

**TWO NEW GĀNDHĀRĪ INSCRIPTIONS:
A PEDESTAL AND HALO FROM THE DAḌIOSEA STŪPA**

Stefan BAUMS*

Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität München

Among the epigraphic genres of early Gandhāra, dedication inscriptions on images of buddhas, bodhisattvas and some non-Buddhist deities occupy a prominent place, equal in importance only to the corpus of relic donation inscriptions. In contrast to the latter, however, there is no up-to-date comprehensive treatment of the image dedications, and the existing overviews¹ do not take account of recent discoveries and do not go into details of the formulas employed. I will therefore use the occasion of the discovery of two new related image inscriptions to provide not just a first edition of them, but to discuss them in the context of the specific epigraphic subcorpus to which they belong.²

An Inscribed Pedestal in the Brooklyn Museum

The Brooklyn Museum in New York houses a small schist buddha image measuring 48.3 cm by 31.4 cm at its base and approximately 55 cm in extant height (accession number 67.200.3; **FIGS. 1-4**).³ The head of the statue is broken off at the neck line and lost. A hole under each armpit shows that the statue was at some point mounted to a wall, and a hole in the neck served to attach a mismatched head (now removed). The buddha is represented as sitting cross-legged on a seat of grass. His proper left hand holds a fold of his garment; his proper right hand was raised and is now, like the head, broken off and lost. The entire statue is supported by a rectangular pedestal bearing a Kharoṣṭhī inscription (CKI 441). It entered the museum as a gift of Arthur Wiesenberger in 1967.⁴

The inscription runs from the right edge of the front surface of the pedestal up to 5.5 cm

* I did not have the pleasure of meeting Francine Tissot in person, but like anybody working in the field of Gandhāran studies, I have benefitted immensely from the erudition that she shared in her writings. I am grateful to Osmund Boppearachchi and Jessie Pons for inviting me to contribute to this collection in her honor. For this corpus see now D. JONGEWARD *et. al.*, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, Seattle, Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, 2012 (*Gandharan Studies* 1).

1. J. Ph. VOGEL, 'Inscribed Gandhāra Sculptures', *Archaeological Survey of India Annual Report 1903-04*, Calcutta, Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, 1905, pp. 244-260; K. W. DOBBINS, 'Gandhāra Buddha Images with Inscribed Dates', *East and West*, 18 (1968), pp. 281-288.
2. For a complete catalog of Gāndhārī texts with comprehensive bibliography refer to S. BAUMS and A. GLASS, *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts*, 2002- <https://gandhari.org/catalog>. In the following, Gāndhārī inscriptions and manuscripts are cited using the sigla 'CKI' and 'CKM' with reference to this catalog.
3. The Museum has published images and catalog information of this item at the address http://www.brooklynmuseum.org/opencollection/objects/93135/Seated_Buddha.
4. I would like to thank Dr. Joan M. Cummins, Brooklyn Museum Curator of Asian Art, who kindly discussed the statue with me by email and prepared a set of new photographs in April 2014.

from its left edge. The *akṣaras* are on average around 2.75 cm in height. Paleographically the inscription belongs to the middle period of Kharoṣṭhī, as shown by the *sa* with old-style distinct, but open head. The orthography is basic, using neither *anusvāra* nor diacritical marks, and *na* for the coronal nasal. Overall, the state of preservation is very good, and the inscription can be read and translated as follows:

da[ḍ]io[sea]mi thubami budharakṣidasa danamukhe
Donation of Budharakṣida to the Daḍiosea stūpa.

Except for the first word, the inscription follows the standard pattern of Gāndhārī donative inscriptions and presents no major problems of interpretation. The last word (*danamukhe*, Sanskrit *dānamukha*) is a technical term marking the statue as a pious donation. It is widely used not just on Buddhist sculpture from Gandhāra, but also on other items donated to the monastic community such as lamps (e.g. CKI 175) or kitchen utensils (e.g. CKI 233). There is a noticeable horizontal gap between the syllables *mu* and *khe* which, in the absence of problems in the stone surface, is most likely due to the scribe's desire to conclude the inscription closer to the end of the writing surface.

The donor is named in the preceding word, in the genitive singular, as a certain *budharakṣida* (Sanskrit *buddharakṣita*). This name is particularly well-attested in Gāndhārī donative inscriptions (occurring in CKI 77, 113, 123), but there is of course no reason to presume that all or even any two of these inscriptions refer to the same person. The name also occurs in the administrative documents from Niya where it refers to a particular monk,⁵ in an ownership inscription on a silver vessel (CKI 728), on a seal (CKI 945), on the Hadda gold leaf (CKI 455, authenticity disputed), in rock inscriptions in the upper Indus valley (Chilas: CKI 357, 520, 523, Hunza: 272) and in a business document from Bajaur (CKM 278).

The dedication of the statue is associated with a particular stūpa (*thubami*, locative singular) as location or institutional recipient. Among the many other Gāndhārī inscriptions referring to stūpas, some record the establishment of the stūpa itself (CKI 33, 48, 65, 175, 225,⁶ 249, 255, 328, 405, 455) or the installation of relics of the Buddha (*dhadu*, *śarira* or *dhaduśarira*) inside a stūpa (CKI 153, 155, 159, 178, 241–242, 255, 368, 401, 509, 564). In some cases, it is a stūpa model (CKI 267) or the drawing of a stūpa that is referred to in a label inscription (CKI 353–354, 356, 518, 530, 531).

There are only six known Gāndhārī inscriptions in which other objects are said to be donated to a stūpa: a stone with hollows for six oil lamps from Chatpat (CKI 221), a stone bowl from (probably) Bajaur (CKI 404), an incense burner from the Jalalabad area (CKI 460), the

5. M. PADWA, 'An Archaic Fabric: Culture and Landscape in an Early Inner Asian Oasis (3rd–4th Century C.E. Niya)' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard University, 2007), p. 321 (hereafter PADWA, 'An Archaic Fabric').

6. Based on a personal examination of the inscription on this relic container in February 2013, R. Salomon's reading *pratiṭhavati Khadadata Utara[ci]tathopo* "Khadadata (= Skandadatta?) establishes [these relics*] (in?) the stūpa built by(?) Utara (= Uttarā?)" (R. SALOMON, 'Three Dated Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions', *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, 9 (1995), p. 129, followed in S. BAUMS, 'Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions', in D. JONGEWARD *et. al.*, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, Seattle, Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, 2012 (*Gandharan Studies* 1), p. 239; hereafter BAUMS, 'Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions') needs to be corrected to *pratiṭhavati Khadadata Utara[dhi]ta thopo* "Khadadata, daughter of Utara, establishes a stūpa." (Cf. for the formula CKI 247: *Loṇa grahavadi[dhita] ime śarira pratiṭhaveti* "Loṇa, daughter of a householder, establishes these relics.")

rim of a water reservoir from an unknown location in northern Pakistan (CKI 833), an oil lamp and a water pot from Butkara I (CKI 218) and the unknown find spot of the Senior collection of Gāndhārī manuscripts (CKI 245). Our inscription is the first example from Gandhāra in which a Buddha statue is explicitly donated to a stūpa (though of course such a recipient will have been implicit in many of the other inscribed Buddha statues).

The first word of our inscription (*da[d]io[sea]mi*, locative singular) further specifies the stūpa in question, but its precise interpretation presents formidable problems, calling for a review of stūpa naming practices in Gāndhārī inscriptions.

The only named subtype of stūpa featuring in Gāndhārī inscriptions is the *gavhrathuba* (CKI 135) or *gahathuba* (CKI 172, 249), probably a ‘womb stūpa’ (Skt. *garbhastūpa*) with special reference to the Buddha relics installed in it.⁷ We also hear of a *gramathuva* ‘village stūpa’ (CKI 175) and a *mahathuba* ‘great stūpa’ (CKI 334), but it is quite possible that either or both of these had become proper names (cf. the Mahāthūpa of Anurādhapura in Sri Lanka).

Other stūpas are simply named after the monastery to which they belong: *ramaramñāmi thuba* ‘stūpa in Rāma Monastery’ (CKI 155), *kadalayigavagamariḡaviharammi thuba* and *kamagulyaputravagamareḡaviharathuba* ‘stūpa in Vagamarega (Son of Kamagulya) Monastery’ (CKI 159, 509), after the person whose relics they contain: *kaśavathubu* ‘stūpa of Kāśyapa’ (Anavataptagāthā, CKM 1) or after (apparently) their founder: *dhammavalasa thuba* ‘stūpa of Dhammavala’ (CKI 221). Real proper names, on the other hand, occur in *thubami dhamaraīmi* ‘Dharma-King Stūpa’ (CKI 218 and 1175, with implied *thuba*, CKI 60, 68, 256, 465, 534, 550 and CKM 5), *ekaiūde thuve* ‘One-Peak Stūpa’ (CKI 249), *vayira[stu]ve* ‘Vajra Stūpa’ (CKI 52) and *vajrakuḡae ... thubami* ‘Vajra-Peak Stūpa (CKI 404).

Two of the previously known Gāndhārī stūpa names remain unclear. The phrase *khamtikaśamtikathubammi baiūtaañami* “Kśāntika-śāntika-Stūpa at Bahutapana” had originally been read on an incense burner (CKI 460) by H. Falk,⁸ but plausibly reinterpreted by R. Salomon as *khsamdikas[a] di [2] thubammi baiūtaañami* “day 2(?) of Khsamdika (Xandikos) to the stūpa at Baiūtaña.”⁹ The interpretation of the place name Baiūtaña remains, however, uncertain.

The other inscription, on the rim of the water reservoir mentioned above (CKI 833), contains the dedication *thubami ayacadivaīe*, interpreted by H. Falk¹⁰ as “at the stūpa (called/endowed with) ‘the beauty of the venerable moon’,” reflecting Sanskrit (hereafter Skt.). **āryacāndryavapuṣi*. H. Falk ingeniously explains the various phonetic difficulties of this interpretation (*aya*, besides *ariya*, is an attested reflex of Skt. *ārya*, and in *cadi* an original *y* can have palatalized *a* to *i*), but at least three problems remain: the attested Skt. word for ‘lunar’ is *cāndra*, not **cāndrya*, without palatalizing agent; in either case *cadi* lacks the expected reflex of *r* (cf. *cadri pravha* in the Khotan Dharmapada, CKM 77); and Skt. *vapuṣ* appears to be otherwise extinct in MIA (though of course a one-off loan from Sanskrit cannot be ruled out).

Even after this review of existing practices, the name of the stūpa to which our statue was dedicated (*da[d]io[sea]mi thubami*) remains regrettably unclear in spite of the mostly

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 229-230.

8. H. FALK ‘Three Inscribed Buddhist Monastic Utensils from Gandhāra’, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 156 (2006), p. 404.

9. R. SALOMON, ‘The Macedonian Month Xandikos in Gandhāran Inscriptions,’ *Studia Orientalia*, 110 (2011), p. 168.

10. H. FALK, ‘The Pious Donation of Wells in Gandhāra’, in G. MEVISSSEN and A. BANERJI (ed.), *Prajñādhara: Essays on Asian, History, Epigraphy and Culture in Honour of Gouriswar Bhattacharya*, New Delhi, Kaveri Books, 2009, p. 34.

straightforward reading. The first *akṣara* is an unambiguous *da*, followed by what I read as *ḍi*, though the shallow head would also allow an interpretation as *ji*. The third *akṣara* is unambiguous *o*, followed by what has been read as *se*, but could in principle also be a *ca* with flat belly, and then an unambiguous *a*. Between *se* and *a* there is a mark resembling a cross. This could be an inserted *akṣara* omitted by accident on first engraving, in which case *tha* would be the most likely reading, or a non-phonetic mark of unknown significance added either during the engraving of the inscription or at some later point. I tentatively adopt the latter interpretation. The name of the stūpa does not appear to contain a reference to a monastery or to a person, leaving a place name or a descriptive name as the most likely types. The first part of the name is reminiscent of Skt. *daṇḍa* ‘stick,’ but the second part remains obscure, and in conjunction they do not clearly suggest any satisfying interpretation.

Survey of Gāndhārī Image Pedestal Inscriptions

Inscriptions recording the dedication of Buddhist images on their pedestals are a well-known epigraphic type, with approximately thirty-five examples from Gandhāra alone.¹¹ The most basic formula simply records the name of the donor in the genitive singular, as in a late example from Jaulian (*śamanamitrāsa* CKI 76). Almost invariably, however, the word *danamukha* is added to the name, with examples from Takht-i-Bahi (*[hora]śadāsa da[namukhe]* CKI 54),¹² Taxila (*vijāpīā danamukha* CKI 451), Jaulian (*[kaśavaśa da]ṇamu[kho]* CKI 83) and one unknown findspot (*valāsa daṇamu(*khe)* CKI 537). This type can be expanded by the addition of one or more titles of the donor, as illustrated by seven further inscriptions at Jaulian (*budharakṣi[dāsa] bhikṣusa da[namu]kho* CKI 77, *dharma(*bhūtiśa) [bhi]kṣusa (*danamu)kho* CKI 79, *(*dharma)[m]i[t]ra(*śa bhikṣusa) daṇa[mu]kho* CKI 81, *dharmanadīśa budhamittra(*śa bhikṣusa danamukho)* CKI 74, *saghamitrāśa budhadevaśa bhikṣ[ū]śa danamukho* CKI 75, *ra[hu]śa v(*e)ṇāeśa bhikṣusa daṇamukho* CKI 80 and *dharmamitrāśa bhikṣ[ū]śa na]garaka[śa] danamukho* CKI 78).

Sometimes a donor is specified further by naming his monastic companion, as in three inscriptions from Loriyan Tangai (*budhamitrāśa [bu]dharakṣidāśa sadāyariśa daṇa[mukhe]* CKI 113,¹³ *a[kṣai]śa danamukhe sa[dharmarataśamanāśa sadāyariśa]* CKI 114¹⁴ and *sihamitrāśa daṇamukhe s[i]hil[i]śa sadavi(*yariśa)* CKI 115).¹⁵

In addition to the donor, dedication inscriptions can – as we have seen – specify a location or institutional recipient, for instance in a Loriyan Tangai inscription whose formula closely resembles that on the Brooklyn buddha: *bu[dh]orumaśa daṇamukh[e] khaṇḍa[vaṇatu]baga[mī]* ‘Donation of Budhorma to the Khaṇḍavaṇa stūpa’ CKI 112. Another optional addition to the formula is the naming of beneficiaries to whose honor (*pūya*), health (*arogadakṣiṇa*) or even immortality (*amrīda*) the dedication is meant to contribute, with examples from Jamalgarhi (*[aṇ]bae savaseṭhabhāriāe daṇamukhe sa[rva](*śa)tvāṇa pūyae*

11. The following inscriptions are by all appearances also image dedications on pedestals, but are too fragmentary to include in this overview of dedication formulas: CKI 82, 86, 87 (all Jaulian), 121 (Lahore Museum), 125 (Palatu Dheri), 130 (Ghaz Dheri) and 329. The overview also excludes four inscriptions from Yakubi (CKI 139), Nowshera (144), Bagram (174) and Peshawar (229) because their formulation is untypical and it is not entirely clear whether the objects they are on were in fact pedestals supporting buddha images.

12. This inscription is unusual in that it occurs on the back of the image.

13. The inscriptions follow the fold of the buddha’s robe hanging over his seat.

14. On a stool on which the bodhisattva rests his foot.

15. Under a bas-relief that probably formed part of the pedestal of a buddha image.

*spamiasa [ca a]ro[ga]dakṣiṇi(*ae)* CKI 117), Shahr-i-Napursan (*[arogada] (*kṣiṇae) saṃghamitrasa[m] śamaṇasa da[ṇa]mukhe budhorumasa arogadakṣi(*ṇae)* CKI 131) and two unknown findspots (*dhamitrasa oloīspare danamukhe budhamitrasa amridae* CKI 222, *saghana(*dasa) danamukhe madapidara[n]a adhvadi(*da)na kalagadana puyae bhava(*tu) uajayasa sagharamasa adhvadida[sa] puya[e] bhavatu* CKI 835).

Finally, four known pedestal inscriptions include the date of the dedication. At Hashtnagar, this constitutes the entire inscription (*saṃ 1 1 1 100 20 20 20 20 4 proṭhavadasa masasa divasaṃmi paṃcami 4 1* CKI 124). At Loriyan Tangai (*sa 1 1 1 100 10 4 4 proṭhavadasa di 20 4 1 1 1 budhaghoṣasa daṇamu[khe] saghorumasa sadaviyarisa* CKI 111), Mamane Dheri (*saṃ 20 20 20 20 4 4 1 margasiraṣa masi 4 1 iṣe kṣunami niryāide ime deyadharme dharmapriena samanena piduno arogadakṣiṇae upajayasa budhapriasa puyae samanuyayana arogadakṣiṇae* CKI 161) and on the so-called Year Five buddha (*sa[m] 4 1 phagunasa masasa di paṃcami budhanadasa trepiḍakasa danamukhe madapidarana adhvadidana puyaya bhavatu* CKI 232), the date is added to one of the other basic formula types. In general, however, beneficiaries and dates occur much more rarely in image dedications than in the related formulas of relic installation inscriptions.¹⁶

A last type of formula serves to label the content of the image (*paḍima*), as much as to record the name and circumstances of its dedication, and is attested at Jaulian (*kaśavo tathagato* CKI 84, *śakamu(*ṇi) tathagato [jinaeśa daṇamukho]* CKI 85) as well as outside Gandhāra proper in a Sanskrit-Brāhmī bilingual inscription at Mathura (*[bu]dhasa pratime mahada[m]ḍanayakasa ehaḍa(*sa)* CKI 440). This type also occurs on images of non-Buddhist deities (*[ś]iriye paḍima* CKI 335, *nagharaesa paḍ(*i)ma* CKI 555).¹⁷

An Inscribed Halo in the National Museum, New Delhi

This is where the story of this inscription on a headless buddha statue from Gandhāra would have ended, were it not for a serendipitous discovery. In March 2015, at a workshop in New Delhi, Mr Abhijeet Kumar, a student at the National Museum Institute, presented a number of inscribed artefacts from the museum's collection. One of these was an inscribed halo that he generously allowed me to discuss in the present article (**FIG. 5**).¹⁸ The halo (accession number 59.295) is said to have a small diameter of 16.5 cm, but I have not been able to verify this on the original. An outer rim, 1.2 cm in width and set off by a double line, is filled with a row of stylized lotus petals. The halo is said to be from the North West Frontier Province (now Khyber Pakhtunkhwa) of Pakistan, and was acquired from Indian Art Palace, New Delhi, in 1959. Its lower part is broken off and lost, doubtless when it was detached from the statue to which it belonged. There is also a large chunk of surface missing at the top, and a hole has been drilled through the lower left part of the halo just below the outer rim (comparable to the holes drilled through the Brooklyn buddha). A rough surface area in the middle of the halo appears to show

16. BAUMS, 'Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions'; R. SALOMON, 'Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions', in D. JONGEWARD *et. al.*, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, Seattle, Early Buddhist Manuscript Project, 2012, (*Gandharan Studies* 1), pp. 181-187, 188-194.

17. More elaborate examples are the inscription on the Hārītī image from Skarah Dheri, which is situated not on the pedestal proper but vertically next to the proper left thigh of the image (*vaṣ(*e) ek[u]ṇa[ca]duśatimae Aṣaḍasa masasa divase 20 1 1 s[var]gapade daśama bharadu śa[r]mam artha[e] taṇay[e]* CKI 133), and apparently also a fragmentary inscription on the image of a bull (*1 100 narapati Maṃkha*, CKI 365).

18. In addition to Abhijeet Kumar, I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Anupa Pande of the National Museum Institute for helping me obtain permission to publish this piece.

the outline of the head of a buddha, with *uṣṇīṣa* discernible at the top.

The Kharoṣṭhī inscription on the halo runs counterclockwise from four o'clock to eight o'clock inside the outer rim of the halo. If the dimension of the halo is in fact 16.5 cm in diameter, then the akṣaras of the inscription are on average around 1.6 cm in height. Paleographically, like the inscription on the Brooklyn buddha pedestal, the halo inscription can be dated to the middle period of the development of the Kharoṣṭhī script, again evidenced by the old-style yet open head of the *sa*. Also like the Brooklyn buddha inscription, the National Museum halo inscription uses *na* for the coronal nasal and neither anusvāra nor diacritics. The ductus, however, appears to be different, as witnessed in particular by the deeper head of the *ba* and the narrower *kha*. Except for the damage to its middle part, the inscription is clear and can be read and translated as follows:

daḍio[sea]mi thubami [dhra]()i[la]sa [ṣama]nasa danamukh[a]*
 Donation of the monk Dhramila to the Daḍiosea stūpa.

Starting again from the end, the halo, or rather the statue to which it belonged, is marked as a pious donation, here apparently spelled *danamukh[a]* rather than *danamukhe*. The last syllable of the word, damaged by the hole drilled through the halo, is followed by a vertical line that may be a punctuation mark concluding the inscription.

The donor of the halo was a monk (*[ṣama]nasa*, genitive singular), the top of the *ṣa* and the *ma* being slightly damaged and abraded, but still clear. His name was probably Dhramila (*[dhra](*)i[la]sa*, genitive singular, Skt. *Dharmila*), the familiar short form of any monastic compound name starting with *Dharma-*. Among Gāndhārī sources, it occurs in the Kopśakasa reliquary (*dhramilaputra* CKD 266) and in four documents from Niya (*dhramilaṣa* CKD 337, *dhamila(*sa)* CKD 442, *śramamṇana śamca sujata dhamilaṣa ca* CKD 419, *śramamṇna dhamila śilapraṣa ca* CKD 592).¹⁹

The location or institutional recipient was again a stūpa (*thubami*, locative singular), and the name given (*daḍio[sea]mi*, locative singular) appears to be the very same as on the Brooklyn buddha image. The first and third akṣaras are unambiguously *da* and *o*, just as on the Brooklyn buddha. The second *akṣara* of the name on the halo is clearly a *ḍi* with deep bowl-shaped head, removing any doubt about this syllable on the Brooklyn buddha. The fourth *akṣara* on the halo has what looks like a single-stroke old-style *sa*, but with a slight protrusion from the top that in light of the Brooklyn buddha inscription I interpret as vowel mark *e*. There seems to be another protrusion on the right of the *akṣara* that at first glance might suggest conjoined *pa* ('*spe*'), but which rather appears to be part of damage to the surface of the stone in this spot. There is nothing on the halo that would correspond to the cross-shaped mark between *se* and *a* on the Brooklyn buddha.

Survey of Gandhāran Halo Inscriptions

The corpus of known Gāndhārī inscriptions on halos is much smaller than that on pedestals, with only five examples, making the National Museum inscription a particularly welcome addition. The most basic type consists of the name of the donor followed by the word *danamukho*, attested at Jamalgarhi (*s[a]phae daṇamukha* CKI 118) and two unknown findspots

19. PADWA, 'An Archaic Fabric', p. 318.

(*bosavarumasa da(*ṇamukhe*) CKI 120, *śamiyae danamukhe* CKI 330). The basic type can be extended by further specifications of the donor, as in an incomplete inscription of unknown findspot last seen in a private collection in Paris (... *rae budhaśaasya bhariyae haridaasya radaṇa[kṣatrasya bha]in[ie] + [pa]iaka + + dae daṇamuye* CKI 252). A further extension consists in the addition of a location or institutional recipient – like on the National Museum halo – as well as beneficiaries, illustrated by the so-called ‘Aśo-raya’ inscription (*dhramatiṭhaṇaṇagarammi dhamaraiaṇmi aśorayapraīṭhividami momadarae balasomabhayae sa[m]aṇakarabhayae daṇamukhe imiṇa kuśalamuleṇa sarvasatva ṇivāiti para(*ṇivāiti)* CKI 256).

Conclusion

The Brooklyn buddha image and the National Museum halo are clearly shown, by their inscriptions, to come from the same, previously unknown, Daḍiosea stūpa. In spite of their at first glance complementary appearance, they are, however, unlikely to be parts of the same statue. First of all, if the measurements provided by the National Museum are correct, the halo is far too small to fit on the body of the Brooklyn buddha. But even if the measurements agreed, the fact remains that pedestal and halo name two different donors, and that not a single image has yet come to light in Gandhāra that bears two inscriptions, one on the pedestal and one on the halo. On the other hand, the finds at Loriyan Tangai and Jaulian make it abundantly clear that sometimes whole groups of buddha images were dedicated at the same site, either at the same time or subsequently. The inscriptions from the Daḍiosea stūpa would then seem to be just such a case and, if the evidence of the paleography is to be believed, they appear to have been carried out at different times, or at least by different scribes or stonemasons. It is to be regretted that the ultimate provenance of both the Brooklyn buddha and the National Museum halo remain unclear, so that we may never know the location of the Daḍiosea stūpa and are unable to identify other uninscribed items from this stūpa that may also have found their way into collections.

FIG. 1

FIG. 1 Inscribed buddha image, Brooklyn Museum, New York (acc. no. 67.200.3). Courtesy of Brooklyn Museum.

FIG. 2 - FIG. 4

FIG. 2 Top: Detail of Brooklyn Museum inscription (right). Courtesy of Brooklyn Museum.

FIG. 3 Center: Detail of Brooklyn Museum inscription (middle). Courtesy of Brooklyn Museum.

FIG. 4 Bottom: Detail of Brooklyn Museum inscription (left). Courtesy of Brooklyn Museum.

FIG. 5

FIG. 5 Inscribed halo in the National Museum, New Delhi (accession number 59.295). Courtesy of National Museum, New Delhi.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CKI = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (part II of BAUMS and GLASS, *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts*)
 CKM = Corpus of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts (part I of BAUMS and GLASS, *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts*)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- S. BAUMS, ‘Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions’, in D. JONGEWARD *et. al.*, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, Seattle, Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, 2012 (*Gandharan Studies* 1), pp. 200-251.
- S. BAUMS and A. GLASS, *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts*, 2002- <https://gandhari.org/catalog>.
- K. W. DOBBINS, ‘Gandhāra Buddha Images with Inscribed Dates’, *East and West*, 18 (1968), pp. 281-288.
- H. FALK ‘Three Inscribed Buddhist Monastic Utensils from Gandhāra’, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 156 (2006), pp. 393-412.
- , ‘The Pious Donation of Wells in Gandhara’, in G. MEVISSEN and A. BANERJI (ed.), *Prajñādhara: Essays on Asian, History, Epigraphy and Culture in Honour of Gouriswar Bhattacharya*, New Delhi, Kaveri Books, 2009, pp. 23-36.
- D. JONGEWARD *et. al.*, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, Seattle, Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, 2012 (*Gandharan Studies* 1).
- M. PADWA, ‘An Archaic Fabric: Culture and Landscape in an Early Inner Asian Oasis (3rd–4th Century C.E. Niya)’, (unpublished doctoral thesis, Harvard University, 2007).
- R. SALOMON, ‘Three Dated Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions’, *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, 9 (1995), pp. 127-141.
- , ‘The Macedonian Month Xandikos in Gandhāran Inscriptions,’ *Studia Orientalia*, 110 (2011), pp. 165-170.
- , ‘Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions’, in D. JONGEWARD *et. al.*, *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, Seattle, 2012 (*Gandharan Studies* 1), pp. 164-199.
- J. Ph. VOGEL, ‘Inscribed Gandhāra Sculptures’, *Archaeological Survey of India Annual Report 1903-04*, Calcutta, Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, 1905, pp. 244-260.

**ASSOCIATION POUR LA PROTECTION DE L'ARCHÉOLOGIE AFGHANE
ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROTECTION OF AFGHAN ARCHAEOLOGY
(Édition APAA)**

ARCHAEOLOGIA AFGHANA

Série scientifique V

**DE L'OXUS AU GANGE
ÉTUDES EN L'HONNEUR DE FRANCINE TISSOT**

éditées par

Jessie PONS

Université de Strasbourg

2025