

FURTHER NOTES ON THE BACTRIAN INSCRIPTION OF RABATAK, WITH AN
APPENDIX ON THE NAMES OF KUJULA KADPHISES AND VIMA TAKTU IN CHINESE

(Plates 9-12)

Nicholas Sims-Williams

The Bactrian inscription of Rabatak came to light in 1993, when it was discovered by chance at an unexcavated archaeological site in the Afghan province of Baghlan. Tim Porter, a British charity worker, brought the discovery to the attention of Joe Cribb of the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum, and subsequently sent a number of photographs.

On the basis of these photographs this important new document was studied by Joe Cribb and myself, and we presented a joint report on our results at the SIE Conference in September 1995. A fuller version of this paper was published under the title "A new Bactrian inscription of Kanishka the Great" in *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 4 (1996), 75-142, where my edition and English translation of the text is accompanied by a historical commentary by Joe Cribb. In both the conference paper and the article we were able to show that the new inscription describes events of the first year of Kanishka I, including the extension of Kushan power over a large part of northern India and the foundation of a temple, possibly at the site of Rabatak itself, in which homage was to be paid to Kanishka and his ancestors as well as to a series of named divinities. The same text was printed again, this time with a French translation, as an appendix (pp. 652-4) to my paper "Nouveaux documents sur l'histoire et la langue de la Bactriane" in the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 1996 [1997], 633-54.

Since the completion of these two articles, I have received a further series of photographs of the Rabatak inscription taken by Jonathan Lee (Sheffield), to whom I am most grateful for allowing me to make use of them (see pl. 9-12). Since the new photographs make it possible to improve on my previous readings in several places—see fig. 1 overleaf for a revised tracing—I am taking this opportunity to present a revised text and translation together with brief comments on the new readings and their significance.¹ In principle I comment on all revisions to the text, except those in which the change only affects indications of legibility.

The present discussion is not intended to replace that in Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, which should be referred to for discussion of historical matters and other points on which no comment is made below.

¹ I have included a few notes on matters which do not arise directly out of the new readings but which result from further reflection on the text and from my continuing research on the later Bactrian documents. I am particularly glad to have the opportunity to mention the valuable suggestions which I have received from Shaul Shaked and Gilbert Lazard (see below on lines 3 and 17f. respectively).

[illegible]

- 1 [ca. 10] *ἴνο βωγο στοργο κανηῖκε κοῖανο*
 ... of the great salvation, Kanishka the Kushan,
ραῖτογο λαδειγο χοαζαιοργο βαγ[η]-
 the righteous, the just, the autocrat worthy of divine worship,
- 2 *ζνογο κιδι ασο νανα οδο ασο οισποανο μι*
 who has obtained the kingship from Nana and from all the
βαγανο ι παοδανι αβορδο κιδι ιωγο χρογο
 gods, who has inaugurated the year one
- 3 *νοβαστο σ(α)γωνδι βαγανο συνδαδο οτηια*
 as the gods pleased. And he
ι ιωναγγο οασο οζοαστο ταδηια αριαο ωσ-
 *issued a Greek *edict (and) then he put it into Aryan.
- 4 *ταδο αβο ιωγο χρον(ο) αβο [ι] ιυνδο φροαγδαζο*
 In the year one it has been proclaimed unto India,
αβο πατριαγγε παορε αγιτα κορ-
 unto the *whole of the realm of the **kṣatriyas*, that
- 5 *αδηανο οδο ι οα(σ)πο οδ(ο) [ι ζ]αγηδο οδο ι*
 (as for) them—both *Wasp, and Sāketa, and
κωζ(αμ)βο οδο ι παλαβοτρο οιδρα αδα αβο ι ζιριτ-
 Kauśāmbī, and Pāṭaliputra, as far as Śrī-Campā—
- 6 *αμβο σιδηιανο προβαο οδο μανδαρσι ζαορανο*
 whatever rulers and other powers (they might have),
αβο ι συνδο ωσταδο οτη(ι)α αρουγο
 he had submitted (them) to (his) will, and he had submitted all
- 7 *ιυνδο (αβο) ι σινδο ωσταδο ταδι παι κανηῖκε*
 India to (his) will. Then King Kanishka
αβο παφαρο καραλαγγο φρομαδο
 gave orders to Shafar the *karalrang*
- 8 *(α)βεινα[ca. 4]ο βαγολαγγο κερδι σιδι*
 *at this ... to make the sanctuary which

- β...αβο ριζιδι αβο μα καδγε ραγα φαρειμοανο β-
is called B. . . ab, in the plain of the (royal) house, for these
- 9 (α)γα(ν)ο κιδι μαρο κιρδαν(ε) ι μα...ο[φ]αρρο
gods, whose *service here the . . . *glorious
ομμα ορηλδι ια αμσα νανα οδο ια αμ-
Umma leads, (namely:) the above-mentioned Nana and the above-
- 10 σα ομμα αορομοζδο μοζδοο(α)νο
mentioned Umma, Aurmuzd, the Gracious one,
σροφαρδο ναρασαιο μιο² οτηια ουδοα-
Sroshard, Narasa, (and) Mihr.² And he
- 11 νο πι(δο)γιρβο φρομαδο κιρδι εμοανο
gave orders to make images of the same, (namely) of these
βαγανο κιδι μασκα νιβιχτιγενδι οτ-
gods who are written herein, and
- 12 ηια φρομαδο αβεμοανο παονανο κιρδι
he gave orders to make (them) for these kings:
αβο κοζουλο καδφισο παο αβο ι φρ-
for King Kujula Kadphises (his) great
- 13 ονιαγο (ο)δο α(βο ο)οημο (τ)ακτοο παο α(β)[ο] ι
grandfather, and for King Vima Taktu (his)
νια(γ)ο οδο αβο οοημο καδφισο παο αβο
grandfather, and for King Vima Kadphises
- 14 (ι) πιδα οδο αβο ι χοβιε αβο κανηρκο παο
(his) father, and for himself, King Kanishka.
τα σαγωνδι παονανο παο ι βαγεποο-
Then, as the king of kings, the scion of the
- 15 ρακ[α]νε [••] φρ(ο)μαδο κιρδι ταδι
race of the gods . . . had given orders to do,

² Over the list of gods in lines 9-10 one can see traces of writing in smaller letters, of which the final words are legible: *ιο οδο μαασην[ο] ριζιδι οδο βιζα(γ)ο ριζιδι* "... and he is called Mahāsena and he is called Viśākha".

βαφαρε καραραγγε κινδο ειο βαγολαγγο

Shafar the *karalrang* made this sanctuary.

- 16 [ca. 8]ο καραραγγο οδο βαφαρο
[Then . . .] the *karalrang*, and Shafar
καραραγγο οδο νοκονζοκο ι αρτοο-
the *karalrang*, and Nukunzuk the *ashtwalg*
- 17 α[λγο κιν]δο ια φρομανο ειμιδβα βαγε
[performed] the (king's) command. (As for) *these gods
κιδι μαρο νιβιχτιγενδι ταδαο αβο ραον-
who are written here—may they [keep] the
- 18 αν(ο) ραο αβο κανηρκε κορανο αβο
king of kings, Kanishka the Kushan, for
ιασηδανι ζορριγι λρου(γ)ο αγγαδ••γο οανψδ-
ever healthy, fortunate, (and) victorious,
- 19 ο π[•••]ι(ν)δι οδ[••]/(δ)ι βα(γ)επορορο
and [may] the son of the gods
ασο ιωγο χρονο αβο ιο (α) χρονο ινδο αρουγο ν-
*rule all India from the year one to the year *one *thousand.
- 20 αρα[ca. 6]ι β(α)γολαγγο αβο ιωγο χρονο ασπαδο
... the sanctuary was *founded in the year one;
ταδι αβο ι αρημεσο χρονο αγγαρ[••]
then in the *third year [it was] *completed
- 21 []χα[ca. 8]ιδο ραο φρομανα αβισσι παρηνα
... according to the king's command, also many *rites
λαδο αβισσι ρηδγε λαδο αβισσι[ι ••]
were endowed, also many *attendants were endowed, also many . . .
- 22 [ca. 13]ραι μαδ••α (α)βο βαγανο λαδο οδο
... the king gave an *endowment to the gods, and
φαρειμοανο αχοδαο [σι]δι [α]βο μι βαγε λ[αδο]
for these . . . *which [were given] to the gods . . .
- 23 []ατιδ(η)οσ[

1f. βαγ[η] | ζνογο “worthy of divine worship”: of the last letter of line 1 there are no significant traces to be seen. Although there are few chips in the stone at the beginning of line 2 it now seems clear that there is not enough space to restore another letter before ζ. In Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, pp. 95-6, the equivalent form in the Dasht-e Nawur inscription was read as βαγο ι ηζρογο. I would now interpret this as a single word, without *ezafe*. The spellings βαγο-ιηζνογο and *βαγηζνογο may both represent a compound *baga-yazn-iyaka-. A parallel may be provided by the month-name *avpηζvo* attested in a recently-discovered Bactrian document, which is evidently cognate with the Sogdian month-name *xwryznych*, in Manichean script *xwrjnyc*, and the Tumshuqese month-name *ahverjane*, and for which I am inclined to propose a derivation from **ahura-yazn-iya*- “(month) of the worship of the Ahura(s)” (see Sims-Williams and de Blois, forthcoming). Cf. the formation of the Old Persian month-names *Bāgayādiya*- “(month) of the worship of the Baga(s)” and *Āciyādi*- “(month) of the worship of fire”.

3 νοβαγο “inaugurated”: Shaul Shaked has kindly pointed out to me that the meaning which I had deduced from the context can be supported by comparing MMP *nwn*^{2a} “to begin”, past stem *nwyšt*. The comparison implies a derivation of *nwn*- from **ni-band*, pp. **ni-basta*- (differently Nyberg 1934, p. 79, who linked the MMP form with Av. ²*vaēd* “to find”).

3f. ωϛ | ταδο “put it”: since it is exceptional that the following clause begins without a conjunction or any other connective, one might suspect that ταδο “then, so” has been omitted by haplography after ωσταδο, though the form to be expected in this inscription is ταδι.

5 οα(ϛ)πο: this is the first of five names of places which had apparently submitted to Kanishka. Since the other four names, all of which are identifiable as cities of northern India, are listed in approximate geographical order from west to east, it is possible that this first name refers to a place further to the west. My previous reading ωζοπο now seems unlikely, but the new reading οασπο is likewise uncertain. If it is correct, it may represent *Wasp* for older *(H)*uwasp*, the expected Bactrian equivalent of Old Iranian **Huwaspā*-. This name is widely attested as that of several different rivers (e.g. Av. *Huuaspā*-, Yt. 19.67, a river flowing into the lake *Kṛṣaōiia*- = Hāmūn, sometimes identified as the Khuspās; Gk. Χοάσπης, a river crossed by Alexander to the south of the Hindukush, sometimes identified as the Kunār, see Schmitt 1991; differently Tarn 1951, p. 97 n. 2) and as that of a town in Arachosia (Χοάσπα, Ptolemy VI, 20, 4; see now Humbach 1996, p. 166).

6 μανδαρσι ζαορανο “other powers”: if it is rightly read, the form *μανδαρσι* may be analysed as μ- “the” + *ανδαρο* “other” + -σι “also” (cf. below on *αβισσι* in line 21). In later texts the word for “power” is attested in the form *ζαοο*, which probably derives from the nom.-acc. sg. **zāwar*, with loss of *r* in final position. For the reappearance of the *r* of the stem in the pl. *ζαορανο* one may compare *βραδ(α)ρανο* “brothers”, which is attested in later documents beside the sg. *βραδο* < nom. sg. **brātā*.

8 $\alpha\beta\omicron$ $\mu\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\delta\gamma\epsilon$ $\rho\alpha\gamma\alpha$ “in the plain of the (royal) house”: the noun $\kappa\alpha\delta\gamma\omicron$ “house, (family) estate”, of which $\kappa\alpha\delta\gamma\epsilon$ will be the obl. sg., is well-attested in later Bactrian. The main interest of the new reading is the suggestion that not only a temple but also a palace may be waiting to be unearthed at the Rabatak site.

9f. $\alpha\mu\sigma\alpha$, f. of $*(v)\alpha\mu(a)\gamma\omicron$ “same, i.e. above-mentioned” (< **hamaka-*, cf. Av. *¹hama-*). The derivative $\nu\alpha\mu(a)\gamma\eta\lambda\omicron$ is used in exactly the same way in an unpublished text: “to the east a vineyard named Ukusak, and to the west a vineyard whose name (is) Palkan ..., and to the north the royal road, and to the south the same ($\nu\alpha\mu(a)\gamma\eta\lambda\omicron$) Palkan (is) the boundary”.

10 $\mu\omicron\zeta\delta\omicron\omicron(a)\gamma\omicron$ “the Gracious one”: see now Sims-Williams 1997 and Wright 1997.

10f. $\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\alpha$ | $\nu\omicron$ “of the same (gods)”: I now interpret this form as a pronominal obl. pl. in - $\omicron\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ (cf. $\epsilon\mu\omicron\alpha\upsilon\omicron$, $\omicron\iota\sigma\pi\omicron\alpha\upsilon\omicron$, etc.). The sg. form may be $\omega\nu\delta\omicron$, which occurs in a recently-discovered text in the phrase ι $\omega\nu\delta\omicron$ $\lambda\iota\beta\omicron$ “this same document (= the present document)”. While $\omega\nu\delta\omicron$ derives from the strong stem **hāwant-* (Av. *hauuant-*, MP *hāwand* “like, similar”), the pl. $\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ appears to be based on the weak stem **hāwat-* (Av. *hauuat-*). Cf. also compounds such as Pth. *h²ws²r*, Arm. *hawasar* “equal, similar”, Bactr. $\omega\rho\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ “companion” (unpublished), Sogd. *²wmr²z* “co-worker”. The usual assumption that such forms contain an irregular *w* < **m* (thus Tedesco 1921, p. 208; Henning 1937, p. 67; Gershevitch 1954, §351) is unnecessary, since this type of compound is already attested in Av. *hauuat₂zam-* “like earth” etc. All these forms contain **hā-wa(n)t-* < IE **sm-h₂-u(e)nt-*, the base being **sm-* (as implied by the comparison with OInd. *samāvant-* in Wackernagel 1914, p. 280; similarly Wackernagel and Debrunner 1954, p. 877, and Hoffmann 1976, p. 555, *contra* Bartholomae 1904, col. 1787). For the suffixal complex **-h₂-u(e)nt-* see Sims-Williams 1997a.

In Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, pp. 85-6, $\omicron\upsilon\delta\omicron\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ was compared with the later Bactrian adj. $\omicron\delta\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\omicron$ “pertaining to the same (person)”, which must derive from a noun or pronoun ** $\omicron\delta\alpha\upsilon\omicron$* “the same (person)”. This is no doubt connected in some way with the group of words discussed here, but the details remain unclear. Rather than a fossilized instr. form, as implied by my former comparison with Sogd. *wntn* “so much, such” etc.,³ ** $\omicron\delta\alpha\upsilon\omicron$* is perhaps a compound containing - $\delta\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ as the postvocalic variant of the attested $\tau\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ < **tanū-* “body, person”.

11 $\mu\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha$ “herein” (rather than “above”). In the later Bactrian documents phrases such as $\sigma\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu\delta\alpha\beta\omicron$ $\mu\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron$ $\nu\iota\beta\iota\sigma\iota\delta\omicron$ “as is written herein” frequently refer to matters mentioned elsewhere in the text. Where the reference is to details already stated the translation “above” seems possible, but in a few instances phrases of this sort refer to something not yet mentioned, indicating that a less specific interpretation such as “herein, hereupon” is more appropriate. In one case $\mu\alpha\sigma\kappa\omicron$ corresponds to $\beta\alpha\nu\delta\alpha\rho\omicron$ (< $\alpha\beta\omicron$ $\alpha\nu\delta\alpha\rho\omicron$ “within”) in another copy of the same text. The etymology from **ima-* “this” + **uskād* “above, over, upon” probably remains valid.

14 $\alpha\beta\omicron$ ι $\chi\omicron\beta\epsilon\iota$ “for himself”: my former reading $\chi\omicron\beta\beta\omicron$ and interpretation of - $\sigma\omicron$ as the equivalent of Av. -*čit* “also” no longer seem satisfactory, since it now appears that this inscrip-

³ On *wntn* etc. see Sims-Williams 1990, pp. 277-8 with n. 6.

tion uses the spelling -σι (cf. *μανδαρσι*(?), line 6; *αβισσι*, line 21). As a possible alternative I propose *χοβις*, which would represent the obl. case of **χοβιο*. Though such a spelling is not attested, it would seem plausible as an intermediate form between the underlying **hwa-paθya*- and the attested *χοβι/χοβο*.

14f. *βαγεποο | ρακ[α]νι* “scion of the race of the gods”: cf. *βαγεποορο* “son of the gods”, which is probably attested in this spelling—with -ε- as compound vowel—in line 19. Here, however, one cannot merely restore *βαγεποορο*, since the second letter of line 15 is clearly α. The reconstruction which I now propose would be the obl. case of a derivative with the suffix -*κανο* < **ka-kāna*-, which is common in Bactrian patronymics and names of families and estates. An alternative, which to me seems less likely, is to restore a diminutive *βαγεποο | ρακ[ο/ε]* (cf. Khot. *pūraka*-).

16f. *νοκονζοκο ι αρτοο | α[λγο]* “Nukunzuk the *ashtwalg*”: an unpublished Bactrian letter containing the title *αρτοοαλγο* (without a preceding ι) shows that the seal-inscription cited in Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, p. 86, must be interpreted as *σασορηο ι αρτοο | αλγο* “Sas-rew the *ashtwalg*”, with ι as ezafe, and thus removes the justification for assuming the existence of **ιαρτο* “worship” in Bactrian. The second part of the compound is probably -*οαλγο* “leader” as previously proposed. For the present I have nothing to suggest for the first component: since the overlining of the initial alpha probably indicates the loss of υ = [h], one may assume *ašt*- < **hašt*-. The name or title *αρτοσοζδο* (see Sims-Williams 1993, p. 173) may be another compound containing the same first element. One or the other of these compounds may be restored in the Palamedes inscription: [...]*βιδο ι ζηνοβιδο ι αρτο*[...].

It should be noted that this interpretation of *νοκονζοκο ι αρτοο | α[λγο]* leaves one with no alternative to restoring the following phrase as *[κιρ]δο ια φρομανο* “[performed] the (king’s) command” (despite the objections expressed in Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, p. 86).

17f. Further examples of *αβο* marking the direct object (cf. Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, p. 87) from unpublished documents include the following: *κιδανο αβαφαγο ... αρκαραδο* “whoever might pursue you”; *οδαλδο αβο τωμαχο αβο λαδο ... οηλαμο* “or (if) we should take you to court”; *κιδαβο βανοζινιο ασο λαρσο βογδο* “who saved the royal infant from (his) illness”. It may be significant that in all instances of this construction noted so far, the object marked by *αβο* is both *human* and *definite*. As Gilbert Lazard kindly reminds me, such features are relevant to object-marking in several Modern Iranian languages, including Persian (-*rā*, cf. Lazard 1982). The Yidgha-Munji and Sanglechi object-marker *vo/va* (Morgenstierne 1938, pp. 139-40, 340-41; Bossong 1985, pp. 92-5) is particularly interesting in the present context, since it may well be connected etymologically with Bactrian *αβο*.

18 *αγγαδ...γο* “fortunate”: the new photographs make it absolutely clear that the fifth letter of this word is δ, though the following letters remain uncertain. The adjective to be restored here is presumably a compound or derivative of **ham-gata*-. The meaning of Pth. *ḡgd*, MP *hangad* “fortunate, rich” fits the context very well. Alternatively, Sogd. *ḡnytk* “whole”

would justify a translation “completely ...” (cf. also Av. *hangata-*, see Henning 1937, p. 107 s.v. *ṅdg*; Szemerényi 1970, pp. 513-14).

19 βα(γ)επφορο “son of the gods”: for the spelling with -ε- cf. βαγεποο | ρακ/α/γ in 14f. above.

19f. γ | αρα/ “[may he] *rule”(?): from the new photographs it seems that the last letter of line 19 is either ν or, less probably, γ. The clear α at the beginning of line 20 is followed by two letters which seem most likely to be ρα or ρν. My previous reconstruction π | αδ/α/χραιο/ is therefore excluded. As a mere possibility one might suggest *ναραδο, 3 sg. subj. of a verb *ναρ-, cf. perhaps MP/Pth. *wynr-* “to put in order” etc. But it must be admitted that the interpretation of line 19 is quite hypothetical, since the readings of several crucial words are altogether uncertain. For instance, if one were to read αβθ in place of ασθ and to disregard ιο (α) “one thousand” as too doubtful, one could translate: “And [when] the son of the gods [had conquered] India completely in (*αβθ) the year one, in a single (*ιοα••) year, [then] in the year one (he) founded the sanctuary”. Such a translation would also help to account for the position of αρουγο, which is oddly placed if it is intended to qualify the preceding noun (contrast αρουγο ιωνδο in lines 6f.).

20f. αβθ ι αρημεσο χθονο αγγαρ/•• | []χα/ “in the *third year [it was] *completed”: this hypothetical interpretation depends on the supposition that αρημεσο may be an ordinal secondarily derived from the cardinal ναρηιο “three” (attested in later documents). The lack of the initial υ = [h] in the language of this inscription is predictable, cf. αρουγο < ναρουγο “whole” etc. The suffix -μεσο resembles that of φορδαμσο “(at) first” in the Surkh Kotal inscription, which probably derives from **fratama-čiya-*, cf. Chor. *fṛmyck*, Sogd. *fṛmcyk* (see Henning 1960, p. 49). At first sight the fact that the ordinal υροδδικο “third” < **θritīya-ka-* is attested in later texts in the phrase υροδδικο βαγο “a third part” seems to tell against the acceptance of a different ordinal formation here, but Choresmian makes a similar distinction between the ordinal *šym* “third” and the fractional *ʾrcyʾdyk* “a third part” < **θritīya-yāta-* (cf. Henning 1956, p. 433). — If the sanctuary was “founded”, i.e. “begun”, in year one, what should have happened in the third year is that it was “completed” or “dedicated”. The context thus suggests that αγγαρ/ might be cognate with MP *hangirdīg* “complete” etc., Chor. *ʾnkʾry-* “to settle (an account); to take one’s leave” (and perhaps Av. *haṅkāraia-* “to celebrate (the Yasna)”, cf. Kellens 1984, p. 144 with n. 43 on pp. 147-8). A later Bactrian document attests πιδαγγρηρ- “to agree, settle” < **pati-ham-kāraya-*.

This reconstruction would of course imply that although the inscription is mainly concerned with events in the first year of Kanishka it was not erected until the third year at the earliest.

21 αβισσι παρηνα λαδο αβισσι ρηδγε λαδο αβισσι “also many *rites were endowed (lit. ‘given’), also many *attendants were endowed, also many ...”: although the second σ of αβισσι is unclear in each place, the three occurrences together make this reading (rather than αβισο ι as read previously) highly probable. The double -σσ- clearly indicates that αβισσι is a compound or combination of two words, αβισ- and -σι, of which the latter is no doubt the

Bactrian equivalent of Av. -čit, MP -iz “also” (see also above on *μανδαρσι* in line 6), later -(ι)σο. The preceding *αβισ-* will then be a variant of the later *υαβισο*, Manichaean *hbyś* “much”, according to the suggestion offered as an alternative in Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, p. 88.

The readings of the nouns which stand between *αβισσι* and *λαδο* in the two parallel clauses are somewhat clearer from the new photographs. The first is probably *παρηνα*, though one cannot entirely exclude the possibility that the first letter is γ or that the third is β. It may represent **pari-ayanā(-)*, either as a f. noun cognate with the OP neuter *parīyana-* “behaviour, conduct” < *pari-ay-* “to behave, observe (the law)” (see Sims-Williams 1981, p. 4, and cf. Av. *ayanā-* beside *ayana-*) or as an old n. plural. A meaning “observances, rites” would fit the context. The previously illegible word *ρηδγϵ* is now entirely clear apart from the γ, which could at a pinch be read as τ or σ. I take *ρηδγϵ* as the plural of **ρηδγο* < **raitaka-*, MP *rēdag* “page-boy, attendant”.

22 *φαρεμμοανο* *αχοδανο* [σι]δῖ [α]βο μι βαγε λ[αδο] “for these ... *which [were given] to the gods ...”: the apparent plural forms *φαρεμμοανο* “for these” and *αχοδανο* (pl. of **αχοδο*, cf. perhaps Sogd. *xtw* “judge”?) provide mutual support, but the final -ο of the first word is rather unclear, so that one might consider a different reading and word-division, e.g. *φαρεμμο* “for this” (sg.) + *αρχαχοδανο* (abstract noun in -*δανο*, cf. *παοδανο* “kingship”?). The following word could equally well be restored as [σι]δῖ “which” or [κι]δῖ “who”. For the words at the end of the line one has a choice between [α]βο μι βαγε λ[αδο] “[were given] to the gods” (cf. *ασο οισποανο μι βαγανο* in line 2) and [α]βο μι βαγολ[αγγο] “to/in the sanctuary” (cf. *κιρδο μι βαγολαγγο* in the Palamedes inscription, if μι is here an article rather than an enclitic pronoun “by me” as generally assumed).⁴

23 The new photographs allow one to read a few letters in line 23 (immediately below -*ανο* *αχοδα-* in line 22), where nothing of significance could previously be seen. After a fault in the stone one can see fairly clearly the letters *ατι*, followed by either δ or λ. The fifth letter seems most likely to be η, though the traces are somewhat contradictory. It is followed by either ο or the head of ρ, after which the last visible letter is a clear σ. Since there are no identifiable traces of any letters after this, although the surface of the stone appears to be well preserved, the end of the word is possibly complete. Since a Bactrian word ending in a consonant is unlikely, one might suspect that the word is Greek, perhaps the name of the stone-mason who carved the inscription (cf. ΔΙΑ ΠΑΛΑΜΗΔΟΥ “by Palamedes” at the end of the Palamedes inscription as explained by Schlumberger *apud* Gershevitch 1967, p. 56).

⁴ The supposed *-μι “by me” is not otherwise attested. In the Berlin “Hephthalite” fragment No. 5, line 4, the words must be divided: *λαδο μισιδδηρο* “... gave. Moreover you ...”. In the Bactrian documents the 1 sg. encl. pronoun is -μο, a form which may occur already in the “Inscription pariétale” of Surkh Kotal, as pointed out in Sims-Williams 1973, p. 95 n. 1 (differently Gershevitch 1979, p. 65 note g; Davary 1982, pp. 228-9): *γοβιχτο μο μαρτο ουβε μο* [...]*παγδο ιωλεσαγωγι* “I, Yölesagōg (lit. “Battle-axe”, cf. Av. *čakuš-* etc.), inscribed both the stairway and the ...”.

The relationship between the names of Qiu-jiu-que 丘就卻 and his son Yan-gao-zhen 閼膏珍, the Kushan chieftains referred to in the Later Han Chronicle, and their presumed counterparts Kujula and Vima represents a long-standing problem. In discussing the historical implications of the Rabatak inscription, Joe Cribb has again drawn attention to the apparent mismatch, but he concludes that the evidence of the Rabatak inscription, which for the first time allows us to identify the son of Kujula Kadphises as Vima Taktu, together with the numismatic data, corroborates these equations (Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, pp. 102-3).

Qiu-jiu-que should derive from *k^huw-dzuw-k^hiak* in Early Middle Chinese as reconstructed in Pulleyblank 1991. It has been suggested (Pelliot 1914, p. 401; Pulleyblank 1962, p. 109) that the third character *que* 卻 is a mistake for *jie* 劫, EMC *kiap*, which would represent the first syllable of Kujula's surname Kadphises. As an alternative, one might consider the possibility that the Chinese derives from a hypocoristic form **Kujuk(a)k*: cf. Sims-Williams 1992, p. 34, on *-kk* as a hypocoristic suffix in Sogdian onomastics. A parallel for the use of **Kujukk* beside *Kujula* as the name of the same person may be found in the occurrence of *ποροκο* = *Puruk* beside *πορ[•]πο*, perhaps to be restored as *πορ[ασ]πο* = **Pur-asp*, in two copies of a single later Bactrian document, where both forms clearly refer to one and the same man.

As yet no plausible etymology seems to have been offered for the name Kujula (Gk. *κοζουλο* etc.). F. W. Thomas's old equation with the title *gušura* in the Kharoṣṭhī documents, cited by Burrow 1935, pp. 781-2, is ruled out by Burrow's own discovery (*apud* Bailey 1947, pp. 149-50) that *gušura* is cognate with MP *wispuhr* "prince" etc. Harmatta's comparison (1964, p. 468) with the Bactrian personal name **κοζγαρκο* (attested in the obl. *κοζγαρκι*) seems more promising. The name **κοζγαρκο* no doubt contains the well-known hypocoristic suffix *-ρκο* (= Toch. *-ške*, *-ške* etc.). The preceding element **κοζγ(α)-* may well be attested, with the expected postvocalic voicing of the initial *k-*, in the personal names *ωλο-γοζγο*, *λαδο-γοζγο* and *οαραζο-γοζγο*, all of which are found in later Bactrian documents. The name *λαδο-γοζγο* seems to be particularly significant for the meaning of the element *kuzg(a)-* or *-guzg*, since compounds with *λαδο* "given" as the first component are formed with a semantically restricted range of second components: **ā-gādaka-* "wish" and **yāna-* "favour" in the divine epithets *λαδοαγαλο* "by whom wishes are granted" and *λαδοιανο* "by whom favours are granted", and perhaps **mižda-* "reward" in the personal name *λαδομ[ο]ζδο* (if rightly read). If *κοζγ(α)-*, *-γοζγο* is a noun from the same semantic sphere, it is natural to think of Chor. *kwzy-* "to ask, request", Khot. *kūś-* "to seek" < **kauzaya-*. With one eye on the internal *-α-* of **κοζγαρκο* and the other on the possible connection with *Kujula* (and **Kujukk*?), I am tempted to reconstruct a f. noun **kuzu-kā-* "request", but the vocalization and gender cannot be determined with any confidence. At any rate, there seems to be no reason to assume that the element in question is of foreign origin.

As a representation of the name of Vima, the Chinese form Yan-gao-zhen, EMC *jiam-kaw-trin* is even more problematic. At first sight, even the first syllable seems scarcely to be an adequate transcription of Bactrian $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$; but Pulleyblank (1962, p. 105) has argued that the Old Chinese form may have been something like **fiwēm*, giving an excellent match (cf. also Pelliot 1914, p. 387 n. 1). The second syllable, *gao*, EMC *kaw*, has been interpreted as a transcription of the first syllable of the surname Kadphises (Pulleyblank 1963, p. 206; cf. Pelliot, *ibid.*), while the third syllable, *zhen*, EMC *trin*, has been emended to 寶 *bao*, EMC *paw*, or to 彌 *mi*, EMC *mji(š)* (Pelliot 1929, pp. 201-3, 264-5). However, since the Rabatak inscription clearly identifies the son of Kujula Kadphises as Vima (I) Taktu, distinguishing him from Vima (II) Kadphises, there no longer seems to be much reason for supposing that the syllables *gao-zhen* represent a form of the name Kadphises. However, it must be admitted that they can hardly represent the surname Taktu either.

As was briefly noted in Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, pp. 84-5 and 93, an unpublished Bactrian document attests a personal name $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$, which seems to stand in the same relationship to $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$, the usual Greek and Bactrian form of the name Vima, as $\omicron\iota\eta\lambda-$, the later form of the verb “to lead”, does to $\omicron\omicron\eta\lambda-$, the form attested in the Rabatak inscription. Since $\omicron\omicron\eta\lambda-$ certainly derives from **wādaya-*, the doubling of the initial *o-* seems to have no etymological significance. The name $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$ could therefore derive from a form such as **waima-*, cf. perhaps Pth. *wym*, Arm. *vēm* “rock, stone”, Av. *vaēma-* “cleft, precipice” as suggested by Humbach 1966, p. 40. Semantic parallels include the Sogd. personal name *snk(ʼ)*, literally “stone”, as well as the more familiar instance of the name Peter.

If this is indeed the etymology of $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$ —or even if the name was merely accidentally homophonous with a word meaning “rock, stone”—it is possible that the rocky mountain-top depicted on the coins of Vima Kadphises, from which the bust of the king emerges or on which he sits, may have been intended as an allusion to his name.⁵ Since the same iconographic feature is found on coins of Huvishka, one might speculate further that $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$ may be a hypocoristic form of $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$, Huvishka being named after his grandfather(?) Vima in just the same way as Vazishka ($\beta\alpha\zeta\eta\mu\omicron$) was later named after his grandfather(?) Vasudeva ($\beta\alpha\zeta\omicron\delta\eta\omicron$). The absence of $-\mu-$ in the form $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$ could have a purely phonetic explanation, cf. the loss of the nasal [ŋ] before [š] in the title $\mu\alpha\rho\sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\omicron$ “Persian satrap” (attested in unpublished documents probably belonging to the Sasanian period) < $\mu\alpha\rho\sigma\alpha\gamma\gamma\omicron$ [parsāŋ(g)] “Persian” + $\mu\alpha(v)\rho\alpha\beta\omicron$ “satrap”.⁶ Alternatively, as in the case of $\beta\alpha\zeta\eta\mu\omicron$, the hypocoristic $\omicron\omicron\eta\mu\omicron$ could have been derived from an abbreviated form of the underlying name.

⁵ Cribb 1997, p. 37, interprets the mountain-top as referring to the god Śiva/Vayu “operating in a high place”.

⁶ Cf. also the loss of [n] before [s] in $\alpha\sigma\kappa\iota\sigma\alpha\gamma\gamma\omicron$ $\mu\alpha\gamma\omicron$ “the plain of Askin”, attested in a late Bactrian document beside the place-name $\alpha\sigma\kappa\iota\omega$ “Askin”. The interpretation of $\alpha\sigma\kappa\iota\sigma\alpha\gamma\gamma\omicron$ as an adjective in $-\sigma\alpha\gamma\gamma\omicron$ = Sogd. $-c'ny$ < $*-čāna-ka-$, cf. f. $-\sigma\alpha\nu\zeta\omicron$ = Sogd. $-c'nc$ < $*-čāna-čī-$ in $\mu\omicron\mu\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu\zeta\omicron$ “Turkish(?)”, seems more natural than the connection with $\alpha\sigma\alpha\gamma\gamma\omicron$ “stone” which I previously suggested (*apud* Grenet 1996).

REFERENCES

- Bailey, H. W., 1947. Recent work in "Tokharian", *TPS* 1947, 126-53.
- Bartholomae, C., 1904. *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Strassburg).
- Bossong, G., 1985. *Empirische Universalienforschung. Differentielle Objektmarkierung in den neuiranischen Sprachen* (Tübingen).
- Burrow, T., 1935. Iranian words in the Kharoṣṭhi documents from Chinese Turkestan—II, *BSOS* 7/iv, 779-90.
- Cribb, J., 1997. Shiva images on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian coins, in K. Tanabe, J. Cribb and H. Wang (ed.), *Studies in Silk Road coins and culture, Papers in honour of Professor Ikuo Hirayama on his 65th birthday* (Kamakura), 11-66.
- Davary, G. D., 1982. *Baktrisch: ein Wörterbuch auf Grund der Inschriften, Handschriften, Münzen und Siegelsteine* (Heidelberg).
- Gershevitch, I., 1954. *A grammar of Manichean Sogdian* (Oxford).
- Gershevitch, I., 1967. Bactrian inscriptions and manuscripts, *IF* 72, 27-57.
- Gershevitch, I., 1979. Nokonzok's well, *Afghan Studies* 2, 55-73.
- Grenet, F., 1996. Ασρχαρνοίς, Ασκισρχαρνοίς, Sangchârak, *Topoi* 6/ii, 470-74.
- Harmatta, J., 1964. The great Bactrian inscription, *AAASH* 12, 373-471.
- Henning, W. B., 1937. *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch* (APAW 1936, No. 10).
- Henning, W. B., 1956. The Khwarezmian language, *Z. V. Togan'a Armağan* (Istanbul), 421-36.
- Henning, W. B., 1960. The Bactrian inscription, *BSOAS* 23, 47-55.
- Hoffmann, K., 1976. *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik II* (Wiesbaden).
- Humbach, H., 1966. *Baktrische Sprachdenkmäler I* (Wiesbaden).
- Humbach, H., 1996. Arachosia in Ptolemy's *Geography*, in *La Persia e l'Asia centrale da Alessandro al X secolo* (Atti dei convegni Lincei 127, Rome), 165-9.
- Kellens, J., 1984. *Le verbe avestique* (Wiesbaden).
- Lazard, G., 1982. Le morphème *râ* en persan et les relations actanciellles, *BSL* 77, 177-207.
- Morgenstierne, G., 1938. *Indo-Iranian frontier languages II: Iranian Pamir languages* (Oslo).
- Nyberg, H. S., 1934. *Texte zum mazdayasnischen Kalender* (Uppsala).
- Pelliot, P., 1914. Les noms propres dans les traductions chinoises du Milindapañha, *JA*, 11^e série 4, 379-419.
- Pelliot, P., 1929. Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie centrale, *T'oung Pao* 26, 201-65.
- Pulleyblank, E. G., 1962. The consonantal system of Old Chinese [I], *Asia Major* 9, 58-144.
- Pulleyblank, E. G., 1963. An interpretation of the vowel systems of Old Chinese and of Written Burmese, *Asia Major* 10, 200-221.
- Pulleyblank, E. G., 1991. *Lexicon of reconstructed pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin* (Vancouver).

- Schmitt, R., 1991. Choaspes, *Encyclopaedia Iranica* V/5, 496.
- Sims-Williams, N., 1973. A note on Bactrian syntax, *IF* 78, 95-9.
- Sims-Williams, N., 1981. The final paragraph of the tomb-inscription of Darius I (DNb, 50-60): the Old Persian text in the light of an Aramaic version, *BSOAS* 44, 1-7.
- Sims-Williams, N., 1990. Chotano-Sogdica II: aspects of the development of nominal morphology in Khotanese and Sogdian, in G. Gnoli and A. Panaino (ed.), *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies held in Turin, September 7th-11th, 1987 by the Societas Iranologica Europaea I: Old and Middle Iranian Studies* (Rome), 275-96.
- Sims-Williams, N., 1992. *Sogdian and other Iranian inscriptions of the Upper Indus II* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II, Vol. III/2/ii, London).
- Sims-Williams, N., 1993. Bactrian ownership inscriptions, *BAI*, N.S. 7, 173-9.
- Sims-Williams, N., 1997. A Bactrian god, *BSOAS* 60, 336-8.
- Sims-Williams, N., 1997a. The denominal suffix *-ant-* and the formation of the Khotanese transitive perfect, in A. Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound law and analogy. Papers in honor of Robert S. P. Beekes on the occasion of his 60th birthday* (Leiden Studies in Indo-European 9, Amsterdam), 317-25.
- Sims-Williams, N., and Cribb, J., 1996. A new Bactrian inscription of Kanishka the Great, *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 4, 75-142.
- Sims-Williams, N., and de Blois, F., forthcoming. The Bactrian calendar, to appear in *BAI*, N.S. 10.
- Sundermann, W., 1973. *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Berliner Turfantexte 4, Berlin).
- Szemerényi, O., 1970. *Iranica IV, Orbis* 19/ii, 500-519.
- Tarn, W. W., 1951. *The Greeks in Bactria & India* (2nd ed., Cambridge).
- Tedesco, P., 1921. Dialektologie der westiranischen Turfantexte, *Le monde oriental* 15, 184-258.
- Wackernagel, J., 1914. *Indoiranica* [II], *KZ* 46, 266-80.
- Wackernagel, J., and Debrunner, A., 1954. *Altindische Grammatik* II/2 (Göttingen).
- Wright, J. C., 1997. Bactrian Rudra, *BSOAS* 60, 339-43.