THE BACTRIAN INSCRIPTION

By W. B. Henning

THE long-awaited Greek-letter inscription discovered, on 6 May 1957, by the Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan in the course of their excavations at ' Surkh-Kotal ', the ancient Bagolango,[1] has now been made public by M. André Maricq under the title of ' La grande inscription de Kaniṣka et l'étéo-tokharien, l'ancienne langue de la Bactriane ', *JA*, CCXLVI, 4, 1958, 345–440.[2] It is wonderfully well-preserved and, once one gets accustomed to the somewhat barbaric forms of certain letters, offers not the slightest difficulty to the reading. The difficulties lie elsewhere : this is the first substantial, and at the same time readable, document of the Iranian language once spoken in Bactria and, appropriately to a text in an unknown language, is slow in yielding its meaning to the scholar, who inevitably has to be guided partly by often contradictory internal evidence, partly by uncertain comparisons with related languages. All those devoted to Central Asian history and languages will be grateful to M. Maricq for his painstaking work and for his unselfishness in publishing this superb monument before being able to submit more than a partial interpretation.

The language of the inscription occupies an intermediary position between Pashto and Yidgha-Munji on the one hand, Sogdian, Khwarezmian, and Parthian on the other : it is thus in its natural and rightful place in Bactria ; this is also the opinion expressed by M. Maricq (pp. 395 sqq.). It would then be best to call it *Bactrian*. Such a long time has passed since that term fell into disuse, as the name of the Avestan language, that it is available again ; there is no reason why we should avoid it. Surprisingly, M. Maricq prefers *étéo-tokharien* as the name of the new language, largely on the ground that in much later times (eleventh century) al-Beruni used *Tokharian* (*ṭuχārīy* in Arabic) for the dialect spoken in Bactria, then called *Ṭuχāristān*. We cannot well follow al-Beruni's example and simply say *Tokharian* ; for that would increase the great confusion already associated with that term. Yet, having some authority in its favour, it could be defended, while *étéo-tokharien* seems inappropriate altogether ; for it implies a claim, not made by M. Maricq himself nor indeed tenable,[3] that the new language is that of the genuine Τόχαροι (as against the people of Qarašahr), who, coming from Kan-su, conquered Bactria in the second century B.C. and caused that country to be renamed. The invaders, as is so often the case, adopted the native language in the course of time ; it is possible, even probable, that they imported some

---

[1] cf. *BSOAS*, XVIII, 2, 1956, 366 sq.

[2] This issue of the *Journal Asiatique* reached London on 16 October 1959.

[3] An intruding language (even if it was also an Iranian one by origin) would not fall so neatly in position.

words into it from their own form of speech, and such words could indeed be properly called *étéo-tokharien*.

It is not at all likely that the inscription, as M. Maricq believes and already suggests by the title of his publication, can be attributed to Kaniṣka (I). True, his name is mentioned in the opening sentence, as that of the founder of the sanctuary ; and no other royal name occurs. Yet, if we consider the contents of the inscription [1] as a whole, we can hardly fail to get the impression that it was set up a long time after Kaniṣka's death. We may not yet be able to produce a full translation, but the general drift of its message seems clear : after its foundation by Kaniṣka, the sanctuary fell into disrepair and was abandoned, until in the *kṣuna*-year 31 one *Nokonzoko*, a high official, came there and repaired and adorned the place ; three other officials, of equal rank, were associated with *Nokonzoko*'s work ; the inscription itself was ' written ', i.e. composed, by Mihrāmān and Burzmihrpuhr, who signed it and caused their heraldic devices [2] to be incised after their names.

The purpose of the inscription, therefore, is to celebrate Nokonzoko's restoration ; we shall hardly go wrong if we take it that it was by his orders that the inscription was written. It mentions at some length his devotion to the king (lines 7–9) ; there is a similar phrase about him and his three colleagues at the end (lines 23–24). As the king's name is stated in neither passage, one would assume that the then ruling king is meant, the only one whose name may be taken for granted. The *kṣuna*-year [3] 31 is mentioned merely incidentally, as the year in which Nokonzoko ' came here ' ($\mu\alpha\lambda o$ $\alpha\gamma\alpha\delta o$). It has caused great perplexity to M. Maricq ; the latest year attested for Kaniṣka being 23, he advances two hypotheses (p. 384 sq.) : *either* that Kaniṣka continued to live in Bactria beyond 23, leaving the rule of Gandhara and India to others ; *or* that the era of the inscription differs from that universally used in monuments belonging to the period of the Kaniṣka dynasty. Once we have recognized that the inscription was not set up by Kaniṣka at all, we can dispense with such cumbrous hypotheses. Its date is 31 + x, in the early part of Huviṣka's reign.

In his chapter ' La destination du sanctuaire ' (pp. 368–72) M. Maricq has laid stress on certain words in the opening lines which he renders as ' un sanctuaire appelé Dieu, Roi Kaniṣka '. Before we can discuss this translation, which is *a priori* improbable, we have to consider some problems of orthography and word-division. The first point to be noticed is the apparent absence of affricates, see Maricq, p. 401. A Middle Iranian language lacking affricates or

---

[1] It is to be regretted that M. Maricq has not supplied a summary of the contents.

[2] As far as I see, M. Maricq has not alluded in his article to these interesting monograms, which are personal or family devices of the kind called *tamγa* by some scholars (in Western Iran, where they were exceedingly common in Sassanian times, they were known as *nišān*).

[3] i.e. regnal year ; the ordinary word for ' year ' may occur in Fragment G of the *inscription pariétale* : $\sigma\alpha\rho\lambda[o]$, see Curiel, *JA*, CCXLII, 2, 1954, 191 (the last letter is unfortunately in doubt ; it might be $\sigma\alpha\rho\delta[o]$).

sounds representing the ancient affricates, particularly č, is frankly impossible. In Bactrian, as in certain related languages, e.g. Pashto and Khwarezmian, the ancient palatal affricates (č, ǰ) probably became dental affricates (c, j): in Greek script these could well be represented by σ and ζ; they might even have developed further to s and z (as happened in some Pashto dialects). The inscription does indeed contain words in which σ = Old Ir. č; none of them has been recognized by M. Maricq. For example, ασο ' from ', lines 4, 5, etc., from hačā, which may be part of the compound ασασκομο 17, possible *hačā-skamba ' buttressed '; φορδαμσο 2 ' at first ', cf. the Sogd. suffix -č(y) beside -čyk, and Sogd. ʼprtmčyk; σιδο line 1, and perhaps ασιδο 2 = σιδο with prefixed ασο ' from ', = ' which, what ', the neuter relative-interrogative combined with the particle familiar from Sogdian (ʼ)čw-ZY, čwt(y); it forms a pair with κιδο ' who ' 7, 9 (as e.g. Parthian cy : ky), cf. Sogd. (ʼ)ky-ZY, (ʼ)kyty.[1]

M. Maricq assumes that the letters ιζ in combination denoted z in μαλιζο, a frequent word in the inscription, obviously an appellative describing the whole complex of ' Surkh-Kotal ', and that this word and its orthography had been borrowed from a Saka dialect (353 sqq., 407 sq.). In face of the fact that z in other words is invariably expressed by plain ζ in the inscription, such a borrowing of an orthographic device (which owes its invention to the lack of a sign for z in the Brāhmī script) is as unlikely as it would have been needless. Moreover, the presumed Saka *malysa ' house ' does not even exist.[2] Since μαλιζο should represent earlier m-ā-d-i-z-, with possible elision of some sounds, it could be a compound with OIr. dizā ' fortress '; provisionally we will translate it as ' acropolis '. A difficult case is that of χohζo 20, where the consonant cluster may denote some variation of z, possibly ž (in which case Parth. xwj, i.e. xŭž, could be compared). Yet are we wise to transcribe ypsilon as h in all cases? The study of the coins has shown long ago that ypsilon was used for h, and it is true that it is so used in the inscription. Nevertheless, in cases where there would otherwise be a heaping of omicra, it may perhaps serve as u̯. For example, λρουο 4, 14/5, surely = lruu̯° from Old Ir. druwa-,[3] which otherwise might have been spelt λροοο (in Λροοασπο = Lruu̯āsp° the awkwardness was less great); probably ναρουγο μαλιζο 19/20 = ' the whole acropolis ', with haruu̯g° from haruu̯aka[3]; thus possibly in χουζο = xuu̯z° or xuu̯ž° (if = Parth. xwj), so that ζ may also serve for ž. The origin of ριζογαργο 8, probably ' beneficent ', is unfortunately in doubt.[4]

The first task that faces the editor of a document of this nature is to divide

---

[1] An unconvincing explanation of κιδο has been given by M. Maricq, 357 sq. Note that the Bactrian equivalent of Sogd. k'δy would be *καλο, and that Khot. käḍe contains -ḍ- from -rt-. It may be better to regard κεδο as a relative adverb, different from κιδο.

[2] It has been inferred from Khot. malysaka- = gṛhapati, but a -ka- suffix does not usually involve so great a change in meaning.

[3] Not recognized by M. Maricq.

[4] Perh. = εὐεργέτης; no connexion with Sogd. šyr- etc. seems possible.

the words correctly : this difficult task has been resolved successfully on the whole by M. Maricq, whose text provides a sound basis for further study. It appears to be the rule that all words must end in a vocalic letter.[1] If a word in fact ended in a consonant, an omicron was added to it, except if the closing consonant was $\underset{\sim}{u}$ expressed by omicron (þαο ' king ' = $š\bar{a}\underset{\sim}{u}$) ; no exception was made in the case of consonantic iota, e.g. final -$e\underset{\sim}{i}$ was spelt -ηιο. It is possible that here and there a closing omicron expressed a vowel actually pronounced in speech at the time of the inscription ; in most cases it functioned virtually as a word-divider. The prepositions πιδο = pid from pati, αβο = aβ from abi,[2] ασο = ac from hačā show that clearly ; the omicron even appears in composition : πιδοριγδο ; πορογατο 11/12 and πορooατο 20 with πορο from pari- ; οζooαστο 12 with οζο = uz- ; even νο- = n- for ancient ni- in νοβιχτο, and νοþαλμο 5, 15/6 ' seat '[3] = nšalm from nišadman-. If an inflexional ending or a suffix is added to the word, the final omicron disappears, e.g. βαγο 1 : βαγε 4, οτο : οτηιο : οτανο passim. On these facts, a spelling -πουροι 8 as inflected form of -πουρο 25 is extremely unlikely. This type of form has induced M. Maricq to assume (359 sq.) a three-case inflexion, with nominative-accusative, genitive, and ' oblique case ', the latter being derived from the genitive (as in the plural gen. -ανο, obl. -ανοι). This hypothesis is not in conformity with what we know of Middle Iranian generally and should be discarded. The difficulties that have led to it disappear if we assume the existence of a word expressed by a single iota : a relative/article ī, identical in origin with Khwarezmian ī and Middle Persian ī(g) ; the occurrence of πιδοι (i.e. πιδο + ι) suffices to demand it. Examples :

(1) (Attributes joined to preceding noun) τα καλδο Νοκονζοκο ι καραλραγγο ι φρειχοαδηογο κιδο φρεισταρο αβο þαο ι βαγοπουρο ι λοιχοβοσαρο ι ριζογαργο ι αλοþχαλο κιδο . . . (6–9) ' until (the time) when [4] Nokonzoko the lord of the marches, loyal-to-the-emperor,[5] who (is) most devoted [6] to the king, the devaputra, the . . .,[7] the *beneficent one, the merciful [8] one, who . . .'. The absence of the iota from the last of a series of epithets confirms our analysis.[9] Καραλραγγο is the same word as Pers. kanārang, Χαναράγγης, a title of the

---

[1] Therefore αλ βαργο 18 should be a single word, αλβαργο, perhaps belonging to OPers. *hadabāra-, MPers. hdb'l-, Pers. yār ' helper ' (rather than a relative of Sogd. δβ'r, Oss. lävar ' present(s) ').

[2] The uncompounded preposition hardly reflects also apa and api, as M. Maricq supposes.

[3] Not recognized by M. Maricq.

[4] καλδο (regarded as a noun by M. Maricq) is a conjunction, from OIr. kada + δο as in σιδο, κιδο, κεδο, and ταδο ' so, then ' ; cf. Sogd. kδwty, and, for ταδο, Sogd. twty (if its first part belongs to the demonstrative stem ta- ; cf. Gershevitch, Gramm., p. 307).

[5] Instead of an appellative adjective, this could be a patronymic, ' son of Φρειχοαδηο '.

[6] cf. Sogd. frystr, Gershevitch, Gramm., § 1297 ; Parth. fry(h)stwm.

[7] Second part of the compound probably OIr. upačāra (Aram. 'wpšr, Pers. afzār).

[8] From hada ' with ' + the noun attested by Parth. 'xšd.

[9] A similar list of epithets connected by the iota in the first line of the Palamedes inscription (Curiel, JA, ccxlii, 2, 1954, 194 ; cf. BSOAS, xviii, 2, 1956, 367). Two of them end in -βιδο from -pati ; the second should probably be read ζηνοβιδο (rather than σηνοβιδο) = Parth. zynpty (Pahl. zynpt) in the Great Inscription of Shapur (Parth. line 24).

governor of the provinces bordering on the lands of the former Kūšān empire,[1] and supplies its etymology : *kanār-drang beside *karān-drang.[2]

(2) (Introducing preceding attribute) . . . ωσογδομαγγο πιδο ι ιωγο οδο νιρσο χρονο . . . μαλο αγαδο (9–11) ' (when) with a pure heart [3] (N.) came here [4] in the regnal year 31 '.

(3) (Direct article) ταδο ι βαγε ασο ι νοβαλμο φροχορτινδο (4/5) ' then the gods *withdrew from the seat '.

(4) (Introducing preceding genitive ?) καραλραγγε μαρηγο πιδο ι χοαδηο φρομανο οτο ειιομανο (23/4) ' (Burzmihr et al.) the lords [5] of the marches, subservient [6] to the emperor's command and acquiescent '.[7] The interpretation depends on φρομανο, which could be = OIr. framānā- ' command ' or Av. framanah-, MPers. frmyn ' joyfully willing '. If the latter, the iota would be a direct article, ' serving unto the emperor willingly and wholeheartedly '. In either case the passage suggests that οτο means ' and ' and therefore is not different from οδο ; M. Maricq regards οτο as a relative pronoun, but as such it would be inexplicable.

Χοαδηο has been correctly recognized as the outcome of *xwatāwya by M. Maricq, who translates ' seigneur ' : it surely deserved some notice in his discussion of the royal titles (pp. 372–84), where it is not even mentioned [8] ; for it clearly denotes the Kūšān emperor.[9] It is also of interest for Persian xidēv, in which we can now see a loan from Bactria.[10]

We are now prepared to resume the consideration of the opening sentence :

Ειδο μαλιζομο Κανηρκο Οανινδο βαγολαγγο σιδο ι βαγο βαο Κανηρκι ναμο-βαργο κιρδο ταδ . . .

M. Maricq's translation ' Ceci est un édifice de moi, Kaniṣka le Victorieux. Un sanctuaire s'étend appelé " dieu, roi Kaniṣka ". Un rempart a été construit . . .' is based on a sentence-division that runs counter to the spirit of all Middle Iranian languages. Clearly there is a relative clause σιδο . . . κιρδο, and ταδ . . . resumes the principal sentence. μο is regarded by M. Maricq as a separate word, the genitive of the personal pronoun of the 1st person. Apart from the

[1] Probably borrowed from the neighbours.

[2] ' Who secures the borders (Av. karan-) '. At a brief talk I had with Dr. Gershevitch I learned that he had found the same explanation of καραλραγγο, and that we were in agreement also on several other points concerning the interpretation of the inscription.

[3] cf. Sogd. 'wswy̆tm'n'ky' (abstr.) ; M. Maricq oddly ' du chanvre (?) fut brûlé '.

[4] From imada ; cf. Sogd. mδy.

[5] One does not see why M. Maricq declines to regard this form as a plural.

[6] So, if the derivation proposed by M. Maricq is correct ; a different meaning, ' mindful ' (from mar- ' remember '), seems not impossible.

[7] Lit. ' unanimous ', from Av. *aēvōmanah- (cf. Av. hamō.manah-, Skt. ekamanas-, Pers. yakmaniš, etc.) ; aiu̯a developed differently from aiu̯aka (ιωγο), cf. e.g. MPers. 'yw and yk ; ειιο- perhaps = äiu̯-.

[8] βαοναυο βαο, on the other hand, does not occur in the inscription (a remarkable fact).

[9] It does here actually agree in meaning with αὐτοκράτωρ = imperator, as demanded by Meillet's etymology.

[10] Χοαδηο also on Hephthalite coins, e.g. apud Junker, Sb.PAW, 1930, 644, top of page, end of obverse (βαγο χοαδηο).

awkwardness of attributing to the inscription (wherein 3rd persons only are used throughout) an isolated form of the 1st person, μo cannot easily belong to the accented pronoun (of which the genitive should be $*\mu a\nu o$) ; nor even to the enclitic pronoun, which should be $*\mu a$ acc. (if it existed) and $*\mu\eta\iota o$ gen.-dat.[1] (since $-\eta\iota o$ = 3rd pers. sing. encl.). In my opinion μo is an enclitic particle, a short form of $a\mu o$ 'same, also, and '. In line 20 $\epsilon\iota o\mu o$ $\sigma a\delta o$ is not perceptibly different from $\epsilon\iota o$ $\sigma a\delta o$, line 12 ; and $\mu a\lambda\iota\zeta o\mu o$ . . . $\beta a\gamma o\lambda a\gamma\gamma o$ compares with $\mu a\lambda o$ $a\gamma a\delta o$ $a\mu o$ $\beta a\gamma o\lambda a\gamma\gamma o$ 11 (end of a clause) ' came here to the sanctuary ', where the full form, used after a verb, serves merely to express the identity of the two terms $\mu a\lambda o$ and $\beta a\gamma o\lambda a\gamma\gamma o$.

One might expect that it would be advantageous to read Middle Iranian in a fully vocalized script : in practice, the lack of distinction of long and short vowels is a great hindrance. Is $\nu a\mu o$ ' name ' ($n\bar{a}m$) or ' homage ' ($n\breve{a}m$)? Is $\beta a\rho\gamma o = \beta\breve{a}rg$, which could be ' fruit, result ' (Sogd. $\beta r'kw$),[2] or $= \beta\bar{a}rg$, which might have a variety of meanings ranging from ' riding animal ' to ' dress ' and (perhaps) ' wall '? Moreover, $\nu a\mu o\beta a\rho\gamma o$ may well be a compound, either $nam\beta arg$ ' offering homage ' (Parth. $nmbr$-, etc.) or $n\bar{a}m\beta\breve{a}rg$ ' bearing a name '. M. Maricq has chosen ' name ' and ' wall '.[3] Even if one accepted his division of words and sentences, one would have to insist that $\beta a\gamma o$ $\rho a o$ $K a\nu\eta\rho\kappa\iota$ $\nu a\mu o$ could only mean ' the lord, king named Kaniṣka '. Putting aside M. Maricq's interpretation, and preferring ' name ' and ' bearing ', we are still troubled by the function of the iota, which may fall within categories 3 or 4 above. Thus there would be two alternative translations:

either ' This acropolis, the Kaniṣka-Nicator [4] sanctuary, which the lord, king Kaniṣka made name-bearing ($=$ to which he gave this name), . . .'

or ' This acropolis, the Kaniṣka-Nicator sanctuary, which was made bearing the name of the lord,[5] king K. ($=$ which was given the name of K.), . . .'.

In either case, $K a\nu\eta\rho\kappa\iota$ is necessarily a genitive, either as possessive gen. or as the agent of a transitive verb in the past [6] ; and therefore $K a\nu\eta\rho\kappa o$ cannot also be a genitive, but must be a ' direct case ' ($=$ nom.-acc.).[7] Hence, $K a\nu\eta\rho\kappa o$

---

[1] Or $*\mu\iota$ at the least, if $\kappa\iota\rho\delta o\mu\iota$ in the Palamedes inscription (Curiel, *JA*, CCXLII, 2, 1954, 194 ; cf. *BSOAS*, XVIII, 2, 1956, 367) is correctly formed acc. to the rules of the ' passive construction ' and not due to confusion with the intransitive past (with $*\mu\iota$ from $ahmi$).

[2] Thus probably in line 9 ($\beta a\rho\gamma a\nu o$ pl.).

[3] This is the least likely of all possible meanings.

[4] M. Maricq is presumably right in regarding $O a\nu\iota\nu\delta o$ as an epithet of Kaniṣka ; he may have chosen it in imitation of Seleucus Nicator.

[5] The customary translation of $\beta a\gamma o$, Sogd. $\beta\gamma\gamma$, MPers. bgy, etc., as ' god ' even when preceding a man's name is grossly misleading. Every gentleman was entitled to it as a prefix, though hardly regarded as a divinity.

[6] The ' passive construction ' is observed throughout the inscription.

[7] So is $N o\kappa o\nu\zeta o\kappa o$ in line 7, as the subject of an intransitive verb. The forms in lines 22–23 were felt to be agents of the preceding transitive verbs, but the following $\kappa a\rho a\lambda\rho a\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ owing to its remoteness was allowed the ending of the direct case ; $K o\zeta\gamma a\rho\kappa\iota$ $\pi o\upsilon\rho o$ is ' K.'s son ', not a compound proper. $K a\nu\eta\rho\kappa\iota$ on the coins should therefore be regarded as a genitive (as it was assumed to be e.g. by Whitehead, *Cat. Panjab Mus.*, I, 187). With regard to the inflexion of these proper names M. Maricq takes the opposite view.

Οανινδο βαγολαγγο is an open compound and should not be rendered by ' the sanctuary of K.-N.'.

The most difficult part of the inscription is that which deals with the abandonment of the sanctuary and its restoration ; its obscurity may be due to the presence of technical terms, unknown to us, relating to buildings. Yet one point is clear: the abandonment was largely caused by a breakdown in the water-supply. M. Maricq failed to recognize this, principally because he took αβο persistently for a preposition, while it is not only a preposition (= αβ) but also the word for ' water ' (āb) ; manifestly the latter in lines 12—before a verb with the preverb uz—and 14—before a negative particle. He approached the correct understanding by seeing that αβαβγο 3/4 must mean ' waterless ' ; but his translation of μαλιζο αβαβγο σταδο 3/4 as ' l'édifice fut asséché ' gives a wrong slant ; it should be ' (whereby) [1] the acropolis came to be waterless '. The preceding words are not clear. Perhaps ' . . . then after (?) he (?) had first completed the acropolis, then its . . . water . . . dried up (?) '. There is not sufficient material to show whether we may assume that intervocalic -št- developed to t (or ṭ),[2] so that χοτο 3 could represent *hušta- [3] ' dried ' ; some such meaning seems required in view of the following ' whereby '.

It is in accordance with this hypothesis that the restoration of the water-supply was Nokonzoko's preoccupation : ταδηιο μαλιζο πορογατο ταδηιο ειιο σαδο κανδο οτηιο αβο οζοοαστο οτηιο πιδο ασαγγε ιθο οιλιρδο ατανο αβο μαλιζο φαρο καρανο αβο μα γαοηιο (11–14) ' (when N. came here, to the sanctuary,) then he *circumvallated the acropolis, then he dug a (?) well and conducted its water out (of it), and he set up *pillars on (with ?) stones, so that through them pure water shall not be lacking to the acropolis '. This translation, which is deliberately literal, is merely tentative and will doubtless have to be improved ; unless it is misleading altogether, it would seem to imply that Nokonzoko built an aqueduct. It is based on the following interpretation of words [4] :

(1) ταδηιο from ταδο ' so, then ' with the enclitic pronoun of the 3rd pers. sing. (Av. hē, Pashto ē, Khw. (h)ĭ, etc.).
(2) πορογατο perhaps = Sogd. prkšt, with -t from -št.[5]
(3) ειιο may well be different from the first part of ειιομανο.
(4) σαδο (which M. Maricq equated with Sogd. s't ' all ') is here clearly = cād = Sogd. č't ' well '.
(5) οτηιο ' and of him/it ' from οτο ' and '.

---

[1] = ασιδο.
[2] If μαβτο 20/21 means ' broken ' (as related languages may induce one to suppose), such an assumption cannot be maintained. M. Maricq's explanation of νοβιχτο, which I accept, affords some support. See also below p. 55, n. 7.
[3] Against Av. hušata-.
[4] Those correctly explained by M. Maricq are omitted.
[5] Another possible case of this kind is πορooατο 20, if from *parwa(r)št ' nursed, looked after ', cf. Parth. prwrz-, Sogd. prwyj-.

(6) $o\zeta oo\alpha\sigma\tau o$ = Parth. '$zw'st$, Av. $uzv\bar{a}\delta aya$-.[1]

(7) $\iota\theta o$ is obviously a noun, the object of the action expressed by $o\iota\lambda\iota\rho\delta o$.[2] Possibly from Av. $\alpha i\theta y\bar{a}$ ' post '. A meaning ' post ' or ' pillar ' is recommended by the verb, cf. Av. $stun\mathring{a}$ $v\bar{\imath}\delta\bar{a}rayeiti$.

(8) $o\iota\lambda\iota\rho\delta o$ from $wid\underset{.}{r}ta$,[3] from dar- ' hold '. The form of the participle agrees with Parth. $dyrd$.

(9) $\alpha\tau\alpha\nu o$ from $\alpha\tau o$ 18, a conjunction, probably ' so that ', from Av. $a\underset{.}{t}$ + x ; to which the enclitic pronoun of the 3rd pers. plur. has been added (from *han-, cf. Sogd. $\check{s}n$, Khw. -na-, etc.). This is found also in $o\tau\alpha\nu o$ ' and of them ', $\kappa\alpha\lambda\delta\alpha\nu o$, and $\tau\alpha\delta\alpha\nu o$.

(10) The first $\alpha\beta o$ in this clause = prep. ' to ', the second = ' water '.

(11) $\phi\alpha\rho o$ postposition referring to -$\alpha\nu o$; preposition [4] in line 9 ; prob. from $fr\bar{a}$.

(12) $\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\nu o$ ' pure ', Sogd. $kr'n$.

(13) $\mu\alpha$ prohibitive negative.

(14) $\gamma\alpha o\eta\iota o$ = $\gamma a\underset{.}{u}\bar{e}\underset{.}{\imath}$, opt. 3rd sing. from $\gamma a\underset{.}{u}$- ' to lack, want, fail ', Sogd. γw-, etc.[5]

When the lack of water had made itself felt, $\tau\alpha\delta o$ ι $\beta\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ $\alpha\sigma o$ ι $\nu o\rho\alpha\lambda\mu o$ $\phi\rho o\chi o\rho\tau\iota\nu\delta o$ . . . $o\tau o$ $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta o$ $\pi\iota\delta o\rho\iota\gamma\delta o$ $\tau\alpha$ . . . 4/6 ' then [6] the gods *withdrew from the seat . . . and the acropolis was abandoned until [7] (N. came . . .) '. M. Maricq has rightly drawn a parallel between this statement and a sentence embedded, in the corresponding place, in the report on Nokonzoko's activities, $\tau\alpha\delta\alpha\nu o$ ι $\beta\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ $\alpha\sigma o$ ι $\nu o\rho\alpha\lambda\mu o$ $\mu\alpha$ $\phi\rho o\chi o\alpha\rho o\nu\delta\eta\iota o$ $o\tau\alpha\nu o$ $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\zeta o$ $\mu\alpha$ $\pi\iota\delta o\rho\iota\chi\sigma\eta\iota o$ 15/7 ' may then the gods not *withdraw from their seat and may their acropolis not become abandoned '. The various conclusions M. Maricq has drawn from this parallelism have already been examined here. The verbal forms in the second passage are optatives, -$o\nu\delta\eta\iota o$ 3rd pers. plural [8] and -$\eta\iota o$ 3rd pers. singular.[9] The meaning of $\phi\rho o\chi o\rho\tau$-/$\phi\rho o\chi o\alpha\rho$- arises from the contexts, but neither the relation of the stems to each other nor the nature of the base is clear.[10]

---

[1] From the same base $o\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\nu\delta o$ 5 = ' they were led ' (Parth. $w'st$ $hynd$). M. Maricq, comparing (uz)$wa\check{s}ta$, needlessly assumes a change of $\check{s}t$ into st ; similarly in the case of $\phi\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\rho o$, where his derivation (*$fry\check{s}t(a)$-) is not clear.

[2] One does not see how M. Maricq arrived at the meaning ' here '.

[3] M. Maricq gives the correct Old Ir. form, but a wrong meaning.

[4] Presumably ; but it might be ' Tyche ' there = $\Phi\alpha\rho\rho o$, $\Phi\alpha\rho o$ on coins (it depends on the meaning of $\alpha\nu o\mu o o\alpha\delta o$; the relative clause $\kappa\iota\delta o$ . . . $\beta\alpha\rho\gamma\alpha\nu o$ probably expresses a pious wish for the king).

[5] M. Maricq has recognized that this is a form of a present stem, but, since the meaning of $\mu\alpha$ escaped him, could not define it closely enough and referred it to the wrong base, Av. gav-.

[6] Apodosis beginning with $\tau\alpha\delta o$; the protasis opened with $o\delta o$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\delta o$; correspondingly in the sentence to be discussed next, $o\delta o$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\delta\alpha\nu o$ . . . $\tau\alpha\delta\alpha\nu o$.

[7] cf. MPers. (Man.) d', Pers. $t\bar{a}$.

[8] Based on 3rd pl. indic. pres. (which presumably ended in -$o\nu\delta o$), cf. the generalized Parthian optative in -$yndy(y)$.

[9] $\beta o o\eta\iota o$ 15 = $\beta o\underset{.}{u}\bar{e}\underset{.}{\imath}$ is another opt. 3rd sing. = Sogd. βwy, $w\beta yy$, MPers. $bwyy$.

[10] One might make bold to emend $\phi\rho o\chi o\alpha\rho$- into $\phi\rho o\chi o\alpha\rho$-, if a suitable base $xwar$- were known ; perhaps Khwar. $xwar\delta$- ' flee ' (see my ' Mitteliranisch ', p. 113) is a derivative of it.

In the concluding paragraph (17–21) Nokonzoko describes further improvements carried out by him and his colleagues (named in 21–22) and sums up his work. Several unknown or uncertain words, such as ασασκομο,[1] αχϸτριγο,[2] αλβαργο,[3] ιθο,[4] χουζο,[5] πορооατο,[6] χιργομανο,[7] compel us to leave this part aside for the present ; some words and short phrases in the main body of the text have also been left for further consideration.

At the end of this largely critical article it is but fitting that we should pay a tribute to the acumen and sureness of judgment displayed by Professor D. Schlumberger, the excavator of the Sanctuary, who from the beginning not only attributed its foundation to Kaniṣka, but also postulated a measure of rebuilding (Period II) at a time well before the end of Huviṣka. The inscription beautifully confirms his views on both points : foundation by Kaniṣka, restoration by Nokonzoko in the early part of Huviṣka's reign.[8]

[1] See above, p. 49.

[2] Perhaps = MPers. or Parth. 'štyrg (itself of unknown meaning), Sogdica, pp. 31 sq., 35.

[3] See above, p. 50, n. 1.

[4] Above, p. 54.

[5] Above, p. 49.

[6] Above, p. 53, n. 5.

[7] Perhaps = Pers. xirman ' halo, threshing-floor ' ; hence possibly ' the great forecourt ', if μαϸτο should reflect OIr. masita- (cf. above p. 53, n. 2).

[8] I have had the advantage of being acquainted with a document written in a closely related language, which Dr. M. Boyce and I are preparing for publication. It would not have been proper to anticipate our joint results ; and had I done so, I should have betrayed the trust the owners of the document have reposed in me. It affords a little help in determining pronominal forms, such as σιδο, κιδο, ταδο, ταδηιο, οτηιο, but otherwise is itself in need of elucidation.