

A New Bactrian Inscription of Kanishka the Great

Nicholas SIMS-WILLIAMS
and
Joe CRIBB

In 1993 a photograph arrived at the British Museum which will lead to a fundamental reassessment of our understanding of the Kushan kings who ruled an ancient empire centred on the territory now known as Afghanistan and Pakistan. The photograph was sent by a British charity worker, Tim Porter, working for the Halo Trust, organising the removal of mines in the Afghan province of Baghlan. Tim Porter was invited by Sayyid Ja'far, Governor of Baghlan, to make photographs of some stone remains which had been found at a site in Baghlan. At the Governor's request Tim Porter sent one of the photographs to the British Museum to seek information about the stone remains.

The photograph was of a rectangular piece of what appears to be a whitish limestone 90 cm wide, 50 cm high and 25 cm thick. All over one face was an inscription written in Greek letters, twenty three lines each containing more than fifty letters. Mr Porter drew attention to its similarity to the Kushan inscription found at Surkh Kotal. His remark proved to be very much to the point, as a preliminary examination of his photograph showed it to be written in the same language, and like the Surkh Kotal inscription it mentioned the Kushan king Kanishka and the Kushan official Nukunzuk.

The stone bearing the inscription was found together with fragments of a sculpture of a lion (four paws and part of the mane were found) and architectural elements, including the base of a pilaster and a capital decorated on two sides with circular stylised lotus motifs. All the fragments were in the same whitish stone. They were found in a hill known locally as the Kafirs' Castle, in a region called Rabatak twenty five miles north of Pul-i Khumri (the site is referred to as a place where Kushan period sherds have been found by Ball 1982, I, 226, no. 944, who describes it as Rabatak Kafir Qal'a, latitude 36.09N, longitude 68.24E, about 40 km east of Haibak on the road to Pul-i Khumri). Tim Porter reported to us that the stones were found in March 1993 by an official party sent by the Governor after the local people reported finding ancient bricks and carved stones while they were salvaging stone from the hill to rebuild their homes after returning to the region following the cessation of hostilities.

The Governor removed the discoveries to the safety of his residence, where as far as we know they remain. The lion and lotus motifs are of Indian style. The bricks from the site are large: 20 cm x 10 cm x 8 cm. The description of the site suggests that it is extensive, perhaps on a similar scale to Surkh Kotal. The site is

on an ancient road which links it with Surkh Kotal. Since the original photograph (a colour print 10 cm × 7 cm) we have also been sent a series of black and white shots of the whole stone and close-ups of sections of it, and a video of the site, the objects in the Governor's residence and further views of the stone. The following account of the inscription is based on our examination of all these. We would like to thank Governor Sayid Ja'far and Tim Porter for their generous help in bringing this valuable document to the attention of the academic world. We also thank Ian Clarke, Tim Porter's colleague at the Halo Trust, who brought the black and white photographs to London. After an initial period of joint examination and discussion the work of translation and textual commentary was undertaken by Nicholas Sims-Williams, and an examination of its historical significance by Joe Cribb.

Part I: The Rabatak Inscription, text and commentary

Nicholas Sims-Williams

The first part of this article consists of the following sections:

(i) Text of the Rabatak inscription with interlinear translation (pp. 77-81 with Fig. 1-8). Doubtful readings are indicated by points below the letters; parentheses indicate a greater degree of uncertainty. Restorations, where no significant traces are visible, are enclosed in square brackets. A bullet (•) stands for an illegible letter. The tracing in Fig. 8 is a composite based on a montage of several photographs and is not perfectly to scale. Dotted lines indicate letters or parts of letters which are partly or wholly illegible. In the translation asterisks are used, no doubt somewhat arbitrarily, to draw attention to particularly uncertain or hypothetical interpretations.

(ii) Epigraphic and linguistic commentary (pp. 82-88) devoted to the reading and literal interpretation of the text rather than to its content and historical significance (for which see Part II).

(iii) Remarks on orthography and morphology (pp. 88-90).

(iv) Glossary to the Rabatak inscription (pp. 90-95). So far as possible an etymology and grammatical analysis is given for each word or form. If a word is known to occur elsewhere (in the same or a variant spelling) this is indicated.

(v) Appendix: the titulature of Vima from the Bactrian inscription of Dasht-e Nawur, lines 1-7 (pp. 95-96 with Fig. 9), for comparison with that of Kanishka in the Rabatak inscription. My text is based on the plates in Fussman 1974 together with one of the original photographs by A. Boutière kindly lent to me by Professor Fussman. However, the poor state of preservation of the inscription means that many readings must remain tentative.

The Bactrian inscriptions of Surkh Kotal (SK) and Dasht-e Nawur (DN) are referred to by the abbreviations proposed by Fussman (1974). Where a particular form is said to occur “later” or “in later texts” the reference is to a private collection of Bactrian documents of Kushano-Sasanian and later date which I am at present preparing for publication.

1 [ca.10]γο βωγο στοργο κανη̄κε̄ κο̄βᾱγο

... of the great salvation, Kanishka the Kushan,

ρᾱβ̄το̄γο̄ λᾱδεῑγο̄ χο̄ᾱζαοᾱργο̄ βᾱγο̄

the righteous, the just, the autocrat, the god

2 *εξνογο κιδι ασ[ο] νανα οδο ασο*

*worthy of worship, who has obtained the kingship from Nana and from

οισποανο μι βαγανο ι βαοδανι αβορδο κιδι ιωγο χρονο

all the gods, who has *inaugurated the year one

3 *νοβαστο σ(α)γωνδι βαγανο σινδαδο οτηια*

as the gods pleased. And he

ι ιωναγγο οασο οζοαστο ταδηια αριαο ωσ-

*issued a Greek *edict (and) then he put it into Aryan.

4 *ταδο αβο ιωγο χρον(ο) αβο [ι] ιυνδο φροαγαζο*

In the year one it has been proclaimed unto India,

αβο βατριαγγε βαορε αγια κρο-

unto the *whole of the realm of the *kshatriyas, that (as for)

5 *αδηανο οδο ι ωζοπο οδ(ο) [ι ζ]αγηδο οδο ι*

them—both the (city of) . . . and the (city of) Saketa, and the (city of)

κωζ(αμ)βο οδο ι παλαβοτρο οιδρα αδα αβο ι ζιριτ-

Kausambi, and the (city of) Pataliputra, as far as the (city of) Sri-Campa

6 *αμβο σιδηιανο προβαο οδο μανδαρ(ο) ι στροανο*

—whatever rulers and other *important persons (they might have) he

αβο ι σινδο ωσταδο οτη(ι)α αρου(γ)ο

had submitted to (his) will, and he had submitted all

7 *ιυνδο (αβο) ι σινδο ωσταδο ταδι βαι κανηκε*

India to (his) will. Then King Kanishka

αβο βαφαρο καραλαραγο φρομαδο

gave orders to Shafar the *karalrang*

8 (α)βεινα[ca. 4]ο βαγολααγο κερδι σιδι β•••αβο ριζδι

*at this . . . to make the sanctuary which is called B. . . ab,

αβο μα κα••• ραγα φαρειμοανο β–

in the *plain of Ka. . ., for these

9 (α)γα(ν)ο (κ)ιδι μαρο κερδαν(ε) ι μα•••ο[φ]αρρο ομμα οσηλδι

gods, (of) whom the . . . *glorious Umma leads the *service here,

ια αμσα γανα οδο ια αμ–

(namely:) the *lady Nana and the

10 σα ομμα αορομοζδο μοζδοο(α)νο

*lady Umma, Aurmuzd, the Gracious one,

σροβαρδο ναρασασο μιρο¹ οτηια ουδοα–

Sroshard, Narasa, (and) Mihr.¹ And he *likewise

11 νο πι(δο)γηρβο φρομαδο κερδι εμμοανο

gave orders to make images of these

βαγανο κιδι μασκα νιβιχτιγενδι οτ–

gods who are written above, and

12 ηια φρομαδο αβειμοανο βαονανο κερδι

he gave orders to make (them) for these kings:

¹Over the list of gods in lines 9-10 one can see traces of writing in smaller letters, of which the final words are legible:]ο οδο μαασην[ο] ριζ(δι) οδο βιζα(γ)ο ριζδι “. . . and he is called Mahasena and he is called Visakha”.

αβο κοζουλο καδφισο βαο αβο ι φρ—

for King Kujula Kadphises (his) great

13 ονιαγο (ο)δο α(β)ο οσημο (τ)ακτοο βαο

grandfather, and for King Vima Taktu

α(β)[ο] ι νια(γ)ο οδο αβο οσημο καδφισο βαο αβο

(his) grandfather, and for King Vima Kadphises

14 (ι) πιδα οδο αβο ι χοβσο αβο κανηβο βαο

(his) father, and *also for himself, King Kanishka.

τα σαγωνδι βαονανο βαο ι βαγοποο—

Then, as the king of kings, the *devaputra*

15 [ρο] α[ca. 7] φρ(ο)μαδο κιδι

... had given orders to do,

ταδι βαφαρε καραλαγγε κιδο ειο βαγολαγγο

Shafar the *karalrang* made this sanctuary.

16 [ca. 8]ο καραλαγγο οδο βαφαρο

[Then . . .] the *karalrang*, and Shafar

καρалаγγο οδο νοκογζοκο ιαβτο ο—

the *karalrang*, and Nukunzuk [led] the worship

17 α[στο πι]δο ια φρομανο ειμιδβα βαγε

[according to] the (king's) command. (As for) *these gods

κιδι μαρο νιβιχτιγενδι ταδανο αβο βαογ—

who are written here—may they [keep] the

- 18 *αν(ο) β̣αο̣ α̣β̣ο̣ κ̣αν̣η̣β̣κε̣ κ̣ο̣β̣α̣νο̣ α̣β̣ο̣ ι̣αο̣η̣δ̣αν̣ι̣ ζ̣ο̣ρ̣ρι̣γι̣*
 king of kings, Kanishka the Kushan, for ever
λ̣ρ̣ου̣(γ̣)ο̣ α̣γγ̣α̣[ο̣](α̣)γγ̣ο̣ ο̣αν̣ι̣ν̣δ̣-
 healthy, *secure, (and) victorious.
- 19 *ο̣ π̣[ca. 4]ι̣(ν̣)δ̣ι̣ ο̣δ̣[••](δ̣)ι̣ β̣α̣(γ̣)ο̣π̣ο̣ο̣ρ̣ο̣*
 And [when] the *devaputra*,
α̣σ̣ο̣ ι̣ω̣γ̣ο̣ χ̣ρ̣ο̣νο̣ α̣β̣ο̣ ι̣ο̣ (,α̣) χ̣ρ̣ο̣νο̣ ι̣ν̣δ̣ο̣ α̣ρ̣ου̣γ̣ο̣ π̣-
 the *ruler of all India from the year one to the year *one *thousand,
- 20 *α̣δ̣α̣[χ̣ρ̣α̣νο̣] ι̣ β̣(α̣)γ̣ο̣λ̣α̣γγ̣ο̣ α̣β̣ο̣ ι̣ω̣γ̣ο̣ χ̣ρ̣ο̣νο̣ α̣σ̣π̣α̣δο̣*
 had *founded the sanctuary in the year one,
τα̣δι̣ α̣β̣ο̣ ι̣ α̣ρι̣α̣μο̣σο̣ (χ̣)ρ̣ο̣νο̣ α̣γγ̣αρ̣[••]
 then *also to the . . . year . . .
- 21 *[ca. 10 π̣ι̣δ̣ο̣ β̣α̣ο̣ φ̣ρ̣ο̣μ̣α̣να̣ α̣β̣ι̣σο̣ ι̣ πα̣β̣η̣να̣ λ̣α̣δο̣*
 . . . according to the king's command, (and) it was given also to the . . . ,
α̣β̣ι̣σο̣ ι̣ ρ̣α̣[ca. 5] λ̣α̣δο̣ α̣β̣ι̣σο̣ [ca. 3]
 (and) it was given also to the . . . , (and) also to . . .
- 22 *[ca. 13]β̣α̣ ι̣ μα̣δ̣•••α̣ (α̣)β̣ο̣ β̣α̣γ̣α̣νο̣ λ̣α̣δο̣*
 . . . the king gave an *endowment to the gods,
ο̣δ̣ο̣ [ca. 4]ο̣[ca. 3]α̣χ̣α̣δ̣[ca. 8]β̣α̣γ̣ο̣[ca. 4]
 and . . .
- 23 *(traces only)*

Epigraphic and linguistic commentary

1f. Kanishka's titulature here may be compared with that of Vima in DN1, for which see the Appendix below (pp. 95-96). To judge from the latter, the missing words at the beginning of the Rabatak inscription may contain a date. Alternatively, since the date may be sufficiently indicated by the references to "year one" in line 2 and elsewhere, the opening words might have been: "This is the likeness of . . ." (assuming that the inscription accompanied a statue of Kanishka).

βαγο στοργο "the great salvation" is evidently equivalent to the Greek title σωτήρ μέγας "great saviour" commonly found on early Kushan coins. For the use of the abstract "salvation" rather than the personal "saviour" one may compare *RBch* 'nwth "great refuge" as an honorific form of address in Sogdian letters.

βαγο εζνογο: the equivalent words in DN1 are most probably to be read ι βαγο ι ηζνογο, with η- rather than ε-. Here ε- is unclear and η- may not be impossible, but there is not room for ι before it either at the end of line 1 or at the beginning of line 2. It therefore seems likely that the ι following βαγο in DN1 is indeed a separate word, as both Fussman and Davary—Humbach also assume. My comparison of εζνογο/(ι)ηζνογο with Av. *yesniia-* "worthy of worship" requires the assumption that an initial *y- could be lost by dissimilation before a palatal vowel (as in Sogdian). Humbach's comparison with Sogd. 'yjn "worthy" (older 'yrzn < *ar'yāna-, see Sundermann 1992, 78-79 n. 53) is at least equally problematic phonologically.

2 ασο οισποανο μι βαγανο "from all the gods": cf. φαιο οισποανο μο οαδοβαργανο "for all creatures" in SK4, M, line 9.

ιωγο χρονο "year one": χρονο is not fully legible here, but the phrase occurs again several times below, most clearly in line 19.

3 νοβαστο: preterite of a transitive verb, with ωγο χρονο "year one" as its object. The context suggests "inaugurated" (cf. below on χρονο αγγαρ[, line 20) or "completed". Etymologically there seem to be two possibilities, though neither gives an appropriate meaning without a semantic detour: (i) *ni-pāsta-, literally "caused to lie down, laid down, deposited", cf. MP *nibāst* "id.", Pth. *nb'y-* "to lay down" (cited by Henning 1937, 85, from unpublished texts; Professor Sundermann has kindly shown me the two attestations known to him, M251 r5 and M 7265 ii r10, in both of which the verb seems to refer to "planting (a seed or seedling)", Sogd. *np'yδ* "to put to bed", Chor. 'nb'zy- "id."; (ii) *ni-basta-, literally "tied up", cf. Av. *niuuaṇda-* "fetter", Sogd. *nyβ'ynt* "he tied on", *nβ'nt* *nβ'nt* "successively", *nβ'nt* "in the presence of, near, with", Bactr. *ναβανδο* "id." (in unpublished texts), Ossetic *nyvond* "sacrifice, sacrificial animal", Inscr. Pth. *nybndn* or *nybndy* "offering" (Morano 1991, 233-234).

οτηια ι ιωναγγο οασο οζοαστο "and he issued a Greek edict": literally "he led out the Greek speech", which could alternatively be understood to mean "he

discontinued (the use of) the Greek language”.

3f. ταδηια αριαο ωσταδο “then he put it into Aryan”. One cannot fail to notice the remarkable similarity to Darius’ Bisitun inscription, Old Persian text, Column IV, lines 88-89: “Proclaims Darius, the king: By the favour of Auramazdā this (is) the form of writing, which I have made, besides, in Aryan” (Schmitt 1991, 73). Similarly, both Darius and Kanishka refer repeatedly to the fact that the events recounted in the inscription took place within a single year (OP *hamahyāyā θarda*, DB IV, lines 4-5 etc.; Bactrian ιωγο χρονο, here, line 2 etc.). Such similarities must be considered in the light of recent discussions (e.g. Skjærvø 1985; Huyse 1990) of the linguistic, thematic, and structural parallels between Achaemenian and Sasanian inscriptions. It is not inconceivable that both Kushans and Sasanians may have had direct knowledge of the content of Darius’ inscription, presumably through an Aramaic version such as that found at Elephantine (Greenfield—Porten 1982; cf. Huyse 1990, 183 n. 31). The alternative is to suppose that such later echoes of the contents of the Achaemenian inscriptions are due to an oral tradition, as both Skjærvø and Huyse are inclined to believe.

4 βατριαγγε “of the *kṣatriyas*”: in assessing the probability of this interpretation it should be borne in mind that a sequence such as τρ or πρ indicates a non-Iranian word (cf. παλαβοτρο = *Pāṭaliputra-*, line 5, and προβαο = *prabhu-*, line 6)

αγιτα might be a fem. noun (in which case the phrase βατριαγγε βαορε “of the realm of the *kṣatriyas*” is in the oblique case as a dependent genitive), or an adverb (in which case βατριαγγε βαορε is governed by the prep. αβο), or a postposition (in which case βατριαγγε βαορε must be governed by the preposition and postposition in combination). A connection with MP *āgenēn* “together” may give a suitable meaning (noun “the whole” or adv. “altogether”). A past stem αγιτο is attested in later texts, but its meaning is not clear to me.

5f. A series of place-names, each preceded by the article ι. (i) ωζοπο, or possibly °γο or °σο, unidentified (the temptation to read *ωζονο = Ujjain should probably be resisted, since it would be difficult to account for the vocalization); (ii) probably [ζ]αγηδο or [σ]αγηδο = Skt. *Sāketa-*, near modern Faizabad; (iii) κωζαμβο = Skt. *Kauśāmbī-*, Pkt. *Kosambī-*, modern Kosam near Allahabad; (iv) παλαβοτρο = Skt. *Pāṭaliputra-*, Greek Παλιβοθρα, the capital of Magadha, modern Patna; (v) ζιριταμβο = Skt. (*Śrī-*)*Campā-*, near modern Bhagalpur. The representation of an Indian palatal stop by a dental stop is attested elsewhere, e.g. in Sogdian (see Sims-Williams 1983, 138). I am happy to acknowledge that I owe the identifications of *Sāketa* and *Campā* to Dr Ranabir Chakravarti, Calcutta.

6 σιδηιανο apparently introduces a verbless clause: “whatever rulers . . . (there might be)”, i.e. “all the rulers . . .” (cf. the similar use of Sogd. *cw*, GMS, §§1546-1552). Though -ηιανο may be merely a variant spelling of the 3 pl. encl. pronoun -ηανο (in κοοαδηανο, lines 4-5), here redundantly repeated after a long parenthesis, Yutaka Yoshida points out to me that one would expect the subject of

the verb $\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\delta\omicron$ to be expressed, as it is in the following sentence. It may therefore be better to interpret $-\eta\iota\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ as containing the 3 sg. encl. pronoun $-\eta\iota\alpha$ plus the hypothetical partical $-\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ (for which see below on lines 17ff.). While $-\eta\iota\alpha$ would provide the required subject for $\omega\sigma\tau\alpha\delta\omicron$ “the submitted”, the particle $-\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ would express the indefinite nature of the relative clause. Formally, the combination $\sigma\iota\delta-$ + $-\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ “whatever” resembles Late Khot. *cu āna*, which occurs frequently in the phrase *ttye pracaina cu āna* “because” (Bailey 1979, 18), but there is no discernible similarity in meaning.

If $\mu\alpha\upsilon\delta\alpha\rho\omicron$ is correctly read it probably represents a combination of the article $\mu-$ with $\alpha\upsilon\delta\alpha\rho\omicron$ “other” (attested in later texts) rather than with $\alpha\upsilon\delta\alpha\rho\omicron$ “internal” (as in SK4, M, line 3). What follows is unclear: $\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\alpha\upsilon\omicron$? $\iota\beta\tau\omicron\rho\alpha\upsilon\omicron$? $\alpha\tau\omicron\rho\alpha\upsilon\omicron$?

8 $\alpha\beta\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha$ [: possibly “at this [time(?)]”, with a combination of prep. + demonstrative pronoun comparable to $\pi\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron$ “by means of this” (SK4, M, lines 18-19).

$\beta\bullet\bullet\bullet\alpha\beta\omicron$: the name of the sanctuary may be a compound ending in $\alpha\beta\omicron$ “water”, but the middle of the word is illegible.

$\alpha\beta\omicron\ \mu\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\bullet\bullet\bullet\rho\alpha\gamma\alpha$: the word-division and the interpretation of $\rho\alpha\gamma\alpha$ as “plain” (Sogd. *r'gh*) are uncertain, but the fact that the last word ends in $-\alpha$, together with the fact that postvocalic κ is not to be expected in Bactrian, makes it likely that $\mu\alpha$ is indeed a fem. article. If $\kappa\alpha\bullet\bullet\bullet$ is a separate word it presumably ends in a vowel, most probably ϵ , while $\kappa\alpha\bullet\bullet\bullet\rho\alpha\bullet\alpha$ as a single word offers additional possibilities: $\kappa\alpha\omicron\gamma\epsilon\ \rho\alpha\gamma\alpha$? $\kappa\alpha\theta\nu\epsilon\ \rho\alpha\gamma\alpha$? $\kappa\alpha\omicron\nu\delta\rho\alpha\pi\alpha$?

$\phi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\mu\omicron\alpha\upsilon\omicron$: possibly altered from $\phi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$, which might be a corresponding sg. form (cf. $\pi\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$, SK4, B, line 22).

9 $\kappa\iota\delta\iota\ \mu\alpha\rho\omicron\ \kappa\iota\rho\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$. . . $\omicron\mu\mu\alpha\ \omicron\omicron\eta\lambda\iota$ “(of) whom . . . Umma leads the service”: the translation is somewhat speculative. $\omicron\mu\mu\alpha$, who is mentioned again in line 10, is evidently the goddess named as $\omicron\mu\mu\omicron$ on a coin of Huvishka, where she is depicted as a consort of $\omicron\eta\beta\omicron = \acute{S}\iota\nu\alpha$. A parallel issue depicts $\omicron\eta\beta\omicron$ with Nana, thus indirectly associating Nana and Umma as in lines 9-10 of the present text. $\omicron\mu\mu\omicron$ is generally taken as a transcription of Skt. *Umā*, a name of the wife of $\acute{S}\iota\nu\alpha$. This fits the context but does not account for the double $-\mu\mu-$, which is most easily explained as due to assimilation from $*-\beta-\mu-$ (cf. $\alpha\mu\omicron < \alpha\beta\omicron\ \mu\omicron$ “to the” in SK4, M, line 11). In that case the divine name $\omicron\mu\mu\alpha/\omicron\mu\mu\omicron$ might be compared with Av. *upāma-* “highest” and explained as the name or epithet of a female deity, who was perhaps conflated with *Umā* on account of the phonetic similarity of the two names.

If the final $-\epsilon$ of $\kappa\iota\rho\delta\alpha\nu\epsilon$ is correctly read, which is quite uncertain, this is perhaps the oblique case of $*\kappa\iota\rho\delta\alpha\nu\omicron$, which may be a noun semantically equivalent to MP *kerdagān* “service (of the gods)” $< *krtakāna-$ (on which see Back 1988) but formally closer to its Sogd. cognate *'krt'nyh* “(evil) deed, sin” $< *krtāniyā-$. (Manichean Bactrian has *qyrdg'n* “action” see Gershevitch 1983, 274, but this may be a MMP loanword.) The verb $\omicron\omicron\eta\lambda-$ “to lead, conduct”

corresponds to οηλ- in later texts in exactly the same way as the PN οσημο “Vima” does to the later spelling οημο. For the occurrence of οσηλ- with κηδανε “service”(?) as its object one may compare the use of forms of the same verb with ιαητο “worship” as their object (see the note to lines 16f. below). Here, however, the fact that the subject of the verb seems to be a goddess rather than a human being indicates that the phrase κηδανε . . . οσηλ- must have a different connotation. Possibly the implication is that Umma “takes precedence here (i.e. in this sanctuary)”, which would make sense if she were the primary dedicatee of the temple.

9f. ια αμσα νανα οδο ια αμσα ομμα “the *lady Nana and the *lady Umma”: the titles given to Nana elsewhere (Bactr. Νανα βαο “Nana the ruler”, Sogd. *nnδβ’mbn* “Nana the mistress”, etc.) suggest a likely range of meanings for αμσα. If αμσα is a specifically feminine title, it may contain the fem. suffix -σα < *-čī- + -ā- (for which see Sims-Williams 1993, 173). I am grateful to Dr Gershevitch for the excellent suggestion that the stem preceding this suffix may be cognate with Vedic *ambī-* “mother”, Gk. ἀμμάς, German *Amme*, etc.

10 αρομοζδο: at first sight the initial αο- is surprising, since the name of Ahura Mazda is attested in the form ωρομοζδο on a coin of Huvishka. However, doubt has been cast on the authenticity of this coin (see Humbach 1975a, 139-140), whilst forms such as ωυρομοζδο, ωρομοζδο, ωορομοζδο, attested as personal names in the Kushano-Sasanian period, are likely to represent a Middle Persian form and are therefore irrelevant as evidence for the name of the god in Bactrian of the Kushan period. A less likely alternative is to read αθηομοζδο, which could be understood as “Fire (and) Mazda” or perhaps as “Fire (son) of Mazda” (cf. Av. *ātarš ahurahe mazadā*).

The presence of the name αρομοζδο (or perhaps μοζδο) beside μοζδοοαο is also disconcerting in so far as the latter is usually interpreted as a Bactrian form of the name of Ahura Mazda. Since the iconography of μοζδοοαο seems to provide no decisive support for this identification, it is worth considering the alternative hypothesis that the name is to be understood as an epithet meaning “the gracious one”, cognate with Vedic *mīdhvāms-*, Khot. *māde*, *mādāna-* “gracious”, the case for which will be presented in detail elsewhere.

σροβαρδο ναρασσο: cf. Av. *sraošō ašiiō* and *nairiiō.səp̄hō*, MMP *srwšhr’y* and *nrysh*, Sogd. *srwšrt* and *nryšnx*, two gods not attested on the Kushan coinage.

The interlinear writing which is faintly visible over parts of lines 9-10 seems to identify the Iranian deities of the main text with Indian divinities. Since one cannot read the whole of the interlinear text it is not clear to which Iranian god or gods the names μαασηνο “Mahāsena” and βιζαγο “Viśākha” are intended to refer. (The γ of the latter name is unclear, perhaps because it has been altered.)

10f. ουδοαο “likewise”(?): this interpretation is based on a comparison with οδαναγγο in a later document, which the context shows to mean “pertaining to the same (person)”, evidently an adj. in -αγγο from an unattested *οδαο “the

same". The spellings ουδοαυο and *οδαυο could represent [ūdwǎn] and [ūdǎn] respectively, the latter form displaying dissimilatory loss of *w*. In origin the form is perhaps a derivative of the pronominal stem **awa-* or **awa(n)t-* (cf. Sogd. *wntn* "so much, such", etc.), but the details are unclear.

12ff. The names of most of the kings listed here are well-known from other sources and are sufficiently well-preserved for the readings to be regarded as certain. For οσημο τακτοο one may compare the name of the king in DN1, line 3, which was read οσημο τακτοο both by Fussman and by Davary—Humbach (cf. below, pp. 95-96 and 97-98). The words φρονιαγο "great-grandfather", νιαγο "grandfather", and πιδα "father" were not previously attested in Bactrian but are etymologically clear. For the formation of φρονιαγο from νιαγο by means of the prefix φρο- one may compare that of Latin *pro-avus* "great-grandfather" from *avus* "grandfather"; cf. also OP *apa-niyāka-* beside Latin *ab-avus* "great-great-grandfather".

For the repetition of the preposition αβο as a marker of grammatical congruence see Sims-Williams 1973.

16f. ιαβοτο "worship" cannot be a native Bactrian form but must, like MP *yašt*, be a religious technical term borrowed from Av. *yešti-*. It may occur again in the first line of the Palamedes inscription (SK 3), the reading of which was improved by Henning 1960, 50 n. 9, and 1965, 80 n. 28: [. . .]βιδο ι ζηνοβιδο ιαβοτο [. . .] "[. . .]-bid the chief armourer [offered(?)] worship". (The first word may be a personal name rather than a title.) My restoration ιαβοτο οα[στο] "led the worship" here is inspired by the formation of the title ιαβοτο-οαλγο on a seal published by Cunningham 1893, P1. X/2: σασορηο ιαβοτο|αλγο "Sas-rew (the) leader of worship". This title (first correctly read by Livšić 1969, 64) may be understood as a compound of ιαβοτο + *οαλγο < **wādaka-*, nomen agentis to the verb οσηλ-/οαστο "to lead, conduct" (cf. Khot. *-bāyaa-* from **wādaka-* in *hina-bāyaa-* "leader of an army" etc.). It is tempting to restore ιαβοτο-οα[λγο] here too (as a title of Nukunzuk), in which case a finite verb for the sentence might be obtained by restoring the following word as [κτω]δο instead of [πι]δο. However, the resulting formulation ("Then Shafar . . . performed (his) command") seems rather weak in view of the fact that the command in question has not been specified. Moreover, the restoration [πι]δο ια φρομανο "according to the (king's) command" is supported by the occurrence of πιδο ια . . . φρομανα at the end of the Ayrtaṃ inscription (where the older spelling φρομανα is used as in line 21 of the present inscription).

17ff. ειμιδβα: the beginning of the word is faint, but the traces definitely suggest ειμ°. The last four letters are clearly °ιδβα or °ιαβα. Comparison with φαρειμοαυο βαγανο, lines 8f., and ειμοαυο βαγανο, line 11, suggests that ειμιδβα βαγε (however the first word is to be read) should mean "these gods". Since ειμιδβα is evidently the first word of a new sentence, the sequence is likely to contain -δ- representing the sentence-initial particle -δι/-δο/-δ- (cf. Sims-Williams 1985). In that case the final -βα must be a further enclitic particle,

possibly equivalent to Av. *bā*, *bāt*, etc. Its function cannot be considered in isolation from that of the particle *-ανο* contained in *ταδανο*. The latter particle occurs several times in SK4, M, lines 13-16, where it is generally taken as a 3 pl. enclitic pronoun. However, this interpretation is awkward in several of the clauses concerned and none of them demands it. In each case *-ανο* accompanies a hypothetical optative. In later texts too, *-ανο* occurs exclusively with the optative or subjunctive. It therefore seems likely to be a hypothetical or modal particle. (See also above on *σιδηιανο*, line 6.) Here the verb seems to be *π[••••]ινδι(?)* in line 19, a form which, if it is correctly read, is probably 3 pl. pres. indicative. If it is nevertheless to be interpreted as having a modal sense, as the presence of *-ανο* seems to imply, it is tempting to suppose that the specific function of *-βα* may be similar to that of the MMP hortative particle *hyb*, which is used with the pres. indicative to express a wish (and which itself probably contains *-b* < **ba* added to an optative form of the verb “to be”).

For the verb of this clause one might expect a transitive verb with a meaning such as “keep” or “make”. Surprisingly, this verb seems to mark its object by means of the preposition *αβο*. In later texts this construction is found in the case of the verb *σην-* “to see”, as in the common epistolary formula *οτανο οαλο βαταρανο καλδανο αβο το χοηο χοαδο λρογο σηνανο* “and then I would be happier if I myself might see your lordship healthy”. This formula is also relevant to the present passage for its two examples of the particle *-ανο* (with subjunctive) and for the adj. *λρογο* “healthy”, a later form of *λρουγο*. The Sogdian cognate of *λρο(υ)γο* is *δrw’k*, later *zwk*, which is also frequent in epistolary formulae, typically paired with a word meaning “at rest, easy, secure” (see Sims-Williams 1991, 184-185). This collocation has suggested the restoration *αγγα[ο]αγγο* here, an unattested but plausible form with just this meaning (present participle in *-αγγο* < **-ānaka-*, cf. Sogd. *-’n’k*, Khot. *-ānaa-*, from a verb **αγγαο-* < **han-gawa-*, cf. Pth. *’ngw-* “to rest”).

19 *αβο . . . χβονο* “to the year . . .”: between *αβο* and *χβονο* is a sequence which, if read as letters, could only be *οχχ* or *οαχ*, with or without a preceding *ι*. Since a word ending in *χ* is impossible in Bactrian, I hazard the guess that the *χ*-like cross at the end of this sequence belongs to the diacritic mark differentiating *,α* “thousand” from *α’* “one” (attested in a later Bactrian text in the form *ΣΙϚ*, written below the letter *α*). If this supposition is correct, the preceding *ι* can only be a compound form of the word for “one” (*ι*ο- < **aiwa-*, as opposed to the independent form *ιωγο* < **aiwa-ka-*, cf. MP *ēw* beside *ēk*).

19f. The last letter of line 19 seems to be *π*, *ν*, *γ*, or *ρ*; this is followed at the beginning of line 20 by an *α* and two more triangular letters such as *δα* or *ρδ*. The restoration of *παδαχβονο* “ruling” is an obvious possibility, since this word is attested in later texts. A conceivable alternative would be **ραδα* < Skt. *rājā* “king”.

20 *ιωγο χβονο*: written in smaller letters, perhaps as a correction.

ασπαδο “founded, built”? The reading is fairly clear but the meaning

uncertain, since no other Iranian language seems to use the root *spā* in this sense. According to Benveniste 1962, the basic meaning of the root is “jeter à terre, déposer sur le sol”; cf. also Gershevitch 1979, 291-292, on OP *spāyantiyā*- “camp”.

ταδι αβο ι αριαμοσο χρονο αγγαρ[: instead of -ιαμο- one could read -ημο-, -καν-, -ναν-, etc. The first two letters of χρονο are almost entirely lost in a hole, but αγγαρ[(or αγγαδ[?] is fairly clear. It is tempting to interpret αγγαρ[as “reckoning” (cf. MP *hangārag* < **han-kāraka-*), or a cognate verbal form, and to see here a reference to the introduction of the era of Kanishka. The repeated αβισο “also to . . .” in the following line (if it is not merely a variant of the later υαβισο “much”, Manichean *hβyś*, see Gershevitch 1983, 279) suggests an interpretation of αβο ι αριαμοσο as “to the *αριαμο also”, in which case *αριαμο might be “community (of the Aryan people)”, cf. Av. *airiīaman-*. The passage might thus be translated, very tentatively, as: “Then the year-reckoning [was given] to the community (of the Aryans) according to the king’s command, (and) it was also given to the . . ., (and) it was also given to the . . .”.

21 On αβισο see the previous note. In view of the unclear context, it is not clear whether λαδο is a verb “(it was) given, (he) gave” or a noun “law”. The vital term here is evidently παθηνα (or σταρηνα, μαθηνα, etc.), for which I unfortunately have no explanation to offer.

22 μαδ•••α may be a word for “capital, endowment”, cf. Latin *materies*, MP *mādišt* “matter”, Sogd. *m’tškh* “capital” (Ancient Letter 3, line 10), and especially Bactr. μαδαριγο (or μαδδριγο), which is attested in a later text in the phrase οαχο αλο μαδαριγο “the interest together with the capital”. If so, it is tempting to restore the sequence]αχαδ[further on in the line as a form of the verb οαχ- “to increase, accrue” (< **waxša-*, MP *waxš-*), thus: “the king gave an endowment (*μαδριγα?) to the gods and [the interest] accrued (*οαχαδο?) . . .”.

Remarks on orthography and morphology

In the three versions of SK4 a number of words containing υ [h] (< OIr. **h* or **θ*) are also attested in variant spellings without υ. Despite its earlier date, the Rabatak inscription (= R) attests only the later forms without **h* (αρουγο, βαγοπορο, μιρο, βαορε). The one exception is υνδο “India”, a spelling which appears to represent [ihnd], by metathesis from the expected *[hind]. Possibly the word was actually pronounced [ind], with loss of initial **h-* as in αρουγο “all” < υαρουγο, in which case the insertion of υ = [h] in the wrong position may be a case of semi-learned orthography.

In R, as in most Bactrian texts, all words end in a vowel letter. The most common ending is -o, which was probably often if not always silent, but -α, -ε, and -ι are also found. The distribution of these finals in R agrees more closely with that of SK4, version B, than with that of versions A or M.

Final -α is found in the f. article ια (and μα?) and some f. nouns (cf. μα

λιζα, SK4, B, ια λογδα, Dilberjin, ια . . . φρομανα, Ayrtaṃ): ια αμσα νανα, ια αμσα ομμα, μα . . . ραγα(?), φρομανα, παβηνα(?), μαδ●●α(?); also in the masculine πιδα (< OIr. nom. sg. *pitā) and in indeclinables: αδα (< OIr. *atā), °βα (< OIr. *bā?), μασκα (< OIr. *uskā(d)), οιδρα (< OIr. *witarā(d)?), τα (< OIr. *tā). But one also finds f. nouns ending in -o (ια φρομανο), and apparently ι beside ια as a f. article (ι . . . ομμα, ι παβηνα(?), cf. ι νοβαλμο in SK4, A and M, beside ια νοβαλμο in SK4, B). The consistent spelling of the 3 sg. encl. pronoun as -ηια agrees with the usage of DN1, contrasting with -ηιο in all three versions of SK4, and must be etymologically significant (see glossary).

Final -ε occurs exclusively in m. nouns and adjectives, apparently (as in SK4) marking the pl. (βαγε) or the obl. case (κωνηβκε, βατριαγγε βαιορε, κιδανε(?), βαφαρε καραλαγγε). In this function -ε seems to be interchangeable both with -o (see below) and with -ι: cf. the (pronominal) plurals μι, εμι^o and the obl. forms βαιοδανι, βαι, ιασηδανι ζορριγι. Final -ι is also found in various other words including the ubiquitous article ι. The consistent writing of -δι rather than -δο for OIr. *-ti, as in the compounds containing *uti (κιδι, σιδι, ταδι, etc.) and the 3 pl. verbal forms in -vδι (< OIr. *-nti), agrees with SK4, version B. The 3 sg. pres. indic. in -δι (< OIr. *-ti), not attested in SK4, fits into the same pattern. Note also the distinction between the preterite in -δο/-το (< OIr. *-ta-), e.g. κιδο, and the inf. κιδι (< OIr. *-tayai); cf. the palatalization attested in later Bactrian texts in the inf. δδριγδο “to hold” < OIr. *draxtayai as opposed to the pp. δδραγδο “held” < OIr. *draxta-, which may be compared with that in the Khot. past inf. (e.g. hvīte “to speak” from past stem hvata-).

The noun inflexion resembles that of Sogdian heavy stems, distinguishing two cases (direct and oblique) and two numbers. The best attested declension is that of thematic stems: dir. -o, obl. -ε or -ι, dir. pl. -ε, and obl. pl. -ανο. All examples of the obl. and pl. forms in -ε/-ι have already been cited above. The obl. pl. is attested by βαγανο, στορανο(?), and βαιονανο (from the partially thematicized *n*-stem βαι, obl. βαι). Cf. also the 3 pl. enclitic pronoun -ηανο, which seems to be a secondary form based on the equivalent 3 sg. -ηια, and the pronominal obl. pl. forms in -οανο (ειμοοανο, οισποοανο), with their etymologically unclear -o- between stem and ending.

While the morphological status of these forms seems to be fairly clear, their syntactic functions are extremely confused. As a working hypothesis I would suggest that this is due to two complicating factors:

(i) The direct form was effectively uninflected, since its final -o was probably silent, and may have been regarded as unmarked for case and number. It may therefore substitute for the oblique (as in line 1, which contains a series of nouns and adjectives all of which are evidently in apposition but only one of which is marked with the obl. ending) and perhaps for the plural (e.g. προβαο “ruler(s)”, line 6?). This would be closely paralleled by the treatment of heavy stems in Sogdian.

(ii) The preterite of transitive verbs appears to have been in transition from an

ergative construction with the subject in the obl. and the object in the dir. case (e.g. ταδι βραφαρε καραλαραγγε κερδο ειο βαγολαγγο “then Shafar the *karalrang* (obl.) made this sanctuary (dir.)”, line 15) to a nom.-acc. construction (e.g. κιδι . . . ι βραοδανι αβορδο “who has obtained the kingship (obl.)”, line 2). Such a transition is of course known to have taken place in many Iranian languages.

Glossary

- ,α numeral “1000”(?) **19***
 αβειμοανο = αβο + ειμοανο **12***
 αβεινα[**8***
 αβισο = αβο + -ισο **21, 21, 21***
 αβο prep. “to, for, in” (= SK4 etc.), perhaps also marking the direct object in lines 17-18, < *abi, OP abiy, MP *ō* **4*, 4*, 4, 5, 6, 7*, 7*, 8, 12, 12, 13*, 13*, 13, 13, 14*, 14*, 17, 18*, 18, 19, 20*, 20, 22***
 αβορδο pret. “obtained” (later (α)βορδο) < *abi-ṛta-, cf. Sogd. ’βy’rt < *abi-arta- **2**
 αγγαοαγγο adj. “at rest, secure” < *han-gawānaka-, pres. participle of *han-gawa-, Pth. ’ngw- “to rest” **18***
 αγγαρ[**20***
 αγιτα fem. noun “the whole”(?) or adv. “altogether”(?) (cf. MP *āgenēn* “together”?) **4**
 αδα adv. with prep. αβο “until, as far as” < *atā, Sogd. ’t(’), MP *tā*, MMP *d’*, *d’* ’w (see Sims-Williams 1975, 134ff.) **5**
 -αζο 3 sg. pret. “was”, used with a past stem to form a periphrastic pf., cf. Sogd. ’z, Pth. ’h’z in *kft* ’h’z “has fallen”, etc. (perhaps < pf. *āha + particle *zi, Gershevitch 1975, 200-205): see φροαγδαζο
 αμσα fem. noun “lady, mistress”(?), perhaps < *am(m)ī-čī- + -ā-, cf. Vedic *ambī-* “mother”, Gk. *ἀμμάς*, German *Amme* **9*, 9f**
 ανδαρο adj. “other” (later ανδαρο) < *antara-, Av. *²antara-*: see μανδαρο
 -ανο hypothetical particle (= SK4): see σιδητιανο, ταδανο
 αορομοζδο name of a god “Aurmuzd” (contrast ωορομοζδο on coins of Huvishka), Av. *ahura-mazdā-* **10**
 αριαμοσο **20***
 αριαο adv. “in Aryan (language)” < *ariya- + suffix as in Khot. *hvatanau* “in Khotanese”, Sogd. *swγdy’w* “in Sogdian”, etc. (see GMS, p. 249) **3***
 αρουγο adj. “whole, all” (SK4 (υ)αρουγο) < *harwaka-, cf. Av. *hauruua-* **6*, 19**
 ασο prep. “from” (= SK4 etc.) < *hačā, Av. *hača* **2*, 2, 19***
 ασπαδο pret. “founded”(?) < *(ā-)spāta-, cf. Sogd. *sp’t-z’nwk* “kneeling”, literally “with knees placed (on the ground)” **20***
 α[**15**

- βα particle giving hortative value to the present indicative(?), possibly < *-bā, Av. bā, cf. also the Inscriptional Pth. hortative particle hyp, Inscriptional MP 'yw, MMP hyb: see εμιδβα
- βαγο noun “god; lord” (= SK4 etc.) < *baga-, Sogd. βγ- **1***, **22***
 pl. βαγε (= SK4) **17***
 pl. obl. βαγανο (attested in later texts) **2***, **3***, **8f***, **11**, **22**
- βαγολαγγο noun “sanctuary, temple” (= SK4 etc.) < *baga-dānaka-, Sogd. βγδ' n'k **8***, **15**, **20***
- βαγοποορο noun “son of the gods, *devaputra*” (SK4 βαγοπουρο/οποορο) < *baga-puθra-, Pth. bgpwhr **14f***, **19***
- βιζαγο name of an Indian god “Viśākha” (= coins) **10n***
- βωγο noun “salvation” (= DN1?) < *bauga-, Sogd. βωγ **1**
- β•••αβο geog. name **8**
- δι, -δ- particle marking the first word of a clause (SK4 -δο/-δι, -δ-) < *uti, Sogd. -ty (see Sims-Williams 1985, 111-114): see εμιδβα(?), κιδι, κοοαδι, οδ[]δι, οτι, σαγωνδι, σιδι, ταδι
- εζνογο adj. “worthy of worship” (DN1 ηζνογο?) < *yazniyaka-, cf. Av. yesniia- **2***
- εμιδβα = εμι + -δ- + -βα(?) **17***
- ειο demonstr. pron. “this” (SK4 ειο/ειο) < *ayam, Av. aēm, cf. also ι **15**
 pl. εμι < *imai, Av. ime, with vocalization influenced by ειο: see εμιδβα
 pl. obl. εμοανο (= Dil., cf. also αβειμοανο, φαρειμοανο) **11***
- ζαγηδο or σαγηδο geog. name < Pkt. < Skt. Sāketa- **5***
- ζιριταμβο geog. name < Pkt. < Skt. Śrī-Campā- **5f***
- ζορριγο noun “time, period, age” (later ζοριγο, ζοραγο) < *zrūnaka-, Sogd. zwrn'k
 obl. ζορριγι **18***
- ηανο 3 pl. encl. pron. “they, them, their” (later -ηνο, -ηνο) < -ηια + pl. obl. ending -ανο: see κοοαδηανο
- ηια 3 sg. encl. pron. “he, his, its, etc.” (= DN1, Dil.) < *-hai, Av. -hē, perhaps with ending adapted to thematic *-ahya (cf. Davary—Humbach 1976, 16-17): see οτηια, σιδηια, ταδηια, ριδηιανο
- ι ezafe and article “the” (= SK4 etc.), in some uses < *ya-, Av. ya-, Chor. 'y, in others < *ayam, Av. aēm, Sogd. yw, as a proclitic variant of ειο **2**, **3**, **5**, **5**, **5**, **6***, **6**, **7***, **9***, **12**, **13***, **14***, **14***, **14**, **20***, **20**, **21***, **21***
 fem. ια (= Ayrtam, Dil.) < *yā-, Av. yā-, Cho. y' **9**, **9**, **17***
 acc. or obl.(?) μο, μ- (= SK4 etc.) < *imam, Sogd. (')mw: see μανδαρο, μασκα
 acc. or obl.(?) fem. μα (= SK4) < *imām, Sogd. (')m' **8**
 pl. μι < *imai, Av. ime, proclitic variant of εμι **2**
- ιασηδανο noun “eternity” (later ιαο(ι)ηδ(δ)ανο) < *yāwai-tāna-, MP jāwēdān
 obl. ιασηδανι **18**
- ιαφτο noun “worship” (cf. the title ιαφτο-οαλγο on a seal) = MP yašt “prayer,

- worship", LW < Av. yešti-, (hu)iešti- 16
- ιο numeral "one" (?) < *aiwa-, proclitic form of ιωγο(?) 19
- ισο, -σο particle "also" (later -(ι)σο) < *čid, Av. -čit, or *čim, Sogd. (')cw, Khot. ju: see αβισο, χοβσο (and perhaps αριαμοσο)
- ιυνδο geog. name "India" < *hindu-, Av. hiṇdu- 4*, 7, 19*
- ιωγο numeral "one" (= SK4) < *aiwaka-, MP 'ywk' 2, 4, 19, 20*
- ιωναγγο adj. "Greek" < *yauna-, OP yauna-, + suffix *-ānaka- as in Sogd. cxwδ'ny "Jewish" etc. 3
- καδφισο PN "Kadphises", cf. Gk. καδφισης etc. on Kushan coins 12, 13
- κανηρκο PN "Kanishka" (= SK4 etc.) 14
- obl. κανηρκε (SK4 κανηρκι) 1, 7*, 18*
- κα... geog. name 8*
- καραλραγγο noun "margrave" (= SK4) < *karāna-dranga, cf. NP kanārang (Henning 1965, 77-79) 7*, 16*, 16
- obl. караλραγге (SK4 °γγε/°γγι) 15*
- κιδι rel. pron. "who" (SK4 κιδο/κιδι) < *ka- + -δι, Sogd. 'ky 'ty 2, 2, 9*, 11, 17*
- κιρδανο noun "service (of the gods)" (?), cf. MP kerdagān "id." < *kṛtakāna-, Sogd. 'krt'nyh "(evil) deed, sin" < *kṛtāniyā-
- obl. κιρδανε 9*
- κιρδο pret. "made" (= SK4 etc.) < *kṛta-, MMP kyrd 15
- inf. κιρδι (later κιρδο) < *kṛtayai, Sogd. 'krty, Khot. yäḍe 8*, 11, 12, 15*
- κοζουλο PN "Kujula", cf. Gk. κοζουλο(υ) etc. on coins of Kujula 12
- κοοαδι conj. "that" (later κοοαδο/κοαδο) < *kuwa, MP kū "where; (so) that" + -δι, cf. Sogd. 'kw ZY, kw 'ty "where": see κοοαδηανο
- κοοαδηανο = κοοαδι + -ηανο 4f*
- κορβανο adj. "Kushan" (= DN1 etc.) 1*, 18*
- κωζαμβο geog. name < Pkt. < Skt. Kauśāmbī- 5*
- λαδειγο adj. "just" (= DN1) < *dātiyaka-, MP dādīg 1
- λαδο pret. "gave" (= Dil. etc.) or noun "law" (later λαδο) < *dāta-, MP dād 21*, 21*, 22*
- λρουγο adj. "healthy" (later λρο(υ)γο, δδρογο) < *druwaka-, Sogd. ḍrwk 18*
- μ-, μα: see ι
- μασηνο name of an Indian god "Mahāsenā" (= coins) 10n*
- μαδϚ 22*
- μανδαρο = μ- + ανδαρο 6*
- μαρο adv. "here" (later μαρο) < *imaθra, Khot. mara 9*, 17
- μασκα adv. "above" (later μασκο) < μ- + *ασκα < *uskā(d), Av. uskāt, Sogd. 'sk', cf. also prep. ασασκο "above" (SK4) 11
- μα...οφαρρο probably a compound adj. containing φαρρο "glory" (= coins etc.) < *farnah- 9*
- μι: see ι

- μυρο name of a god “Mihr” (= coins), Av. miθra- **10**
- μοζδοοανο name of a god “Muzhduwan” (= coins), possibly < *miždwan- “the generous, the gracious one”, Khot. māḍe, māḍāna- **10***
- νανα name of a goddess “Nana” (= coins), cf. Sogd. nny, nn-δβ’mbn **2, 9**
- ναρασαο name of a god “Narasa”, cf. Av. nairiiō.sarəhō, MMP nrysh **10**
- νιαγο noun “grandfather” < *niyāka-, OP niyāka- **13***
- νιβιχτο past stem “written” (SK4 νοβιχτο) < *ni-pixšta-, Sogd. np’xšt-
3 pl. pf. νιβιχτιγενδι (later ναβιχτιγινδο) **11, 17**
- νοβαστο pret. “inaugurated”(?) or “completed”(?) (see commentary) **3**
- νοκονζοκο PN (= SK4) **16**
- οανινδο adj. “victorious” (= SK4) < *wanant-a-, cf. Av. vanant- **18f***
- οασο noun “edict” < *wāč-, MMP/Pth. w’c “word, speech” **3**
- οαστο: see οσηλ-
- οδο conj. “and” (= SK4 etc.), repeated οδο . . . οδο . . . “both . . . and . . .” < *uta, MP ud **2, 5, 5*, 5, 5, 6, 9, 10n, 10n, 13*, 13, 14*, 16, 16, 22***
- οδ[]δι conj. “and [when]”(?) < οδο + an unidentified element + -δι **19***
- οζοαστο pret. “brought out, released, issued (an edict)” (SK4 οζοοαστο, αζοοζστο, ζοοαστι “brought out (water)”) < *uz-wāsta-, Pth. ‘zw’st “led out, set free” **3**
- οιδρα adv. “so long” (with αδα αβο “until”) < *witarā(d), cf. Sogd. wytwr (with kw . . . prm “until” etc.) < *witaram (Sims-Williams 1986, 417) **5**
- οισπο pronominal adj. “all” < *wispa-, Av. vīspa-
pl. obl. οισποανο (= SK4) **2**
- ομμα name of a goddess “Umma” (= ομμο on a coin of Huvishka) **9, 10***
- οσηλ-/οαστο vb “to lead, conduct” (later ο(ι)ηλ-/οαστο, cf. SK4 οαστινδο) < *wādaya-/wāsta-, Pth. w’y-/w’st
3 sg. pres. οσηλδι **9**
pret.(?) οαστο **16f***
- οσημο PN “Vima” (= DN1, later οιημο) **13*, 13**
- οτηα = οτι + -ηα (= DN1) **3*, 6*, 10, 11f***
- οτι conj. “and” (SK4 οτο/οτι) < οδο + -δι, cf. Sogd. ’PZY = ’ty “and; that” (cf. Sims-Williams 1985, 112): see οτηα
- ουδοανο adv. “likewise”(?) (cf. later *οδανο “the same”, attested via the adj. οδαναγγο “pertaining to the same (person)”) **10f**
- παδαχβανο adj. “having authority, ruling, ruler” (later παδαχβανο) < *pāti-xšāna-, Pth. p’dyxš’n **19f***
- παλαβοτρο geog. name < Pkt. < Skt. Pāṭaliputra- **5***
- παρηνα **21***
- πιδα noun “father” < *pitā, OP pitā, nom. of pitar- **14***
- πιδο prep. “at, by, according to” (= SK4 etc.) < *pati, Av. paiti **17*, 21***
- πιδογιρβο noun “image” < *pati-kṛp-, MMP phykyrb “form, figure” **11***
- προβαο noun “ruler, chief”, LW < Skt. prabhu- **6***
- π[]ινδι 3 pl. pres. indic.(?) **19***

- ραγα fem. noun “plain”(?) < *rāgā-, Sogd. r’γh **8***
 ραφτογο adj. “righteous” (= DN1?) < *rāštaka-, cf. Pth. r’št “right” **1***
 ρα[**21***
 ριζ- vb “to be called, be named” < *rāzya-, passive to *rāza- (later ραζ-) “to call, name”, Khot. rrāys- “to cry out”
 3 sg. pres. ριζδι (= Ayrtaṃ, later ριζδο) **8*, 10n*, 10n**
 σαγωνδι conj. “as” (later σαγωνδο/σαγονδο) < *čiyā-gauna-, MP cygwn’ + -δι **3, 14**
 σιδηιανο = σιδι + -ηια + -ανο(?) **6***
 σιδι rel. pron. “what, which” (SK4 σιδο/σιδι) < *či- + -δι, Sogd. ’cw ’ty **8**
 σινδ-/σινδαδο vb “to wish, desire” (later σινδ-) < *sandaya-, Av. sənḍaiia-
 pret. σινδαδο **3**
 σινδο noun “will, desire”, verbal noun to σινδ- **6, 7***
 -σο: see -ισο
 σροβαρδο name of a god “Sroshard”, Av. sraošō ašiiō, Sogd. srwšrt **10**
 στοργο adj. “great” (= DN1) < *stūraka-, MP sturg **1**
 στορο id.(?) < *stūra-, Khot. stura-
 pl. obl. στορανο **6***
 τα conj. “then, so” (= SK4) < *tā, Av. tā **14**
 ταδανο = ταδι + -ανο (= SK4) **17**
 ταδι conj. “then, so” (SK4 ταδο/ταδι) < τα + -δι **7, 15*, 20**
 ταδηια = ταδι + -ηια (SK4 ταδηιο) **3**
 τακτοο PN “Taktu” (= DN1?) **13***
 φαρειμοανο = φαρο + ειμοανο **8**
 φαρο prep. “for” (= SK4), cf. Pth. frh’ (according to a suggestion of Yutaka Yoshida): see φαρειμοανο
 φροαγδαζο = φροαγδο + -αζο **4**
 φροαγδο past stem “proclaimed” < *fra-wāxta-, cf. Av. fra-uuak “edicere, enuntiarae”, Sogd. wγt-, Pth. w’xt “said”: see φροαγδαζο
 φρομαδο pret. “commanded” (later φρομαδο) < *fra-māta-, OP framāta- **7, 11*, 12*, 15***
 φρομανα fem. noun “command” (= Ayrtaṃ) < *fra-mānā-, OP framānā- **21***
 φρονανο id. (= SK4) **17***
 φρονιαγο noun “great-grandfather” < prefix *fra- (= pro- in Latin proavus “id.”) + νιαγο **12f***
 χοαζαοαργο adj. “self-powerful, αὐτοκράτωρ < *hwā-zāwaraka-, cf. Av. prefix huuā- “self-” and zāuuar- “power” **1**
 χοβο reflexive pron. “(one’s) self” (later χοβο), deriving, like the more common χοβο/χοβι “(one’s) own” (Sims-Williams 1993, 173), from *xwa-paθya- (cf. Pashto xpal “own; self”): see χοβσο
 χοβσο = χοβο + -(ι)σο **14***
 χρονο noun “(calendar) year, (regal) year” (= SK4 etc.), possibly LW < Gk. χρόνος (A. Thierfelder apud Humbach 1966, 24) **2*, 4*, 19, 19, 20*, 20***

- ωζοπο geog. name(?) 5*
 ωσταδο pret. “placed, submitted” (= SK4) < *awa-stāta-, Sogd. ’wst’t 3f, 6*, 7*
 βαο noun “ruler, king” (= SK4 etc.) < *xšāwā(h), nom. of *xšāwan-, Late Khot.
 šsau (official title) 12, 13*, 13*, 14, 14, 18*, 21*
 obl. βαι 7*, 22*
 pl. obl. βαοναο (= DN1, coins) 12*, 14, 17f*
 βαοδανο noun “kingdom, kingship” < βαο + abstract suffix *-tāna- (cf.
 ιασηδανο and perhaps the Sogd. abstracts in -t’ny(h), GMS, §1074a?)
 obl. βαοδανι (DN1 βαοδανε) 2
 βαορο noun “kingdom, realm” (later βα(υ)ρο) < *xšaθra-, Av. xšaθra-
 obl. βαορε 4
 βατριαγγο adj. “pertaining to the *kṣatriya* class” < Skt. *kṣatriya-* + adj. suffix
 *-ānaka-
 obl. βατριαγγε 4
 βαφαρο PN 7, 16
 obl. βαφαρε 15

**Appendix: The Bactrian inscription
 of Dasht-e Nawur (DN1), lines 1-7**

- 1 σοθ’ γορπιαιοϋ ιε’
 [Greek:] (Year) 279, (month) Gorpiaios, (day) 15.
- 2 βαονανδε βαι ι βωγο
 [Bactrian:] Of the king of kings, the
- 3 ι στρογγο οσημο τακτρο
 great salvation, Vima Taktu
- 4 κοβαγο ι ραβτογο ι λαδει–
 the Kushan, the righteous, the just,
- 5 γο ι βαγο ι ηζνογο κιδι πιδο ι
 the god worthy of worship, who according to
- 6 χοβε ιανε βαοδαγε λφαχ–
 his own will has gained the kingship
- 7 το
 ...

NOTES

- 1 Although not every letter is clear, the reading of the date is agreed by all editors (Fussman 1974; Davary-Humbach 1976; cf. also Bivar 1976 and Davary 1982, 64-66).
- 2 On the basis of the general context and the Kharoṣṭhī parallel text (*rajatirajasa* “of the king of kings”, DN4, line 2) both Bivar and D-H assume that the first word must be βαοναο, but the last letter does not present the normal outline of an ο. Fussman therefore reads βαοναα, which might be an archaic spelling of the same form, with obl. pl. ending °αα < **-ānām* (rather than βαο ναα “the ruler Nana”, as suggested by Fussman himself). However, this leaves the difficulty that the following letter is clearly ε, which is incompatible with the expected βαο “king”. I therefore prefer to interpret the disputed letter as δ, assuming that βαονανδε represents βαοναο + the sentence-initial particle -δι/-δο. (The spelling -δε is admittedly unique, but note that final -ε is unusually frequent in this text.) The following letters are read πα by Fussman and να or ρα by D-H; βα is equally possible. At the end of the line one must certainly read βωγο as in the Rabatak inscription (Fussman [•]ωο ο°, D-H °σεωγο). Between βα(?) and βωγο comes what previous editors have unanimously read as ν. This reading, plausible in itself, is excluded by the context, since no word can end in a consonantal letter. I therefore tentatively interpret the short and long vertical strokes, which are the clearest marks in this area, as two iotas. The first will be the obl. case ending of βα “king”, a form found at Rabatak, and the second the article ι.
- 3 The Rabatak inscription strikingly confirms the reading ι στοργο “the great” of D-H (Fussman °[γ]οτο β[α]ο, Bivar υοτοργο). There follows the name of the king in the form οσημο τακ••ο (so read by all editors). The traces of the two letters left unread (for which Fussman proposed [πι?]) are in fact fairly distinct. If they are combined with the traces of the same name in Rabatak, line 13, no reading other than τακτοο seems possible.
- 4 ρατογο was read •αβ•ρ•ο by Fussman and ματογο by D-H. Cf. ρατογο, Rabatak, line 1. The first letter is unfortunately unclear in both texts, but initial μ° is certainly not possible in Rabatak.
- 4-5 The Rabatak inscription again confirms the reading ι λαδειγο of D-H (Fussman ι δασεμ[γ]ο).
- 5 ι βαγο ι ηζνογο (Fussman ι βαγο ι ηζ•ητο°, D-H ι βαγο ι ηζν(ο) ι[ο]ο) corresponds to βαγο εζνογο in Rabatak, lines 1-2 (q.v. for discussion of the reading). My reading of the end of the line agrees with that of D-H (Fussman °ηδη ειδο η[•?]).
- 5-7 The clause “who according to his own will has gained the kingship” seems to correspond in part to the epithet χοαζαοαργο “αὐτοκράτωρ” of Rabatak, line 1, in part to the clause which there follows the king’s honorific titles: “who has obtained the kingship . . .”. The reading χοβε ιαβε (Fussman χοκι•χοε°, D-H χοβ(ο) ι νανδ°) seems fairly clear. These words will be the obl. forms of χοβο “(one’s) own” (see Sims-Williams 1993, 173) and ιαβο “wish, favour” (= Av. *yāna-*), both of which are attested in later texts. For the use of ιαβε in this context cf. the Sogd. PN *y’nxsrδ*, literally “ruling at (one’s own) will, independent” (Sims-Williams 1992, 81). The following βαοδανε (Fussman °βαβ[δ?]α[γ?]β°, D-H °ιζαοανε) corresponds to βαοδανι in Rabatak, line 2, both forms being obl. of βαοδανο, an otherwise unattested abstract noun from βαο “king, ruler”. Of the last word of the clause (Fussman °κφα|[ρ?]ο°, D-H ι(•) φαχ[το] only -φα- is quite clear. The preceding letter is broken at the top, but one can see the bottom of an upright followed by a slanting stroke. These remains do not agree with the normal shape of any letter (except perhaps γ, which seems out of the question before φ, as does Fussman’s κ). If the vertical stroke were an ι, the following slanting stroke would be inexplicable. It seems possible, however, that the two strokes belong to a λ, here written (as α so often is in this text) with an upright first stroke. Initial λφ- is plausible and indeed attested in Bactrian: see Sims-Williams 1992, 28, where a derivation from OIr. **θw-* is suggested. If D-H’s reading of the end of the word is accepted λφαχτο could represent **θwaxšta-* = Sogd. *δβχšt-* “gained” (cf. also Pers. *alfaxdan*, *alfaxtan*, etc.), which fits the context well. However, the τ in particular seems quite doubtful.

Part II: The Rabatak Inscription, its historical implications and numismatic context

Joe CRIBB

A new era in Kushan studies is opened up by the information presented by the Rabatak inscription. The most startling revelation is the identification of a new king Vima Tak[to] (line 13), whose position among Kushan kings is clearly indicated. To this new king Vima I Tak[to] it is now possible to attribute two other inscriptions, a portrait sculpture and several coins which were previously associated with the king identified in this inscription as his son Vima II Kadphises.

The New Kushan King, Vima I Tak[to]

The Vima of the Dasht-e Nawur inscription is now clearly recognisable as the same king. The Mat sculpture of a seated king (Rosenfield 1967, plate 1) can now also be identified as a portrait of Vima I Tak[to] on the basis of its inscription, which has been tentatively read as *Vima Takshamasya.*, but could perhaps be read as *Vima Takpa-masya.*, as the letter combination previously read as *ksha* would have the same external shape as *kpa*. The reading *Taka damasya* has also been suggested by Lüders (1961, p. 135) on the basis that there is a large space between the *k* and *m*, but it seems that this space is necessary for the *sh* or *p* element adjoined to the base of the *k*. The only certain part of his name is Vima Tak... , and what follows is equally unclear on the Rabatak inscription and the Dasht-e Nawur inscriptions.

Three groups of coins with the name Vima can now be associated with Vima Tak[to]. These also leave the end of his name uncertain.

The largest group is the bull and camel coins with the name of Vima which can be distinguished from the bull and camel issues of Kujula Kadphises by their inscription arrangement and content. There are two varieties: a small denomination (about 4 grams) inscribed in Kharoshthi *maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputrasa Vema [Takho]* (Cribb 1981); and a larger denomination (about 10 grams) inscribed in Kharoshthi *maharayasa rayatirayasa devaputrasa Vema Tak[. ja ...* (an example is illustrated but not recognised in Göbl 1993, plate 40, no 45, six others are in the British Museum). Unfortunately the subscript element of the *k* in his name is very small and illegible and does not help solve the problem of this king's full name. After the name there are two letters on one example and four on another; they appear to read *maha*, and *mahatasa*, i.e. the great, but not with great certainty. These bull and camel coins were originally attributed (Cribb 1981) to Vima II Kadphises because of their issue by a king named Vima, immediately succeeding Kujula Kadphises, but the new inscription clarifies their true identification and confirms their position as an issue

immediately following an issue in the name of his father Kujula Kadphises.

The second group consists of two known coins of a *Soter Megas* issue with the name Vima (*Vemasa*) at the end of their Kharoshthi inscription (Cribb 1993, note 47).

The third group is represented by a single coin found in Hazara, Pakistan, now in the British Museum, published in 1898 by Smith (1898, no. VII) and then forgotten, on which the Bactrian inscription OOHMO TAK... is clear. The letter after the *k* is either a *t* or *p*. The front of this coin shows a seated king, resembling in posture and hand position the Mat portrait sculpture, accompanied by the symbol used on all *Soter Megas* issues. The back shows two standing figures with a Bactrian inscription which cannot be fully read or understood: ...TAPOOANAXAO... This coin continues to point to a strong relationship between Vima I Tak[to] and the *Soter Megas* coinage.

It has also been suggested that a coin of Vima II Kadphises (Cunningham 1892, p. 33, no 14; Göbl 1984, p. 35 and 73, no. 765) shows a relationship between the issuer and the *Soter Megas* coinage, but this connection is based on the misinterpretation of its image of Shiva holding a trident as a royal portrait accompanied by the tamga found on the *Soter Megas* series.

The relationship between the new king and the *Soter Megas* coinage is further strengthened by the use of what appears to be Vima I Tak[to]'s initial, the Kharoshthi letter *vi* on three of the *Soter Megas* issues (Göbl 1993, plate 40, nos. 53, 56 and 57).

The simplest explanation for these relationships between Vima I Tak[to] and the *Soter Megas* coinage is that he is its anonymous issuer. However it is still difficult to explain why the issue normally lacks the ruler's name. The details and context of the *Soter Megas* are discussed in an appendix.

The Rabatak inscription shows that the title *Soter Megas* was also used, in its Bactrian language form, by Kanishka I. Vima II Kadphises copper coins give him the same title in Greek and Kharoshthi and in the Dasht-e Nawur inscription its Bactrian form is applied to Vima I Tak[to]. The title appears to have been adopted by the Kushans from Sasan the Gondopharid Indo-Parthian ruler who used it on his coins.

As exciting as the revelation of a new king might be, in many ways it is the context in which this name appears that is the most important contribution to Kushan history. Vima I Tak[to] is named as the second of three ancestors of Kanishka I. Their family relationships are also described. This gives us for the first time a firm structure for the history of the early Kushan kings, affirming Kanishka's direct connection to the Kushan kings before him. The Rabatak inscription makes it clear that, as far as a subject of Kanishka I was concerned, the Kushan dynasty was to be traced back to Kujula Kadphises and that there was a direct succession from him to Kanishka I through his son and grandson, both of whom are called *shao*, king, and therefore appear to have had their own distinct reigns. It should be added that in erecting the inscription the author of it was

working on the orders of Kanishka I.

Kushan Chronology

The sequence of four Kushan kings down to Kanishka I revealed by the Rabatak inscription can be matched to the record presented by both coins and inscriptions. The Rabatak inscription clarifies with its new evidence the interpretation of both coins and inscriptions.

The Coin Sequence:

The coins attributable to the early Kushans suggest a sequence of four kings down to Kanishka I: Kujula Kadphises, the anonymous Soter Megas ruler, Vima II Kadphises and Kanishka I. There are several groups of coins of Kujula Kadphises. Their position at the beginning of the Kushan series is clear from their types which copy Indo-Greek, Indo-Parthian, Indo-Scythian and Roman coin designs. Overstrikes and the copied designs show that Kujula Kadphises issued coins south of the Hindu-Kush as a contemporary and successor to the Indo-Parthian ruler Gondophares and his Indo-Scythian neighbor the satrap Zeionises (Jihonika) (Cribb 1993). It has been suggested that the so-called "Heraus" coins are earlier than the issues of Kujula Kadphises, but I have shown elsewhere that the "Heraus" coins are also issues of Kujula Kadphises, with designs based on the coins of Gondophares and Zeionises (Cribb 1993). The next series of coins issued by the Kushans is the *Soter Megas* series, its position after Kujula Kadphises' coinages is demonstrated by its use of designs copied from the coins of Sasan the last Indo-Parthian ruler in Taxila and Gandhara and a contemporary of Kujula Kadphises and their use as overstrikes by a later Indo-Parthian king Pakores for his Arachosian issues (MacDowall 1974). After the coins of the *Soter Megas* types the next issue consists of the coins in the name of Vima II Kadphises. They copy the script styles and part of the inscriptions of the *Soter Megas* coins; they also continue the use of the Attic weight standard reintroduced for the *Soter Megas* coinage, but with new denominations, including gold. The use of gold is continued by Kanishka I. The script style and use of Greek language on Kanishka's first issue copy exactly those of Vima II Kadphises last issues. The reign after Kanishka I is confirmed as that of Huvishka by a die link between a late coin of Kanishka I (Göbl 1984, no 80) and an early coin of Huvishka (Göbl 1984, no. 314).

The sequence of the coins shows that the coins with the Soter Megas symbol with the name Vima and the bull and camel coins with the name Vima, are issues of Vima I Tak[to], the second Kushan king of the Rabatak inscription sequence. The position of the *Soter Megas* coins between the issues in the name of Kujula Kadphises and Vima Kadphises also shows that these anonymous coins should also be attributed to Vima I Tak[to].

The absence of coins with the name of Kujula Kadphises and the abundance

of *Soter Megas* issues north of the Hindu-Kush has been remarked upon by many scholars. It has led some to suggest that Kujula Kadphises issued the Soter Megas coinage (Stavisky 1986, pp. 138-140). The Rabatak inscription prompts a reassessment of this evidence. The coinages which apparently precedes the Soter Megas coins north of the Hindu-Kush are local issues imitating the coins of the Greco-Bactrian kings Eucratides and Heliocles and the so-called "Heraus" coins. As noted above the "Heraus" coinage can be attributed to Kujula Kadphises and I would like to suggest that the imitation coinages are also issues of Kujula Kadphises. There are clearly different coinage traditions north and south of the Hindu-Kush in the period immediately prior to the rise to power of Kujula Kadphises. In Bactria from the time of the fall of the Greco-Bactrian kingdom the use of coinage became very limited, whereas in the Indo-Greek kingdoms and their Scythian and Parthian successor states coinage was a well developed and persistent phenomenon. It seems likely that Kujula Kadphises' "Heraus" coinage and the imitation coinages represent the re-emergence of the use of coinage north of the Hindu-Kush under the influence of the practices south of the Hindu Kush after Kujula had brought north and south into a single state as he became leader of the whole Yuezhi people and launched his conquest of the Indo-Parthian and Indo-Scythian states.

The Inscription Sequence:

The sequence of kings named in inscriptions other than the Rabatak inscription also features the same series of four kings, except that the first king has the name of Kushan rather than that of Kujula Kadphises. The sequence of Vima I Tak[to] and Vima II Kadphises is in agreement with their dated inscriptions which appear to be in the same era. The year 279 Dasht-e Nawur inscription of Vima I Tak[to] precedes the Khalatse inscription of Vima Kadphises (*Uvima Kavthisa*) which should also be placed in the same era and its date read as 'year 284 (or 287)' (not as previously misread '184 (or 187)', Cribb "Numismatic Perspectives on Chronology in the Crossroads of Asia", at press).

The inscriptions of the king called simply "Kushan" are dated in the Azes Era years 122 and 136 (Konow 1929, pp. 67-77), apparently shortly after the Azes Era year 103 inscription of Gondophares (Konow 1929, pp. 57-63). This king seems to be occupying the same chronological slot after Gondophares as the coins of Kujula Kadphises. The inscription on the Mat sculpture of Vima I Tak[to] also seems to make the same identification of king "Kushan", calling Vima I Tak[to] (son of Kujula Kadphises according to the Rabatak inscription) the son of "Kushan" or descendant of "Kushan" (I have discussed the identification of king "Kushan" as Kujula Kadphises more fully in Cribb 1993).

The inscriptions of Kanishka start a new era, apparently based on his regnal dates, a practice already apparent in his first year, according to the Rabatak inscription. He can be placed after the other three early Kushan kings because the names of his successors for the next 100 years are clearly indicated in later inscriptions.

The Kushan King List:

The Rabatak inscription therefore gives a clearer and more reliable view of the context of coins and inscriptions in the early Kushan period (this context has been extended to show the sequence of later Kushan kings suggested by numismatic evidence):

sources: kings:	Rabatak inscription	Other Inscriptions	Coins
Kujula Kadphises	Kozoulo Kadphiso	Kushan years Azes era 122-136)	Kozoulo Kadphises (<i>Kujula Kata Kapasa</i>)
Vima I Tak[to]	Ooēmo Taktoo	Vima Tak[to] year 279	<i>Soter Megas/ Vema Tak...</i>
Vima II Kadphises	Ooēmo Kadphiso	Vima Kadphises year 284 or 287	Ooēmo Kadphises
Kanishka I	Kanēshko	Kanishka years 1-23	Kanēshki
Huvishka		Huvishka years 26-64	Oēshko
Vasudeva I		Vasudeva years 64-98	Bazodēo
Kanishka II		Kanishka years 5-17	Kanēshko
Vasishka		Vasishka/ Vajheshka years 22-30	Bazēshko
Kanishka III		Kanishka year 41	Kanēshko
Vasudeva II			Bazodēo (<i>Vasu</i>)
Shaka		Shaka (subject to Samudragupta)	(<i>Shaka</i>)
Kipunada			(<i>Kipunada</i>)

The context for early Kushan history created by the Rabatak inscription and correlated with inscriptional and numismatic evidence can now be reviewed in relation to other chronological evidence relevant to dating the Kushans.

