The Gandharan reliquary inscriptions cataloged and translated in this chapter are found on four main types of objects: relic containers of a variety of shapes, thin gold or silver scrolls deposited inside reliquaries, thicker metal plates deposited alongside reliquaries, and stone slabs that formed part of a stūpa's relic chamber or covered stone reliquaries. Irrespective of the type of object, the inscriptions follow a uniform pattern described in chapter 5. Three principal eras are used in the dating formulae of these inscriptions: the Greek era of 186/185 BCE (Salomon 2005a); the Azes (= Vikrama) era of 58/57 BCE (Bivar 1981b);¹ and the Kanishka era of c. 127 CE (Falk 2001). In addition to or in place of these main eras, regnal years of a current or (in the case of Patika's inscription no. 12) recent ruler are used in dating formulae, and detailed information is available about two of the royal houses concerned: the kings of Apraca (family tree in Falk 1998: 107, with additional suggestions in Salomon 2005a) and the kings of Oḍi (family tree in von Hinüber 2003: 33).

In preparing the catalog, it became apparent that not only new and uniform translations of the whole set of inscriptions were called for, but also the texts themselves needed to be reconstituted on the basis of numerous individual suggestions for improvements made after the most recent full edition of each text. All these suggestions (so far as they could be traced) are integrated in the texts presented here, and so are a number of new proposals for improvement (fully justified in the notes). The result can be considered a first step toward a complete (and much-needed) reedition of the corpus of Gandharan reliquary inscriptions.

¹. The conventional equation of the Azes and Vikrama eras has recently been questioned, and it has been suggested that the absolute dates for the Greek and Azes eras should be moved forward to c. 174 and c. 46 BCE (see the detailed discussion in Errington and Curtis 2007: chap. 3, and Falk and Bennett 2009; see also above, p. 186). This proposal remains under discussion, and for present purposes I follow the established dates.
inscriptions, but it remains preliminary since only selected difficult passages were reread and verified from photographs and none of the objects were available for direct examination. Nevertheless, it is hoped that the several improvements proposed here will hold up to scrutiny.

Three Gandharan reliquary inscriptions are of doubtful authenticity. The gold leaf inscription of a brotherhood establishing a stūpa in year 39 of Azes (CKI 455) most clearly appears to be a forgery (Salomon 1999: 144; 2005a: 369) and is not included in the present catalog. The inscription on the “base” belonging to the reliquary lid that bears Ariāśrava’s inscription (no. 23) may also be forgery (see note on the text), and it is not clear whether Budhapriya’s earthenware pot (no. 42) did in fact serve as a reliquary (see chap. 5, n. 15), but giving them the benefit of the doubt, these latter two inscriptions are included.

The structure of the catalog entries is as follows:

Donor(s), year and era of the inscription (where known) [date in Common Era]
Description of the object
Provenance
Last known location and inventory number
(Position of the inscription on the object:) Text of the inscription
(Position of the inscription on the object:) Translation of the inscription
References to main previous publications on the inscription

Number of the inscription in part II (abbreviated CKI) of the *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts* (Baums and Glass, http://gandhari.org/catalog/)

In titles and translations, the spelling of Gandhari proper names has been harmonized so that they occur in the same form throughout the catalog. Sanskritized forms are used only for pan-Indian terms such as the names of months and gods. In the Gandhari texts, double angle brackets ⟨ ⟩ indicate interlinear insertions by the engraver, double curly braces { } deletions by the engraver, square brackets [ ] uncertain readings, parentheses with an asterisk (*) restorations of lost text, angle brackets with an asterisk ⟨* ⟩ restorations of text accidentally omitted by the engraver, simple curly braces { } deletions of text erroneously added by the engraver, question marks ? illegible syllables, and plus signs + lost syllables; in translations, parentheses indicate additional information not in the corresponding Gandhari texts; in Gandhari texts as well as in translations, line numbers are placed in square brackets. References are primarily to earlier editions of the inscriptions and to other publications used in establishing the present texts and translations; as a matter of principle, publications predating Konow 1929a are not included since an exhaustive bibliography and summary of earlier research is available in that work. Complete documentation of all publications relating to Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions forms part of the *Bibliography of Gāndhārī Studies* (Baums and Glass,
http://gandhari.org/bibliography/) and can be consulted there. The inscriptions are here presented in two sections: those that can be placed in reasonably secure chronological sequence, either because they have known dates or donors or are from the sparsely documented early period, and those that can be dated only approximately on paleographical or archaeological grounds.

A. Inscriptions with known dates or donors

1. Unknown year of Menandros [c. 150 BCE]; reestablished by Vijayamitra (II), year 5 [8/7 BCE]²

Steatite cylindrical (fig. 6.1)
Shinkot, Bajaur, Pakistan
Location unknown

2. Falk (2005) argues on the basis of their layout, language and unexpected content that inscriptions A/A¹, A², C1/C2, and D1 on this reliquary are modern forgeries. Some of the features he notes may, however, simply be due to the fact that these inscriptions, if genuine, would be more than one hundred years older than the bulk of preserved reliquary inscriptions. Inscription B would then have been added by the reliquary's first new owner (identified by Salomon [2005a: 382] as Vijayamitra I, predecessor of Viṣṇuvarma), and inscriptions D2/D3 and E, in connection with its final reestablishment (by Vijayamitra II, son of Viṣṇuvarma).

3. The date for the establishment of the relics was apparently changed from the 8th to the 14th day of the month Kārttika, (*relics of the Lord,) [A¹] (*the Śākya sage,) that are endowed with life are established.”

(Outside of lid:) “[A] . . . of the great king Menandros, on the 14th day of the month Kārttika, (*relics of the Lord,) [A¹] (*the Śākya sage,) that are endowed with life are established.”

(Inside of lid:) “[A²] pranāsamel[a] (*śarira bhagava)-
[to] śakunisa

(Outside of lid, added:) [C1] vijaya[mi](*t)[r](*e)[n][a]
[C2] pate pradithavide

(Inside of base, rim:) [D1] ime śarira palugabhuṭa
na sakareṇa tasa śariṇī kalaḍe na śadho na
piṃḍoya ke yi pitri grīṇayaṇa tasa ye patre vapomua

(Inside of base, side:) [B] viyakamitraṇa apracarajasa

(Inside of base, middle:) [D2] vaṣaye pamcamaye 4
1 veśakhaṇa masasa divasa paṃcaviṃaye iyo

[D3] pratiṃhavite vijyamitrāṇa apracarajena
bhagavatu śakunisa samasabhasa śarira

(Underside of base:) [E] viśpilena anāmkaṇeyena
likhiṭe

(Outside of lid:) “[A] . . . munedrasa maharajasa
kaṭiṣa divasa 4 4 4 11³ praṇasa[me][da] (*śarira bhagavato) [A¹] [śa](*śakunisa prati)[thavi]ta

(Inside of lid:) [A²] pranāsamel[a] (*śarira bhagava)-
[to] śakunisa

(Outside of lid, added:) [C1] vijaya[mi](*t)[r](*e)[n][a]
[C2] pate pradithavide

(Inside of base, rim:) [D1] ime śarira palugabhuṭa
na sakareṇa tasa śariṇī kalaḍe na śadho na
piṃḍoya ke yi pitri grīṇayaṇa tasa ye patre vapomua

(Inside of base, side:) [B] viyakamitraṇa apracarajasa

(Inside of base, middle:) [D2] vaṣaye pamcamaye 4
1 veśakhaṇa masasa divasa paṃcaviṃaye iyo

[D3] pratiṃhavite vijyamitrāṇa apracarajena
bhagavatu śakunisa samasabhasa śarira

(Underside of base:) [E] viśpilena anāmkaṇeyena
likhiṭe

(Outside of lid:) “[A] . . . of the great king Menandros, on the 14th day of the month Kārttika,
(*relics of the Lord,) [A¹] (*the Śākya sage,) that are endowed with life are established.”

(Inside of lid:) “[A²] (*Relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage, that are endowed with life.”

(Outside of lid, added:) “[C1] By Vijayamitra (II)
[C2] (this) bowl is established.”

(Inside of base, rim:) “[D1] These relics, having become broken, are not treated with respect. tasa
śariṇī after (some) time. Nobody provides the
funerary ritual nor food and water to the ancestors. The bowl that belongs to it is barely covered.”
(Inside of base, side:) “[B] Of Vijayamitra (I), king of Apraca.”
(Inside of base, middle:) “[D2] In the fifth—5th—year, on the twenty-fifth day of the month Vaiśākha, this [D3] relic of the Śākya sage, the completely enlightened one, is established by Vijayamitra, king of Apraca.”
(Underside of base:) “[E] Written by Viśpila, the anankaios.”

Fig. 6.1. Portion of the Shinkot inscriptions, unknown year of Menandros (no. 1)
Cylindrical steatite container
Location unknown

CKI 176

4. Cf. the note on *amaca* in inscription no. 30.
2. *Gomitra, year 12*
Stone relic-chamber slab
Provenance unknown
Hirayama Ikuo Silk Road Museum, Hokuto, Japan 105111

gomitrena śaṃaṇeṇa [4] dhamakasikena ime
śarira pradi[5]ṭhaviḍa tasa bhagavadu śakam[u]-
ma[7](*haṣamaṇasa) [sava]sapahiḍas(*u)[kha]-
(*ya)

(Inside of slab:) “[1] . . . [2] and in the current
twelfth year . . . [3] by the monk Gomitra, the
great sage who has attained . . . [4] the reciter of
the dharma, [5] are established these relics of that
Lord, the Śākya sage, [6] the highest man, the
chief god of the gods, [7] the great monk, for the
benefit and happiness of all beings.”

Sadakata 2003; Tanabe 2007: 227, 297; Salomon
2009b
CKI 464

---

5. Paleographically not later than the first century BCE and
possibly as old as the middle of the second century BCE. “Twelfth
year” most likely refers to the reign of an unknown king.

6. Paleographically not later than the middle of the first
suggested that Theodotos and Menandros (no. 1) might have
been contemporaries.

3. *Theodotos*
Steatite miniature stūpa (figs. 5.8, 5.9)
Swat, Pakistan
Lahore Museum, Lahore, Pakistan G 344

(Outside of base:) the[u]dutena meridarkha
pratiḥavīḍa ime śarira śakamunīsa bhagavato
bahujaṇaḥ[ita]ye

(Outside of base:) “By Theodotos, the meridarch,9
are established these relics of the Śākya sage, the
Lord, for the benefit of many people.”

Konow 1929a: 1–4; Konow 1939–40: 639–40;
Sircar 1965: 111; Ghosal 1981b; Tsukamoto 1996–
98: 1001–2
CKI 32

4. *Unknown meridarch*
Copper sheet
Taxila, Pakistan
Indian Museum, Kolkata, India

---

7. Konow (1929a: 2) read *theudorena* (Greek Θεόδωρος);
Salomon (above, p. 198) improves the reading to the[u]dutena
(Greek Θεόδωτος).

8. Konow (1929a: 4) read -stitiye and translated “for the
purpose of security”; Salomon (above, p. 199) suggests that the
engraver, though stumbling on the first two akṣaras, intended
hitaye.

9. Greek μεριδάρχης, “governor of a district or province”
(Liddell and Scott 1940 s.v.).

10. Paleographically datable to the second half of the first
century BCE (Konow 1929a: 4; Fussman 1994: 26) or later
(Konow 1939–40: 640).

“... by the meridarch together with his wife is established (this) stūpa, in honor of mother and father (and) for the highest reward.”

CKI 33

5. Loṇa

Schist lid
Provenance unknown
Private collection

(Inside of lid:) kumarasa viṣuvarmasa [a]teuria loṇa grahavadi[dhita] ime śarira pratiḥaveti sarva budha puyaḥa atitaṇagatapracupaṇa praceg-

11. Konow (1929a: 5) read meri[da]khenā with da < dra, itself presumably < dar by “Dardic metathesis.” The latter would, however, not be expected in a loanword such as meridarkha, and a further development to d is also not typical of (orthographic) dr that arose from Dardic metathesis. Fussman (1994: 20, 26) read merilukhenā and questioned the identity of the word with the Greek title. Konow’s reproduction does, however, allow reading meri[a]khenā, the word is reproduced as such in the eye copy in Cunningham 1871: 125, and the form without d is now also attested in Nāgānada’s inscription no. 6, l. B2, meriakh[sa]; in Senuvarma’s inscription no. 24, l. 14, meriakhena; and in Utara’s inscription no. 9, l. 3, meriakhomata.

12. See the note on inscription no. 3.

13. This reliquary must have been established several years before Vijayamitra II succeeded his father, Viṣuvarma (in the year 12/11 BCE, as shown by no. 13), since Viṣuvarma himself is still called a prince in the inscription. The name of the ruling king at the time is not known, but it might have been the (hypothetical) Vijayamitra I who added inscription B to the Shinkot reliquary (no. 1).

14. Salomon (1995a: 27) read loṇagrahavadi dho (or co) ta (or kha) and translated “Dhota [ . . .] a householder of (?) Loṇa.” But the photographs used for Salomon’s edition also allow reading [dhita] “daughter” and taking Loṇa as the name of the donor, which reduces the number of unknown proper names from two to one and is thus preferable on principle. Another donation by a lady from the women’s quarters (amteuriae), of Viṣuvarma’s son Vijayamitra II, is attested some thirty-five years later in Prahodi’s
budha puyaïta bhaga[va] to šavaša puyaïta braña saha[m]pati puyaïta šakro de[va]ṇa idro puyaïta catvaro ma[ha]raya puyaïta sarvaASTERISK-TERM sarvaASTERISK-TERM (Inside of lid:) “A (lady) of the women’s quarters of prince Viśuvarma, Loṇa, daughter of a householder, establishes these relics. All buddhas are honored; past, future, and present solitary buddhas are honored; the disciples of the Lord are honored; Brahman Sahāṃpati is honored; Śakra, ruler of the gods, is honored; the four great kings are honored; all beings are honored.”

Salomon 1995a; Mukherjee 1997: 143–44; Salomon 2005a: 360, 380, 382, 385

CKI 247

6. Ṇagaṇaḏa, year 50 or 60 (of Azes) [8/7 BCE or 2/3 CE]

Schist spherical

Dir, Pakistan

Private collection


(Outside of base:) [C1] mahatavipraheṇasa śarira padiṭhavima [C2] saba budha puyaïta Dharmaguptin saga [dana]

(Inside of lid:) “[A1] In the 50th [or 60th] year, on the 24th day of the month Kārttika, in the reign of Vijayamitra (II), [A2] king of Apraca, under the constellation Hasta, on this day [A3] Ṇagaṇaḏa.”

(Outside of lid:) “[B2] On this day Ṇagaṇaḏa, wife of the meridarch Taravia, [B1] establishes a stūpa at jalo + + + (thinking,) ‘Of the one who has abandoned greatness.’”

(Outside of base:) “[C1] ‘Of the one who has abandoned greatness we establish relics.’ [C2] All buddhas are honored. Gift to the Dharmaguptin community.”


CKI 454

7. Saṃgharakṣita, year 60 (of Azes) [2/3 CE]

Schist cylindrical (fig. 5.3)

Provenance unknown

Private collection

(Outside of base:) saṃ 20 20 20 khsaṃdikasa 10 4 1 saṃgharaksitena śirakaputreṇa śarirae pratistavite svabudhança puyaे

inscription no. 19, and the donor of inscription no. 29, Cadrabhi, is likewise distinguished as the daughter of a householder (dhrammassa grahavatisa dhita).
(Outside of base:) “In the year 60, on the 15th of Ksandikos, by Saṃgharakṣita, son of Śiraka, a relic is established in honor of all buddhas.”

Salomon 2000: 55–59
CKI 403

8. Imdravarma (I) with others, year 63 of Azes [5/6 CE]
Schist spherical (fig. 5.7)
Bajaur, Pakistan
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA
1987.142.71a, b

(Outside of body:) [3] samvatsarae tresatḥīmāe 20 20
20 1 1 1 maharayasa ayasa atidasa kartiasa masasa

15. Bailey’s (1978: 10) suggestion that cetrike is derived from citra, “excellent, distinguished,” and should be translated as “auspicious” is followed with some hesitation by Salomon (1982: 60) and Salomon and Schopen (1984: 109) (reading cetrike kṣene), whereas Fussman (1980b: 3–4) reads and translates cetripekṣeṇa, “par cette quinzaine brillante” (taking cetri as citra and pkeṣeṇa as pakteṣa). The third akṣara of the phrase is, however, clearly ke (as pointed out by Salomon and Schopen 1984: 109), and cetrike ks[aa][e] thus seems to be the best reading. As for the interpretation of this phrase, the best approach may be to take cetrika as the regular Gandhari equivalent of Sanskrit caitrika, which according to Pāṇini 4.2.23 (Böhtlingk 1887) is an alternative form of caitra, “related to the constellation Citrā; the month Caitra.” The intended meaning may then be that the preceding date is to be interpreted according to the system in which the year starts with the month Caitra rather than that in which it starts with Kārttika, the same month in which the relic establishment in question took place, which may have prompted this specification. If this interpretation is correct, it would provide proof that already in the first century of its existence, the Azes/Vikrama system of dating operated with these two variants known from later and modern sources (see Salomon 1998: 182).

16. The name should presumably be read rukhuṇaka, but the e mātrā is not clearly visible in the available images. Falk (1998: 95) correctly identified the title as jī(va)putra but read rukhuṇaka ajuputra with “inverted position of vowel signs” in the second word, not realizing that a has to be part of the instrumental ending of the name and that the title is here given in its shorter form jiputra (for which cf. Śatruleka’s inscription no. 17, l. 5, rukhuṇaka jiputra).

17. The name of Imdravarmā’s aunt probably corresponds to Sanskrit Bhagadattā. In the sixth to eighth centuries, the Palola Śāhis of the Gilgit region claimed to be descended from a “Bhagadatta line” (bhagadatta-vanśa, bhagadatta-anvya; von Hinüber 2004: 85–99, with further reference to a certainly unrelated Bhagadatta line in seventh-century Assam). Bhagadatta also occurs as the name of a prince in the Mahābhārata (Sörensen 1904 s.v.).
(Outside of body:) “[3] In the sixty-third—63rd—year of the late great king Azes, on the sixteenth day of the month Kārttika, at this moment (according to) Caitrika (reckoning) Prince Iṃdravarma (I), son of the king of Apraca (Viṣuvarma), [4] establishes these relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage, in a secure, deep, previously unestablished place. He produces Brahman merit together with his mother, Rukhuṇaka, who has a living son (Vijayamitra II), the wife of the king of Apraca (Viṣuvarma); [5] together with his maternal uncle Ramaka; together with his maternal uncle’s wife Daṣaka; together with his sisters and wife, Vasavadata, Mahaveda, and Nika, and the lady of the house, Utara; [6] and in honor of his father, Viṣuvarma, king of Apraca. [7] His brother Vaga, the general, is honored, and Vijayamitra (II), king of Apraca. His mother’s sister Bhaïdata is honored.

(Outside of lid:) “[1] And these relics, from a Maurya period stūpa, on which a miracle has been performed, are established in a secure(?), safe, central(?) establishment. [2] visia fifty.”


9. Utara with Iṃdravarma (I)
Silver sheet (found in schist elliptical container)
Bajaur, Pakistan
Private collection

[1] [sa]va budha puyaïta aditaanagatapracupaña
[sa]va pracega budha puyaïta sarvarahamta puyaïta
utura (*kuma)[2][ra]bhaya sadha imdrvarmena
pupidrio uṣaṃveo puyoai(*ta) meriakhomata śreṭha
puyoïta śpaśuro viṣu(*varmo) [4] apacarayo
puyoïta jivaputra rukhunaka puyoïta [va]go18
[stra]teo puyoïta apacaraya vi(*jaya)[5]mitr[o]
puyoïta dhrama[s]eno śamano ṇaveamio puyoïta

“[1] All buddhas are honored, past, future, and present. All solitary buddhas are honored. All saints are honored. Utara, [2] wife of the prince (Iṃdravarma I), together with Prince Iṃdravarma (I) establishes relics of the Lord. A stone pillar is set up. . . a. sadaḍha ujimda . . . [3] Utaraüta,
Pupidria, (and) Uṣaṃvea are honored. Śreṭha, mother of the meridarch,19 is honored. (Her)
father-in-law Viṣuvarma, [4] king of Apraca, is honored. Rukhuṇaka, who has a living son, is honored. The general Vaga is honored.

18. Salomon (1997a: 184) read /a\go but now (personal communication) prefers /va\go. The name is possibly related to vagamarega in inscription nos. 43 and 44.
19. See the note on inscription no. 3.
[5] Vijayamitra (II), king of Apraca, is honored. The monk Dhramasena, the superintendent of construction, is honored.”

Salomon 1997a; Salomon 2005a: 381, 385

CKI 265

10. Utara

Schist cylindrical (letters inlaid with gold) (fig. 5.1)
Bajaur, Pakistan
Hirayama Ikuo Silk Road Museum, Hokuto, Japan

100156

(Outside of lid:) “Utara, wife of the general (Imdravarma I), establishes this stūpa in a previously unestablished place, in the Tramaṇa ospa. All buddhas are honored, past and future; the solitary buddhas are honored; the saints are honored.”


CKI 255

11. Ajidaseṇa, year 4²⁰

Gold sheet (found in schist spherical container) (fig. 3.10)
Mata, Swat, Pakistan
Hirayama Ikuo Silk Road Museum, Hokuto, Japan

101740

20. Although the three known inscriptions of the royal house of Oḍi are dated only by regnal years (no. 11: year 4 of Ajidaseṇa; no. 22: year 5 of Varmasena; no. 24: year 14 of Senavarma), it is possible to calculate approximate absolute dates for their production. The inscription of Senavarma (no. 24, l. 8) refers to Kujula Kadphises (kuyulakataphśpā) as “great king, chief king of kings” (maharayarayatiraya) and must therefore have been composed during this Kusāṇa ruler’s reign, sometime between 40 and 90 or 95 CE (Errington and Curtis 2007: 54; Bopearachchi 2008: 52). An earlier, rather than later, point within this time span is suggested by two possible (though by no means certain) identifications. Suhasoma, the anankaios of Senavarma in no. 24, l. 9, may be the same person as Suhasoma, the co-donor in the earthenware pot inscription CKI 369 associated with the British Library collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts, which is likely to belong to the middle of the first century CE (Salomon 1999: 150, 152–53). If this is the case, it would lend support to the possibility that this manuscript collection originated in Swat (Nasim Khan and Sohail Khan 2004: 9) rather than, according to a hearsay report, in Hadda (Sadakata 1996: 311). A second possible identification concerns Vasavadata, wife of Suhasoma and main donor in the earthenware pot inscription CKI 369, who may be the same person as Vasavadata, the sister of Imdravarma I in no. 8 (Salomon 1999: 152–53, 2005a: 385). The two firm dates that we have for Imdravarma I are 5/6 CE (no. 8) and 15/16 CE (no. 13). Vasavadata is mentioned as his sister in 5/6 CE, when he was still a prince (kumara), but she is not mentioned in 15/16 CE, when he had become general (strategos). If we therefore assume that she became the wife of Suhasoma just before the latter date, at a young age of about fifteen years, then she would have been forty years old in 40 CE (the earliest possible date for the Senavarma inscription) and, less likely, sixty-five years old in 65 CE (in the middle of the possible date range for the inscription). Both proposed identifica-
[1] the son of King Vijidasena, the fortress master, Ajidasena, king of Odi, navha master, he honors all buddhas, past, future, and present, honors all solitary buddhas, past, future, and present, honors all disciples of the Lord, honors mother and father, honors all who deserve honor, and

The Gandharan reliquary inscriptions seemed preferable for purposes of this catalog to treating them in an entirely separate section.

21. The overall construction of the sentence is in the active voice, with a series of gerunds (puyaïta) followed by the main verb pratiṭhaveti. The titles odiraja and navhapati should therefore be in the nominative case, just like the preceding p(*u)tre ajidasena. It is possible that a scribe involved in the preparation of this inscription had the text ajidasena odiraja navhapati sa saba budha puyaïta . . . pratiṭhaveti, with a nominative singular demonstrative pronoun sa following the name and titles (cf. the inscription of Ajidasena’s ancestor Vasuseña, as quoted inside Senavarma’s inscription no. 24, l. 3: vasuseña odiraya ismahokulade se imo ekaüdo pratiṭhaveti, and maybe Vagamarega’s inscription no. 43, l. 1: kamagulyaputravagaramega sa . . . bhagavadha śakyamune sarira paritḥaveti), but that he wrongly interpreted navhapatisa as an agentive genitive and the first puyaïta as a past participle, prompting him to add another genitive ending to odiraja after the words p(*u)tre ajidasena had already been written.


22. Fussman (1986: 2) interpreted this word as a compound of śaka and viraja (= Old Indo-Aryan viraja), translating “exempt de passion parmi les Śākya.” The sequence of epithets bhagavān śākyamuniḥ śākyādhirājaḥ is, however, well attested in Sanskrit Buddhist texts: Saṅgha bheda vastu II 67.13–14 (Gnoli 1977–78), Divyāvadāna 193.9 (Cowell and Neil 1886), and Smaller Sukhāvatīvyūha 99.15–16 (Müller and Nanjio 1883); and an extended version (bhagavantaṃ tathāgatam arhantam samyaksambuddham śākyamunim śākyādhirājom) occurs in Abhidharmakośavyākhyā 376.19–20 (Wogihara 1932–36). The Gandhari word in question is therefore best understood as a compound of śaka and aviraja, the latter being a phonetic spelling of abhiraja with the common prefix variant abhi- for adhi- (on which see, e.g., Glass 2007: 167–68). While a compound *sakkābhiraja is not attested in Pali, the form abhiraja with abhi- does occur in canonical texts as part of the compound rājabhiraja (Suttanipāta 553 = Majjhimanikāya II 146 = Theragāthā 823; Jātaka IV 309.15, V 322.22).
establishes these relics [4] of the Tathāgata, the Lord, the saint, the completely enlightened one, the Śākya sage, chief king of the Śākyas, [5] perfect in knowledge and conduct, in a previously unestablished place of the earth, in Tira, [6] in the great stūpa, in the southern part. This now may serve for the elimination of all suffering, for nirvana. [7] In the fourth—4th—year, on the tenth—10th—day of the month Āṣāḍha.”


12. Patika, year 78 of Maues
Copper sheet (fig. 6.3) Taxila, Pakistan
British Museum, London, UK 1967,1018.5

(.Recto:) [1] [saṃva]tśaraye aṭhasatatimae 20 20 20
10 4 4 maharayasa mahamtasa mogasa pa[ne]-
masa masasa divase paṃcame 4 1 etaye purvaye
kṣaha[ra]t[sa] [2] [cukhsa]sa ca kṣatrapasa liako
kusuluko nama tasa [pu]tro pat[ī]ko takhaśilaye
nagare utareṇa pracu deśo kṣema nama atra
[3] (*de)še patiko apratiṭhavita bhagavata śakam-
muṇisa śariraṃ (*pra)ṭiḥaveti [saṃhga]ramaṇ ca
sarvabudhana puyae matapitaram puyayaṃ(*o)

23. The wording of the date in this inscription is ambiguous: it could refer either to year 78 of an otherwise unknown era established by Maues, or to year 78 of an unknown era (or, possibly, of the Greek era) that fell in the reign of Maues. Since the reign of Maues is assumed to have begun around 80 BCE (Cribb) or between 78 and 58 BCE (Falk), Patika's inscription would date to between 1 and 20 CE under the former assumption (followed here), or either 108/107 BCE (assuming the Greek era and a very early date for Maues) or between 80 and 50 BCE (both of which seem too early). See Salomon 2005a: 371–73 for a fuller discussion and further references.
[4] [kṣatrapa]saputradarasa ayubalavardhi[e]
bhratara sarva ca [ṇatigabāṃḍha]vasa ca
puyayaṃto mahādanapatipatikasa ja uva[ja]e
[5] rohinimitrēṇa ya ima[m]i saṃgharame
navakamika
(Verso:) patikasa kṣatrapa liaka

( Recto:) “[1] In the seventy-eighth—78th—year of
the great king, the great Maues, on the fifth—
5th—day of the month Panemos, on this first
(lunar day), Patika, the son of the kṣaharata
[2] and governor of Cukhsa—called Liaka
Kusuluka—establishes in the city of Takṣaśilā—
the northeastern area is called Kṣema—in [3] this
area Patika (establishes) an unestablished relic
of the Lord, the Śākya sage, and a monastery in
honor of all buddhas, honoring mother and father,

[4] for the increase of lifespan and strength
of the governor with son(s) and wife, honoring
(his) brothers and all relatives and kinsmen, and
the teacher of the great donation master Patika.
[5] With Rohiṇimitra, who is the superintendent
of construction in this monastery.”
(Verso:) “For Patika the governor Liaka.”

Konow 1929a: 23–29; F. W. Thomas 1931: 6, 10, 15;
Konow 1932: 953; Brough 1962: 61; Sircar 1965:
124–25; Fussman 1989: 455–56; Tsukamoto 1996–98:
1006–8; Cribb 1999: 196; Falk 2002: 88; Salomon
2005a: 370–73

CKI 46

13. Rukhunā, year 27 of Vijayamitra (II), 73 of Azes
and 201 of the Greeks [15/16 CE]
Schist spherical
Bajaur, Pakistan
Private collection

(Inside of lid:) vaṣaye sataviśaye 20 4 1 1 1 iṣparasa
vijayamitrāsa apacarajasa anuṣastiye ye vucati
ayasa vaṣaye tresa(*ta)timae 25 20 20 10 1 1 1
yoṣaṇa vaṣaye ekaduṣatimaye 2 100 1 śravanaṣa
masasa divasaye athamaye iṣa divasaṃmi prati-
ṭhavidu thuve rukhunaye apacarajabharyae vijaya-

24. This word was reconstructed as an instrumental uva[za]e(*na) by F. W. Thomas (1931: 6), followed by Konow (1932:
953; 1936: 530–31), and as uva[ja]e(*na) by Fussman (1989:
455–56). All of them identified this teacher of Patika with
Rohiṇimitra, the superintendent of construction, in the following
line. This ignored, however, Konow’s earlier observation (1929a:
24, 28) that line 5 had been added subsequently to the main part
of this inscription, just as the line mentioning the superintendent
of construction in Lala’s inscription (no. 37) is a subsequent
addition. It seems preferable, therefore, to interpret uva[zaj]e as
an accusative and connect it with the preceding as an additional
object of puyayamto, making Patika’s teacher and the superinten-
dent of construction two separate persons. As originally suggested
by Konow, both in this inscription and in Lala’s the superinten-
dents added their own footnotes to the main text in order to be
associated with the merit of the relic establishment.

25. The reading trisac(*ta)timae in Salomon 2005a: 363 is a
misprint (Salomon, personal communication). I have further
shown (2006: 37) that tre- may be the regular form of “three” in
compound with multiples of ten.
mitreṇa apracarajena imdravarmena strategeṇa sabharyarehi sakumarehi

(Inside of lid:) “In the twenty-seventh—27th—year in the rule of Lord Vijayamitra (II), king of Apraca, in the seventy-third—73rd—year that is called ‘of Azes,’ in the two-hundred-and-first—201st—year of the Greeks, on the eighth day of the month Śrāvaṇa, on that day a stūpa is established by Rukhuṇa, wife of the (former) king of Apraca (Viṣ̄uvarma), by Vijayamitra (II), king of Apraca, (and) by general Iṃdravarma (I), together with their wives and sons.”

Salomon 2005a; MacDowall 2007; Jakobsson 2009

14. Ramaka, year 74 of Azes [16/17 CE]
Stone relic-chamber slab (fig. 6.4)
Bajaur, Pakistan
Location unknown

(Inner side of slab:) [1] saṃvatsaraya codusatimae
20 20 20 10 4 maharayasa [2] mahatasa ayasa
vurtakalasa aśpa[i]sa26 [3] masasa divasaṃmiṃ

26. Fussman (1980b: 6) read aśpa[i]sa, but his plate allows the reading aśpa[i]šusa, which is closer to the expected Gandhari form aśpa[i]usa (so in the donative stone inscription CKI 116; Fussman 1980b: 18) < Old Indo-Aryan āśvayuj-; for intervocalic i instead of y, see also dukhadaīae from -dāyīya in line 15 (Salomon 2000: 65–66) and šaīa < šayyām in verse 37b of the British Library Gandhari version of the Anavatapta-gathā (Salomon 2008).

[6] pratiṭhaveti bhagavato śariram ka[i]hakami
ka[7]laretramim sarvabadhaṇa sarvapraceśem-
budha[8]ṇe puyae matipidu bharyyae putrana maha-
[9]vermasa mahimdrasas puyee s[u]kaṃkaśpa[pa]-
so[10]ṇa bharyae kṣatra[pa] + + + + muṇatrasa
kṣatra[11]ṇa yola + + + + + puyae savasa-
kimatrae bhod[14]e samudayapra(*)hāṇae28
magabhavaṇae nir[o]ṣa(*)kṣ[i](*)e29
[15] dukhadaīae

(Inner side of slab:) “[1] In the seventy-fourth—74th—year of the great king, [2] the great Azes, whose
mātra of नि in combination with the upper-left part of the preceding न. The vowel mātrā of the following रो is faint but visible so that the expected reading निरोशा is secure. The identity of the second part of the compound is less clear: Fussman’s identifications of a base consonant क्ष and an अक्षरा e seem correct, but the spacing suggests that another अक्षरा, mostly obliterated and crossed by the vertical line marking the left border of the main text area, intervened between these two. A solution is suggested by two Gandhari commentaries in the British Library collection, which, in enumerations of the four noble truths, refer to निरोश-सक्ष्य (Saṅgītisūtra commentary, British Library fragment 15, frame 31 verso, seventh line of the vimuktyāyatana section) and निरोशाक्ष्य (verse commentary [Baums 2009, scroll 13, line 70], with the same apparent haplography as in the inscription).

[14] For the abandoning of the origin (of suffering), for the development of the path, for the realization of cessation, [15] for the elimination of suffering.”


CKI 251

15. Ramaka and Uḍita32

Schist ovoid container (fig. 3.44)
Bajaur, Pakistan
Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, USA 1987.142.70a, b

(Inside of lid:) [1] ramakaṣa mahaśravaputraṣa daṇamukhe
(Outside of base:) [2] ramakasa maha śrava putrasa kaṃti grama vaṣṭa vaśa io śarīra uḍiteṇa ime śarīra
[3] pratiṭhavida ye sava puyaraḥa puyaïda

(Inside of lid:) “[1] Donation of Ramaka, son of Mahāśrava.”
(Outside of base:) “[2] This relic is (given) by Ramaka, son of Mahāśrava, resident of the village Kaṃṭi. Uḍita33 [3] establishes these relics. All those who deserve honor are honored.”

30. Fussman (1980b: 7) translated “ici, à Kamikalaretra,” combining the uncertain first ka with the preceding to give either an otherwise-unattested compound, Sanskrit śarīrāṅka, literally “body part,” or a derivative, śarīraka, in “graphie fleurie.” But both of these phrasings are phonetically difficult and do not occur in any other reliquary inscription. Taken together with the fact that [i]ha is unlikely to correspond to Sanskrit iha since the regular Gandhari form of this adverb is iśa, it seems preferable to interpret simple śariram as the accusative object of pratiṭhaveti, followed by not one but two words, possibly place-names, with the locative ending -ami(m).

31. It is possible that this damaged phrase contains the word śpasa, “sister” (instead of śpa[p]a), cf. nos. 8 and 22. It is less certain whether kaṇika can be interpreted as Sanskrit kanyakā, “young girl, daughter,” or the equivalent of Sanskrit kaṇīyasī, “younger sister, daughter” (Salomon, personal communication). The expected Gandhari reflex of the former would be *kaṇaka (historical spelling) or *kaṇea (phonetic spelling) and that of the latter would be *kaṇīya, but it is not clear whether Gandhari had an independent reflex of Sanskrit kaṇīyasī, which in Pali merged with kaṇā.

32. This relic container was found in association with the relic-chamber slab of no. 14.

33. While this word appears to be a personal name in the context of the present inscription, one should also consider a possible connection with the unclear expression aodito (thubu) in the Chilas rock inscriptions CKI 353 and CKI 356.
16. Year 76 of Azes [18/19 CE]

Stone relic-chamber slab
Swat, Pakistan
Ryukoku Museum, Kyoto, Japan

[1] savatśaraye ṣa satadimaye 20 20 20 10 4 (*1 1)
[2] ayasa ka[l]agadasa teśasa masasa (*di)[3][va-
asalye navamaye 4 4 1 iś[a] (*divasami) (4) ++
[p][*r][a]dīṭhaveti ś[ari](*ra) . . .

“[1] In the seventy-sixth—76th—year [2] of Azes,
who has died, on the ninth—9th—day of the month
Tiṣya, on this (*day) . . . [4] establish relics . . .”

Falk 2010: 13–16

17. Śatruleka, year 77 of Azes [19/20 CE]

Steatite ovoid cointainer (fig. 3.45)
Bajaur, Pakistan
Museum für Asiatische Kunst, Berlin, Germany
I 5892

(Outside base:) [1] savatsaraye satasa{sa}tatimaye
maharajasa ayasa vurtakalasa śavaṇasa masasa
divaseye catuviśaye 20 4 śatrulekena kṣatrayena
subhutikaputreṇa apracarajabhagineyenā
[2] bhagavato śakamune dhatuve pratiḥavita
apraṭiḥavitapuruṣāṃ pradeśaṃ athayi-
gramāṃ kaśāvīyana bhādamtana parigrāhmāṃ
sarva budhā puyayita sarva pragegasabudha-
rāhantasaṣavaka puyayita sarve [3] pujaraha
puyayita ima dhatuvi pratiḥaviti sadha bhārayi
daviliye putrehi ca imdrasenena menamdrena ca
matapita puyayita bhrada imdase iśparo
stra[5]tego35 gaṃdhara śpami puyayidu rukhuṇaka
jiputra sarva [pu]jaraḥaṃ puyayi[t]a36 imi dhatu
pṛakṣalavati pṛatulaśīṣara

34. The stone slab is broken off at this point, but on the
parallel of the other reliquary inscriptions, it is likely that the
inscription continued with a reference to the Buddha, the names
of the donors (unless they preceded the verb in the very small
gap at the beginning of l. 4), and possibly a listing of the intended
beneficiaries of the relic deposit.

35. This attractive new reading (proposed in Falk 2008b: 105)
is here provisionally adopted in place of earlier deśamihgro

36. Falk (1998: 97) suggests that rukhuṇaka is the subject of
both the finite verb pṛakṣalavati and a preceding gerund that in
his reading is spelled puyayitra but was “pronounced pṛujaitītā.”
This syntactic interpretation would account for the absence of a
conjunction ca linking rukhuṇaka jiputra and sarva [pu]jaraḥaṃ
(Outside base:) “[1] In the seventy-seventh year of the great king Azes, whose time has passed, on the twenty-fourth—24th—day of the month Śrāvaṇa, by Governor Śatruleka, son of Subhutika, nephew of the king of Apraca (Vijayamitra II), [2] relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage, are established in a previously unestablished place, in the village Athayi, in the possession of the Kāśyapīya venerables. All buddhas are honored; all solitary buddhas, saints, and disciples are honored; all [3] who deserve honor are honored. He establishes these relics together with (his) wife Davili and his sons Iṃdrasena and Menandros. Mother and father are honored. Brother Iṃdrasena, Lord Vijayamitra (II), king of Apraca, [4A] [5] (and) General Iṃdravarma (I), master of Gandhara, are honored. Rukhuṇaka, who has a living son (Vijayamitra II), (and) all who deserve honor are honored. Patrulaśiśara washes this relic.”


37. Falk (1998: 94) interprets gaṃdharaśpami as the locative of a compound *gaṃdhara-śpa, in which śpa would be a term for “some rather large area” and possibly related to Sanskrit svu, “property.” It seems more straightforward to take śpami as a nominative singular corresponding to Old Indo-Aryan svāmī, “master,” and as part of the subject of pujayidu. The word in question is attested with added ka-suffix in Aśoka’s Ninth and Eleventh Rock Edicts at Shahbazgarhi (ll. 19 and 24) and Mansehra (ll. 5 and 13) (spamikena), as well as in the pedestal inscription CKI 117 (spamiasa) and in Kharoṣṭhī scroll 19 in the Senior Collection (spamiana). (This solution has now also been adopted in Falk 2008b.)
18. Iṃdragivarman
Schist cylindrical
Bajaur, Pakistan
Hirayama Ikuo Silk Road Museum, Hokuto, Japan
100157


(Outside of base:) “(1) Prince Iṃdragivarman, son of Vijayamitra (II?), king of Apraca, establishes relics in Śpadia in a previously unestablished place. [2] All buddhas are honored.”

Salomon 2003: 51–54; Salomon 2005a: 382, 385

CKI 402

19. Prahodi, year 32 (of Vijayamitra II) [20/21 CE]39
Schist spherical
Bajaur, Pakistan
Ryukoku Museum, Kyoto, Japan

(Outside of lid:) [1] iśparasa viyidamitrasa avacarayasapratihavitaśarirapratihavita [2] vaisayae duatriśae 20 10 1 1 thuvana vakammiśārile nama tasa samadravana tasa amtevase aśorakṣida nama se navakaṃmike40

(Outside of lid:) “[1] By a (lady) of the women’s quarters of the lord Vijayamitra (II), king of Apraca, Prahodi by name, these relics are established [2] in the thirty-second—32nd—year. The superintendent of stūpa construction is called Śirila. (It) is his samadravana. His pupil is called Aśorakṣida. He is a superintendent of construction.”


CKI 359

38. Assuming that Iṃdragivarman was a son of Vijayamitra II (Salomon 2005a: 382), he would have belonged to the same generation as Vijayamitra II’s nephew Śatruleka (Falk 1998: 107).

39. Rukhuṇaka’s inscription (no. 13) shows that the first year of Vijayamitra II’s reign corresponded to 12/11 BCE.

40. Sadakata (1996: 303) divided the words and translated as follows: thuvanavakammiśārilena mantasasamadravanatasamaṃtevase aśorakṣidena masenavakammi; “⟨Le reliquaire a été fabriqué⟩ par Aśorakṣida, intendant de mesure, élève de Śirilenama, intendant de construction du stūpa, samadravanata (?).” Salomon (1997a: 190) suggested reading instead
20. Yasi Kamui; reestablished by Śuḍasa

Stone pillar capital (fig. 6.5)

Mathura, India

British Museum, London, UK (1889,0314.1)


thuvanavakammike śirile nama tasa samadro vana tasa amtevase ašorakṣide nama se navakammika and translating “The superintendent of the construction of stūpas [was] named Śirila. His [disciple] was in turn (vana = Sanskrit punar) Samadra. His [Samadra’s] disciple is named Ašorakṣida (Ašokarakṣita). He is the superintendent of construction [of this stūpa].” While most of these suggestions are clear improvements, it still seems preferable to read samadravana as one word, on the grounds that Gandhari vana is the enclitic form of Sanskrit punar (corresponding to Pali pana, not puno; cf. Brough 1962: §69) and as such should follow the first word of its clause in Salomon’s interpretation (*vana samadro) and that the abrupt construction without any word for “disciple” seems awkward. If, on the other hand, samadravana is understood as an action noun with prefix sam- and suffix -ana- indicating the role of Śirila in the construction of the stūpa or establishment of the relics, then the overall composition of the sentence is balanced: two persons are introduced by name and a statement is made about each of them. The exact interpretation of samadravana remains unclear, but a reexamination of this passage (only part of which is illustrated in Sadakata’s plates) in the original or in good images may help resolve this question and should at the very least make it possible to decide between Sadakata’s reading samadro and Salomon’s conjecture samadro.

41. Patika is referred to as “great governor” and bears the title kusulaa in line G1 of this inscription, whereas he was a simple “governor” and the title kusuluka was associated with his father in Patika’s inscription no. 12, l. 2. I follow Falk (2011: 134) in assuming that approximately ten years have elapsed between the two inscriptions.

42. Śuḍasa’s inscription is arranged around the bodies of the two lion sculptures, in seven registers following the reading direction of the Kharoṣṭhī script when standing in front of the pillar: B (head of right lion); E, M (back and side of right lion); I1a–4 (front of right lion); I1b and J1–2 (front of left lion); KL (side of left lion); F (head of left lion); G and J3 (back of left lion). Refer to Konow 1929a: pl. VI for an illustration of this arrangement.

43. Falk (2011) treats E′ as a later addition without relation to Śuḍasa’s inscription. It would be a suprising coincidence, however, to find the words kamuia and kamuio in close physical proximity to the names of Kharaosta’s daughter Yasi (l. A3) and Kharaosta himself (l. E1) if the latter occurrence was not intended to form part of Śuḍasa’s inscription. Konow took the same view in reading kharaostano yuvaraya kamuio, but kamuio, inserted above the first akṣara of yuvaraya, is better read before yuvaraya, following the usual convention for interlinear insertions in Gandhari manuscripts.

Fig. 6.5. The inscriptions of Yasi Kamui and Šudasa (no. 20)
Stone pillar capital
British Museum 1889,0314.1


44. This grouping of the donors’ names and titles follows Konow 1929a and Falk 2011. At least three alternative arrangements and interpretations are possible: (1) the relic is established by Yasi Nadadiakasa, main wife of Rajula, daughter of Kamui, and mother of Kharaosta (F. W. Thomas 1907–8: 140); (2) it is established by Nadadiakasa, daughter of Yasi Kamui, who is the main wife of Rajula and mother of Kharaosta (Fleet 1907: 1025);
and (also) a stūpa and quarters for the community, [A16] in the possession [A15] of the community of the four directions of the Sarvāstivādas.”


(Bottom:) “[N2] The act of possession [N1] of the teacher Budhila, the city-dweller (and) Sarvāstivāda monk, should be announced to the Mahāsāṃghikas.46 In honor of the whole Saḵastana. [O1] Honor to all buddhas, [O2] honor to the dharma, honor to the community.”

or (3) it is established by Rajula, his main wife Yasi, his daughter Kamui, the young king Kharaosta and his mother Nadadiakasa (reading one name in each line). Under alternative interpretations (1) and (2), Kharaosta would be the son of Yasi and the son (or adopted son) of Rajula. Under alternative interpretation (3), Kharaosta would appear to be the son-in-law of Rajula (and heir apparent through Kamui; see kharaosto ≈kamuio⟩ yuvaraya in l. E1). These three alternative interpretations provide an explanation for the continued reference to Kharaosta as “young king” in Śuḍasa’s inscription by assigning these two rulers to the same generation. On the other hand, Kharaosta refers to his father as Arṭa rather than Rajula in his coins (Salomon 1996a: 440), and the interpretation of Kharaosta as Yasi’s father now receives further support from the corresponding specification “husband–title–name–father” in Loṇa’s inscription no. 5 (kumarasa višvarmasa [a]teuria loṇa grahavadi[dhita]). Under this scenario, two interpretations suggest themselves for the use of yuvaraya in Yasi’s as well as in Śuḍasa’s inscription: (1) Rajula’s marriage to Kharaosta’s daughter Yasi was intended to establish a dynastic alliance but did not result in offspring, leading to the rapid succession of Rajula’s son Śuḍasa from another wife while Yasi’s father, Kharaosta, still remained “heir apparent” to Arṭa; (2) the title yuvaraya could (pace Salomon 1996a: 440–41) be a mainland-Indian interpretation “young king” of a compound with the foreign title reflected in Gandhari yauga- and yauga- (coins of Kujula Kadphises), yaiwa- ( Priavaśa’s inscription no. 28, l. 5; all three extended with the Indian suffix -ka-), and [ya]gu-ramṇa (Kharaosta in Imdravarma’s inscription no. 25) and would thus not refer to the age or succession status of Kharaosta.

45. Falk (2011: 127) translates “the camp Vaijayadinna, which is separated from the Victory-camp by the Bodha-hill,” but it is not clear that viyaakadhavoro can be interpreted as an ablative, and in view of the previous mention of the Bhusa Monastery in lines A13–14, busaparva(*take){?}na is likely to refer to this monastic institution rather than a geographical feature.

46. Falk (2011: 128) translates “must not be offered to the Mahāsāṃghikas,” but the more literal translation of the verb as “announce” yields a satisfactory meaning: the Mahāsāṃghikas were the predominant Buddhist group in Mathura at the time (Falk 2011: 132), and it was therefore particularly important that the new Sarvāstivāda monastery declare its existence to its powerful neighbors.

(Lion necks:) “[H′] Dharma gift [H] in the cave monastery.”


CKI 48

21. Sons of Dhramila, Kumuka, and Dasadija, year 83 of Azes [25/26 CE]; reestablished by Kopśakasa

Stone short cylindrical (fig. 6.6)

Provenance unknown

Private collection

(Outside of lid:) “[1] In the year eighty-three [2] of the great king Azes, whose time has passed, [3] on the fifth—5th—day of the month Āṣāḍha

47. Fussman (1984: 39) read niṣāhīde anṭra ca aparimanaṇada[du[khaṭo] logo ce vanṣaṇa pratranō ido and translated “[. . .] sont (données ?). Et à l'interieur (?), ce don (?) incommensurable . . . les gens ici-bas (?) . . .” The first word is better read niṣēhīt[a] (compare the much narrower do at the end of l. 15) and is in all likelihood the same word form as niṣayeta in ll. 5–6 of Senavarma's inscription (no. 24), with Gandhari palatalization of a and h written for the intervocalic glide and with an expected accusative object (to dhaduve). (The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit form corresponding to this Gandhari word is niśrayivā, and Edgerton [1953 s.v.] notes for Saddharma puṇḍarīka sūtra 335.11 the variant niṣevitvā, which appears to be based on the Gandhari form with palatalized a.) The interpretation of the following is guided by a passage in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (14.20–21; Vaidya 1960): maṣaya sarva-saṁyayā aparimaṇaṇaṇa-dharmakṣaṇaḥ, “I have to liberate all these beings from the immeasurable mass of suffering.” Instead of anṭra I propose to read a[A]h[o] (note the round top of the second akṣara and the thin but clear trace of the o mātrā) with a foot mark on the initial a, referring to the donor of the relics. In light of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā parallel, the following words should then be divided aparimanaṇa du[khaṭo], tentatively reading as for Fussman's [pa]. The next word, mo[d][t][o], is the regular Gandhari form of the Old Indo-Aryan past participle mocitaḥ, “liberated,” and reoccurs with a prefix in the next line. The two syllables following logo are best interpreted as ceva = Old Indo-Aryan caiva, with a foot mark on va. The interpretation of the next two akṣaras remains somewhat unclear: the damaged first akṣara could also be read as [s], but in view of the next clause, which apparently also starts with a demonstrative pronoun referring to the Buddha, whose relics are being established, it seems not unlikely that the word intended here is [t][e]na, “by him.” The last word of this sentence is praḍimoido, with the common suffix variant prati- for pari- in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā passage.


[14] I am liberated from the immeasurable suffering, [15] and what is more, the world is liberated by him. [16] And the great king Kopśakasa establishes these [17] relics of that one [18] in Tramaṇa.”


CKI 266
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22. Ayadata, year 5 of Varmasena
Silver sheet (found in schist ovoid container)
(figs. 3.18, 6.7)
Swat, Pakistan
Hirayama Ikuo Silk Road Museum, Hokuto, Japan
101371

[1] vaṣa 4 1 rayasa varmaseṇasa oḍiraya[sa] ṇabha-
thubo pradīthaveti bhagavado śakamunīsa dhadue
i[ša] tiraye atari ṇagarami sarva (*budha) [p]uyita
[prac](*ega)[sam]budha [3] puyita sarva budha-
śavaka puyita rayo rvarmas(*e)ño puyita ayaseno
kumaro puyi(*ta) + ? [lo]yo [ayida](*se)ño rayo
[4] puyita ṭḥaya[te] madara bhadara śpasa dara ya
puyaīto

“[1] In the 5th year of King Varmasena, king of Oḍi,
nabha master, on the . . . day of Śrāvaṇa, on . . . day
Prince Ayadata . . . establishes . . . [2] dhodo stūpa
relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage, here in Tira, in
the inner city(?). All buddhas are honored; the
solitary buddhas [3] are honored; all disciples
of the buddhas are honored; King Varmasena is
honored; Prince Ayasena is honored; . . . King
Ajidasena [4] is honored; the mothers, brothers,
sister, and wife who remain are honored.”

Salomon 2003: 39–51
CKI 401

23. Ariaśrava, year 98 of Azes(?) [40/41 CE]
Deep-based schist spherical (figs. 3.43, 6.8)
Dir District, Pakistan
Private collection

(Inside of lid:) sarva budha puyaīta sarva praceasa-
budha putaiṭa sarva rahata puyaīta sarva anāgami
puyaïta sa(yi)dagami⁵³ puyaï(ta) sodavaṇa
puyaïta ṣega puyaïta sarva śilavata puyaïta sarva
puyaraha puyaïta sarvasapa puyaïda ariaśrava
siasena[va]ya⁵⁴ sadha putrehi dhramaruyena
dhamaūtena ca śīthakehi⁵⁵ putrehi sadha dhidue
arupraeva labubhayae śīthikehi ca dhiturehi⁵⁶
[yo] sa⁵⁷ bhakava śilaparibhavi(to)⁵⁸ samasipari-
 bhavito vimutiparibhavito vimutiparibhat[o] tasa
bhagavato dhadu pariḥavemi eva pariḥaveataya
eva paricaamṭaya⁵⁹ niṇaṃaprat[i]e bhotu siasena
puyaïda parabha[vi]da vuto

(Inside of base:)⁶⁰ maharayasa mahatasa ayasa
samvatsāraya athaṇavatimaye 20 20 20 20 10 4 4
cesa masa diye paṃcadayeye 10 4 1 gupharasa
bhratuputrasa avakaṣasa rajami imdravarmaputre
stattree āśpavarmame rajami
(Inside of base:)⁶¹ daṇamukho denaṃthishavapraava ??
(Inside of lid:) “All buddhas are honored; all solitary
buddhas are honored; all saints are honored; all
nonreturners are honored; the once-returners are
honored; those who have entered the stream are

53. Sadakata (1996: 308) and Nasim Khan (1997: 26) read
sadagami. See the note on no. 24, l. 8, for the reconstruction of
this word.

54. Sadakata (1996: 308) read siasena phaya and translated
“épouse de Śivasena”; Nasim Khan (1997: 26) read siasenagaya
and translated “family of Śrīyasena.” Neither of the suggested
Sanskrit forms of the name is phonetically possible, and the most
likely equivalent is in fact Śimhasena (see no. 48 for two more
names based on simha). The second part of the compound is a
Gandhari form of bhāryā, “wife,” as correctly recognized by
Sadakata, but with initial vh weakened from intervocalic bh
rather than with ph and unmotivated devoicing.

55. One of the Gandhari commentaries in the British Library
collection (Baums 2009: l. 13.28) also uses śiṭhaka in the
meaning “the rest, the others.”

56. Sadakata (1996: 309) read dhiturehi, and Nasim Khan
(1997: 26) read dhiturehi, but dhiturehi is possible and preferable
in view of the preceding form dhidue.

26) read yosa. The best interpretation seems to be as two separate
words, the relative pronoun yo followed by the demonstrative
pronoun sa, introducing a relative clause and with a correlative in tasa.

58. Emended on the basis of the three following parallel terms.

59. This form corresponds to Sanskrit parityajantyāḥ; cf. the
concluding sentence in Urasaka’s inscription no. 30: atvaṇo
aroγadaksīnāe niṇaṃe hotu a[y]a desamaparīcāga.

60. This part of the inscription was considered a forgery in
Senior 2001: vol. I, 125, and Salomon 2005a: 369. The base on
which it is inscribed appeared to be a modified lid, and the
inscription itself seemed fresh and in a different style from the
genuine inscription on the lid. As regards its content, the conclud-
ing words present syntactical problems (but compare the several
mistakes in the genuine inscription) and the position of the name
of Azes preceding the year is unparalleled (with the exception of
Rukhunaka’s inscription no. 13, which has its own special syntax:
ye vucati ayasa vaṣaye). On the other hand, it can be argued that
a forger who was obviously familiar with reliquary dating
formulae would have avoided such idiosyncracies, and the
form paṃcadayeye with otherwise-attested but rare y for s or ś
also appears genuine. Salomon (personal communication) now
considers it possible that this part of the inscription may not be
a forgery after all.

61. This faint inscription, written above the preceding one,
was first noticed by Nasim Khan (1997: 21). It is unclear whether
it could be genuine even if contrary to current appearances the
base is in fact a modified lid and the inscription bearing the date
is a forgery.
Fig. 6.8. Portion of the inscription of Ariaśrava (no. 23)
Schist lid
Private collection
honored; those in training are honored; all those who are virtuous are honored; all those who deserve honor are honored; all beings are honored.

I, Ariaśrava, wife of Siaseṇa, together with (my) sons Dhramaruya and Dhamāïta (and) the other sons, together with (my) daughter Aruprava, wife of Labu, and the other daughters, establish a relic of that Lord who is pervaded by virtue, pervaded by concentration, pervaded by liberation, pervaded by concentration. May it be for the attainment of nirvana of her who thus establishes (it), who thus donates (it). Siaseṇa is honored. *Parabhavida vuto.*

(Inside of base:) “In the ninety-eighth—98th—year of the great king, the great Azes, on the fifteenth—15th—day of the month Caitra, in the reign of Abdagases, nephew of Gondophares, in the reign (of?) General Aśpavarma, son of Imdravarma (I).”

(Inside of base:) “Donation *denaṇitharvapraava ? ?*”
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24. *Seṇavarma, year 14*

Gold sheet (found in gilded-schist miniature stūpa) (figs. 3.26, 6.9)
Swat, Pakistan
Location unknown

---


62. The reading is *-aṇuśaṇa-, which appears to be a miscopying of *-aṇuśaya-.
Sisamavatisapratipurasa dhatu pra[ti]ṭhavemi ye
Tada tadiśate atmabhavate vayirasaghaṇade
Aṁḍimaśarirate visayuyena pacimaena śarireṇa
Niṣaye[6]ta anūtaravosi apisavudha apisavujita te
dhama tatha dritchya yasa ke aṇe pāṣeati aṇoma
Anāsia te dhama apisavujita savasamgharaṇakṣaye
Sarvaṣajitaramaraṇabhayaviṇavatasa avayidrogati-
kṣayapayosāne kide niṣaṇe sarvajadījaramaraṇaṇasa
tasa dani anuvatae [7] pariṇivudasa ima dhadu
Śilaparibhavita samasipraṇavimuti(śvimuti)-
Nyāṇadraśa(śna)paribhavita63 ime śarireṇa tada-
gadapavadiśaṇivaṇadhathugade ta pratiṭhavemi

Prasamu ce vata bhagavatarahasamasamvudho
dhataragadoṣamokha daśavalavalasamunāgata
catvariveśarayaprata [8] agrodakṣiṇe puyita
praceasavudharahaṇtaṇaṣaṇakaṇaṇamisa(śyi)-
dagami[so]davanisarvaaryapugala64 puyita mata-
pita dukara[ca]ṇa the uzamda jivaputra tiṭhata
Pida ca adhvadida ayidaseṇo oḍiraya puyita
Maharajahatirayakuyulakataph[sp]aputro
Sadaskaṇo devaputro [9] sadha añakaṇa suhaso-

63. These are the five “pure” skandha/khanda (Sanskrit/Pali)
or sampadā (Pali), discussed by Schopen (1987: 204–6, 1999:
296–8) and Radich (2007: 523–70). Since the fifth skandha is
consistently called vimuttiṇāṇadassana in Pali canonical
literature, it is likely not only that in this inscription one vimuti
was omitted by haplography (Schopen 1999: 319) but also that
the last member of the compound should be reconstructed as
draśa(śna). The first three skandha are likewise said to pervade

Fig. 6.9. The inscription of Sennavara (no. 24)
Gold sheet
Location unknown

“[1] He greets with his head the feet of the noble flock, the ascetic flock, the chaste flock, of the twofold community that has assembled, of the guardian of the priadirasata stūpa. Seṇavarma, the lord, king of Oḍi, navha master, announces: this stūpa Ekaūḍa is the donation of me, the kadama, as the heir of the prince that established it, as I transcend the name of my brother Varmaseṅa. When this Ekaūḍa burnt down, then also other [2] great nearby womb stūpas66 of my fathers and grandfathers burnt down. These have been made

the relic in the inscription of the sons of Dhramila, Kumuka, and Dasadija (no. 21, ll. 11–12); and in Ariaśravas inscription (no. 23) the Buddha is pervaded by what appears to be a garbled version of the full set of five.

64. Salomon (1986) and von Hinüber (2003) reconstructed ‐saṅ(ṅ)gādamī‐, apparently on the basis of Pali sakadāgāmin, but the Gandhari form saṭyiđakami is now attested in the British Library Saṅgītisūtra commentary (British Library Fragment 15, frame 30 verso, third line of the anuttarya section).

65. Falk (2003–4: 577) suggests that solite was miscopied for tolite.

66. A womb stūpa is a special kind of stūpa, apparently with reference to the relic installed in it, as suggested by Falk (2003a: 78). Compare further the repeated reference in the third chapter of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (31.10–11, 26–27, 28; 32.13–14, 15; 32.31–33.1; 33.16, 32; 34.15–16, 20; 35.12; 36.11–12; Vaidya 1960) to the construction of sapatratnamaya- tathāgatadhātugarbha- stūpa‐, “stūpas that are wombs for
(whole) by me, Senavarma, and this Ekaṇḍa is completed with a great change of height. Having completed these properly, I continue my efforts. There was a lightning strike in this Ekaṇḍa. A change was made of the stūpa that had been burnt by it. This whole devastation was laid open by me. The root enclosure was thrown out and entered(?) An inscription about the establishment was there: ‘Vasuseṇa, son of Utaraseṇa, king of Oḍi from the Ikṣvāku family, he establishes this Ekaṇḍa.’ Back then there was in the root enclosure by order of the king a relic of the Lord. I, Senavarma, son of Ajidasena, and then, because of (my) birth in the Ikṣvāku royal family, king of Oḍi, having considered everything with (my) heart, everything with (my) mind, having spread some (relics?) because of the ripening (of action), some [4] on purpose widely from the root (a)va, establish this relic of that Lord, the miraculous man, excellent man, elephant; the great caravan leader; who in all respects has reached the attainment of highest control over the factors (of existence) and whose impurities are blown away; dasa; who over many hundreds of thousands of world ages has assembled the roots of good; who has gradually grown; who has destroyed lust, hate, and delusion; [5] who in all respects through meditation has abandoned inclinations, impurities, obstructions, blemishes, and fetters; who through all good factors (of existence) that one should be acquainted with has fulfilled meditation, powers, liberation, concentration, and attainments. He

Tathāgata relics and made of the seven jewels” (presumably referring to the same seven precious substances that are in fact often found deposited inside Gandharan reliquaries; Fussman 1987: 70), and to tathāgatadhātugarbhaṇi caturaśṭī stūpakotisaahasrāṇī, “eight hundred and forty billion stūpas that are wombs for Tathāgata relics” in Samādhirājasūtra 218 (Vaidya 1961). The interpretation of gaha as “womb” (Sanskrit garbha) rather than “chapel” (Sanskrit grha) receives further support from inscription no. 57, (*śa)ṛ[a]jīr[v]aṁ pratīhavedi gavh[r]aṁ (*hubammi), where gavhr a can only be interpreted as corresponding to Sanskrit garbha, “womb,” not to Sanskrit grha, “house.”

67. This seems to refer to the relic chamber, with mulaśaḷe corresponding to Old Indo-Aryan *mūlasālaḥ and avaśīta (for *avaśīta) to Old Indo-Aryan apāśīral, past participle of apāśrayati, “to resort to.” Von Hinüber (2003: 17) read mulaśave ukṣīvita avaśīta and translated “Die *ursprüngliche Reliquie(?)* wurde aufgestellt und *fertig gestellt(?)*” in this passage, but mulaśale, “in der Reliquienkammer(?),” in line 3.

68. It is possible but not certain that we should read mulavato(śa)ḷaṁ “from the root enclosure,” for mulavato.

69. Von Hinüber (2003: 22) Sanskritizes abhiñehi as instrumental singular abhiijayā (expected Gandhari form: abhiinae) but translates it as plural: “durch die Einsichten.” Salomon (2008: 265–6) discusses the form jihitsehi, apparently the instrumental plural of a feminine ā-stem with the ending of the masculine a-stems, supporting von Hinüber’s translation of the form abhiñehi. Syntactically, however, the phrase sarvēhi kuśalehi dhamehi abhiñehi remains difficult under this interpretation, even if one supplies a conjunction ca after abhiñehi. A promising alternative interpretation is suggested by the fact that in Pali dhamma very frequently serves as the patient of abhiñayya (Critical Pāli Dictionary, s.v. abhiñayya), and in Milindapañha 69.18–21 it occurs with the gerundive abhiññeyya in an expression that parallels our inscription: yo sammā paṭipanno abhiññeyya dhamme abhiñjānati...so labhati nibbānam. Therefore, the Gandhari word abhiñehi in our passage is here interpreted as
who at that time supporting himself\(^{70}\) with his last
body—which is separate from his final body, the
corporeality that is of that kind (just described),
the thunderbolt agglomeration—\([6]\) attained the
highest enlightenment and, having attained enlight-
enment, saw these factors (of existence) in such
a way that anybody else can see them without
subtraction or addition and, having been enlight-
ened to these factors, make exhaustion of all
impulses, exhaustion and conclusion of all birth,
aging, death, fear, and falling apart and of wrong
and bad rebirth, an end of all birth, aging, and
death—of that one, \([7]\) who has gone to nirvana
without remainder, I now establish this relic,
pervaded by virtue, pervaded by concentration,
understanding, liberation, and the seeing and
knowledge \(^{*}\) of liberation, this (relic) which
has bodily gone to the nirvana element that is
pravadiśa\(^{71}\) of the Tathāgata. And first indeed is
honored the Lord, the saint, the completely
enlightened one, who has destroyed lust, hate,
and delusion, who is endowed with the power of
the ten powers, who has attained the four confi-
dences, \([8]\) who deserves the best reward. The
solitary buddhas, saints, disciples, nonreturners,
onece-returners, those who have entered the stream,
and all noble persons are honored. Mother and
father, who undertake a difficult practice—Uzaṃda,\(^{72}\)
who has a living son and who is still alive, and
(my) father who passed on, Ajidasena, king of
Oḍi—are honored. Sadaṃkaṇa, son of the great
king, chief king of kings Kujula Kadphises, son

---

70. The form niṣayeta appears to correspond to Buddhist
Hybrid Sanskrit niśrayitā and to nișehit[a] in the inscription
of the sons of Dhramila, Kumuka, and Dasadija (no. 21, l. 13;
see there for further discussion), even though (as noted by von
Hinüber 2003: 25) it here has a dependent instrumental rather
than the expected accusative.

71. The meaning of pravadiśa remains unclear. On the basis
of a Jātaka verse and its commentary, von Hinüber (2003: 26–27)
suggests that diśa corresponds to Pali disā, “region,” as a term
for nirvana, with prava corresponding either irregularly to Old
Indo-Aryan prāpya (the region to be attained by a Tathāgata) or
by emendation to pravara (the best region of the Tathāgata).
One should also consider whether pravadiśa might have been
mis copied for pravadita or pravadiya (the nirvana element
spoken of by the Tathāgata). Finally, the available image shows
a small blob at the lower left of pra that could be interpreted as

---

72. Falk (2003–4: 576) proposes to reanalyze von Hinüber’s
(2003, 28) matapita dukaracara athe uzaṃda, “Die Eltern opfern
sich für ihre Kinder auf. Daher sind Ujhaṃda . . . ,” as matapita
dukaracara[ō] theuzama. In this reading, he takes -cara[ō] as
a nominative dual (Old Indo-Aryan -cārakau), which would be
highly unexpected in Gandhari even in reference to a natural
pair such as mother and father (matapita itself does not carry a
dual ending). On the imperfect analogy of purely Greek names
such as theudata (see inscription no. 3), he suggests taking
theuzama as a mixed name whose prior element is Greek and
whose latter part looks like the frequent Iranian zāda, “son,” but
would have to be another unknown word since here we have a
woman’s name. In view of the difficulties raised by this reinter-
pretation, another solution is adopted here. One of the verse
commentaries among the British Library Kharoṣṭhī fragments
(Baums 2009, l. 9.39) cites the word drokaraṭha- from a canonical
of the gods, [9] together with the \textit{anankaios}\textsuperscript{73} Suhasoma, the \textit{asmanakara}, with his yoke animals and with his army and carriages, together with the \textit{guśurakas} and the \textit{sturakas}, is honored. The brother who passed on, Varmaseṇa, king of Oḍi, and the princes Ajidavarma and Ayaseṇa, who are still alive, are honored. Beginning with King Bhadasenā and up to my great-grandfather Diśasena, all kings of Oḍi, born in the royal family of Ikṣvāku, [10] are honored. The whole retinue is honored. Brahman Sahaṃpati, Śakra, ruler of the gods, the four great kings, the twenty-eight yakṣa generals, (and) Hārīti with her retinue are honored. In brief, starting from the Avīci great hell at one end and upward until the top of existence, whichever beings exist here in between, footless or two-footed or four-footed or many-footed, [11] with form or formless, conscious or unconscious, may it be for the benefit and happiness of all beings. This donation now and this faith and the tranquillity that there is, for what purpose should that be? The teaching to which the Śākya sage, the saint, the completely enlightened one, became enlightened—(which is) the crushing of conceit, the removal of thirst, the destruction of attachment, the cutting of the course (of rebirth), exhaustion of craving, complete [12] fading (of lust), cessation, (which is) calm, advanced, without fever,\textsuperscript{74} unshakable, (which is) health, complete perfection, complete chastity, complete conclusion—in that immortal element may they come to rest, where there will be exhaustion and conclusion of this round (of rebirth) without end or beginning, where all of these feelings will be cool. Who, however, when this stūpa Ekaūḍa [13] is perfectly completed, later burns it, that one—god or human or yakṣa or nāga or suparṇin or gandharva or kumbhāṇda—shall fall into the Avīci great hell with his body. Who, on the other hand, applauds it, may that(?) be for the merit-making and glory of those. The (inscription) about the establishment of the relic was written by Saṃghamitra, son of Lalia, the \textit{anankaios}, and (it) was manufactured [14] by Ṣaḍia, son of Sacaka, the meridarch,\textsuperscript{75} and (it) \textit{ukede} by Batasara, son of Preaputra, the \textit{tirata}. In the fourteenth—14th—year of the lord

\textsuperscript{73} See the note on \textit{amaca} in inscription no. 30.

\textsuperscript{74} Following Salomon 1986: 280, corresponding to Old Indo-Aryan *\textit{ajvara}, with unexplained ending \textit{sa}.

\textsuperscript{75} See the note on inscription no. 3.
Seṇavarma, lasting a thousand years, on the eighth—8th—day of the month Śrāvaṇa. And this gold was weighed by Valia, son of Makaḍaka, the householder.”
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25. Iṃdravarma (II) with wife
Combination of two silver goblets (fig. 5.2)
Provenance unknown
Miho Museum, Shigaraki, Japan

(Underside of base:) nāṃ
(Outside rim of lid:) mahakṣatrapaputrasa [ya]gu-raṃṇa kharayosta [ṣa] 20 4 4 ana 4 ma 2
(Outside rim of lid:) iṃdravarmasā kumarasā sa 20 4 4 dra 1
(Outside rim of base:) iṃdravarmasā kumarasā sa 20 20 1 1 1

(Underside of base:) “nāṃ”
(Outside rim of lid:) “Of the yau king Kharaosta, son of the great governor. 28 staters, 4 dhānaka(s(?), 2 māṣa.”
(Outside rim of lid:) “Of prince Iṃdravarma (II). 28 staters, 1 drachm.”

76. The main donor of this reliquary, Prince Iṃdravarma II, son of Viśpavarma, cannot be identical with Prince (later General) Iṃdravarma I, husband of Utara (see nos. 8, 9, 10, 13, and the possibly spurious second inscription in no. 23), who is also referred to as an honoree in this reliquary. Iṃdravarma II is conjecturally placed two generations (c. fifty years) after Iṃdravarma I, possibly illustrating the same sharing of names between grandfather and grandson as with Vijayamitra II and Vijayamitra III (and maybe Vijayamitra I: Falk 1998: 107; Salomon 2005a: 380–81).
(Outside rim of base:) “Of prince Iṃdravarma (II). 43 staters.”

(Outside body of lid:) “[1] Prince Iṃdravarma (II), son of General Viśpavarma, establishes together with (his) wife these relics in (his) personal stūpa. General Viśpavarma and Śiśireṇa, [2] wife of the general, are honored. Iṃdravasu, (former?) king of Apraca, and Vasumitra, who has a living son (Vijayamitra III), are honored. General Iṃdravarma (I) and Utara, wife of the general, are honored. [3] Vijayamitra (II or III?), (former?) king of Apraca, is honored together with his wife. The community of all relatives is honored. All beings are honored. All beings are brought to nirvana.”

(Outside body of base:) “[1] Prince Iṃdravarma (II), son of General Viśpavarma, establishes together with his wife these relics in (his) personal stūpa. General Viśpavarma and Śiśireṇa, [2] wife of the general, are honored. Iṃdravasu, (former?) king of Apraca, and Vasumitra, who has a living son, are honored. General Iṃdravarma (I) is honored. Utara, [3] wife of the general, is honored. Vijayamitra (II or III?), king of Apraca, is honored together with his wife. The whole community of relatives is honored, and [4] all beings are honored. All beings are brought to nirvana.”

Salomon 1996b; Falk 1998: 103–6; Salomon 2005a: 381–82
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26. Helaiûta, year 121 of Azes [63/64 CE]
Copper sheets
Provenance unknown
Location unknown


“[1] In the one‐hundred‐and‐twenty‐first—121st—year of the great king, the great Azes, whose time has passed, [2] on the thirteenth—13th—day of the month Gorpiados, under the constellation Uttara Proṣṭhapada, [3] at this moment Helaiûta, son of Demetrios, avivage establishes [5] relics of the Lord, the saint, [4] the completely enlightened one, the well‐gone one, the father of the world, the best driver of men who need to be tamed, the teacher of gods and men, [5] the Śākya sage, in (his) personal stūpa, in the [6] possession of the Dharmaguptaka teachers (and) monks, for (his)

77. Wrong historical spelling (and possibly misinterpretation) of logavido, “knower of the world.”
own benefit and happiness, for (his) preparation for nirvana, for the *mosañada* of Maitreya *dhami* . . .”

Falk 2010: 17–19
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27. Unknown donor

Copper sheets
Orakzai, Pakistan
Private collection

[1] . . . kṣatrapasa yodamuṇisa mahipiduse[ṇa]e
+ [kha] + + ṃ ṇa dhisraśiṣada [8] + + + + + sataṇa
puyae samagu + hanasa kha[da]ti . . .


Khan 2002; Falk 2010: 17
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28. Priavaśa, year 126 of Azes [68/69 CE]

Schist box
Provenance unknown
Private collection

(Outside of body:) [1] savatsaraye śaviśavaśaśatimae

---

78. Paleographically first or second century CE (Khan 2002: 154).

---

79. Fussman (1985c: 48–49) considered reading *rajami* but settled on *rakṣami* and translated “pour la protection” because *rajami* seemed to fit neither the general context nor the preceding genitive *yauasa*. On the other hand, one would expect a dative rather than locative to express purpose (cf. the frequent *puyae*, “in honor of”), and the word *rajami* is now attested in Ariaśrava’s inscription no. 23: *gupharasa bhratuputrasa avakāśa rajami imdравaśamapatri statee aṣpavarmam rajami*. Even though some doubt remains about the genuineness of this parallel, on balance the reading *rajami* seems preferable.

80. Miscopied for *priavaśa*.

81. Miscopied for *mahiṣasagaṇa*, itself a variant of expected *mahiṣasagaṇa*.

82. Fussman (1985c: 48–49) interprets this occurrence of *i* and the one in line 14, but not the one in line 11, as the conjunctive particle corresponding to Old Indo-Aryan *ca*. Since the latter occurs in the form *ya* in line 13, however, and since none of the three occurrences of *i* is in the expected enclitic position, it seems preferable to interpret all cases of *i* as short forms of the demonstrative pronoun in either the singular (l. 14) or plural (l. 11; the referent in l. 5 is unclear).
great king . . . relatives and friends [7] vhajao
[16] In the possession of the Mahīśāsaka [17] teachers.”

CKI 331

29. Cadrabhi, year 134 of Azes [76/77 CE]
Copper sheet (found with miniature stūpa [fig. 3.25])
Kalawan, Taxila, Pakistan
National Museum, New Delhi, India
8788 KW 31-289/1

[1] saṃvatšaraye 1 100 20 10 4 ajasa śravaṇasa
masasa divase treviśe 20 1 1 1 imeṇa kṣuṇeṇa
camdrabhi uasia [2] dhraṃmasa grahavatīsa dhita
bhadralasa bhaya chaḍaśilaē śarira praīstaveti
gahathu[3]bami sadha bhraduṇa ṇamdivadhaṇeṇa
grahavatīna sadha putrehi śameṇa saïteṇa ca
dhituṇa ca [4] dhramaē sadha ṣūṣaehi rajae idrae
ya sadha jivanamdiṇa śamanputr[e]ṇa ayariṇe ya
sarva[sval]vaṇa puyaē ṇivanasa pratiae hotu

“[1] In the 134th year of Azes, on the twenty-third—
23rd—day of the month Śrāvana, at this moment
the lay-follower Cadrabhi, daughter [2] of the
householder Dhrama, wife of Bhadravala, estab-
lishes at Chaḍaśila relics in a womb [3] stūpa
together with her brother, the householder
Naḍivaḍhaṇa, together with her sons Śama and
Saïta and her daughter [4] Dhrama, together with
her daughters-in-law Raja and Iṃdra, together
with Jivaṇadi, son of Śama, and in the possession
of the [5] Sarvāstivāda teachers. The kingdom and
town are honored. May it be in honor (and) for the
attainment of nirvana of all beings.”

Konow 1931–32; Konow 1932; Sircar 1965: 131–32;
Ghosal 1981a; Tsukamoto 1996–98: 971–72; Salomon
1998: 269–70; Falk 2003a: 71, 78; Seyfort Ruegg
2005
CKI 172

83. Initial n is unexpected in nati < Old Indo-Aryan jñāti, but
the extended form natiga also occurs in Vagamarega’s inscription
no. 43: natigamitraśambhatigaṇa puyae. Compare further
Urasaka’s inscription no. 30: mitramacaṇṭiṣaloha(*ta)na [pulyae].
In light of Vagamarega’s -sambhatigaṇa, “associates,” it is
tempting to see an equivalent (*sam)vhajao in the following
word (interpreted as a proper name by Fussman 1985c).
30. Urasaka, year 136 of Azes [78/79 CE]
Silver sheet (found with fragments of schist container)
Taxila, Pakistan
National Museum, New Delhi, India 8789 Dh’ 12-65

[1] sa 1 100 20 10 4 1 1 ayasa aṣaḍasa masasa divase
10 4 1 iṣa diva[se pradi]stavita bhagavato dhatu[o]
urasa[sa][2]keṇa [iṃ]tavhriapatraṇa bahaliena ņoaca
ṇagare vastavena tena ime pradistavita bhagavato
dhatuo dhama[3]e tānuvae bosi-
satvagahami maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputrasa
puyae pracagabudhaṇa puyae araha(*tα)ṇa pu[yα]e
sarvasa(*tva)ṇa puyae matapitu puyae mitramaca-
ṇivaṇae hotu a[ya] desamaparicagο85

“[1] In the 136th year of Azes, on the 15th day of the
month Āṣāḍha, on this day relics of the Lord are
established [2] by Urasaka, (one) of the sons of
Iṃtavhria, a Bactrian and resident in the town

Noaca. He establishes these relics of the Lord
[3] in the Dharmarajika (stūpa) in Takṣaśilā in (his)
personal bodhisattva-womb (stūpa) for the reward
of health of the great king, chief king of kings, son
of the gods, the Kuṣāṇa, [4] in honor of all buddhas,
in honor of solitary buddhas, in honor of saints, in
honor of all beings, in honor of mother and father,
in honor of friends, intimates, relatives, [5] and
blood relatives. May this giving of a donation be
for (his) own reward of health and nirvana.”

Konow 1929a: 70–77; Lüders 1940: 22–26; Brough
1962: 82; Harmatta 1964: 18; Sircar 1965: 133–34;
Ghosal 1986; Tsukamoto 1996–98: 1008–9; Falk
2003a: 78; Salomon 2005a: 377

31. Year 139 of Azes [81/82 CE]
Stone spherical
Provenance unknown
François Mandeville, Hong Kong, China

(Outside of body:) sa 1 100 20 10 4 4 1 ayasa
aṣaḍasa{sa} diase 20 1 iṣa divasa pradīṭhavita
bhagavato dhatuu

(Outside of body:) “In the year 139 of Azes, on the
21st day of Āṣāḍha, on this day relics of the Lord
are established.”

Falk 2010: 16

CKI 60

84. Gandhari amaca = Sanskrit amātya here preserves its
Vedic meaning “intimate,” as shown by its position between
mītra and īnati‐salohita. On the way to classical Sanskrit the
meaning had narrowed to “minister” (or, maybe better, “privy
counsel,” German Geheimrat). In the Gandharan context it may
therefore be equivalent to the Greek title anākaya
(ἀναγκαῖος),
“of persons, connected by necessary or natural ties, i.e. related by
blood” (Liddell and Scott 1940, s.v.), that occurs in nos. 1 and 24.

85. The Sanskrit form corresponding to this word is deva-
dharmaparītyāgaḥ; cf. Ariaśrava’s inscription no. 23: eva
parīṭhaṃataya eva paricāṃtaya nivāṇaprati[e] bhotu.
32. **Year 147 (of Azes) [89/90 CE]**
Sandstone box (figs. 3.47, 3.59)
Provenance unknown
Location unknown

(Inside of lid:) [1] vaṣa 1 100 20 20 4 1 1 1 [2]
dhamavadaa[1a]ṭa sadha ku[1b][e]ṇa

(Inside of lid:) “In the 147th year, on the fourteenth
day of Jyaiṣṭha, this is the donation of the lord
dhamavadaaṭa together with his family.”

Falk 2010: 16–17

CKI 536

33. **Saṭaṣaka and Muṃji, year 156 (of Azes) [98/99 CE]**
(reestablished by Aprakhaka, year 172 (of Azes) [114/115 CE])
Steatite spherical
Provenance unknown
Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, UK EA 1995.72

śapamcāiśaṣadama maše ire d⟨*i⟩asa 20 1 1 1
[s]aṭaṣake hirmaaputra muṃji [s]aṭaṣakaputra
thuvam [3] pratiṭhaveti apratiṭhavitapruve sarva-
budhana pujae matapidu pujae budhaṇa bhosi
pravuṇama na agho duho

(Inside of lid:) [4] ime bhag̱avato śarira praṛṭiṭhap̱iśa
savabudhana pujae aprakhakasa heliuphilaputrasa
[5] duesaṭiṣiṣadama gurpiya yaṃbulima maṣa
saste 4 4

(Inside of base:) [6] avinavuliehi

(Outside of lid:) “[1] Donation. [2] In the one-
hundred-and-fifty-sixth year, in the month Aira,
on the 23rd day, Saṭaṣaka, son of Hermaios, (and)
Muṃji, son of Saṭaṣaka, [3] establish a stūpa in a
previously unestablished (place) in honor of all
buddhas, in honor of mother and father. (May)
we attain the enlightenment of the buddhas, not
highest pain.”

86. Falk (2010) took bhaṭarasa as the name of the donor and
read dhamavadaaṭasadhakulaṇa, translating “of Bhaṭṭāra who
belongs to the groups of judges (and) executers.” It seems
preferable to understand bhaṭara in its usual sense of a title. The
following sequence, read by Falk as dhamavadaaṭa, would then
in all likelihood contain the name of the donor and should as such
be in the genitive case. Compound names starting with dhama-
are richly attested, but the last akṣara of the sequence cannot be
read as sa, presenting an unsolved problem. If we provisionally
accept this interpretation, however, then the following sequence
is an instance of the very common pattern of specifying family
members as co-donors in the instrumental case following the
preposition sadha. This also removes the need to introduce the
otherwise-unattested technical terms Sanskrit dharmavāda in the
meaning “judge” and arthasādha.

87. The name of this donor may be related to that of the
honoree Sadaskana in Senavarma’s inscription no. 24, l. 8, and
the reading [S]aṭaṣaka is therefore preferred to the graphically
identical [S]atraṣaka proposed in Falk 2010: 27.
(Inside of lid:) “[4] These relics of the Lord are established in honor of all buddhas by Aprakhaka, son of Heliophilos, [5] in the one-hundred-and-seventy-second (year), in the intercalary (ἐμβόλιμος) month Gorpiaios, after 8 days.”

(Inside of base:) “[6] With the avinavulias.”


34. Khadadata, year 157 (of Azes) [99/100 CE]
Schist wide-mouth spherical
Provenance unknown
Private collection


(Outside of lid:) “[1] In the one-hundred-and-fifty-seventh—157th—year, in the month Prauṣṭhapada, after twenty-seven days, at this moment Khadadata establishes the stūpa built by Utara [2] in the Great Forest (Monastery), in order to honor mother and father, in order to honor all beings, in order to honor Utara.”


35. Utaraya, year 157 (of Azes) [99/100 CE]
Schist miniature stūpa (fig. 5.4)
Hazara District, Pakistan
Asian Art Museum, San Francisco, USA 1999.49

(Base:) saṃbatsara satapamiśa iṣa 1 100 20 20 10 4 1 1 1 mase pr(o)ṭha [1] utaraya bhikhuṇi pradiṭhava[ći] bhaghava[du]tu kharavalamahavane rañe matapitaini puyartha

(Base:) “In the fifty-seventh—157th—year, in the month Prauṣṭhapada, on the 1st (day), the nun Utaraya88 establishes a relic of the Lord in the Kharavala Great Forest Monastery in order to honor mother and father.”

Salomon 1995b: 133–39

36. Year 303 (of the Greeks) [117/118 CE]
Schist miniature stūpa (fig. 5.5)
Kula Dheri, Charsadda, Pakistan
Peshawar Museum, Peshawar, Pakistan 3218


88. The name Utaraya is a variant of Utara, and it is possible that nos. 34 and 35 refer to the same person (cf. the use of Rukhuṇaka in nos. 8, 9, and 17 but Rukhuṇa in no. 13).
sarvabudhana puyae sarvarahataṇa puyaṃ
puyae sarvarahatana puyaṃ

(Outside of base:) [4] putradarasa puyae mitrañadisalohidaṇa puyaṃ maharayasa grama vamisa
avakhazadasa puyae kṣatravasa

(Outside of base:) “[1] In the 303rd year, on the 8th
day of the month Śrāvaṇa, macayemaṇa89 establishes relics of the Lord in his personal stūpa in
the monastery,”

(Inside of base:) “[2] in Avaśāūra. In honor of mother
and father, in honor of all buddhas, [3] in honor of
solitary buddhas, in honor of all saints,”

(Outside of base:) “[4] in honor of (his) son(s) and
wife, in honor of friends, relatives, and blood
relatives, in honor of the great king, the village
master Avakhazada, the governor.”

Majumdar 1937–38b; Konow 1940; Konow 1947a;
Tsukamoto 1996–98: 957–58; Salomon 1997b:
368–71; Falk 2003a: 78; Salomon 2005a: 377; Falk
2008b: 205

CKI 178

37. Lala, year 18 of Kanishka [144/145 CE]
Stone relic-chamber slab (found with copper con-
tainer) (fig. 6.10)
Manikyala, Pakistan
Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, France

89. As explained in Salomon 1997b: 371, macayemaṇa is a
deliberately garbled version of the name of the donor of these relics.
The true name may not be recoverable.


CKI 149

38. Year 18 (of Kanishka) [144/145 CE]
Brass box
Afghanistan
Location unknown

(Lid:) saṃ 10 4 4 maše arthamisyā sastehi 10 iś[e] kṣunamṛṇi gotamaśamaṇasa śarīra paristavida

(Lid:) “In the 18th year, in the month Artemisios, after 10 (days), at this moment relics of the Gautama monk are established.”

Konow 1929a: 151–52; Tsukamoto 1996–98: 941

CKI 152

39. Śveḍavarma, year 20 (of Kanishka) [146/147 CE]
Copper miniature stūpa (fig. 3.46)
Kurram Valley, Pakistan(?)
Location unknown

pracaga namaruva namaruva pracagahnana praca phaṣa [ph]aṣapraca
[3] vedana vedapraca taṣa taṣapraca
uvadana uvanapraca bhava bhavapraca
jadi jadapraca[ga] jaramaranaśogaparidevadukha-
dornastaśvagasa [evam asa] kevalasa dukha-
Kaṃdhasa saṃmudeś bhavadi [4] sarvasatvana
puyae aya ca praticasammapate likhida mahiphati-
ena sarvasatvana puyae

(Outside of base:) “[1] In the 20th year, on the 20th
day of the month Audunaios, at this moment
Śveḍavarma, son of Yaśa, establishes in (his)
personal monastery, the New Monastery, in the
possession of the Sarvāstivāda teachers, in a stūpa,
[2] relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage. As has been
said by the Lord: Under the condition of ignorance
there is determination; under the condition of
determination there is consciousness; under the
condition of consciousness there is name and
form; under the condition of name and form there
are the six (sense) spheres; under the condition of
the six (sense) spheres there is contact; under the
condition of contact [3] there is feeling; under the
condition of feeling there is craving; under the
condition of craving there is assuming; under the
condition of assuming there is existence; under
the condition of existence there is birth; under
the condition of birth there is aging, death, grief,
lamentation, suffering, distress, and trouble. This
is the origin of this whole mass of suffering.

[4] In honor of all beings. And this dependent
arising has been written by Mahiphatia in honor
of all beings.”

Konow 1929a: 152–55; Konow 1929b; Sircar 1965:

CKI 153

40. Mitravarma, year 20 (of Kanishka) [146/147
CE]
Slate block with hollow
Shahi Kot, near Torkham, Afghanistan
Location unknown

(Outside of lid:) budhasa
ULO saste 20 10 iše kṣu[3]ṇami pratītavite bhagav-
tauakami śpae

(Outside of lid:) “Of the Buddha.”
(Inside of lid:) “[1] (In)91 the year twenty—20—
[2] in the month Oloios, after 30 days, at this
[5] in Mitravarma’s personal, own stūpa.”92

Falk 2003a: 71–74
CKI 368

91. See Baums 2006: 41–42.
92. As part of his argument concerning "gandharaśpami in
line 5 of Śatruleka’s inscription no. 17 (see the note there), Falk
41. *Saṃghamitra, year 28 (of Kanishka) [154/155 CE]*

Earthenware container
Hadda, near Jalalabad, Afghanistan
Location unknown

(Outside of body:) [1] *saṃbatśarae aṭhaviśatihi 20 4 mase apelae sastehi daśahi 10 iša kṣunāṃmi*
*pratistapita śarira ramaramṇāmi thubami saṃghamitrena navakarmi(*)na [2] edena k(*)uśalamule(*)na* eteṣa dharmanabhi bhavima y(*)eṣa
dharmanāṃ eta vo syet(*)i śarira sarvasatvana nirvanasambharac bhavatu ramasa agrippacaya*

(Outside of body:) “[1] In the twenty-eighth—28th—year, in the month Apellaios, after ten—10—(days), at this moment relics are deposited in the Rama Monastery in a stūpa by Saṃghamitra, the superintendent of construction. [2] Through this root of good may we obtain those dharmas of which these your relics consist. May it be for the preparation for nirvana of all beings and the best share of Rama.”


CKI 155

42. *Budhapriya and others, year 44 (of Kanishka) [171/172 CE]*

Earthenware spherical
Jalalabad, Afghanistan
Private collection

(2003a: 73) interprets śpae in the present inscription as an “area-name . . . to do with property rights.” While this suggestion is good and the possibility needs to be considered, I prefer to understand gaṃdharaśpami in Śatruleka’s inscription as “master of Gandhāra” and therefore adopt the conservative translation of śpae as “own” (Sanskrit svake).

93. The original of this inscription is lost and Konow edited it from an imperfect eye copy prepared by its discoverer, Charles Masson. Konow (1935–36: 41–42) considered whether the clear reading pracaya should be taken as Old Indo-Aryan prataya, “support,” or rather as a miscopied pracaśa = Old Indo-Aryan pratyanśa, “share.” In light of several parallels (nos. 37 and 43), the latter interpretation is adopted here.

[1] *saṃvatsarae caducapariśadima 20 20 4*


[1] “In the forty-fourth—44th—year, [2] this monastery is established by Budhapriya and, individually, by Budadeva, Zadasara, the monastery master Sagila, Bhatamuḍaya, [3] and Budhavarma.”

Strauch 2007: 79–83

CKI 511

43. *Vagamarega, year 51 (of Kanishka) [177/178 CE]*

Bronze spherical (fig. 4.33)
Wardak, near Kabul, Afghanistan
British Museum, London, UK 1880.93

(Outside of body:) "[1] In the 51st year, in the month Artemisios, after 15 (days), at this time Vagamarega, son of Kamagulya, he establishes here in Khavada, in the kadalayiga94 Vagamarega Monastery, in a stūpa relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage. [2] Through this root of good may it be for the best lot of the great king, chief king of kings Huvishka; may it be in honor of my mother and father; may it be in honor of my brother Haṣthunahmaregasa; and may it be in honor of my further relatives, friends, and associates; and [3] may it be for the best share and lot of me, Vagamarega; may it be for the reward of health of all beings; and may it also be in honor of all, whoever there is here in between, from the Avici hell at one end to the top of existence, (whether) egg-born, womb-born, moisture-born, (or) formless; and may it always be for the best lot and share of my horsemen,95 with all umbrella-bearers and with the retinue; and may there be a best lot for the one who is wrong. [4] This monastery is the possession of the Mahāsaṃghika teachers."


94. Konow (1929a: 167; following Lüders and Pargiter) interpreted sa as the nominative singular demonstrative pronoun, kadalayiga as equivalent to Sanskrit kṛtālaya, “having fixed his residence,” with additional -ka suffix, and the phrase enclosed by these two words as parenthetical. The newly discovered inscription of the daughter of Vagamarega, however, contains what appears to be the same word in the spelling kadalyage. In both inscriptions, the word precedes the designation of the monastery in which the relics are established, apparently forming a compound with it in the present inscription, and in the locative case in the daughter’s inscription. The word in question, whose equivalence with kṛtālaya is thus made less certain, appears to be a specification of the monastery rather than a place-name (as suggested by Falk 2008a: 70). The interpretation of the remaining phrase as parenthetical is further weakened by the appearance of iṣa khavadami without pronoun or other subject immediately after the dating formula of the daughter’s inscription. But in spite of the unexpected spelling sa (instead of sa) it seems possible to
44. Daughter of Vagamarega, year 51 (of Kanishka) [177/178 CE]
Bronze spherical
Wardak, near Kabul, Afghanistan
Private collection

(Outside of body:) [1] saṃ 20 20 10 1 maše arthamisyā sastehi 10 4 1 iṣa khavadamī khamagulya-putavagamaregāvihāra[thu]ba kadālyage viha(*ra)mi śaṃanāna mahasamigīna parigraha khoḍadhīda dhīdae (*thu)bae96 pratiṭhaviti

nirvāṇaeda nirvāṇadae naye bhavatu mahiṇa ca rohana agrabhagadāe bhavatu bahulaṃthiḥagasya ca agrabhagadāe bhavatu

(Outside of body:) “[1] In the 51st year, in the month Artemisios, after 15 (days), here at Khavada, at the stūpa of the Vagamarega Son-of-Kamagulya Monastery, in the kadalyaga monastery, in the possession of the Mahāsāṃghika monks, the little daughter(?) establishes the daughter’s stūpas(?). [2] In each of them relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage, are established. By this root of good may it be in honor of mother and father, may it be in honor of Haśthunahmarega, may it be for the best lot of Vagamarega, and may it be for the reward of health of me the daughter (and for) the best lot; [3] may it also be for the best lot of all beings and conducive to (their) nirvana; and may it be for the attainment of nirvana of all, whoever there is here in between, from the Avīci hell at one end to the...”

95. Konow (1929a: 169) interpreted this word as genitive plural of Sanskrit roha, “sprout,” and translated “my descendants,” whereas Falk (2008a: 73) translated “my horsemen,” apparently connecting it with Sanskrit roha, “riding on” (attested only at the end of compounds), and under the influence of his reinterpretation of the following words as “umbrella-bearers” and “retinue.” The latter interpretation is tentatively followed here, but it has to be noted that the occurrence of the word in the inscription of Vagamarega’s young daughter (no. 44)—which is otherwise suitably modified from Vagamarega’s own—presents a problem.

96. This reconstruction (Falk 2008a: 70) is provisional. One problem is the apparent absence of the daughter’s name; another is the proposed form (*thu)bae, which would have to be interpreted as a diminutive (Old Indo-Aryan *stūpaka-) with unexpected Gandhari ending -e for Old Indo-Aryan -āṇ.
top of existence, (whether) egg-born, womb-born, moisture-born, formless, (or) spontaneously arising; and may it be for the best lot of my horse-men(?); and may it be for the best lot of the one who holds many wrong views.”

Falk 2008a
CKI 509

45. **Mahasena and Samgharakṣita**

Gilded-bronze incense container (fig. 3.32)
Shah-ji-ki-Dheri, Peshawar, Pakistan
Peshawar Museum, Peshawar, Pakistan 2848

(Outside of lid:) “[2] kaniṣ[kapu]re ṇagare [a]lyam
gadha[ka]raṃde + t. (*mahara)jasa kaṇi-
(Outside of body:) “[3] ṣkasa vihare mahasenasa
samgharakṣitasa agiśalanavakarmiana
[3] deyadharme sarvasatvana hitasuhartha bhavatu
(Top of lid:) “[1] acaryana sarvastivatina pratigrahe

(Outside of lid:) “[2] In the city Kaniṣkapura, this incense box . . .”
(Outside of body:) “[3] is the donation [4] of Mahasena and Samgharakṣita, superintendents of construction of the fire chamber in the monastery of the (*great) king Kanishka. [4] May it be for the benefit and happiness of all beings.”
(Top of lid:) “[1] In the possession of the Sarvāstivādin teachers.”

CKI 145

---

97. This incense box (the so-called Kanishka casket) was found inside the relic chamber of a stūpa and itself contained a small crystal flask with bone fragments. While it is thus clear that in its final use it served as a relic container, it remains unclear whether the inscription on it refers to its establishment in the stūpa or to an earlier donation of the incense box for use in a monastery. Errington and Falk (2002: 101–10) date the establishment of the relic to the time of Huvishka (second half of the second century CE) on numismatic, art-historical, and archaeological grounds.
B. Undated inscriptions

46. Śatrea\(^{98}\)
Steatite spherical
Provenance unknown
Private collection

(Outside of lid:) [1b] [bhagavato dhatue] śatraeṇa
sagharthāṇeya pra\(\text{*di}thavidi sarvasaṇa puyae
(Inside of lid:) [2] im\(\text{*e}\)ṇa [ku]śa[lamuleṇa
agadakṣiṇa]\(^{99}\) śatreasa bharyae [3] {yara}
[1a] yarae

(Outside of lid:) “[1b] Relics of the Lord are estab-
lished by Śatrea, the \textit{sagharthāṇa}, in honor of all
beings.”
(Inside of lid:) “[2] By this root of good (may there
be) the highest reward [3] [1a] for Yara, the wife
of Śatrea.”

Fussman 1985a; Salomon 1997b: 372–75
CKI 326

\(^{98}\) Paleographically, this inscription can be dated between
c. 50 BCE and c. 50 CE (Fussman 1985a: 30).

\(^{99}\) Salomon (1997b: 374) reconstructed \text{*arogadakṣiṇa} but
noted that “there is nothing in the extant text corresponding to
the second syllable, \textit{ro}.” The simpler reading proposed here
seems preferable in light of \textit{aghadakṣonayae} in the unknown
meridarch’s inscription no. 4 and \textit{agrodakṣine}a in Senevarma’s
inscription no. 24, l. 8 (while the apparent absence of \textit{r} in \textit{ag(r)a}
in two of these three occurrences remains a problem).

47. Mahazada, Krīṇi, and Śamasabaha\(^{100}\)
Silver sheet (found in silver compressed-spherical
container)
Provenance unknown
Private collection


Salomon 1996a: 233–35
CKI 327

48. Sihila and Siharakaṣṭita\(^{101}\)
Schist ovoid container
Taxila, Pakistan
Government Museum and Art Gallery, Chandigarh,
India N.N. 1

(Outside of body:) sihileṇa siharkaṣiteṇa ca
bhratarehi takhaśilae ayaṃ thuvo pratīthavito
savabudhaṇa puyae

(Outside of body:) “By the brothers Sihila and
Siharakaṣṭita this stūpa is established in Takṣaṇi in
honor of all buddhas.”

Konow 1929a: 87; Tsukamoto 1996–98: 1010
CKI 65

\(^{100}\) Paleographically, this inscription can be dated to the
beginning of the first century CE and is possibly related to
Utara’s relic establishments, nos. 9 and 10 (Salomon 1996a: 238).
An identical copy of this inscription on a gold sheet (CKI 332;

\(^{101}\) Paleographically, this inscription is slightly later than
Patika’s inscription (no. 12, c. 1–10 CE; Konow 1929a: 87).
49. Ayabhadra
Steatite container
Sanghol, Punjab, India
Location unknown

(Outside of lid:) upasakasa ayahadvrasa
(Outside of lid:) “Of the lay-follower Ayabhadra.”

CKI 239

50. Sacabhama
Schist spherical
Provenance unknown
Asian Civilisations Museum, Singapore
1994.4956-1

(Outside of lid:) bharyae ca sacabhama&lt;e&
(Outside of lid:) “And of (his) wife Sacabhama.”

Krishnan 2007: 81, 268
CKI 400

102. The archaeological context of this relic container belongs to the Kuṣāṇa period (Sharma 2003: 27). On paleographical grounds, Mukherjee (in Sharma 2003) dated it to either the first century BCE or the first century CE, while Gupta (1987: 101–2) preferred the early first century CE.

51. Śira
Gold sheet (found in circular granite dish)
Taxila, Pakistan
Location unknown

[2] hasisa pitu hasase loo tasa siati yo ha
[3] dehajati

“[1] (Donation) of Śira establishing a relic of the Lord [2] in her mother’s goose, in her father’s goose. May it be her world when there is [3] rebirth of the body.”

CKI 64

103. The archaic shape of sa and the attachment of pre-consonantal ra in a separate stroke point to a date not later than the early first century CE. This inscription is similar in type to Patika’s inscription (no. 12, c. 1–10 CE) and the Takht-i-Bahi inscription (CKI 53, 45/46 CE; Konow 1929a: 84).

104. Paleographically, this inscription is intermediate between Patika’s inscription (no. 12, c. 1–10 CE) and the Takht-i-Bahi inscription (CKI 53, 45/46 CE; Konow 1929a: 84).

105. See chapter 4, Appendix, no. 392.

106. The original of this inscription had already been lost when Konow (1929a) published it from an eye copy. It was found together with a crystal figurine of a goose, confirming that part of the interpretation. The interpretation of the second half of the inscription remains particularly uncertain.
52. Śivarākṣīta
Steatite spherical (fig. 4.24)
Bimaran, near Jalalabad, Afghanistan
British Museum, London, UK 1880.27

(Outside of lid:) bhagavaṭa śarihehi śivarākṣīṭasa
mumja[v]aṃḍaputraśa daṇamuhe
(Outside of base:) śivarākṣīṭasa mu[m]javaṃḍapu-
tr[asy]a daṇamuhe niyātide bhagavaṭa śarihehi
sarvabudaḥ puye

(Outside of lid:) “With relics of the Lord, donation
of Śivarākṣīta, son of Mujavada.”
(Outside of base:) “Donation of Śivarākṣīta, son of
Mujavada, offered with relics of the Lord in honor
of all buddhas.”

Konow 1929a: 50–52; Dobbins 1968: 151–55;
Fussman 1987: 69–71, 83–84; Errington and Cribb
2005a: 360

CKI 50

53. Son of Gaṇavṛyaka
Bronze cylindrical (fig. 4.6)
Manikyala, Pakistan
British Museum, London, UK 1848,0602.2.a–b

(Outside of lid:) kaviśia kṣatrapasa gaṇavṛyaka-
ṣatrapaputraśa daṇamukho
(Outside of lid:) “Donation of the governor of
Kapiśā, son of the governor Gaṇavṛyaka.”

Konow 1929a: 150–51; Tsukamoto 1996–98: 984

CKI 150

54. Gomaṇa
Silver disk (found in gold cylinder inside no. 53)
(fig. 6.11)
Manikyala, Pakistan
British Museum, London, UK 1848,0602.3.c


107. Dated c. 20–50 CE on numismatic and paleographical
grounds (Fussman 1987: 70).
108. This inscription is written in comparatively early
Kharoṣṭhī, with half-open s and angular k.
109. Paleographically, this inscription is similar to the one on
the casket in which it was found.
Konow 1929a: 151; Tsukamoto 1996–98: 984
CKI 151

55. Unknown donor\textsuperscript{110}
Stone spherical (fig. 4.23)
Kabul, Afghanistan
Location unknown
Jacquet 1836: 259–62; Honigberger 1851: 73
CKI 600

56. Trami\textsuperscript{111}
Schist miniature stūpa (fig. 5.6)
Kula Dheri, Charsadda, Pakistan
Peshawar Museum, Peshawar, Pakistan 3219
(Base:) tramisa daṇam[u] khe ime śarira presthevida
budhaṇa puyae
(Base:) “Donation of Trami. These relics are established in honor of the buddhas.”
CKI 177

57. Fragmentary inscription\textsuperscript{112}
Stone relic-chamber slab (fig. 6.12)
Khudu Khel, Pakistan
Location unknown

\begin{verbatim}
[1] . . . (*śa)[ri]ra[m] pratiṭhavedi gavh[r]a-
 \[2]\{*thu\baṃmi\}  . . . [daṇamu]kh[o ca]
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
. . . and the donation . . .
\end{verbatim}

CKI 135

\textsuperscript{110} This reliquary, discovered in 1832 by Johann Martin Honigberger, was sold to an unknown buyer at the Hauptmaut in Vienna in 1850, and its further whereabouts remain unknown. Jacquet (1836: 259) reported faint traces of an ink inscription on the outside of the lid. The reliquary probably belongs to the Kuśāṇa period.

\textsuperscript{111} Paleographically identical with the inscription of year 303 (of the Greeks, 117/118 CE), no. 36, with which it was found (Majumdar 1937–38b: 10).

\textsuperscript{112} Paleographically comparatively late and reminiscent of the Jamalgarhi inscription (CKI 116, 173/174 CE; Konow 1929a: 128).

\textsuperscript{113} Konow (1929a: 128) reconstructed ⟨*bha⟩gavhra(⟨*to⟩). While the spelling vh does rarely occur in place of v (e.g., kara[vha]eṇa in no. 37), it is not otherwise attested in the word bhagava. Moreover, the hook to the right would have to be taken, not as postconsonantal r, but as the diacritical mark that indicates fricativization or other weakening of the base consonant, which would not make any sense with an original fricative like v. On the other hand, gavh[r]a is a perfectly regular outcome of Sanskrit garbha, with weakening of bh (leading further to h in gaha) and Dardic metathesis of r. That the expression should be completed as (*śa)[ri]ra[m] pratiṭhavedi gavh[r]a(*thu\baṃmi) is made likely by the parallel in Cadrabhi’s inscription (no. 29): śarira praṣṭaveti gahathubami.
58. Teyamitra

Schist cylindrical
Swat, Pakistan
Private collection

(Outside of base:) teyamitreaṇa .uh..eraputreṇa
pratiṭhint[a] bhagavado śarira śakamuṇisa
budhasatvaga(*ham)m (*budha)satagahaṃmi
viharami

(Outside of base:) “By Teyamitra, son of .uh..era, are
established relics of the Lord, the Śākya sage, in a
bodhisattva-womb (stūpa) in the monastery.”

Falk 2003a: 77–78
CKI 457


______. 1936. “Note on Toramāṇa.” *Indian Historical Quarterly* 12: 530–33.


MSS Eur. E161/VII. British Library India Office Collections, Masson Manuscripts, Correspondence VII (copies of Masson’s letters).

MSS Eur. E164. British Library India Office Collections, Masson Manuscripts, Journals and Narratives III.

MSS Eur. F63. British Library India Office Collections, Masson Manuscripts, Sketches and Drawings I.

MSS Eur. F64. British Library India Office Collections, Masson Manuscripts, Sketches and Drawings II.


______. 1887. “A Note to Accompany These Antique Budhist [sic] Relics.” British Museum Asia Department Archives, 18870717.30.
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