

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

Stefan Baums

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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provide a survey of the geographical information given in the inscriptions themselves, then discuss three previously unpublished Gāndhārī inscriptions with interesting place-names, and conclude with an addendum to my article on the chronology of Gandhāran inscriptions published in the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 Kaṃboya<sup>3</sup> (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 Paliṃda from the southeast; the Coḍa and Paṃḍiya from the far south; and the Taṃbapaṃniya on Sri Lanka. The only group mentioned in Aśoka’s list that has resisted clear identification with one of the

<sup>1</sup> 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[i]sa*; CKI 595 in Baums & Glass 2002b; Strauch 2012: 205-206).

<sup>2</sup> Henceforth referred to by their ‘CKI’ numbers in that catalogue.

<sup>3</sup> It is possible that the epithet *kamuia-* on the Mathura Lion Capital (CKI 48) is ultimately the same ethnonym.

regions of classical India is the Satiya in CKI 2 and 15. In addition to these, Aśoka mentions Saṃbodhi 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 Gaṃdhara (CKI 257) are met with again, and joined by the geographical designation Saḡastana – '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 Oḡi 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.<sup>4</sup> The second name is consistently spelled Oḡi (in three inscriptions),<sup>5</sup> and can almost certainly be connected with Sanskrit Uḡḡiyāna, 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 Kharoṣṡhī collection (Kadamaga in CKM 14 and Kaḡamaha in CKM 15) as well as in the form *kardamarāja* in the Rājatarāṅgiṅī.

The situation gets more complicated as we turn to the names of cities. Tira, attested in two inscriptions from Swat connected to the Oḡi 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 *atithaṅaṅagara* which – if indeed corresponding to the Sanskrit *adhiṣṡhānanagara* – 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.<sup>6</sup>

Another major city just to the east of Gandhāra proper was Taxila, the name of which is amply attested in inscriptions as Takṣaśila (CKI 60, 66, 233), Takhaśila (46, 65, 99), and as the adjective Takṣaīlaa (CKI 68), all of which agree well with the Sanskrit form Takṣaśilā. 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 Takṣila referring to an inhabitant of this city. Salomon (2005: 269), in a detailed article devoted to the name of this city, considered the form Takṣaīla (now also attested in several of the Gāndhārī manuscripts) as a 'missing link that justifies an equation between Sanskrit Takṣaśilā and Takṣila 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 *tākṣila* (compare *tākṣaśila* 'Taxilan', prescribed by Pāṅini 4.3.93), presupposes a *takṣila* or *takṣilā* 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 Pāṅini'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 Takṣaśilā (weakened but still four-syllable in Gāndhārī Takṣaīla), its inhabitants can be called not just Tākṣaśila, but also Tākṣila (i.e.,

<sup>4</sup> The difficult question of the seat of power of the Apraca rulers is now discussed in detail in Skinner & Rienjang forthcoming.

<sup>5</sup> Compare, however, also the somewhat obscure expressions [sa]haehi pida[pu](\*trehi) [u]ḡḡiliakehi (CKI 116), *siiharaḡsitaoḡreasva* (CKI 456) and *hoḡreana* (CKI 69).

<sup>6</sup> 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 Ταξιλος and Ταξιλις referring to the king of Taxila (besides Τάξιλα referring to the city, which would then have to be considered an analogy within Greek). While the ultimate origin of the compound name Takṣaṣilā 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 Takṣaṣila 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 Ṇoacaa, 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 Kaniṣkapura at Peshawar (CKI 145). Among ‘villages’ (*grāma*), we have Aṭhayi-grama (CKI 257, findspot unknown), Kaṃti-grama and possibly identical Kutī-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 Oṇi (CKI 519, traveller’s graffito at Chilas), to which can be added Kaviśi (Sanskrit *Kāpiśi*), 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), Khudacia (CKI 61, 149, Manikyala), Radana (CKI 219, findspot unknown, and 510, Hadda), Rayagaha (CKI 371, findspot unknown) and Lova (CKI 735).

Avadānas in the British Library collection of Gāndhārī 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 Pokhaladi (Sanskrit *Puṣkalāvati*) in CKM 2 and 14.

As is apparent from the preceding survey, the majority of place-names in the Gāndhārī 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,<sup>7</sup> while Arrian refers to it as Bazira.<sup>8</sup> 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 Gāndhārī inscription (CKI 404: *vajrakuḍae ... thubami* ‘at the Thunderbolt-Peak Stūpa), but also as the name of a fabulous city in the story collection *Kathāsaritśāgara* (*vajrakūṭākhyam pṛṣṭhe himavataḥ puram* ‘the city behind the Himalaya called Thunderbolt Peak’) and in the modern place-

<sup>7</sup> *Coenon in obsidione urbis opulentae - Beira incolae vocant - reliquit* (Curtius Rufus, *Historiae* [ed. Koch] 8.10.22).

<sup>8</sup> Ἐνθὲν 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).<sup>9</sup> 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 \*Βεῖρα with a pronunciation [vejira]. This then corresponds quite precisely to the Gāndhārī form of the word, spelt *vayira* in CKI 249 and 367, *vāira* in CKI 367, and likewise pronounced [vejirə]. 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 Daḍioseā

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:

*da[ḍ]io[sea]mi thubami budharakṣīdasa danamukhe*

(Donation of Budharakṣīda 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:

*daḍio[sea]mi thubami [dhra](\*)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 *vihāra*). 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 Daḍioseā *stūpa*' or, equivalently, 'the *stūpa* in Daḍioseā'.

<sup>9</sup> In view of these parallels, it even seems plausible to interpret the -kot of Barikot (or -koṭ- of Bīr-koṭ-ghwaṇḍai) 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).<sup>10</sup> 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:

*aiḍami ghama[th]ubami K[a]ḍuasa daṇamukh[e]*

(Donation of Kaḍua at the Village Stūpa *aiḍami*.)

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

*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 (خرکی), 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 *ghama[th]ubami* 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.

<sup>10</sup> I am grateful to Osmund Boparachchi for sending me images of this object on 28 November 2018 and providing further details on 5 December 2018.



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. Bopearachchi.)

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 oversized, 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:

*aya divhaliya aüḍiyami dhamaraiṇa malaśpaṇa*

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

or (as Falk surmises) to monastics coming from such a *stūpa*. Whether a *stūpa* in Dargai or elsewhere is meant, the preceding word *āḍiyami* will again provide a further specification of the place in Dargai where the donation is made. It appears to be a suffixed form of *āḍa-* 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 Aūḍa,’ the oversized lamp most likely indicates a donation ‘at the X of Aūḍa,’ 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. saṃvatsara[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.<sup>11</sup> This can be illustrated with the relic donation formula on the Śātruleka 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 Śātruleka 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 catuśīsaye 20 4 (3) śātrulekeṇa kṣatraveṇa subhutikaputreṇa apracarajabhagineyeṇa

<sup>11</sup> 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).

2. bhagavato śakamune dhātuve pratīḥavita (4) apratīḥavitapurvaṃmi pradeśaṃmi aṭhayigramāṃmi (5) kaśaviyana bhadaṃtana parigrahaṃmi (6) sarva budha pujayita sarva pracegasabudharahaṃtaṣavaka pujayita sarve
3. pujaraha puyayita ...

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 vutrika(\*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).

## References

- Baums S. 2012. Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions. Pages 200-251 in D. Jongeward, E. Errington, R. Salomon and S. Baums, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries (Gandharan Studies 1)*. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Baums S. 2018a. A Framework for Gandhāran Chronology Based on Relic Inscriptions. Pages 53-70 in W. Rienjang and P. Stewart (eds) *Problems of Chronology in Gandhāran Art: Proceedings of the First International Workshop of the Gandhāra Connections Project, University of Oxford, 23rd-24th March, 2017*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Baums S. 2018b. Greek or Indian? The Questions of Menander and Onomastic Patterns in Early Gandhāra. Pages 33-46 in H. P. Ray (ed.) *Buddhism and Gandhara: An Archaeology of Museum Collections. Archaeology and Religion in South Asia*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Baums S. Forthcoming. Two New Gāndhārī Inscriptions: A Pedestal and Halo from the Daḍioseia Stūpa. In O. Bopparachchi and J. Pons (eds) *Francine Tissot Commemorative Volume*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Baums S. & Glass A. 2002a. A Dictionary of Gāndhārī. <https://gandhari.org/dictionary>
- Baums S. & Glass A. 2002b. *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts*. <https://gandhari.org/catalog>
- Chhabra B. 1935-36. Utmanzai Lamp Inscription in Kharoshthi. *Epigraphia Indica* 23: 289.
- Falk H. 2000-01. A Copper Sieve from Taxila. *Indo-Asiatische Zeitschrift* 4/5: 28-34.
- Falk H. 2006. Three Inscribed Buddhist Monastic Utensils from Gandhāra. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 156: 393-412.
- Karttunen K. 1997. *India and the Hellenistic World (Studia Orientalia 83)*. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- Salomon R. 2000. Two New Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 14: 55-68.
- Salomon R. 2005. The Name of Taxila: Greek Τάξιλα, Gāndhārī Takṣaīla, Sanskrit Takṣaśilā, Pali Takkasilā. *East and West* 55: 265-277.
- Salomon R. 2007. Dynastic and Institutional Connections in the Pre- and Early Kuṣāṇa Period: New Manuscript and Epigraphic Evidence. Pages 267-286 in: D. Srinivasan (ed.) *On the Cusp of an Era: Art in the Pre-Kuṣāṇa World (Brill's Inner Asian Library 18)*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schwyzler E. 1939-60. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, zweite Abteilung, erster Teil)*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Skinner M. and Rienjang W. Forthcoming. Localizing the Apraca Dynasty: New Evidence for an Old Problem. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference of the European Association for South Asian Archaeology and Art, Cardiff, 2016*.
- Strauch I. 2009. Inscribed Objects from Greater Gandhāra. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 23: 209-219.
- Strauch I. 2012. Catalogue of Inscriptions and Drawings in the Cave Hoq. Pages 25-218 in I. Strauch (ed.) *Foreign Sailors on Socotra: The Inscriptions and Drawings from the Cave Hoq (Vergleichende Studien zu Antike und Orient 3)*. Bremen: Hempel Verlag.
- Wackernagel J. & Debrunner A. 1896-1957. *Altindische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.



# **The Geography of Gandhāran Art**

**Proceedings of the Second International  
Workshop of the Gandhāra Connections Project,  
University of Oxford, 22nd-23rd March, 2018**

Edited by  
Wannaporn Rienjang  
Peter Stewart

ARCHAEOPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD  
Summertown Pavilion  
18-24 Middle Way  
Summertown  
Oxford OX2 7LG

[www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

ISBN 978-1-78969-186-3  
ISBN 978-1-78969-187-0 (e-Pdf)

DOI: 10.32028/9781789691863

© Archaeopress and the individual authors 2019

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website [www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)