

- 1 For more details on the historical aspects of ancient Champa, see Southworth (2004) and Vickery (2005).
- 2 The corpus of inscriptions of Campā is maintained by the *École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO)* and their numbering has been organized, with each inscription being assigned a number preceded by the letter C. For C.73A, see Finot (1904); Jacques (1995, 9-14) and Majumdar (1927, 9-14 of Book III).
- 3 For details, see Majumdar (1927, 4-8 of Book III) and Jacques (1995, 3-7).
- 4 For C.79, see Finot (1904), Jacques (1995, 110), and Goodall and Griffiths (2013). For a revised edition and translation of C.173, see Goodall and Griffiths (2013, 434-37). For C.136, see Jacques (1995, 236).
- 5 The three records (C.79, C.173, C.136) are all engraved on plain stone slabs which served as image supports but seem to refer to more elaborate places of worship. This is especially true of the Trà Kiêu record (C.173), which mentions the rebuilding of a *pūjāsthāna*.
- 6 Majumdar (1927, 44-51, 100-07 of Book III) and Golzio (2004: 38-44 and 13-21).
- 7 Majumdar (1927, 38-41 of Book III). For a more detailed treatment of the subject, see Maxwell (2003: 440-442) and Dhar (2016).
- 8 Majumdar (1927, 61-64 of Book III).
- 9 Majumdar (1927, 41-44 of Book III).
- 10 Finot (1904, 910-12 and 970-75).
- 11 Majumdar (1927, 65-67 of Book III).
- 12 Golzio (2004: 126-128). Sanskrit loan terms are often used to indicate a temple in Cham language inscriptions. At times, associated words in Cham and Malay (such as *rumah*, house, palace) contextually indicate a temple. See Aymonier and Cabaton (1906, 421: *rumo'h*). I am grateful to Arlo Griffiths for leading me to this source (email communication, April 19, 2015).
- 13 As Geoff Wade explains, "In classical Chinese descriptions of people south of the Yangtze, there appears a term 干闥 or 干栏 which in modern Chinese is rendered as *gan-lan* (middle Chinese *kan-lan*) and which derives from a non-Chinese language referring to the houses of people in these regions. The term and descriptions of such houses date from the fifth century and refer to wooden houses raised on stilts, as are still seen across Southeast Asia today. This is probably linked with the Austroasiatic terms for house, eg. Khmer, *khna: ŋ*. The Cham term *kalan* is perhaps a reference to the 'house' of the deity." (email communication, April 19, 2015).
- 14 H. Parmentier (1904) had reported fragments of a large *liṅga* and *yoni* from the E1 site on the basis of which he reconstructed their appearance atop the E1 altar-platform. This large-sized *liṅga-yoni* was a later addition. The dimensions of the enclosed space are as recorded by H. Parmentier.
- 15 Pierre Baptiste has proposed that, on the analogy of the pre-Angkorian interior hall of S2 at Sambor Prei Kuk in neighbouring Cambodia, the wooden pillars at My Son E1 may have supported a textile-like canopy to shelter the *liṅga-and-mahāvedi* (Baptiste and Zéphir 2005, 109-21).
- 16 Two of the *mahāvedi* stone blocks are now unavailable.
- 17 See footnote 7.
- 18 For a detailed discussion of the architectural motifs and geometrical patterns carved on the My So E1 platform and their affinities with Indian art and architecture, see Dhar (2016).
- 19 Griffiths *et al.* 2012, 277-279.
- 20 See Dhar (2016). This chronological assessment also matches the one proposed by Trần Kỳ Phương. See Trần (2009, 181, Table 1).
- 21 J. Boisselier situates its time of making close to the Mỹ Sơn A1 and C1 tympana, with which it shares stylistic affinities (Boisselier 1963, 51).
- 22 The F1 tympanum, though damaged, had survived in a fair state of preservation until the early 20th century (Parmentier 1904, fig. 39).
- 23 The Sanskrit temple terminology used in this paragraph is drawn from the corpus of Indian temple terms painstakingly studied by M.A. Dhaky and his associates in the *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture (EITA)* volumes. See *EITA* entries under Bibliography. Since architectural treatises or manuals have not been found from ancient Campā and such terms are clearly articulated in the inscriptions of Champa, the corpus of Indian architectural terms is useful in extending the Sanskrit terminology already found in the inscriptions of Champa.
- 24 While the interior of the F1 temple-model is not visible in the relief sculpture, this deduction is supported quite clearly by the surviving *liṅga* pedestals which were in the sanctums of My Son F1 and A1 temples.
- 25 See footnote 2.
- 26 See footnote 4.
- 27 See C.72 of Bhadravarman, c. fifth century; C.73A of Śambhuvarman, c. late sixth century; and C.73B of Prakāśadharman Vikrāntavarman, c. late seventh century in Jacques (1995, 3-14, 171-72). See also endnotes 2 and 3 here.
- 28 The final blow to the 10th-century grand edifice known as Mỹ Sơn A1 was wrought in the third quarter of the 20th century by US bombing of the temple during the American-Vietnam war.
- 29 See Vickery (2005).
- 30 *Ibid.*
- 31 For C.95, see Majumdar (1927, 155-57 of Book III) and Golzio (2004: 132-34).
- 32 C.100, see Majumdar (1927, 183-92 of Book III) and Golzio (2004: 153-61).
- 33 C.84A, see Majumdar (1927, 180-83 of Book III) and Golzio (2004: 164-65).