A survey of place-names in Gāndhārī inscriptions and a new oil lamp from Malakand
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Introduction

Gāndhārī inscriptions were produced over a vast geographic range, stretching from Bamiyan in the west to Luoyang in the east, and from Mathura in the south to Kucha in the north.¹ Their chronological range is the third century BC until approximately the fourth century AD. A total of 1,163 published Gāndhārī inscriptions are documented in Baums & Glass 2002b.² Some of these are pottery fragments (such as those from Termiz) that can be reassembled, and others are parts of larger sets produced on the same occasion (such as the Aśokan edicts at Shahbazgarhi and Mansehra), so the total number of Gāndhārī inscriptions in the narrower sense of ‘distinct object bearing one or more texts’ is closer to one thousand. For approximately three hundred of them, their findspots remain unknown as they were unearthed in illicit diggings and reached their current collections and the desks of scholars through the art market. Unfortunately, this is especially true for inscriptions from the heartland of Gandhāra in the Peshawar valley and more broadly Pakistan and Afghanistan, much to the detriment of art-historical research as well as any philological work (such as dialectology) requiring precise geographic information.

The same problem afflicts the numerous Gāndhārī manuscripts that have come to light in recent years, and to an even greater extent. In theory, geographic information from inscriptions could be correlated with that from manuscript finds; in practice, the lack of documentation makes this impossible, and all one can do is group inscriptions and manuscripts among themselves and with each other using material evidence in the form of the writing support, palaeographic and orthographic observations, and especially the place-names that are mentioned in many donative inscriptions. The present article will provide a survey of the geographical information given in the inscriptions themselves, then discuss three previously unpublished Gāndhārī inscriptions with interesting place-names, and conclude with an addendum to my article on the chronology of Gandhāran inscriptions published in the proceedings of the first Gandhāra Connections workshop (Baums 2018a).

Survey

The two sets of Aśokan rock edicts at Shahbazgarhi (CKI 1-14) and Mansehra (CKI 15-28) provide our first epigraphic witnesses for place-names in ancient Gandhāra. As the texts of these inscriptions are essentially identical, however, with the parallel versions from mainland India, and as they were ultimately composed at the court of Aśoka in Pāṭaliputra, their vantage point is eastern Indian rather than Gandhāran. The names of people and regions mentioned as recipients of Aśoka’s instruction thus include the Gaṃdhara themselves, as well as the Yona (Greeks, or more broadly western foreigners) and Kamboya³ (Bactrians) from the northwest; the Nabhaka and Nabhapaṃti from the north; the Raṭhiga, Pitiniga and Bhoja from the west; the Kaliṃga from the East; the Keraḍa from the southwest; the Aṃdhra and Palimda from the southeast; the Coda and Pāṃdiya from the far south; and the Tambapanniya on Sri Lanka. The only group mentioned in Aśoka’s list that has resisted clear identification with one of the

¹ A single Gāndhārī inscription was even found as far afield as the island of Socotra off the coast of Yemen: the graffito of a merchant traveller leaving his name for posterity (upal[ī]s; CKI 595 in Baums & Glass 2002b; Strauch 2012: 205-206).
² Henceforth referred to by their ‘CKI’ numbers in that catalogue.
³ It is possible that the epithet kamuiya- on the Mathura Lion Capital (CKI 48) is ultimately the same ethnonym.
regions of classical India is the Satya in CKI 2 and 15. In addition to these, Aśoka mentions Sambodhi as the place of the Buddha’s birth to which he did pilgrimage. As we move forward in time, the ethnonyms Yona (CKI 405, 455) and Gandhara (CKI 257) are met with again, and joined by the geographical designation Saḵastana – ‘dominion of the Scythians’ – (CKI 48) on the Mathura Lion Capital.

Two royal houses dominated the mountain regions north of the Peshawar valley in the first century AD and sponsored the production of a large number of inscribed objects (and in all likelihood also Buddhist manuscripts): the Apraca kings and the Oḍi kings (Salomon 2007). Spelling variants of the first name include Apaca, Apraca and Avaca in a total of nine currently known inscriptions (see Baums & Glass 2002- a, under those names), and it is at least likely from their reported findspots that the Apraca kings ruled in Bajaur. The second name is consistently spelled Odi (in three inscriptions), and can almost certainly be connected with Sanskrit Uḍḍiyāna, i.e. Swat. A third dynastic name, Kadama, is mentioned in only one inscription (CKI 249), but also occurs in two of the avadāna manuscripts in the British Library Kharoṣṭhī collection (Kadamaga in CKM 14 and Kaḍamaha in CKM 15) as well as in the form kardamarāja in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī.

The situation gets more complicated as we turn to the names of cities. Tira, attested in two inscriptions from Swat connected to the Oḍi royal house (CKI 334 and 401), appears to have been the capital or at least a major city of this dynasty. Similarly, Tramana appears to have been the main city of the Apraca royal line and is attested in five inscriptions, all with uncertain findspot, connected with this dynasty (CKI 255, 256, 266, 327, 332). Once (in CKI 256), Tramana is called an atithaṇṇagāra which – if indeed corresponding to the Sanskrit adhiṣṭhānanagara – would confirm its status as capital (Salomon 2007: 273-275). Three times (CKI 255, 327, 332), Tramana appears in a compound or with a suffix -(o)s(p)a-, the precise meaning of which remains unclear.

Another major city just to the east of Gandhāra proper was Taxila, the name of which is amply attested in inscriptions as Takṣaśīla (CKI 60, 66, 233), Takaśīla (46, 65, 99), and as the adjective Takaśīlāa (CKI 68), all of which agree well with the Sanskrit form Takaśīlā. They collectively contrast, however, with the trisyllabic Greek form of the name, which has been variously explained as a hypocoristic form on Greek linguistic grounds (Schwyzer 1939-60: I 485) or more loosely as a ‘curious contraction [that] could perhaps be due to the careless spelling of a foreign name, perhaps already established by the Achaemenids and now adopted in Greek’ (Karttunen 1997: 33). These explanations fail to take account of the fact that already on the Mathura Lion Capital (CKI 48), we encounter a trisyllabic form Takṣīla referring to an inhabitant of this city. Salomon (2005: 269), in a detailed article devoted to the name of this city, considered the form Takṣīla (now also attested in several of the Gāndhāra manuscripts) as a ‘missing link that justifies an equation between Sanskrit Takṣaśīla and Takṣīla of the lion capital.’ After duly noting that the latter is not the name of the city itself, but a designation of one of its denizens, he claims that ‘[t]his adjectival form, presumably pronounced tākṣīla (compare tākṣaśīla ‘Taxilan’, prescribed by Pāṇini 4.3.93), presupposes a tākṣīla or takṣīla for the name of the city itself’ (Salomon 2005: 270).

The fact remains, however, that in all our Indian sources, the name of the city always consists of four syllables, and I would like to suggest that instead another rule of Pāṇini’s grammar (5.3.79) should be invoked that adds the suffix -ila- to the first part of a two-member compound in order to express nīti ‘decorum’ or anukampā ‘compassion’ (cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner 1896-1957: II, 2, §231aβ). This would explain how on the basis of the four-syllable compound name of the city Takaśīlā (weakened but still four-syllable in Gāndhāra Takṣaśīla), its inhabitants can be called not just Takaśīla, but also Tākṣīla (i.e.,

---

4 The difficult question of the seat of power of the Apraca rulers is now discussed in detail in Skinner & Rienjang forthcoming.
5 Compare, however, also the somewhat obscure expressions [sa]haehi pida[pul][trehi] [si]diliakehi (CKI 116), siiharakṣitaodreaśva (CKI 456) and hoḍreana (CKI 69).
6 The place-name Damana on the Sui Vihar copper plate (CKI 147) is probably unrelated.
the first part of the larger compound, Tākṣa-, with the suffix -ila-, though here used as an abbreviatory device rather than in the specific meanings given by Pāṇini). It even seems likely that Tākṣila referred not just to any inhabitant, but to the ruler of the city in particular, in line with the Indian practice by which Aśoka refers to himself simply as Māgadha ‘the Māgadhan’ (a title born in later Buddhist texts by king Bimbisāra). On the Greek side, too, this is supported by the forms Ταξίλος and Ταξίλης referring to the king of Taxila (besides Tāξīλa referring to the city, which would then have to be considered an analogy within Greek). While the ultimate origin of the compound name Takṣaśilā escapes us, it seems plausible to connect it with the Iranian naming pattern in toponyms such as Samar-kand and Tash-kent, which similarly contain a second member meaning ‘stone’.

Turning to place-names associated with Taxila, Chaḍaśila (CKI 172) clearly shares its second part with the name Takṣaśilā itself, while Cukhsa (CKI 46, 63) was a location close to Taxila. The case is less clear with Avrisara-patha-naara (CKI 109) on a seal that was found at Taxila, but could have been brought there from somewhere else. Similarly, the donor of a reliquary found at Taxila (CKI 60) is called a resident or citizen (vastava, Sanskrit vāstavya) of a city Noacaa, but may have been visiting Taxila from another location. Falk (2000-01: 32-33) suggested that the word śirae in the difficult Taxila inscription CKI 64 (only known from an eye copy) could refer not to the donor (the usual interpretation) but the place at which the donation took place, and could then be connected with the śeriana vihāra ‘monastery of the Śeria’ in an inscription from Bagram (CKI 233) as well as with the Taxila toponyms Sir-kap and Sir-sukh.

Other settlements called ‘city’ (nagara or pura) in the epigraphic corpus include Ari-ṇayara in Swat (CKI 828), Avaśāūra at Charsadda (CKI 178) and Kanisṭkapura at Peshawar (CKI 145). Among ‘villages’ (grāma), we have Āṭhayi-grama (CKI 257, findspot unknown), Kāṃṭi-grama and possibly identical Kuti-grama (CKI 243, findspot unknown, and CKI 251, Bajaur) as well as Hida-grama (CKI 139, Swabi). Three further settlements that are not explicitly called ‘city’ or ‘village’, but that were probably substantial because their inhabitants were called vāstavya, ‘residents’, are Obhara (CKI 154, findspot unknown) and Oni (CKI 519, traveller’s graffito at Chilas), to which can be added Kaviśi (Sanskrit Kāpiśī), ruled by a satrap (referred to in CKI 150 from Manikyala). Gandhāran settlements mentioned without any indication of their significance are Khavada (CKI 159, 509, Wardak), Khudacā (CKI 61, 149, Manikyala), Radana (CKI 219, findspot unknown, and 510, Hadda), Rayagaha (CKI 371, findspot unknown) and LOVE (CKI 735).

Avadānas in the British Library collection of Gandhāri manuscripts also mention a number of cities by name. Some of these occur in stories set in India proper, such as Ujeṇi (Sanskrit Ujjayinī) in CKM 5 and Palaḍiputra (Sanskrit Pāṭaliputra) in CKM 1, 14 and 18, but we have also (in addition to Taxila, discussed above) mentions of Pokhalaṇdi (Sanskrit Puṣkalāvatī) in CKM 2 and 14.

As is apparent from the preceding survey, the majority of place-names in the Gandhāri epigraphic corpus are etymologically obscure, and only a few names can clearly be derived from an Indo-Aryan linguistic base. Among the Indo-Aryan names (such as that of Taxila), we observed different degrees of Sanskritization side by side, which would appear to depend on the individual user and the formality of the context. It is instructive, in this connection, to consider the two different name forms transmitted for the city of Barikot (Bīr-koṭ-ghwaṇḍai) in the classical sources: Curtius Rufus calls the city Beira, while Arrian refers to it as Bazira. The latter form can be interpreted quite straightforwardly as Sanskrit vajra ‘thunderbolt’ with superficial epenthetic i. The compound name Vajrakūṭa ‘Thunderbolt Peak’ is attested not only in a Gandhāri inscription (CKI 404: vajrakuḍae … thubami ‘at the Thunderbolt-Peak Stūpa), but also as the name of a fabulous city in the story collection Kathāsaritsāgara (vajrakūṭākhyaṃ prṣṭhe himavataḥ puraṃ ‘the city behind the Himalaya called Thunderbolt Peak’) and in the modern place-

8 Ἑνθεν δὲ Κοῖνον μὲν ὡς ἐπὶ Βάζιρα ἐκπέμπει (Anabasis [ed.Wirth/von Hinüber] 4.27.5). I thank Luca Olivieri for raising this question and discussing the names of Barikot with me.
name Bajrakot in Orissa (Salomon 2000: 64-65).\(^9\) The former form, Curtius’ Beira, has, however, so far remained obscure. I would like to suggest that it reflects a vernacular, Middle Indo-Aryan pronunciation of the same place-name. As written, we would expect Beira to be based on a Greek spelling *Beĩpa with a pronunciation [vejíra]. This then corresponds quite precisely to the Gāndhārī form of the word, spelt vayīra in CKI 249 and 367, vaĩra in CKI 367, and likewise pronounced [vejira]. In other words, the sources of Curtius Rufus on the one hand and of Ptolemy on the other appear to have ultimately drawn from two different sociolinguistic levels among their Indian informants (one using the vernacular, the other Sanskrit) when eliciting the name of the city of Barikot.

**A Buddha statue and halo from Daḍiosea**

Our treasury of Gāndhārī place-names is enriched by the recent discovery of three new dedicatory inscriptions related to stūpas. Two of these inscriptions, on textual evidence, hail from the same findspot. A fully annotated edition and discussion on the background of the genre of Gandhāran image inscriptions is provided in Baums, forthcoming. Here only the basic facts of this pair of inscriptions and the place-name they contain are introduced.

The Brooklyn Museum houses, under the accession number 67.200.3, a small schist Buddha statue with missing head that was acquired as a gift from Arthur Wiesenberger in 1967. Its pedestal bears a short donative inscription (CKI 441) that I read and translate as follows:

\[
\text{da}[\text{ḍ}]\text{i[o]sea}[\text{mi thubami budharaksidasa danamukhe}
\]

(Donation of Budharakṣida to [or at] the stūpa daḍioseami.)

The National Museum in New Delhi preserves, under the accession number 59.295, a small detached halo that was acquired from Indian Art Palace, New Delhi, in 1959. Around the upper part of its rim runs an inscription that I read and translate as follows:

\[
\text{da}[\text{ḍ}]\text{io[sea]mi thubami [dhra](*m)i[la]sa [ṣama]nasa danamukh[a ]}
\]

(Donation of the monk Dhramila to [or at] the stūpa daḍioseami.)

The sizes of these two pieces of sculpture do not appear to match, and we do not know of any case in Gandhāran sculpture where a single statue bears two different dedicatory inscriptions by two different donors. It therefore seems clear that both fragmentary pieces belonged to two separate, differently-sized statues installed by two different donors at the same unknown stūpa. The fact that they were acquired by their current holding institutions around the same time further supports the idea that they formed part of the same discovery.

The first word in both inscriptions identifies the stūpa. In general (see Baums, forthcoming for a detailed survey), stūpas in Gandhāra can bear names referring to their appearance or function, they can be named after their founder, or they can be specified with reference to the town or monastery in which they are located. In the above two inscriptions, the word daḍioseami is clearly not the name of a person, nor does it seem descriptive on the basis of Indo-Aryan vocabulary, nor does it contain a word for monastery (such as vihara). By this process of elimination, it seems likely therefore that here we have to do with the place in which the stūpa was situated, and should translate as ‘the Daḍiosea stūpa’ or, equivalently, ‘the stūpa in Daḍiosea’.

\(^9\) In view of these parallels, it even seems plausible to interpret the -kot of Barikot (or -koṭ- of Bir-koṭ-ghwândai) as a reflex of kūṭa ‘peak.’
A heart-shaped lamp from Malakand

The third new epigraphic discovery presented here is on a heart-shaped vessel of dark stone, apparently an oil lamp, without (or with missing) lid (Figures 1-7).¹⁰ According to its current owner, the lamp was found in the village ‘Kharki’ (see below) in Malakand District of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. No precise measurements are available, but judging from the photographs, the object is approximately 12 cm in diameter and approximately 5 cm high, tapering slightly from top to bottom. The inscription begins and ends at the tip of the heart, running around the side of the lamp in counterclockwise direction when seen from above. The letters are deeply engraved and clear, measuring approximately 3 cm in height. Palaeographically, they are unremarkable; only the vowel mark e on the final akṣara is attached with a slight flourish. No anusvāras or footmarks are used, and the sign ṇ represents the coronal nasal. The shape of the s, written with a single line but maintaining a distinct, open head, allows a very rough dating to the middle period of Kharoṣṭhī palaeography (first century BC to first century AD).

My reading and translation of the inscription are as follows:

\[ \text{aiūḍami ghamathubami K[α]duasa daṇamukhe} \]

(Donation of Kaḍua at the Village Stūpa aiūḍami.)

This reminds one immediately of another lamp inscription from Malakand district published in Chhabra 1935-36 (CKI 175):

\[ \text{thuvami danamukhe gramathuvami Sagarakṣidasa danamukhe} \]

(Donation at the stūpa. Donation of Sagarakṣida at the Village Stūpa.)

The measurements given by Chhabra for his lamp (1.6 inches high, 4 inches in diameter) are almost identical to the ones I estimated for the heart-shaped lamp. The shape of Chhabra’s lamp is also pointed on one side, but it is not clear from his illustrations whether the opposite side was indented to form a proper heart. Like the heart-shaped lamp, Chhabra’s lamp is made from a dark stone. Finally, the location and direction of the inscription are identical with that on the heart-shaped lamp, starting at the pointed end and running around the side anti-clockwise. All this makes it likely that both lamps were produced in the same local tradition, and possibly in the same workshop, for deposit at the same stūpa. To clinch the argument, Chhabra reported the findspot of his lamp as ‘a place near Dargai in the Malakand Agency’. Now as it turns out, a village called Kharkai (خرکئ, apparently the same as the heart-shaped lamp’s ‘Kharki’) borders immediately to the north on the village Dargai, so even the reported findspots of both lamps may be identical.

The spelling gramathuvami on Chhabra’s lamp confirms the interpretation of ghamathubami on the heart-shaped lamp as ‘Village Stūpa’. Chhabra (1935-36: 389, n. 9) expressed doubt whether this term simply meant ‘stūpa in the village’ or had acquired the value of a proper name. Ultimately, this cannot be decided, but the reoccurrence of the name in the new inscription makes it somewhat more likely that Village Stūpa was a proper name (just as Mahāthūpa ‘Great Stūpa’ had become the proper name of the structure in Anurādhapura (cf. also mahathuba in CKI 334). The name of the donor, Kaūḍa, appears to be local, or at any rate not Indo-Aryan. In contrast to the donor of Chhabra’s lamp, the donor of the heart-shaped lamp does not appear to have been a monastic.

¹⁰ I am grateful to Osmund Bopearachchi for sending me images of this object on 28 November 2018 and providing further details on 5 December 2018.
We are left with the enigmatic first word of the inscription, *aüḍami*. As in the case of the two sculptural pieces discussed above, this could prima facie either be a descriptive term or alternatively the ancient name of the place in which the *stūpa* was located. One is reminded of the descriptive *stūpa* name Ekaüḍa ‘One-Peak’ in the Senavarma inscription (CKI 249) as well as of the *stūpa* name Vajrakuḍa ‘Thunderbolt Peak’ (CKI 404, mentioned above). It would be strange, however, if the present *stūpa* was accordingly called ‘No-Peak,’ elevation being such an important characteristic of any *stūpa*. It therefore seems preferable, at least for the time being, to take Aüḍa, like Daḍiosea, as a place-name.

The story has not quite run its course, however, since the same name – whatever its meaning – also occurs in another recently discovered lamp inscription from Dargai, i.e., from almost exactly the same findspot as the Chhabra and heart-shaped lamps (CKI 465; Falk 2006: 406-410). This third lamp is oversize, at 13 cm high and 46-47 cm in diameter, and has a handle attached at the back. It is pointed on one side, but not indented on the opposite side, with adornment around the rim and a lotus rosette on the handle. In this case, the inscription is not on the side of the lamp, but on the upper side of the part of the rim near the handle. Falk reads:

\[\text{aya divhaliya aüḍiyami dhamaraïṇa malaśpaṇa}\]

He concedes that several of the words remain unclear. The beginning of the inscription, *aya divhaliya*, does seem to mean ‘this lamp,’ and *dhamaraïṇa* does appear to be a reference to a Dharmarājika *stūpa*,

\[\text{Figures 1-7. Heart-shaped oil-lamp reportedly found in Malakand District, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. Top view and side views of inscription. (Photos: courtesy of O. Bopearchchi.)}\]
or (as Falk surmises) to monastics coming from such a stūpa. Whether a stūpa in Dargai or elsewhere is meant, the preceding word aüḍiyami will again provide a further specification of the place in Dargai where the donation is made. It appears to be a suffixed form of aüda- in the heart-shaped lamp, and is probably best interpreted as an adjective. While the heart-shaped lamp then speaks of the ‘Village Stūpa in Aüḍa,’ the oversized lamp most likely indicates a donation ‘at the X of Aüḍa,’ and it is quite likely that here too the word thuba- ‘stūpa’ is implied. If this interpretation as well as Falk’s surmise is correct, we may in the case of the oversize lamp be dealing with a donation by monks coming from one stūpa made while visiting another stūpa, and thus precious evidence for transregional exchange among Gandhāran Buddhist centers.

**Conclusion**

As I hope the preceding discussion of new epigraphic finds from Gandhāra has shown, the place-names given in Gandhāran inscriptions are invaluable for connecting disparate and undocumented finds of inscribed artwork with each other. In those cases where at least one of the pieces does come from a known location, the others can then also be placed on a map, and the entire ensemble – as was the case with the three oil lamps from Dargai and Kharkai in Malakand – may begin to tell a larger story of local and translocal Buddhist practice. Even in those cases where a shared name links several pieces whose findspot remains unknown – such as the Buddha image and halo from Daḍiosea – the pieces can shine light on each other’s role in life, and the possibility always remains that one day, they are joined by a further, documented find definitively locating them, too, and filling another blank spot on our map of ancient Gandhāra.

**Addendum to Gandhāran chronology**

One recently published item can be added to my framework for Gandhāran chronology based on relic inscriptions, published in the proceedings of the first Gandhāra Connections workshop (Baums 2018a). This is a fragmentary inscribed reliquary slab (CKI 558) that reads as follows (Strauch 2009: 213-215 with minor adjustments):

1. saṁvatsara[y](*e) ///</
2. ayasa vutraka///(*lasa)
3. tha[va]re kurea ///</
4. ṭhe śa[r]agaḍue ? ///</
5. pa[t]igrahe śarira ///</ ... (*sa)-
6. (*r)vab(*u)dhap(*u)ya(*e) ///</

The editor of this inscription interpreted line 4 as a reference to a secondary donor and translated ‘the elder/excellent (?) Śaragaḍua’ (Strauch 2009: 214). In keeping with the theme of the second Gandhāra Connections workshop, I would like to suggest instead that at this position of the formula we rather expect a place-name. This can be illustrated with the relic donation formula on the Śatruleka reliquary (CKI 257; Baums 2012: 216-217) which seems particularly close to that on the new relic slab. In the following, I reproduce the main part of the Śatruleka inscription, and add in parentheses numbers corresponding to the lines of the relic slab and the parts of the formula that they preserve (1: date, 2: era, 3: donor, 4: location, 5: recipients, 6: honoring of all buddhas):

1. (1) savatsaraye satasa{sa}tatimaye maharajasa (2) ayasa vurtakalasa śavaṇasa masasa divasaye catuviśaye 20 4 (3) śatrulekaṇa kṣatraveṇa subhutikaputreṇa apracarajabhagineyenā

The editor of this inscription interpreted line 4 as a reference to a secondary donor and translated ‘the elder/excellent (?) Śaragaḍua’ (Strauch 2009: 214). In keeping with the theme of the second Gandhāra Connections workshop, I would like to suggest instead that at this position of the formula we rather expect a place-name. This can be illustrated with the relic donation formula on the Śatruleka reliquary (CKI 257; Baums 2012: 216-217) which seems particularly close to that on the new relic slab. In the following, I reproduce the main part of the Śatruleka inscription, and add in parentheses numbers corresponding to the lines of the relic slab and the parts of the formula that they preserve (1: date, 2: era, 3: donor, 4: location, 5: recipients, 6: honoring of all buddhas):

1. (1) savatsaraye satasa{sa}tatimaye maharajasa (2) ayasa vurtakalasa śavaṇasa masasa divasaye catuviśaye 20 4 (3) śatrulekaṇa kṣatraveṇa subhutikaputreṇa apracarajabhagineyenā

11 I would also prefer to interpret the name Thavara of the primary donor as Greek Theōrós rather than related to Sanskrit sthāvara (cf. Baums 2018b: 37-38, with reference to CKI 88, 89, also compared in Strauch 2009: 215).
Since the number of the year is lost on the new relic slab, its precise position in the sequence of dated Gandhāran relic inscriptions (cf. Baums 2018a: 66) cannot be determined. As Strauch (2009: 214) points out, however, the expression ayasa vutraka(*lasa) 'of Azes who is deceased' most likely places it at some point in or just outside the range from Azes year 63 (AD 16/17) to Azes year 126 (AD 79/80).
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