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. I 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. 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).
1. ca. 10 Ἰον βογος στοργο κανηρκες κοφαγο
   ... of the great salvation, Kanishka the Kushan,
   ραφτογον λαδεγον χοαζαοργο βαγη-
   the righteous, the just, the autocrat worthy of divine worship,

2. ζηνογο κιδι ασο νανα οδο ασο οισσοανο μυ
   who has obtained the kingship from Nana and from all the
   βαγαγο ι θαοαν αβορδο κιδι ιογο χρονο
   gods, who has inaugurated the year one

3. νοβαστο σ(α)γωνιδι βαγαγο συναδο στημα
   as the gods pleased. And he
   ι ιοαγγον οασο αξοαστο ταδημα αριαο ωσ-
   *issued a Greek *edict (and) then he put it into Aryan.

4. ταδο αβο ιογο χρον(ο) αβο [ι] ιννο θροαγδαζο
   In the year one it has been proclaimed unto India,
   αβο θατριαγγε θαορε αγντα κοο-
   unto the *whole of the realm of the *kṣatriyas, that

5. αδηγοο οδο ι οα(α)πο οδ(ο) [ι] ζηαγηνο οδο ι
   (as for) them—both *Wasp, and Sāketa, and
   κως(αμ)βο οδο ι παλαβοτρο οιδρα αδα αβο ι ζηρητ-
   Kauśāmbī, and Pāñjaliputra, as far as Śrī-Campā—

6. αμβο αδηγανο προβαο οδο μανθαροι ζαορανο
   whatever rulers and other powers (they might have),
   αβο ι συνδο ωσταδο στην(ι)α αρουγο
   he had submitted (them) to (his) will, and he had submitted all

7. ιννο (αβο) ι συνδο ωσταδο ταδι θαι κανηρκες
   India to (his) will. Then King Kanishka
   αβο θαφαρο καραλραγγο φρομαδο
   gave orders to Shafar the karatrag

8. *(α)βενα/ ca. 4 Ιον βαγολαγο κιρδι σιδι
   *at this ... to make the sanctuary which
βοιβο ρεξκι άβο μα καδσε ραγα φαρεμοανο β-
is called B...ab, in the plain of the (royal) house, for these

(α)μα(γ)ο κεκι μαρο κιφδαγι(ε) μακοφ/αρρο

gods, whose *service here the ... *glorious

ομμα ουελδι ια αμσα νανα οδο ια αμ-

Umma leads, (namely:) the above-mentioned Nana and the above-

σα ομμα αορομοζδο μοζδο(α)ρο

mentioned Umma, Aurmuzd, the Gracious one,

σροφαρδο ναρασαο μιρο2 οτιηα ουδοα-

Sroshard, Narasa, (and) Mihr.2 And he

νο πε(δο)γρμβο φρομαδο κεκι εμοανο
gave orders to make images of the same, (namely) of these

βαγανο κεκι μασκα νιβιχτιγενδι οτ-
gods who are written herein, and

ημα φρομαδο αβεμοανο βανανο κεκι

he gave orders to make (them) for these kings:

αβο κοζειλο καδφισο οαο αβο ι φρ-

for King Kujula Kadphises (his) great

ονιαγο (ο)δο αβο(ο)οημο (τ)ακτοο οσο ο(β)/ο/

grandfather, and for King Vima Taktu (his)

νιςγ(γ)ο οδο αβο οουμο καδφισο οαο αβο
grandfather, and for King Vima Kadphises

(ε) πεια οδο αβο ι χοβιε αβο κανγρκο οαο

(his) father, and for himself, King Kanishka.

τα σαγνονδι βανανο οαο ι βαγεποο-
Then, as the king of kings, the scion of the

ρακ(α)νε [•••] φρ(ο)μαδο κεκι 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: ήο οδο μααημοο τεξκι οδο βιζκα(γ)ο μεξι "... and he is called Mahāsena and he is called Viśākha".
καραλραγγε κιρδο ειο βαγολαγγο
Shafar the karalrang made this sanctuary.

[ca. 8]  } καραλραγγο οδο παφαρο
[Then... .] the karalrang, and Shafar
καραλραγγο οδο νοκονζοκο ι αρτοο-
the karalrang, and Nukunzuk the ashiwalg

[performed] the (king’s) command. (As for) *these gods
κιδι μαρο νιβιχτιγενδι ταδαψο αβο βαο-
who are written here—may they [keep] the

αν(ο) παο αβο κανιγρκε κοφανο αβο
king of kings, Kanishka the Kushan, for
ιασοδαν ζορριγι ιρουγι(γ)ο αγγαδογοι οανψδ-
ever healthy, fortunate, (and) victorious,

ο πισιντοι (γ)ιδι οδεσινι (δ)ι βα(γ)εςροι
and [may] the son of the gods
ασο ωογο χρονο αβο ιο (α) χρονο ωνδο αρουγο υ-
*rule all India from the year one to the year *one *thousand.

[ca. 6]  } βι(α)γολαγγο αβο ωογο χρονο απαδο
... the sanctuary was *founded in the year one;
ταδι αβο ι αριμεσο χρονο αγγαρ[••]
then in the *third year [it was] *completed

[ca. 8]  } πιδο παο φρομανα αβιστι παρηνα
... according to the king’s command, also many *rites
λαδο αβιστι ηδιγε λαδο αβιστι[••]
were endowed, also many *attendants were endowed, also many...

[ca. 13]  } ραι μαδο (α)βο βαγανο λαδο οδο
... the king gave an *endowment to the gods, and
φανεμοσανο αχνηδινο (σιδι (α)βο μι βαγε λαδο)
for these... *which [were given] to the gods...

[••]  } ιατιδι(γ)οσι
Commentary

1f. βαγγηνα ζνυγο “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 Dast-e Nawir inscription was read as βαγγον ηζνυγον. I would now interpret this as a single word, without ezafe. The spellings βαγγον-ιζνυγον and βαγγηζνυγον may both represent a compound *βαγα-γαζν-ιγα. A parallel may be provided by the month-name αυρηζνο attested in a recently-discovered Bactrian document, which is evidently cognate with the Sogdian month-name xwryznych, in Manichean script xwryanāc, and the Tunshquese 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 Bāgāyādiya- “(month) of the worship of the Bagā(s)” and Āciyādi- “(month) of the worship of fire”.

3 νοβαγγτα “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-[w] “to begin”, past stem nwy. 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. 2vaēd “to find”).

3f. ωστο ταδο “put it”: since it is exceptional that the following clause begins without a conjunctive 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 οο(σ)το: 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 ωστοταδο now seems unlikely, but the new reading οοστο is likewise uncertain. If it is correct, it may represent Wasp for older *(Η)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 Kasoavia= Hamtūn, sometimes identified as the Khuspās; Gk. Χοσπάς, 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 (Χοσπάς, Ptolemy VI, 20, 4; see now Humbach 1996, p. 166).

6 μανδαρα ζαρανο “other powers”: if it is rightly read, the form μανδαραι may be analysed as μ- “the” + ανδαρ “other” + -αι “also” (cf. below on αβιαοι 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. ζαρανο one may compare βραδ(α)ρανο “brothers”, which is attested in later documents beside the sg. βραδο < nom. sg. *brūā.
8 ἀβδο μὰ καδγε ραγα “in the plain of the (royal) house”: the noun καδγε “house, (family) estate”, of which καδγε 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. αμσα, f. of *(ν)αμ(α)γο “same, i.e. above-mentioned” (< *hamaka-, cf. Av. 1’hama-). The derivative ναμ(α)γηλο 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 (ναμ(α)γηλο Palkan (is) the boundary”.

10 μοξδο(α)γο “the Gracious one”: see now Sims-Williams 1997 and Wright 1997.

10f. ουδοα | νο “of the same (gods)”: I now interpret this form as a pronominal obl. pl. in -ονο (cf. εμοαι, οισποαι, etc.). The sg. form may be ουδο, which occurs in a recently-discovered text in the phrase τ ουδο λεβο “this same document (= the present document)”. While ουδο derives from the strong stem *hawksat- (Av. hauwant-, MP ḥawand “like, similar”), the pl. ουδοαι appears to be based on the weak stem *hawksat- (Av. hauvat-). Cf. also compounds such as Ph. ḥwṣy, Arm. hawasar “equal, similar”, Bactr. φωωνο “companion” (unpublished), Sogd. ṣmr “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. hauvat-zam “like earth” etc. All these forms contain *hawksat(ν) < IE *sm-h2-u(e)nt-, the base being *sm- (as implied by the comparison with Ohnd. samvānt- 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, ουδοαι was compared with the later Bactrian adj. ὁδαναγγο “pertaining to the same (person)”, which must derive from a noun or pronoun *οδανο “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. wnt “so much, such” etc., οδανο is perhaps a compound containing -δανο as the postvocalic variant of the attested τανο < *tanu- “body, person”.

11 μασκα “herein” (rather than “above”). In the later Bactrian documents phrases such as σαγονδαβο μασκο νιβισιδο “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 μασκο corresponds to βανδαρο (< αβδο ανδαρο “within”) in another copy of the same text. The etymology from *ima- “this” + *usād “above, over, upon” probably remains valid.

14 αβδο τ χαβιε “for himself”: my former reading χαβιε and interpretation of -σο as the equivalent of Av. -cīt “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. μνῆμαρσι(?), line 6; αβισσι, line 21). As a possible alternative I propose χοβίςε, which would represent the obl. case of *χοβίο. Though such a spelling is not attested, it would seem plausible as an intermediate form between the underlying *hawks- and the attested χοβί/χοβο.

14f. βαγεπου | ρακ/ανή “scion of the race of the gods”: cf. βαγεπουρο “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 βαγεπουρο, since the second letter of line 15 is clearly a. The reconstruction which I now propose would be the obl. case of a derivative with the suffix -κανο < *-κα-κάνα-, 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 βαγεπου | ρακ/ο[ε] (cf. Khot. pūraka-).

16f. νοκοφζοκο | αντου | α/λγο “Nukunuzk the ashtwaš”: an unpublished Bactrian letter containing the title αρτοαλγο (without a preceding i) shows that the seal-inscription cited in Sims-Williams and Cribb 1996, p. 86, must be interpreted as σασρεθ | αντου | α/λγο “Sas-rew the ashtwaš”, with i as ezafe, and thus removes the justification for assuming the existence of *αρτο “worship” in Bactrian. The second part of the compound is probably αλγο “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 v = [h], one may assume ašt- < *ḥas-t-. The name or title αρτοαζο (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: [...]βίδου | ξηροβίδο | αντο[...].

It should be noted that this interpretation of νοκοφζοκο | αντου | α/λγο leaves one with no alternative to restoring the following phrase as [κιρ] do | φρομάρν “[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: κιδάνο αβαφαγο ... αφκαράδο “whoever might pursue you”; οδάλδο αβο τομαχο αβο λαδο ... οιηλομο “or (if) we should take you to court”; κιβαβο βανοζμιο ασο λαρο βογό “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*γγο “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. ’ngd, MP hangad “fortunate, rich” fits the context very well. Alternatively, Sogd. ʾnɔtk “whole”
would justify a translation "completely ..." (cf. also Av. hangata-, see Henning 1937, p. 107 s.v. 'ngdg; Szemerényi 1970, pp. 513-14).

19 βα(γ)ητοφορος "son of the gods": for the spelling with -ε- cf. βαγεπεοο | ρακ[α/φε] in 14f. above.

19f. γ | αρπαζ [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 ρυ. My previous reconstruction π | αδα(χρανο) is therefore excluded. As a mere possibility one might suggest *ναραδνο, 3 sg. subj. of a verb *ναγ-, cf. perhaps MP/Pth. wyν' “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 αβο in place of αρπο and to disregard ωο (α) “one thousand” as too doubtful, one could translate: “And [when] the son of the gods [had conquered] India completely in (*αβο) the year one, in a single (*ιας•) 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 ὤνο in lines 6f.).

20f. αβο ε αρημεσο χρονο αγγαρε[••] | /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 ναρημο "three" (attested in later documents). The lack of the initial ν = [h] in the language of this inscription is predictable, cf. αρουγο < *ναρουγο “whole” etc. The suffix -μεσο resembles that of φορδαμο "(at) first" in the Surkh Kotal inscription, which probably derives from *fratama-čiya-, cf. Chor. fmyck, Sogd. fimycy (see Henning 1960, p. 49). At first sight the fact that the ordinal ναρδιγο "third" < *θριγκα- is attested in later texts in the phrase ναρδιγο 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 υμ "third" and the fractional *τοντρικ "a third part" < *θριτκα- (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 αγγαρε might be cognate with MP hangirdig "complete" etc., Chor. ḫŋk’Bγ. "to settle (an account); to take one’s leave" (and perhaps Av. hankāraia- "to celebrate (the Yasna)", cf. Kellens 1984, p. 144 with n. 43 on pp. 147-8). A later Bactrian document attests πιδαγγηρ- "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 αβισοι παρηνα λαδο αβισοι ρηδέλε λαδο αβισοι i “also many *rites were endowed (lit. 'given'), also many *attendants were endowed, also many ...": although the second σ of αβισοι is unclear in each place, the three occurrences together make this reading (rather than αβισο i as read previously) highly probable. The double -σο- clearly indicates that αβισοι is a compound or combination of two words, αβισ- and -σο, of which the latter is no doubt the
Bactrian equivalent of Av. -čít, MP -iz “also” (see also above on μανδαρσι in line 6), later -(ι)σο. The preceding αβισα- will then be a variant of the later ναβισα, Manichaean hβyś “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 αβισασι and λαδο in the two parallel clauses are somewhat clearer from the new photographs. The first is probably παρηγα, though one cannot entirely exclude the possibility that the first letter is γ or that the third is ζ. 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 φαρεμουαρο αχοδανο [σιβι / αβιμ μι βαγε λαιδε] “for these ... *which [were given] to the gods ...”: the apparent plural forms φαρεμουαρο “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. φαρεμο “for this” (sg.) + αχοδομο (abstract noun in -δομο, cf. πανθομο “kingship”). The following word could equally well be restored as [σιβι] “which” or [κιβι] “who”. For the words at the end of the line one has a choice between [αβιμ μι βαγε λαιδε] “[were given] to the gods” (cf. ασο οισσομο μι βαγανο in line 2) and [αβιμ μι βαγολιαγο] “to/in the sanctuary” (cf. κιβι μι βαγολιαγο 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 -αγο 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 ο 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 Schumberger apud Gershevitch 1967, p. 56).

4 The supposed *-μι “by me” is not otherwise attested. In the Berlin “Hepthalite” fragment No. 5, line 4, the words must be divided: λαδο μουαδιδηγο “... 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): νοβικτο μου μαφτο ουδε μο [...]παγδο ωλεσαγοϊ “I, Yölesagö (lit. “Battle-axe”, cf. Av. ėkād- etc.), inscribed both the stairway and the ...”.
APPENDIX: THE NAMES OF KUJULA KADPHISES AND VIMA TAKTU IN CHINESE

The relationship between the names of Qiu-jiu-que 丘就卻 and his son Yan-gao-zhen 閔膏珍, 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 kʰuːw-dzɯw-ʰiːak 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 *Kujuk beside Kujula 朱 the name of the same person may be found in the occurrence of ποροκο = Puruk beside πορ[α]/πο, perhaps to be restored as πορ[α]/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 *koζγαɾkο (attested in the obl. koζγαɾκι) seems more promising. The name *koζγαɾkο no doubt contains the well-known hypocoristic suffix -ɾko (= Toch. -ške, -ške etc.). The preceding element *koζγ(α)l- may well be attested, with the expected postvocalic voicing of the initial k- in the personal names ىووى-γοζɡυο, λαδο-γοζɡυο and ىآμαζى-γοζɡυο, all of which are found in later Bactrian documents. The name λαδο-γοζɡυο seems to be particularly significant for the meaning of the element kuzg(a)- or i-guzg, since compounds with λαδο “given” as the first component are formed with a semantically restricted range of second components: *ā-gądaka- “wish” and *yāna- “favour” in the divine epithets λαδαγαλυο “by whom wishes are granted” and λαδιαλο “by whom favours are granted”, and perhaps *mižda- “reward” in the personal name λաδοβο/οζɡυο (if rightly read). If koζ(α)-, -γοζɡυο is a noun from the same semantic sphere, it is natural to think of Chor. kovy “to ask, request”, Khot. kās “to seek” < *kauzaya-. With one eye on the internal -a- of *koζγαɾkο 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 oọημο; 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 bao, EMC paw, or to mi, EMC mij(j) (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 oọημο, which seems to stand in the same relationship to oọημο, the usual Greek and Bactrian form of the name Vima, as oọηλ-, the later form of the verb “to lead”, does to oọηλ-, the form attested in the Rabatak inscription. Since oọηλ certainly derives from *wādaya-, the doubling of the initial o- seems to have no etymological significance. The name oọημο could therefore derive from a form such as *waima-, cf. perhaps Pth. wym, Arm. vem “rock, stone”, Av. vaēma- “cleft, precipice” as suggested by Humbach 1966, p. 40. Semantic parallels include the Sogd. personal name snkt(’), literally “stone”, as well as the more familiar instance of the name Peter.

If this is indeed the etymology of oọημο—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 oọηρκο may be a hypocoristic form of oọημο, Huvishka being named after his grandfather?) Vima in just the same way as Vazishka (βαζηξηρκο) was later named after his grandfather(?) Vasudeva (βαζηξοδη). The absence of -μ in the form oọηρκο could have a purely phonetic explanation, cf. the loss of the nasal [ŋ] before [s] in the title παροςαραβο “Persian satrap” (attested in unpublished documents probably belonging to the Sasanian period) < παροςαγγο [parsāŋ(g)] “Persian” + παραβαρ “satrap”.6 Alternatively, as in the case of βαζηξηρκο, the hypocoristic oọηρκο 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 [ŋ] before [s] in ασκησαγγο ράγα “the plain of Askin”, attested in a late Bactrian document beside the place-name ασκίν “Askin”. The interpretation of ασκησαγγο as an adjective in -αγγο = Sogd. -c’ng < *-cana-ka-, cf. f. -cακο = Sogd. -c’nc < *-cana-či- in ṭοροςαγγο “Turkish(?))”, seems more natural than the connection with ασαγγο “stone” which I previously suggested (apud Grenet 1996).
REFERENCES

Bartholomae, C., 1904. Altiranisches Wörterbuch (Strassburg).
Bosson, G., 1985. Empirische Universalienforschung. Differentielle Objektmarkierung in
den neuriranischen Sprachen (Tübingen).
Burrow, T., 1935. Iranian words in the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Chinese Turkestan—II,
BSOS 7/iv, 779-90.
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).
Henning, W. B., 1956. The Khwarezmian language, Z. V. Togan’a Armağan (Istanbul),
421-36.
Hummbach, 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.
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,
11e série 4, 379-419.
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).
Wackernagel, J., 1914. Indoiranica [II], KZ 46, 266-80.