]

(1) cakradhātur asau ś(ū)nyā•tīto v(ai)rocanājñayā •
vajrasutvasya hetuḥ syā•t tṛtīyo (2) bhūj jinālayaḥ ||
ab. ś(ū)nyā•tīto v(ai)rocanājñayā: possibly the actual spelling was śūnyātīto verocanājñayā. The stone is too worn here to be sure.
c. vajrasutvasya: vajrasattvasya Huber. Huber's is the expected

reading (with normalized spelling ttv), but the presence of the vocalization u is undeniable.

XI. [anuṣṭubh]

nāgapuṣpāhvayo bhāti • sthāviras tulyaśīladhīh •

pūrvveṇa nāgapuṣpākhye•nātma(3)vamśena bhikṣuṇā • ||

b. sthāviras: the long ā is undeniable here, but cf. sthavira in st. IV.

asmai śrīpramuditalokeśvaravihārāya tatpuṇyāya yat sarvvaṃ idaṃ (4)
kṣetraṃ śrībhadravarmmadevas tadanujñayā dattavān •

punar api sa śrī°indravarmmadevaḥ sakalarājādhi(5)rājaḥ
tadanugrahasadbhāvāt• tad eva niyuktam• ||

3. °vihārāya: °viharāya Huber.

5. °sadbhāvāt: °saṃbhāvāt Huber.

XII. [upajāti of triṣṭubh]

gate śakābde yugakarmṇakāyairh

jye(6)ṣṭhasya śukle navame dine yam •

tena pratiṣṭhāpitayātmakīrttyai

śrīlokanātha(7)s tu sa jīvavāre || • ||

c. pratiṣṭhāpitayātmakīrttyai: corr. pratiṣṭhāpita ātmakīrttyai (as already proposed by Huber).

mutiy• dai kṣetraṃ • kravāv• kṣetraṃ • vuyat• kṣetraṃ • glām kṣetraṃ •

(8) durī kṣetraṃ • vyauv• kṣetraṃ • klov• huviy• kṣetraṃ • jrāy• kṣetraṃ •
tupamīn• kṣetraṃ • || • ||

(9) drain• kṣetraṃ • kratam kṣetraṃ • jalān• nauk• kṣetraṃ ||

7. dai: day Huber.

8. huviy•: one could possibly read huriy•.