

THE WELL OF BAGHLAN

by ILYA GERSHEVITCH

The title of the monograph reviewed in the present article* is somewhat misleading. The inscription to which it refers is neither of Kaniška nor belongs to his reign. It is a building inscription of the early part of Huviška's reign, set up at the entrance of the acropolis of Baylān in order to commemorate the digging of a well and the "circumvallation" of the acropolis, which operations had been ordered by a "lord of the marches" whose name is written *Ноконџоко*.

These facts, recognized by Henning in *BSOAS* XXIII 1960, pp. 47-55, and confirmed in respect of the well by the subsequent discovery of a well opposite the spot where the inscription had been found, have remained unknown to Göbl who, working in Vienna and Strasbourg (p. 5), states (p. 13 with n. 15) that he lacked access to that article. The only information Göbl has on the contents of the inscription is derived from Humbach's fantastic translation of it as a hymn to Mithra, which Benveniste had rejected uncompromisingly in *JAs*. 1961, 140, the present reviewer in *BSOAS* XXVI 1963, 193 *seqq.* (which review will be referred to below as *RH*), and Henning in *ZDMG* 1965, 75 *seq.* (an article which admittedly Göbl could not have seen at the time of writing).¹ As Humbach's translation failed to convince even Göbl, who in any case abstains from linguistic discussion, the author found himself reduced to writing his monograph without as much as an inkling of what the inscription is about. Such disability he is, however, far from considering a disadvantage. On the contrary, believing, in his ignorance of the breakthrough achieved, that Iranianists are at their wits' end in respect of the contents, he expresses the hope that his own contribution as that of an epigraphist, numismatist, and historian unencumbered with linguistic prejudice, will provide others with a broader and safer basis for the discussion of linguistic problems. He also offers guidance to Iranianists as to where else they might find enlightenment on the tenor of the inscription (see the last paragraph of this review).

* Robert Göbl, *Die drei Versionen der Kaniška-Inschrift von Surkh Kotal*. 24 pp. and 17 plates. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Denkschriften 88/1, Wien, 1965.

¹ As the pagination of Henning's two articles on the subject does not overlap, reference to Henning in the present review will be simply by page number. Where Maricq is quoted the reference is to his article in *JAs*. 1958, 345 *seqq.*

The problem which essentially engages Göbl's attention is the epigraphic relation between the three versions of the inscription. One is inscribed on a monolith, and has therefore been called **M**; the other two, **A** and **B**, were cut into composite surfaces consisting respectively of 21 and 32 stone blocks. **M** was discovered, face downwards, to the right of the steps leading into the acropolis and facing the well. The inscribed blocks which had made up **A** and **B**, however, were found inside the very well whose construction their text commemorates, having been used for lining its interior with complete disregard of the positions they had occupied in respect of each other at the time when the text was inscribed across them. By correctly joining photographs of the inscribed sides of the blocks, Benveniste was able to recover the text of the two versions, which he published in the article quoted above. Although the two disrupted versions are largely identical with **M**, one is shorter than **M** by one sentence, the other by two, the sentences additional to the latter consisting mainly of proper names of which none hitherto identified in the former is absent from **M**. From this situation Benveniste drew the logical conclusion that the shortest version must have been the earliest of the three, which is why he labelled it **A**.

Göbl rejects this conclusion without even mentioning the reason which prompted it. There is, he maintains, an epigraphic evolution which he terms "slant",² leading from **B** to **A** and thence to **M**, in that **A** displays a more careful ductus, a straighter alignment, and a more regular spacing than **B**, while **M** is as good as perfect in all three respects. This "slant" is taken by Göbl as proof that **B** was written before, and not after, **A**.

Such a conclusion Göbl could hardly have reached had he been aware of what is common knowledge, *viz.* that the words which in **B** are additional to **A** are mostly proper names that reoccur in **M**. But even on his own, epigraphic premise the conclusion makes no sense. For on p. 20 he rightly states: "That **M** and **A**, viewed individually, are each due to a single hand is certain, but it is possible that the writer [*i.e.* stone-cutter, I.G.] of **A** was also the one of **M**; by contrast, **B** seems to have been cut by a quite different hand." Does it not follow from this obvious observation that although **M** may at a stretch be regarded as an "epigraphic evolution" of **A**, neither of them can have evolved from **B** as far as writing-technique is concerned?

Clearly so narrow an epigraphic approach is no match for a common-sense judgement based on consideration of contents. Benveniste's relative chronology remains unshaken, since it not only agrees with the relative length of the three versions, but despite Göbl is not contradicted even by the epigraphic "slant" he sees in them.

² The German word Göbl uses is "Gefälle", which he explains on p. 20, n. 23 as meaning "evolution" ("... Gefälle meint hier eine Entwicklung und nicht mehr.")

Benveniste, however, had defined his chronology beyond mere relativity, and in a way which a recent article by Schlumberger in *JAs.* 1964, 303 *seqq.*, issued at the same time as Göbl's monograph, makes it clear raises serious misgivings. According to Benveniste the well fell into disrepair at some time after **A** had been set up. The officials concerned with its restoration, wishing their names to be recorded in the inscription, had the whole of it inscribed afresh on the blocks forming **B**, whereupon the blocks of **A** could be used as materials for rebuilding the well. Subsequently the well again fell in need of repair; this time the text of **B** was transferred to **M** with the addition of the names of the officials in charge of the second restoration, as materials for which the blocks of the second, now obsolete version were used.

Schlumberger accepts Benveniste's hypothesis, as I had done in *RH*. But he is understandably puzzled by the repetition of the procedure, curious even at a single occurrence, of using all the blocks of an obsolete version to restore the very well whose original building the version had once proclaimed. To reduce the difficulty Schlumberger suggests that **A** and **B** may have been set up simultaneously in two distinct places of the façade of the acropolis, in which case only one restoration of the well would need to be postulated. With this assumption, however, the fact that the **B** version names officials not mentioned in **A** is not easy to square. In any case either assumption fails to satisfy, not only because wells are unlikely to suffer damage requiring a total of 53 blocks for repair, but also because, although Schlumberger does not say so *expressis verbis*, it appears from his archaeological account that, were it not for the fact that the blocks are inscribed, there would be no reason to think that the well had been subjected to any restoration at all.

It is here that Göbl unwittingly plays the *deus ex machina* to Schlumberger. For convinced as he is that **M** had evolved from **B** via **A**, he argues that **B** and **A** were but trials executed on easily quarriable blocks, in order to practise on cheap material the best shape, spacing, and alignment of letters, as well as testing the most suitable wording ("*Textgestaltung*"), before irrevocably cutting the monolith, valuable on account of its unusual size. In Göbl's opinion, therefore, **A** and **B** were never set up as official inscriptions.³ The blocks were assembled to form merely provisional walls into which drafts could be cut; immediately after serving this purpose the walls were pulled down, and the blocks put to "any secondary use, not necessarily in the last place where they were discovered" (my italics).⁴

³ A valid argument he quotes in support of this view as far as **B** is concerned, is the mis-spelling discovered by him of Kaniška's name as *κανηρηρικι* in line 3 of that version.

⁴ "Sie sind hernach gleich in eine beliebige (nicht unbedingt die letzte, wo sie gefunden wurden) sekundäre Verwendung gekommen", p. 22.

The advantage of this conclusion over Benveniste's may seem to lie merely in its meeting Schlumberger's desire to reduce the number of supposed restorations of the well from two to one. In fact there is much more to it, or rather to one part of it. Suitably modified, and stripped of the words we have printed in italics, Göbl's conclusion provides the answer not only to the questions which Schlumberger did ask, but also to a vital one which he failed to raise. The distinguished archaeologist took it for granted that the **A** and **B** versions of the inscription referred to a well whose original lining had long been completed by the time the blocks of **A** and **B** were torn from the array in which they had stood whilst they were being inscribed. He was therefore obliged to make room, as it were, for the inscribed blocks inside the well by assuming that the original lining had fallen into disrepair. But if the disruption of the two versions took place not only shortly after they had been carved, as Göbl suggests, but also before the well had received its original lining, as Göbl did *not* envisage, then the archaeologically unnecessary postulate of restoration will not be required by the presence of inscribed blocks inside the well either.

One may then go further, and declare that what Göbl calls the "secondary use" of the blocks was in fact the primary: the blocks were not quarried for the purpose of being inscribed, and the employment of all 53 of them as lining material was no freak of accident: the blocks were destined from the beginning to line the well, and were brought for this purpose to the site where the well was being dug; while they lay on the site, somebody thought of building with them two temporary walls to serve as writing surfaces; as soon as the digging of the well had been completed, the walls were pulled down, and the blocks, which had meanwhile been inscribed, went to line the well.

This hypothesis fits the circumstances, but rests, as we have seen, on a conclusion which Göbl drew from a wrong premise. Fortunately the correction of Göbl's preliminary mistake does not compel us to reject that part of his conclusion on which our hypothesis rests. We have seen that in Göbl's opinion the hand of **A** and **M** may be the same. If this identity can be confirmed by evidence more valid than mere opinion, Göbl's excellent idea that the two provisional walls were pulled down soon after they had been inscribed will no longer depend on his unacceptable premise that one of them had served as practising ground for further trial on the other. A trial would indeed have taken place, but not in the sense urged by Göbl: the two versions, **A** and **B**, would have been written by craftsmen wishing, or told, not to practise and improve their skill, as Göbl imagines, but to give proof of what skill they already possessed to employers uncertain whom to trust with the cutting of the valuable monolith. The result of the competition would have been that the monolith was entrusted to the cutter, or cutters, of **A**. We shall see that on this assumption the problem presented

by the greater length of **B** in respect of **A**, and of **M** in respect of **B**, becomes amenable.

But were **A** and **M** really cut by the same hand? To answer this question we must go beyond Göbl's all too narrow terms of reference, and consider the contents of the three versions. It will be necessary first of all to quote at least the text of **M** (which apart from spelling variants is, up to §8 inclusive, identical with the whole of **A**, their "signature" being also the same) and the form which its ninth paragraph takes in **B** (which apart from its "signature" ends with that paragraph, the preceding eight displaying only spelling differences from **M**). The presence of monograms will be indicated by means of the abbreviation mg.

§1. ειδο μα λιζο μο κανηρκο σανινδο βαγολαγγο σιδο ι βαγο βραο κ²ανηρκι ναμοβαργο κιρδο

§2. ταδιοο κεδο φορδαμσο μα λιζο φρο³γιδο ταδηιο μανδαρο αβο νιστο χστο ασιδο μα λιζο αβαβγ⁴ο σταδο

§3. οδο καλδο ασο λρουο μινανο ιειρο σταδο ταδο ι βαγε ⁵ασο ι νοβραλιο φροχορτινδο

§4. ταδο αβο λραφο οαστινδο ⁶αβο ανδηζο στο μα λιζο πιδοριγδο

§5. τα καλδο νок⁷ανζοκο ι καταλαργγο ι φρειχοσδηγοο κιδο φρειστα⁸ρο αβο βραο ι βαγοπουρο ι λοιχοβοσαρο ι βιζογαργο ι ⁹α⁹λοβ⁹χαλο κιδο φαρο οισπιτοανο μο οαδοβαργανο ω¹⁰σογδομαγγο πιδο ι ιωγο οδο υιρσο χ¹¹ρνοο νεισανο μ¹²ασο μαλο αγαδο αμο βαγολαγγο

§6. ταδηιο μα λιζο πο¹²ρογατο ταδηιο ειιο σαδο κανδο σθηιο αβο οζοοαστο ¹³οθηιο πιδο ασαγγε ιθο οιλιδο ατανο αβο μα λιζο φ¹⁴αρο καρανο αβο μα γασηιο

§7. οδο καλδανο ασο λρο¹⁵σο μινανο ιειρο βοσηιο ταδανο ι βαγε ασο ι νοβ¹⁶αλιο μα φροχοαβρονδηιο στανο μα λιζο μα πιδ¹⁷οριχησιο

§8. σθηιο ασασκο μο σαδο αχ¹⁸ριγγο κιρδο αλβαργο ωσταδο ιθο ατο πιδ¹⁹εινο σαδο πιδεινο αχ¹⁹ριγγο ναρουγο μα λ²⁰ιζο χουζο ποροοαστο

§9. στο ειιο μο σαδο οδο μ²¹α²¹ρτο χιργομανο κιρδο αμο βορζομιυρο αμο κο²²ζαβ²²κι πουρο αμο αστιλογανσειγι αμο νок²³ονζικι καταλαργγε μαρηγο πιδο ι χοσδηο φ²⁴ρομανο

§10. στο ειιομανο νοβιχτο αμο μιυρα²⁵μανο αμο βορζομιυροπουρο mg₁ αμιυραμανο mg₂

In the **B** version §9 reads: στο μο σαδο βορ²⁵ζομιυρο κιρδι ι κοζαβ²²κι πι[ο]υρο ναστιλο²⁶γανσειγιο νок²³ονζικι καταλαργγι μαρηγι ²⁷πιδο χοσδηο φρομ[αν]ο

Corresponding to §10, **B** has a few letters and traces of letters which Göbl reads τιλαρω||ταδει²⁸γα. Of these, the ones which belong to line 27 run along the bottom of two blocks which in Göbl's collage (the scale of which is not given) are separated by a 1 mm. gap represented by his sign ||. Between Göbl's omega and the gap a slanting stroke is visible, which both Benveniste and Göbl take for the left wing of what they believe to have been the V-shaped top of a monogram, assuming the right wing to have disappeared in the gap. This monogram, which we shall call mg₃, has its base fully preserved on the block below, where it forms a wide loop at the level of line 28, a line which otherwise only has, at its beginning, the last two

letters of the inscription,⁵ followed by a stroke. This is the stroke which forms the top of the other monogram of **B**, mg₄. The stroke protrudes into line 28 from a lower level, where the angular base of the monogram hovers in empty space, but may be thought of as resting on the otherwise empty 29th line. The position of mg₄ in respect of line 28, and of mg₃ in respect of line 27, corresponds to that which in **M** is occupied by mg₂ in respect of line 25, the last of that version. Each of the three monograms has a sprawling base that hangs below the line to which its top belongs, no doubt because they were all cut from the top, beginning at the upper level of the letters that preceded them. As there has never been any doubt that mg₂ belongs to line 25 of **M**, on which line in any case, eleven spaces to the left, the whole of mg₁ compactly stands, it is clear that despite the void which surrounds their bases, the whole of mg₃ must be counted as occupying the place which its top fills in line 27, and the whole of mg₄ as the third and last sign of line 28. In other words, just as in **M** the legend αμιυραμανο is bracketed between mg₁ and mg₂, so the legend which Göbl reads ταδειγα is bracketed between mg₃ and mg₄.

This fact was not understood by Göbl who, in his transcription of **B** in plate I, places mg₃ and mg₄, with a blank of 4 cm. between them, on one and the same line, the 29th as it were, fully detached from the text of the inscription. Moreover, because in his collage mg₃ is situated near the end of line 27, and mg₄ near the beginning of line 28, the former therefore to the right of the latter, though of course on a higher level, Göbl places in his transcription mg₄ to the left of the blank, mg₃ to the right. That this is not merely an oversight on Göbl's part, but an act of conviction, is made clear on pp. 14 *seq.*, where he argues that mg₄ must be related to mg₁ because both are "left-hand monograms".

Göbl's failure to recognize that what stands higher in a horizontally aligned inscription precedes what stands lower, is surprising not only because in this very context he insists that "in *sein Auge* (*viz.* the stonemason's) *und in seine Hand* haben wir uns einzufühlen" (Göbl's italics), but also because Benveniste, though ignoring mg₄, had correctly printed mg₃ in front of the last word of the **B** version (p. 130). Even more surprising is the ease with which Göbl glosses over the total dissimilarity of his two "left-hand monograms", *i.e.* mg₁ and mg₄: "man kann nicht sagen, dass die Version **B** etwas *ganz* anderes plante" (Göbl's italics). The aim of this verdict turns out to be anything but epigraphic: it is to minimize the inapplicability to **B** of Humbach's extravagant interpretation of mg₁ as spelling an unattested

⁵ The last two letters were transcribed by Benveniste as πδ on p. 130, but as γο on p. 131. Göbl reads γα, taking the second letter for an omicron corrected to alpha. It is more likely an alpha corrected to omicron, as the latter is by far the most common word final in the inscription. Moreover, if the two letters are the last of a proper name, as we shall see is probable, the ending to be expected is omicron.

word *δαιος, which inapplicability stands in the way of Göbl's projection of the monograms into a "höhere, also königliche oder sakrale Sphäre".

Needless to say, Göbl also relates to each other mg_2 and mg_3 , on the ground that they are both "right-hand monograms". Not surprisingly, however, the base of mg_2 not only has two loops against the single one of mg_3 , but its second loop cannot simply be thought to have been omitted from mg_3 , seeing that the direction of its curve is contrary to that of the tail-end of mg_3 . In view of the irreconcilability of their bases the two monograms could not be identified even if the top of mg_3 had the same V-shape as mg_2 , which, as explained above, is by no means certain (*cf.* also below, p. 10).

By contrast, the close relationship between mg_1 and the monogram preceding the legend $\alpha\mu\iota\omicron\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ (as it is there spelled) in **A**, which Benveniste apparently, and Göbl explicitly, took for granted, is undeniable. What is missing in **A** are the flourish at the top of mg_1 , and one of its three short vertical strokes at the right. As the addition of either would not violate the direction of any of the strokes of the **A** monogram, we may take it that the latter is simply an abridged version of mg_1 . The adoption of this view is strongly recommended by the complete identity of the second monogram of **A**, the one which closes the legend $\alpha\mu\iota\omicron\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$, with mg_2 .

It is, one must suppose in the absence of reasons given by Göbl, because of the blank he thinks was left between the two monograms of **B**, and because the last few letters of that version do not agree with any of the words occurring in **M**, that Göbl believes the **B** version to be unfinished. But once it is understood that **B** ends, like **M** and **A**, with a legend enclosed between two monograms, it also becomes clear that that version is as complete as the other two. The problem posed by **B** is therefore not: why is that version aesthetically less satisfying than **A** and **M**, as Göbl asks, believing the answer to be a chronologically improbable evolution from **B** to **A**. The problem is: why are not only hand and spacing, but also the two monograms, the legend they enclose, and the preceding few letters, different in **B** from what we see in the **M** and **A** versions?

In order to solve this problem we must take a closer look than has hitherto been taken at the legend $\alpha\mu\iota\omicron\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ of **M** and **A**. As a prelude to this scrutiny attention may be drawn to four conclusions, three of them as yet unstated, which result from a comparison of the two versions of §9 in **B** and **M**.

The first is that $\epsilon\iota\omicron$ in **M**, since it is absent from **B**, merely reinforces the following $\mu\omicron$, and is therefore a demonstrative pronoun, clearly deriving from OIr. *ayam*.⁶

⁶ $\epsilon\iota\omicron$, which occurs once before in §6, was there regarded by Henning, with due reserve, as an indefinite article (p. 53); the **B** version, which in §9 contradicts this view, was unknown at the time. Since $\mu\omicron$ (on which see Benveniste, p. 148) acts as article, the phrase $\epsilon\iota\omicron \mu\omicron \alpha\delta\omicron$ corresponds to what in Greek would read $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \tau\omicron \phi\rho\epsilon\alpha\rho$ (*cf.* below, p. 14, n. 22).

The second conclusion, drawn already by Benveniste, p. 139, is that, since in §9 the personal name $\beta\omicron\rho\zeta\omicron\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\omicron$ precedes the verb in the phrase $\beta\omicron\rho\zeta\omicron\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\omicron \kappa\iota\rho\delta\iota$ "Burzmihir made" in the **B** version, but comes after it, introduced by $\alpha\mu\omicron$ "as well as", in the **M** version, the word $\chi\iota\rho\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$, which in **M** takes the place occupied by $\beta\omicron\rho\zeta\omicron\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\omicron$ in **B**, must also be a proper name.

Third conclusion: since in **B** the presence of the "iḏāfat" ι after $\kappa\iota\rho\delta\iota$ shows that $\beta\omicron\rho\zeta\omicron\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\omicron$ was $\kappa\omicron\zeta\gamma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$'s son,⁷ the conjunction $\alpha\mu\omicron$ before $\kappa\omicron\zeta\gamma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$ in **M** must be a stone-mason's lapse for ι , due to the $\alpha\mu\omicron$ -s which introduce the other names.

The fourth conclusion is strictly speaking a corollary of the second: the position of the name $\chi\iota\rho\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ in front of $\kappa\iota\rho\delta\omicron \alpha\mu\omicron$ in §9, shows that the first word of the sequence $\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\omicron \nu\omicron\beta\iota\chi\tau\omicron \alpha\mu\omicron$ in §10 is also a personal name.⁸ Three men are therefore named as subjects of the verb $\nu\omicron\beta\iota\chi\tau\omicron$: $\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$, $\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$, and $\beta\omicron\rho\zeta\omicron\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron$.

We may now consider the legend $\alpha\mu\iota\omicron\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ itself. No writer on the subject has as yet commented on the identity of the greater part of this legend with the personal name $\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$, which we have just seen is one of the subjects of $\nu\omicron\beta\iota\chi\tau\omicron$.⁹ The reason for such restraint no doubt lies in the puzzling initial α of the legend. Since what follows is beyond doubt Mihrāman's name, what else can α be, but a preposition governing it? Its etymology is uncertain, seeing that it may have lost a final consonant by assimilation to the initial μ of $\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$,¹⁰ but its function can hardly have been other than to convey that Mihrāman had discharged some kind of responsibility. We may translate the legend as "*per Mihrāmanem*",¹¹ and assume for simplicity's sake that the preposition α here corresponds to Av. *ā* "von wegen".¹²

⁷ Henning, p. 52, n. 7, recognized that $\kappa\omicron\zeta\gamma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron$ is not a compound, but lacked the information required to link the phrase with $\beta\omicron\rho\zeta\omicron\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\omicron$. The correct reading $\kappa\iota\rho\delta\iota \iota$ is Göbl's.

⁸ The $\nu\omicron\beta\iota\chi\tau\omicron$ clause therefore begins with $\omicron\tau\omicron$, and not as assumed by Henning (p. 51 with n. 7), with $\nu\omicron\beta\iota\chi\tau\omicron$ itself.

⁹ Göbl implicitly denies their identity by referring to "Mihrāman" as a "name", but to $\alpha\mu\iota\omicron\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ as a "word" (p. 15). Maricq acknowledged, in a way, their identity, by restoring the legend as $\alpha\mu[\omicron M] \iota\upsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ (p. 353); but the meaning of $\alpha\mu\omicron$ being "as well as", this restoration is excluded by the **A** version of which Maricq had no knowledge. Humbach, who took the initial α for an exclamatory particle, "O", went astray owing to his refusal to accept Henning's identification of $\mu\iota\upsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ as a proper name. Henning himself, on the other hand, merely stated (p. 48): "the inscription itself was 'written', i.e. composed, by Mihrāman and Burzmihirpuhr, who signed it and caused their heraldic devices to be incised after their names."

¹⁰ *Cf.* my interpretation of $\alpha\mu\omicron$, the last but one word in §5, as from * $\alpha\beta\mu\omicron$ (see *RH*, p. 196 a, n. 1), now confirmed by Göbl's wholly unbiased reading (since the existence of *RH* had escaped his notice) $\alpha\beta\omicron \mu\omicron$ in the corresponding passage (line 15) of **B**.

¹¹ A slight change in the etymology of the name *Mihrāman* as proposed in *RH*, p. 193 a, is called for, in that a haplogogy of OIr. **Miθra-rāman*- "finding peace in Miθra" will suffice to account for it.

¹² The identification of the initial α of the legend with Bactrian $\alpha\omicron\omicron < \text{OIr. } hačā$, which in some respects may seem preferable, would require a detour. One would

The clue to the nature of the responsibility attributed to Mihrāman by the legend lies in the verb $\nu\omicron\beta\iota\chi\tau\omicron$, of which Mihrāman, named in this connexion before the legend refers to him once more, is one of three subjects. The verb means "wrote", but Henning took "wrote" in the present case to mean "composed" (see above, p. 8, n. 9). Version **A**, unknown to Henning at the time, conflicts with this assumption. For in it the legend $\alpha\mu\upsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ is bound to convey the discharge by Mihrāman of the same kind of responsibility in respect of **A**, as it does in **M** in respect of the **M** version. If composition were intended in **A** (which version, it will be remembered, ends apart from monograms and legend with the last word of §8), one would be driven to the unlikely conclusion that when he turned to **M** Mihrāman required two assistants (*viz.* the two named in §10) to "compose" paragraphs 9 and 10, both of which consist largely of names, the latter, moreover, of the names of the supposed "composers" themselves. In addition, despite the slight differences between the **B** and the **M** versions in §9, it would be strange if none of the three "composers", if that is what they were, of that paragraph in **M** had had a share in its "composition" where **B** was concerned; yet none of their names agrees with either the final legend of **B**, or the few traces of letters visible before the legend.

We thus have no choice but to take $\nu\omicron\beta\iota\chi\tau\omicron$ in its literal sense of "wrote", and recognize in Iyuman,¹³ Mihrāman, and Burzmihrpuhr three stone-masons who collaborated in the cutting of **M**, one of whom, Mihrāman, held an overall responsibility for the work performed which is reflected in the legend "*per Mihrāmanem*". In twentieth-century terms we may say that the sequence $mg_1 \alpha\mu\upsilon\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\omicron mg_2$ was the trade-mark of a firm, workshop, or family concern of which Mihrāman was the titular head.¹⁴

In the light of the above conclusion the answer to the question we posed earlier, before quoting the text of the inscription (p. 5), will be both yes and no. The hand of **M**, since that version was cut by several men, cannot be throughout the same as that of **A**, and one cannot exclude the possibility that **A** was not also cut by several men without Mihrāman having seen fit to record the fact. Yet the general epigraphic affinity of the two versions, presumably due to all cutters concerned having learned their

Continued from previous page:

hardly expect *c* to have been assimilated to a following *m* as it was to a following *c* in $\alpha\mu\iota\delta\omicron$, §2 (see Henning, p. 49). But if legends of the present type were commonly used, the final *c* of Bactr. $\alpha\sigma(\omicron)$ might have disappeared in course of time before a sufficient number of names beginning with certain consonants and consonant clusters (*e.g.* *c*, *s*, *š*, *xš*, *st*, etc.) for the variant *d* of *ac* to oust the latter in the formulary legend.

¹³ "The single-minded, purposeful"; *cf.* Henning, p. 51, n. 7, whose intention, however, was different.

¹⁴ The idea of a "family concern", which I owe to my wife, has the advantage over the more hard-headed "firm" or "workshop" that it provides not too unlikely a reason why the titular head allowed the names of his assistants to be incised, Iyuman's (perhaps his aged father emerged from retirement for a great occasion) even before his own.

skill from one master, is unmistakable. The fact that in **M** all omicra are round, while in **A** most of them are square, should neither blind us to the basic affinity of hand of the two versions, nor raise false hopes that individual hands may be identifiable in either. For the few round omicra of **A** are so distributed (see Göbl's plate X) that it would be absurd to attribute every change of *o*-shape to a change of stone-cutter. Clearly the same man was able, and apt, to cut either shape, and while in **A** after some hesitation the square shape was adhered to (with one lapse in the "trade-mark"), by the time the monolith was taken in hand the pendulum of opinion had swung over to uniform roundness.

Unless we have grievously misinterpreted the meaning of the "signature" of **A** and **M**, the final sequence $mg_3 (?)\alpha\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\omicron mg_4$ of **B** will be the "trade-mark" of a stone-cutting concern distinct from Mihrāman's. Unfortunately it is not clear whether a letter is to be read between mg_3 and α . It will be remembered that the right-hand wing of the top of mg_3 , if that top had at all the shape of a V, has perished in the gap marked || by Göbl, between the two blocks across which the signature of **B** was written (see above, p. 5). Legibility returns on the right-hand block with α , there being room for one letter before it. Benveniste's photograph, more clearly than Göbl's, suggests that the left margin of that block is chipped to the width of one letter from the preceding line downwards, so that the two marks in the stone which Göbl reads τ need not be writing at all; even if they are, there can be no assurance that they do not form part of the right-hand top of mg_3 , whose similarity to that of mg_2 is, after all, a matter of sheer guesswork. Accordingly, if no letter stood before α , the name of Mihrāman's rival will have been either $\Delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\omicron$ preceded by the preposition α , or $A\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\omicron$ un-introduced by any preposition; and if a letter has been lost before α , this may have been either α representing the preposition, in which case the name remains $A\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\omicron$, or any other that will have been the first letter of the name un-introduced by α .

As regards the traces of the letters (six, perhaps, or seven, or eight) which are visible between the final omicron (lost in a hole) of $\phi\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ and mg_3 , Göbl's restoration $\tau\iota\lambda\alpha\rho\omega$ is unconvincing as regards at least tau, lambda, rho, and omega, but he is right in so far as they certainly do not agree with any word or name occurring in **M**. As $\phi\rho\omicron\mu\alpha\nu\omicron$ is the last word of §9 (*cf.* above, p. 8, n. 8), it is a safe guess that the traces are those of a name, more precisely the name of the man who took turns with *Adīg, his titular "boss", in cutting **B**.

We cannot tell to what extent it was usual for Bactrian stone-masons not only to sign with "trade-marks" the inscriptions they cut, but also to quote the names of their assistants. If the practice was common, **B** and **M** simply fall in with it, and we shall have reason to think that Mihrāman cut **A** single-handed. If the practice was uncommon, we may imagine that it was

*Adīg's initiative, displayed in **B**, which prompted Mihrāman, once he had cut the received text of **M**, to add the νοβιχτο clause before signing with his "trade-mark". The fact that he was clothing his mention of the assistants in a clause whose verb was νοβιχτο, would virtually compel Mihrāman, who had taken his share in the cutting, to include his own name among the subjects of the verb, although he knew it to be due to reappear in his "trade-mark". *Adīg, by contrast, who had not presumed to add a whole clause of his own (he was after all, if our theory is correct, merely on trial), would be under no such compulsion, and could be satisfied with the mention of his name in the "trade-mark" only; he may nevertheless safely be assumed to have cut part of **B** himself.

Let us now turn to the gist of the inscription, with a view to obtaining a more convincing sequence of events than Göbl's "Gefälle" theory permits. A difference in §9 we have not yet considered between **B** and **M** is the insertion in the latter version of the words οδο μαρτο "and māst" after ειντο μο σαδο "this (here) well". The longer one studies the inscription, the clearer it becomes that the commemoration of the digging and equipment of the well is the almost exclusive purpose for which it was set up. It is true that Henning, while giving due prominence to the well, conceived of the "general drift of the message" in considerably wider terms: "after its foundation by Kanīṣka the sanctuary fell into disrepair and was abandoned, until in the kṣuna year 31 one Nokonzoko, a high official, came there and repaired and adorned the place" (p. 48, my italics).^{14a} But if one scans the inscription, in the light of the understanding so far achieved of it, for possible references to disrepair, repair, or adornment, one is reduced, apart from the unknown word μαρτο, to the sequences ταδηιο μονδαρο οβο νιστο χστο in §2, and ταδηιο μα λιζο πορογατο in §6. Henning's translation of the second was "then he *circumvallated the acropolis" (p. 53), implying an interpretation of πορογατο on which it is difficult to improve.¹⁵ But "circumvallation" cannot properly be considered as falling under the heading of either "(dis)repair" or "adornment". This leaves, apart possibly from μαρτο, only the earlier sequence as a candidate, though only for disrepair. Here, however, Henning's translation is but partial, and in any case does not necessarily presuppose disrepair: "then its . . . water . . . dried up (?)" (p. 53).

^{14a} This statement requires testing because M. Schlumberger, relying more on it than on the remainder of Henning's decisive article, bases his reasoning on the assumption that the inscription is "un texte de restitution" (*art. cit.*, 308). I hope to show that it is in fact exclusively un texte de construction.

¹⁵ It is to be noted, though, that instead of corresponding to Sogd. *prkšt-*, πορογατο may belong to OIr. **pari-kan-*, cf. Oss. *ŕelgātæg* < **pari-kaða-ka-*. The immediately following preterite *καυδο* "dug" constitutes no decisive objection, as OIr. had two bases *kan-*, one meaning "to throw", the other "to dig"; in the *ta* participle their root structure may have differed. On the tau cf. below, n. 24.

The two words left untranslated are *μονδαρο* and *νιστο*. It so happens that in the whole inscription not one substantive with initial vowel (such as *αχρτριγο* or *ασαγγε*) is preceded by the article. We therefore lack evidence as to the form which the article that appears as *μο* before consonant would take before vowel. There are, however, reasons to think that its omicron would not necessarily be written. It appears from the greater frequency of the spelling *αχρτριγο* (§8, twice each in **A** and **M**, and once in **B**) against the single occurrence, identified by Göbl, of *αχρτριγο* in **B**, that in Bactrian orthography epenthetic vowels were not usually expressed in writing. Therefore in final position an omicron, which as Henning has pointed out (p. 50), is in most cases a phonetically meaningless addition to almost any Bactrian word, would conceal, rather than represent, any epenthetic vowel that might have developed between two words. Thus the sequence *ασασκο μο σαδο* in §8 strictly speaking represents *acask m cād*. In fact, however, it was surely pronounced either *acask-ə-m cād*, or *acask m-ə-cād*, or *acask-ə-m-ə-cād*, without our being entitled to say that either omicron concerned spells the unstressed epenthetic vowel *ə*. If then the omicron of antecorsonantal *μο* was written only because the consonantal beginning of the following word set off the article as a separate word, it is likely that in antevocalic position no omicron would be written, because the vowel of the first syllable of the new word, forming syllable also with the article, in respect of which it occupied the interconsonantal place of an epenthetic vowel, would deprive the latter of its status of a separate word.

Before an inflectional ending or a suffix, the omission of non-phonetic final omicron was noticed straight away by Henning, p. 50. To the examples he quoted one may add the oblique plural form *οαδοβαργανο* = *wādbargān* in §5 against the singular *ναμοβαργο* = *nāmbarg* in §1 (cf. *RH*, p. 194a).¹⁶ It needs to be stressed, though, that there is no example to show whether the omission took place also before suffixes beginning with a consonant, and that at the end of first terms of compounds, including preverbs and prepositions, the "silent" omicron is written before consonant (with the exception of *ποργα[το]* in §6 of **B**, against *πορογατο* in **A** and **M**),¹⁷ but omitted in the one attested compound whose second term begins with a vowel. That compound is *λοιχοβοσαρο*, §5, in which Henning has identified the second term as representing OIr. **upačāra-* (p. 50, n. 7); in its first term *λοιχ*, which as a separate word one expects to appear as **λοιχο*, I would recognize

¹⁶ Note, however, the different treatment of the preceding plural *οισποανο*, see below, p. 18, n. 30.

¹⁷ Rather than ranging *αλβαργο*, §8, so written in both **M** and **B**, with the isolated *ποργα[το]* of **B** (in the **A** version the letters preceding *βαργο* can no longer be seen), one may hold that the absence of an omicron between *λ* and *β* argues against an identical origin of the first term of this compound with that of the compound written *αλορχαλο* in **M** and **B**, *αλαρχαλο* in **A**, §5. See *RH*, p. 193 b.

the outcome of OIr. *dahyu-*, so that the meaning of the compound would be "he who takes care (*cf.* Skt *car+upa*) of the country".

With the compound *λοιχοβοσσαρο* one may range, in respect of the treatment of "silent" omicron, the juxtaposition expressing the numeral 31 in §5. As the spelling of it is *ιωγοδουρσο* = *yōg-ud-ā-hrs* in **A** and *ιωγουρσο* = *yōg-ā-hrs* in **B**, the sequence *ιωροδουρσο* in **M** may stand for *yōg-ud-ā-hrs*, the *ə* of our phonetic transcriptions being an epenthetic vowel which, having drawn upon itself the stress of the word for 30, **hris* (< *Θrisat-*), had caused a reduction of the latter to *hrs*, of which *υρσο* and *υρσο* would be equally legitimate renderings.¹⁸ Here, since the omicron which precedes *υ* occupies a place where at least in **A** and **B** one expects a stressed vowel, it is clear that in these two versions its value is phonetic, and consequently that the final "silent" omicron is absent before it from the words for "one" in **B** and for "and" in **A** and perhaps **M**. It also appears to be absent before the *υ* of *ud* from the word for "one" in **A**.

Another juxtaposition in point, this time one that has passed unrecognized, is *πιδεινο*, occurring twice in §8. This is surely the Bactrian counterpart of NP *bad-in* "through this", from *pati+*aina-*. The Bactrian demonstrative pronouns so far attested are therefore *εινο* (pronounced *in*), *ειδο* (*id*) < *aita-*, *ειο* (*i*, *cf.* the variant *ειο* in §6 of the **A** and **B** versions) < *ayam*, and *μο* < *ima-* (see Benveniste, p. 148) used as article. The absence before vowel of the "silent" omicron of *πιδο* (§§5, 6, and 9) in *πιδεινο*, contrasts with its presence before consonant in the verbal compound *πιδοριχσ-/πιδοριγδ-* occurring in §§4 and 7.

If now from juxtaposition we pass to separate words, version **B** provides one instance of omission of "silent" omicron before the initial vowel of a following word. This is the variant *αβοζοοαστι* in §6, of what in **A** is written *αβοαζοοαστο*, and in **M** *αβοοζοοαστο*, all three representing *āb azwāst*.

The cumulative effect of the above considerations is that an analysis of *μανδαρο* as consisting of the article *μο* deprived of its omicron before initial alpha, and *ανδαρο*, would not seem indefensible in the light of what is known of Bactrian orthography. However, since in the present clause the article would refer to *αβο*, the question arises whether this noun would really take as article the antevocalic form of *μο*. For its Old Iranian ancestor, *āp-*, was feminine, and there is evidence, unnoticed hitherto, that with Bactrian feminine nouns the *m* article had the form *μα*.

The sequence *μαλιζο*, for which Maricq, p. 353, had proposed the

¹⁸ Before the discovery of the **A** and **B** versions it would have been natural to infer from the **M** spelling that the Bactrian form of the word for 30 when used by itself, was **hirs*. This still remains a possibility, but as the enclitic form *-hrs* attested in **A** and **B** would have developed more easily from **hris* than from **hirs*, I take the former to have been the form of the numeral that was used under the stress.

meaning "un édifice", was identified as the Bactrian word for "acropolis" by Henning, p. 49, who subsequently (pp. 76 *seq.*) explained the word as closely related to the name of the village *Amdiza* and representing an OIr. compound **hamá-diza-* "ganz mit Festung(smauern) (umgeben)". This explanation still leaves one wondering why the Bactrian word for "acropolis" was not simply *λιζο*, from the OIr. feminine noun **dizā-* to which Henning had so convincingly referred in the first place. What suggests that this is indeed the form used in the inscription is that, unless we take *μα* as a separate word, the noun in question will be found unpreceded by an article throughout its seven occurrences, and this despite the clearly attested Bactrian use of the definite article with nouns in determinate status.¹⁹ "μαλιζο" thus acquires the distinction of being the first Bactrian ghost word.²⁰ Our gain from its ghostification is the recognition that the Bactrian language had preserved a gender distinction whose formal expression, as far as at present ascertainable, was confined to the definite article *m*.²¹ The initial phrase *ειδο μα λιζο*, which was presumably pronounced *id ma liz*, is syntactically comparable to the phrase *ειο μο σαδο* in §9 (see above, p. 7, n. 6).

And so, regardless of whether *μανδαρο* represents *m'andar* or *māndar* (as a contraction of *ma andar*), we are led to translate the phrase *ταδηιο μανδαρο αβο* in §2 as "then the water inside it", referring the article to *αβο*, and taking *-ηιο* as being governed by *ανδαρο*.²²

There remains, untreated as yet, the word *νιστο* which follows upon *αβο*. Its resemblance to *nist-*, the past stem of the Sogdian and Yaghnobi verb for "sitting", is such²³ that we can ill afford to take semantic incompatibility for granted. In Sanskrit the meaning "to sink or go down (as a ship)" is quoted for *nīśad* "to sit down" at least from the *Harivamśa*. I would attribute a similar meaning to *νιστο*, as a natural figurative extension of the etymological meaning, and translate it as "subsided".

¹⁹ *Cf.* *αβο μο βαγολαγγο* (see above, p. 8, n. 10) "to the (above-mentioned) sanctuary", §5; *ασασκο μο σαδο* "over the (afore-mentioned) well", §8; *ειο μο σαδο*, see above, p. 7, n. 6.

²⁰ Henning's explanation of the toponym *Amdiza* remains unaffected by the dismissal of "μαλιζο", but its spelling with *γ* may now be attributed to the OIr. form having been **hama-dāizaka-*, with *ai*. The variant **Amze* from **Amdize* will be due to contamination with *diz*.

²¹ It would not be surprising if corresponding to *μα* the Bactrian "*idāfat*" *t*, from the OIr. rel. pron. *ya-*, were replaced by *ια* when used as an article before feminine nouns. It is tempting to interpret in this sense the appearance, twice, of *ια* before *νιβαλμο* (from an ancient neuter noun that would be apt to be treated as a feminine) in the **B** version of §§3 and 7. But as the corresponding passages in **A** and **M** have *t*, the matter cannot be decided.

²² The construction, except for the antecedence of the governed pronoun, is Greek, and may have developed as a calque during the centuries of Greek rule in Bactria. *Cf.* also *ειο μο σαδο* above, p. 7, n. 6, and *ειδο μα λιζο* as analysed in the text above.

²³ For the secondary shortening of *i* in this past stem, *cf.* Sogd. *nst-* (Henning, *BBB*, p. 87 on 754). If Göbl's restoration of the **B** variant as *νιστι* is correct, Bactrian will have had *nist* beside *nist*.

The following, and, last word of the clause, $\chi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron$, could then still be an asyndetically appended preterite meaning "(and) dried up". But as proof is still lacking that OIr. *-ust-* would have become *-ut-* in Bactrian as Henning surmised (*cf.* n. 15, and below on $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$), one may consider the possibility that $\chi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron$ simply corresponds to Av. *x^vatō* and means "by itself, on its own". It is true that OIr. **xwatāwya-* resulted in $\chi\omicron\sigma\delta\eta\omicron$ in Bactrian (*cf.* Henning, p. 51), but the enclitic use of the word to which the present and only occurrence would seem to bear witness, may suffice to account for the exceptional absorption of *a*.²⁴

Thus, whether we adhere to Henning's partial translation of the crucial clause, or boldly render it "then the water inside it (*viz.* the acropolis) subsided by itself", §2 cannot be said to disclose a condition of disrepair. Nor can any other statement in the first eight paragraphs of the inscription. The building operations recognizably mentioned in them are only two: firstly, and prominently, the well with its $\alpha\chi\tau\tau\iota\gamma\omicron$ and $\alpha\lambda\beta\alpha\rho\gamma\omicron$; secondly, but only in passing, the "circumvallation" of the acropolis.

If then in §9 of the **B** version we read: "and the well was built by . . . Nokonzok", there can be little doubt that this statement was intended as a kind of summary of what preceded: the essence of the inscription was indeed "the well". But the same paragraph reads in **M**, the final version: "and this (here) well and *māšt* was built by . . . Nokonzok". The word $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron$ does not occur in the preceding eight paragraphs; on the other hand the "circumvallation" was left out in the summing-up clause of the **B** version. Should one not conclude that the addition in **M** makes amends for the omission in **B**, the word $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron$ representing the "circumvallation", which had been so fleetingly mentioned in the main text that at the first summing-up it was overlooked, or not thought worthy of a second mention? Such a conclusion, if correct, will give us the meaning of $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron$. For the result of "circumvallation" is a wall.

It is of course inconceivable that the acropolis, which had been "completed", $\phi\omicron\pi\omicron\gamma\iota\rho\delta\omicron$ (§2), presumably still in Kanīška's time, had to wait for Nokonzok's arrival to be enclosed with a wall. But in the concise statement of §6 the verb $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron(\omicron)\gamma\alpha\tau\omicron$, "circumvallated", does not have to imply enclosure from all sides. Three sides would be sufficient to justify its use, and this would be true even if two of them did not coincide with the whole length of the acropolis. Such three sides requiring "circumvallation" can only arise, in the case of a "completed", and therefore already "circumvallated" acropolis, if an extension is added to one of its sides. This is

²⁴ The spelling with tau, as against the delta of $\chi\omicron\sigma\delta\eta\omicron$, is paralleled by the free interchange of $\sigma\tau\omicron$ and $\omicron\delta\omicron$. *Cf.* also the tau of $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\gamma\alpha\tau\omicron$ (above, p. 11, n. 15), and of $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ as interpreted below, p. 17. It would seem that the Bactrian orthography of the second century involved some measure of historical (as well as inverse, *cf.* below, p. 18, n. 30) spelling.

precisely what happened to the acropolis of Baylān, where the excavations of the last few years, as M. Schlumberger explains on pp. 308 *seq.* and 315 *seq.* of the article quoted above, p. 3, have brought to light the "foundation terrace" that was added to the east side of the original monument after its completion. This terrace constitutes an eastward extension of the acropolis of nearly 25 metres, reaching a line opposite whose central opening (from which four westward rising flights of steps led across four successive terraces to the sanctuary at the top), at a further distance of appr. 15 metres, the well was discovered. The monolith, with its reference to $\epsilon\iota\omicron\ \mu\omicron\ \sigma\alpha\delta\omicron\ \omicron\delta\omicron\ \mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron$ "this (here) well and *māšt*", was found to the right of the foot of the lowest flight of steps, so that if *māšt* means "wall", and the wall in question was the one built around the new terrace, anybody reading the inscription of the monolith inserted in the wall, would be looking at "this" wall and having immediately behind him "this" well.

The present definition of the meaning of $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\omicron$ has been reached on purely contextual grounds. Etymological support is desirable, and can be tentatively provided: the word may represent OIr. **ham-aršta-*, related to Av. *uzaršta-* "gerade aufgerichtet", *cf.* Bartholomae, *Air. Wb.* s.v. *aršta-*.

This etymology, if correct, and in any case the omission of omicron before mu in the sequence $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\mu\iota\nu\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ as it is written in §3 of the **B** version, run counter to the word division $\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \upsilon\omicron\mu\iota\nu\alpha\upsilon\omicron$ in §§3 and 7 which I proposed in *RH*, p. 195 b, assuming $\upsilon\omicron\mu\iota\nu^{\circ}$ to represent OIr. **hamina-* "summer". Clearly we must return to Henning's division $\lambda\omicron\upsilon(\omicron)\ \mu\iota\nu\alpha\upsilon\omicron$, which will enable us to find the same treatment of OIr. *ham*+vowel in *māšt* and in *min*^o. On the other hand, this division compels acceptance, at least in principle, of Henning's interpretation of $\lambda\omicron\upsilon(\omicron)$ (p. 49) as representing an older **druwa-*. As the meaning of Av. *drva-* does not suit an adjective qualifying "summer", a homonym must be postulated to which one would preferably assign the meaning (and etymology? < **dhru(gh)-*) of Engl. "dry", although "harsh, severe" might do (*cf.* either Sogd. *žwy-/žyw-*, or NP *duruš*). The proto-Iranian form may have been either **druwa-* or, if Bactrian shared with Avestan and Ossetic (*cf.* *AHM*, pp. 215, 327) the disappearance of *g* before *w*, **drugwa-*.

It will be convenient, before outlining the probable course of events, to attempt a complete translation of the inscription, but first we must briefly discuss the words $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ in §8, and $\tau\alpha\delta\iota\omicron\omicron\ \kappa\epsilon\delta\omicron$ in §2.

$\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ was tentatively regarded by Henning (p. 53, n. 5) as deriving from **pariwaršta-* and meaning "nursed, looked after". But the $\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$ clause is introduced by $\iota\theta\omicron\ \alpha\tau\omicron$, which conjunctions in §6 introduce a series of optatives (see *RH*, p. 196 a). These optatives prove what in any case is to be expected, namely that the text of the inscription was dictated before the long-term effects of the building of the well could be tested. The author was therefore not in a position to say that the acropolis *was* well "nursed". All he

could do was to express his hope or conviction that the acropolis would be well *nursed in future. The verbal form ποροοατο should therefore be a 3rd sing. subj., of which -ατο = -ād would be the expected ending. What is left after the subtraction of -ατο cannot, of course, belong to **pari-warz-*. It is more difficult to say what it does belong to. If a preverb is involved, the pres. stem ποροο- may represent OIr. **pari-ru-* with haplogy, cf. Av. *urvāθra-*, and mean "to be supplied with water (?)". But it is simpler to derive ποροο- from a pres. stem **parwa-* of ⁴*par-*, so as to link it etymologically and semantically with Engl. "to fare".

As regards the meaning of ταδιοο κεδο no guess seems to fit the context better than "when".²⁵ One may derive ταδιοο (= *tadyu*) from **tat ayu*,^{25a} and regard κεδο (A κιδο, B κεδι) as the outcome of the juxtaposition of the neuter rel. pron. (used as conjunction) *kat* and *uti*, which in Bactrian would merge with that of the masc. *kah* and *uti* (attested twice in §5, as recognized by Henning, p. 49); the original meaning of ταδιοο κεδο will then have been "(at) the period that" = "at the time when". If this is how §2 begins, §1 will be left hanging in the air²⁶ unless we take μα λιζο in §2 as a logically helpful, but grammatically incongruous repetition of μα λιζο in §1. Instead of saying: *Haec arx . . . , cum primum perfecta est*, the author dictated: *Haec arx . . . , cum primum arx perfecta est*. We shall find it more convenient to say: *Cum haec arx . . . primum perfecta est*.

In the following translation the rendering of sentences and words which I take from Henning is printed in italics. Justification of my own rendering, except for the details discussed in the present review, will be found in *RH*.

(§§1-2) At the time when *this acropolis, the Kanīška-Nicator sanctuary, to which the lord, king Kanīška, gave this name, was first completed*, at that time (lit. *then*) the *water* inside it subsided by itself, *whereby the acropolis came to be waterless*,

(§3) *and when(ever)²⁷ because of dry (?) summers drought arose, then the gods were removed from the seat*,

²⁵ Henning, p. 53, doubtfully translated "then after (?) he (?)", separating what he called the "relative adverb" κεδο (whose A variant was unknown to him at the time) from the rel. pron. κιδο (p. 49, n. 1).

^{25a} Assuming the resulting **ta (a)yu* > **tayu* "then" to have been contaminated with **tad* "then" (as attested in ταδηιο and ταδανο) from **tatā*, which is itself a contamination of *tat* "then" and *tadā*.

²⁶ Unlike Maricq (p. 353), Henning (p. 52) rightly refrained from supplying the substantive verb in the first paragraph, although it is not clear from his translation of ταδιοο κεδο (see fn. 25) whether he did not, after all, reckon with its invisible presence.

²⁷ I now take μινανο as a proper plural, not a *plurale tantum*; if this is correct, drought and the consequent abandonment of the acropolis must have taken place repeatedly.

(§4) *then they were led to λαφο, to ανδηζο,²⁸ and the acropolis was abandoned*;

(§5) [all this continued to happen] *until (the time) when Nokonzok the lord of the marches, son of Frixwadēw, who (is) most devoted to the king, (who, king, is) the devaputra, the helper of the country, the friendly,²⁹ the merciful, who(, king, is) pure-minded towards all the living beings,³⁰ came here to the³¹ sanctuary in the month Nisān of the kšuna-year 31.³²*

(§6) *Then he circumvallated the acropolis, then he dug this well, and he conducted the water out (of it), and he lined it with stones³³ (lit. fitted³⁴ stones to it), so³⁵ that to (φαρο) the people (lit. peoples) in their acropolis water should not be lacking,*

(§7) and (so that) when(ever) they *have³⁶ drought because of dry (?) summers, then they remove not the gods from the seat and abandon not the acropolis.³⁷*

(§8) And over the well he built a water-wheel (and) installed a tank,³⁸ so that by means of this well, by means of this water-wheel *the whole acropolis fare well*. [End of the original text and, apart from the "trade-mark" mg₁ per Mihrāmanem mg₂, of A.]

(§9 in B) And Kozgašk's son Burzmihir, Hastilgāndzig, (and) the lord of the marches Nokonzok, mindful of the Emperor's command, built the well. (Space for, and traces of, one name) mg₃ (?) Adig mg₄ [End of B].

(§9 in M) And Xirgman,³⁹ *as well as Kozgašk's son Burzmihir,⁴⁰ as well as Astilgāncig,⁴¹ as well as the lord of the marches Nokonzok, mindful of the Emperor's command, built this well and wall.*

²⁸ Toponyms? I no longer care for the translation of these words as proposed in *RH*, p. 195 a.

²⁹ On λιζο see *RH*, p. 193 b.

³⁰ In preference to the alternative considered in *RH*, p. 194 a, I now regard φαρο as the Bactrian preposition corresponding to Sogd. *pr*, with its initial adapted to *frā* (cf. Henning, p. 54, sect. (11)), and οισποαο as an inverse spelling of *wispān* due to the fact that the final omicron of *οισπο, as the adjective would be written in the singular, was not pronounced.

³¹ See above, p. 8, n. 10.

³² Recognized by Maricq, *veισαο* by Benveniste, see Maricq, p. 364.

³³ ασαγγε, recognized by Maricq, p. 365.

³⁴ Identified, but translated differently from the above and from each other, by Maricq (p. 365) and Henning (p. 54 with n. 3).

³⁵ ιθο, recognized by Maricq, p. 365.

³⁶ Optative owing to *consecutio modorum*, see *RH*, p. 196 a.

³⁷ The extension of the "passive construction" from the preterite to the present, to which this passage if correctly interpreted in *RH*, pp. 194 b *seq.*, bears witness, is a noteworthy feature of the Bactrian language.

³⁸ Cf. above, p. 12, n. 17.

³⁹ Recognized as n. pr. by Benveniste, p. 139.

⁴⁰ Recognized individually, but not yet linked, by Henning; cf. above, p. 8, n. 7.

⁴¹ Note the B variant *Hastilgān(d)zig*. Despite Henning's warning to leave this

(§10) And Iyuman, as well as Mihrāman, as well as Burzmihrpuhr, did the writing (lit. *wrote*). mg₁ per Mihrāmanem mg₂ [End of M].

We are now at last in a position to attempt the promised outline of the course of events.

1st stage. The sanctuary and acropolis are completed, probably in Kaniška's reign, but their internal water supply peters out. Water is brought in from outside, taken probably from the canal which was later encroached upon by the entrance to the well.⁴² In times of drought, when the canal is dry, the acropolis is evacuated.

2nd stage. In between evacuations the "foundation terrace" is built, but not yet "circumvallated".

3rd stage. Nokonzok arrives on an inspection tour of temples. He orders the terrace to be "circumvallated", and a well to be dug, lined, and equipped with water-wheel and tank. He also dictates the text of the inscription as we read it in A, and orders the monolith to be set aside for skilled carving. While he is still at Baylān, Mihrāman executes the cutting of A, copying the text from a draft supplied by Nokonzok's secretary, on a wall provisionally built out of blocks that are waiting for the well to become ready for lining. Nokonzok inspects A, and departs in the belief that that is the text which in due course will be cut into the monolith. He leaves Burzmihr and Hastilgāndzig in charge of the building operations, which are only just beginning.

4th stage. Burzmihr and Hastilgāndzig invite Adig to display his skill on a second wall provisionally erected on the site of the well. They hand him a draft which apart from spelling variants, is a repetition of Nokonzok's wording, followed, however, by a summing-up sentence in which they name themselves in precedence to Nokonzok, whom they do not expect to return to Baylān. Adig cuts B with the help of an assistant, whose name is incised at the end of the text, before the "trade-mark". The two drafts, that of Nokonzok's secretary, and the one of the two men in charge, are deposited in the latter's office.

5th stage. Nokonzok sends Xirgman to supervise and assist Burzmihr and Hastilgāndzig. His chief concern is the wall, as the well is by now nearly ready, having been lined with the blocks of A and B which en route had proved Mihrāman's superiority over Adig. When the wall, too, approaches completion, it is time to cut the monolith. Xirgman compares the two drafts. He has no objection to the additional sentence, provided that the list of names is headed by his own. As he himself, however, had been

largely concerned with the wall, he misses, and therefore inserts in the summing-up statement, a reference to it, which he feels Nokonzok would have approved of, seeing that he had mentioned the "circumvallation". In view of the two additions, and because Xirgman prefers the spelling of Nokonzok's secretary to that of his own colleagues, he has a new draft prepared, which is handed to Mihrāman for cutting into the monolith. The latter, seeing the additional sentence, and being aware that Adig had recorded the name of his assistant, asks for, and obtains permission to add a further sentence naming himself and his assistants as inscribers of the text.

It will have been gathered that despite surprising shortcomings Göbl's work is not without merit even apart from the helpful suggestion we accepted from him above, p. 4. Reference has been made to his collage. This consists of photographs supplied by Schlumberger of the inscribed sides of the A and B blocks, which Göbl cut out and fitted together more closely than Benveniste had done in his edition. In some respects Benveniste's photographs (also supplied by M. Schlumberger) are clearer, in others Göbl's, so that the two editions usefully complement each other. Göbl's plates provide not only photographs, but also painstakingly executed copies of his collages of A and B, as well as transcriptions of all three versions, both single and synoptic, and a long table showing the shape every letter takes each time it occurs throughout the three versions. The sturdy labour has been rewarded with the identification of several ligatures previously overlooked, and an occasional improvement on previous readings.

The monograph oddly ends with advice "für alle, die sich weiter an Übersetzungen der grossen Kaniška-Inschrift versuchen wollen", to search for parallels to it in the Great Inscription of Šāpur at Naqs-i Rustām [*sic*]. A parallel is indeed to be found at the end of the Parthian version of that inscription, as Sir Harold Bailey, on being told of the above interpretation of Mihrāman's role, points out, in that there, too, the stone-mason has added a sentence to record his name. But for the purpose of understanding the text of which he has so laboriously copied and re-copied every letter, Göbl would have found it more profitable to consult the work of his predecessors, from which he might have gathered what some of these letters spell.

Continued from previous page:

name in peace (p. 80, n. 27), I cannot forbear from pointing out that if its suffix is -ig, the consonants preceding it agree, if γ is from k, with those of the mysterious Sogdian compound 'stk'njl (BBB, p. 43, line 23).

⁴² On the canal see Schlumberger, *art. cit.*, p. 317.