

pedestal therefore probably dates to the second half of the 9th century and is contemporary with *Đồng Dương* and its 875 CE inscription of the builder king *Indravarman II*. (Majumdar 1985: III, 121; Stern 1942: 16-7; Boisselier 1963: 118-28). The decorative patterns of both pedestals derive from those of the *Mỹ Sơn E1* pedestal, but are simpler. These are the only pedestals with images of ascetics at *Mỹ Sơn*. They are also the only ones to have square frames between floral or vermicular motifs. The sequence of the three pedestals shows that the decoration became simpler over time. When the interiors were walled up and the sanctums darkened, it can be argued

**Fig.13** Remnant gopura of a *Đồng Dương* sanctuary. (Photo: *Trần Kỳ Phương*)



that this discouraged the continuation of the early rich decorative tradition for pedestals. With walls of brick and sandstone, ornamentation migrated to the temple exteriors. This cannot however be stated as a hard and fast rule, because one elaborately carved *Đồng Dương* pedestal, along with numerous icons disposed on it, was contained within brick walls without windows and with only one door opening to the east.<sup>9</sup>

In summary, we can trace the evolution of Cham temple architecture as beginning from the mid-7<sup>th</sup> to mid-8<sup>th</sup> centuries with a system of wooden pillars supporting a frame and tiled or thatched roof.<sup>10</sup> Pedestals sculpted in sandstone for these open-sanctum temples have rich decoration with narrative reliefs. *Mỹ Sơn E1* is eminent and *Mỹ Khánh* is clearly related. The *Trà Kiệu* pedestal, possibly from Point B, is different in conception, and scholars are divided on whether to place it in the 7<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Subsequently, closed-sanctum temples became the norm from the late eighth century onwards with corbelled roofs in brick. In this period, sculpted pedestal decoration declined and ornamentation composed of human figures and flora was transferred to the exterior walls. Architectural examples include the *Phố Hải/Pajai*, *Po Dam* complexes as well as the *Mỹ Sơn C7* and *B4* (*Trần Kỳ Phương* 2015: Part 2, 17-20). Pedestals include *Mỹ Sơn A1* and *A10* (*Trần Kỳ Phương* 2008: 69). Most of the extant Cham temple architecture constructed with corbelling were erected from the 10<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> centuries. The turning point towards this momentous change is generally acknowledged as being reached with the construction of the vast brick Buddhist monastery complex at *Đồng Dương* in 875 CE by the *Indrapura* dynasty (*Shige-eda, Momoki, Higuchi*. 1999: 147-225; *Shige-eda* 2001: 100-07; *Trần Kỳ Phương* 2006: *ARI Working Paper*). (Fig. 14). In this very large scale complex the corbel technique was perfected and for the first time sandstone was successfully combined with brick. The *Đồng Dương* structural complex was fully developed with architectural features influenced somewhat from South Indian art (*Dhar* 2014: 116). At the same time, in the *Đồng Dương* art period, new vermicular or 'silkworm' decorative patterns were widely used. Some historians therefore choose to divide Cham art

**Fig.14** Sculpted sandstone frieze on the foundation of the central *Chiên Đàn* temple. (Photo: *Trần Kỳ Phương*)