

# Wine in the Gandhāran Epigraphic Corpus

Stefan Baums

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany

**Abstract** Vessels used in the consumption or ritual use of wine have been recovered from sites in ancient Gandhāra. Some were donated to Buddhist monasteries, and one even repurposed as a reliquary. The inscriptions attached to the vessels provide information about their ownership and uses without indicating any active involvement of Buddhist institutions in the production or use of wine. A recent new reading of the Dasht-e-Nawur inscriptions also points to a non-Buddhist ritual use of wine. Some information about practical aspects of viticulture is preserved in Central Asian Gāndhārī documents, and such documents may yet be found in Gandhāra itself.

**Keywords** Wine. Gandhāra. Inscriptions. Ritual. Buddhism. Viticulture.

**Summary** 1 Introduction. – 2 Taxila. – 3 A Silver Hoard of Unknown Findspot. – 4 Another Silver Hoard of Unknown Findspot. – 5 The Dasht-e-Nawur Inscriptions. – 6 Wine and Buddhism in Gandhāra. – 7 The Goblet of Kharayosta and Indravarma. – 8 A Third Silver Hoard of Unknown Findspot. – 9 Conclusion and Outlook.

## 1 Introduction

The wine culture of ancient Gandhāra, so richly attested in its art history and reflected in the accounts of outside observers, has left only modest traces in the epigraphic and manuscript record of Gandhāra itself. In this article, I collect the available material and consider the information that can be extracted from it. A number of inscribed drinking vessels preserve information about their owners, while objects from monastic contexts provide only suggestions for

a possible engagement of Buddhist communities with wine-related activities. Recent research on the Bactrian and Gāndhārī inscriptions from Dasht-e-Nawur in Afghanistan has uncovered a likely record of a mountain-top ritual activity involving the consumption of wine. Documents concerning viticulture are entirely missing from Gandhāra itself (but preserved in the Gāndhārī archives from the Central Asian kingdoms of Krorayina and Kucha, casting an indirect light on Gandhāran wine culture).

## 2 Taxila

John Marshall's excavations at Taxila in 1926 and in 1929 brought to light five inscribed vessels that, judging from their shape and parallels in the Hellenistic world, were likely used for pouring wine and for either drinking it or using it in libations. All of these formed part of a hoard of various gold and silver objects, including personal jewellery, hidden beneath the floor of house 2D behind the apsidal temple D in the lower city of Sirkap.<sup>1</sup>

The first of these is a small silver *askos*,<sup>2</sup> 17.8 cm high and 20 cm long, with a handle in the shape of two knotted vines with leaves at their ends providing an unambiguous connection to wine culture. The inscription (CKI 63)<sup>3</sup> runs around its neck and was read by Konow as follows:<sup>4</sup>

*ka 1 100 20 20 20 20 10 1 maharaja[bhra](ta ma)[ṇi](gula)sa putra-  
sa jinoṇikasa cukhsasa kṣatrapasa*

The main part of the inscription consists of a name and associated titles in the genitive singular, indicating the owner of the vessel: the Western Satrap Jihonika.<sup>5</sup> The name of his dominion Cukhsa is also known from the Taxila copper plate of Patika (CKI 46), and the name of his father Manigula is reconstructible from his coin legends,<sup>6</sup> though the identity of the 'great king' to whom his father was close remains unknown.<sup>7</sup> The main part of the inscription is preceded by

---

1 Marshall 1951, 155-7.

2 Marshall 1951, 156, no. 17, 611; cf. Scheibler 2000b.

3 Baums, Glass 2002b.

4 Konow 1929, 81-2, no. 1. I follow modern transliteration conventions: [ ] mark uncertain readings, ( ) reconstructions, ( ) editorial insertions, and /// the edge of the writing support.

5 See Boppearachchi 2012.

6 E.g., CKC 219, Baums, Glass 2002b.

7 See Marshall 1951, 156 on the use of 'brother' as an honorific.

the clear number '191', and this in turn by an akṣara *ka* that has given rise to much discussion.

Konow originally suggested that it introduced a date and should be interpreted as an abbreviation for *kale* 'at the time' in place of the usual *saṃvatsare* 'in the year' of dating formulas.<sup>8</sup> In his review of Konow's edition, Thomas thought he could make out an additional akṣara *sa*, and suggested reading *saka* with reference to a hypothetical Saka era.<sup>9</sup> Konow adopted Thomas's suggestion, noting that while the additional letter was invisible on renewed eye inspection of the *askos*, it could be made out in a new plaster cast.<sup>10</sup> The older cast reproduced on Konow's plate XVI does not show any sign of an additional akṣara, and the reading consequently continued to be doubtful.<sup>11</sup>

The debate rested for almost seventy years, until Cribb and Senior independently suggested that rather than providing a date, the number '191' on the silver *askos* could indicate a weight, with the akṣara *ka* (without uncertain *sa*) as an abbreviation for the unit *kārṣāpaṇa*.<sup>12</sup> Salomon considers this possibility, correctly pointing out that a date would be unexpected on what is otherwise a simple ownership (not a dedicatory) inscription, but noting that the units used on other such inscriptions (some examples of which are discussed below) are staters and drachms, and in the end agrees with Konow's original interpretation as a date.<sup>13</sup>

Recently, however, the balance of likelihood has swung more definitely in the direction of a weight indication, with the publication of a birch-bark manuscript of unknown provenance (CKM 297) datable on internal evidence to the time of Vima Kadphises and containing a list of items (including, apparently, one *kuḍi* 'water pot') in combination with numbers preceded by *ka*, which here seems to indicate monetary values and therefore most likely serves as an abbreviation of *kārṣāpaṇa*.<sup>14</sup> Allon also discusses the inscription on the Taxila *askos*,

---

<sup>8</sup> Konow 1929, 82.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas 1931, 3-4.

<sup>10</sup> Konow 1931-32, 255.

<sup>11</sup> Konow 1929.

<sup>12</sup> Cribb 1999, 196-7; Senior 2001, 96, 104. Marshall (1951, 609) argued that notations such as this referred to the value rather than the weight (as maintained by John Allan) of the objects in question, on the basis that the latter when compared to the actual weight of the objects resulted in too widely varying values for the units. The discoveries of similarly inscribed gold bars at Dalverzin-tepe in 1972 (Пураченкова 1976), however, made it clear that the units in question must designate weight since otherwise the value of silver and gold would have been almost identical (Salomon 1990, 152). The discrepancies observed by Marshall may at least in part be due to the imperfect state of preservation of many objects. On weight (and thus indirectly value) indications on drinking vessels as social markers, see the article by Antonetti in the present volume.

<sup>13</sup> Salomon 1999, 144-5; 2005, 374-5.

<sup>14</sup> Allon 2019.

and accordingly favours the interpretation of its *ka* in the same way,<sup>15</sup> attributing it (unaware of Cribb, Senior, and Salomon's earlier contributions) to Bracey.<sup>16</sup>

If, in spite of this preponderance of evidence, the number '191' on the *askos* were to be interpreted as a year, then it would have to be assigned to the Greek era that, probably, commenced in 175 BC,<sup>17</sup> which would put the inscription in the year AD 16-17 and thus slightly too early for the accepted dates of Jihonika. On the other hand, when applied to silver in the context of the Western Kṣatrapas, a *kārṣāpaṇa* appears to have been equivalent to approximately 2.6 g,<sup>18</sup> which would put the weight of the silver *askos* at 495 g. This seems plausible given its size, but needs to be verified with an actual weight measurement of the object.

The inscription can then be translated as follows:

191 *kārṣāpaṇa*. Of Jihonika, satrap of Cukhsa, son of Manigula, brother of the Great King.

In the inscriptions discussed below, weight indications follow the name of the owner, and it may therefore be preferable to start the reading of this circular inscription with *maharaja[bhra](ta)* as well. There is a small space in front of this word that would support doing so, but in the available images, taken from the side, an even larger space seems to precede the *ka* of the weight indication. A new image taken from the front of the *askos* would further clarify the layout of the text.

Part of the same hoard as the *askos* were two identical *phialai* measuring 13.3 cm in diameter, and bearing two copies of the same inscription (CKI 88, CKI 89) on their side.<sup>19</sup> Konow read both as

*theutaras[y]a thavaraputras[y]a*<sup>20</sup>

He suggested that they were "apparently meant for keeping grain or flowers", but this is made unlikely by their small size and shallow shape, and in the wider Hellenistic world, the *phiale* type of vessel is firmly associated with the ritual drinking or the libation of wine.<sup>21</sup>

---

**15** Allon (2019, 16-17) also attempts to see *ka* for *kārṣāpaṇa* in the inscriptions (CKI 462, CKI 1192) on two Maitreya images in the Indian Museum.

**16** Bracey 2009, 48.

**17** Baums 2018a, 62.

**18** Sircar 1965b, 165.

**19** Marshall 1951, 157, no. 20, 612, no. 7; cf. Luschey 1939; Schütte 1994; Scheibler 2000c.

**20** Konow 1929, 97-8, nos. 1, 2.

**21** See also the essay by Antonetti in the present volume.

Konow interprets the name of the owner as a Kharoṣṭhī spelling of the Greek name Theodoros, now doubt correctly, but does not see the possibility of a Greek name in the spelling of the owner's father, suggesting a connection with Skt. *sthāvara* 'stable' instead. While this word is attested in the Gāndhārī form *thavara* in the Khotan Dharmapada (CKM 77), it is unexpected as a personal name, and I suggested previously that a possible and more likely correspondent is the Greek name Theoros.<sup>22</sup> We may then translate both inscriptions as

Of Theodoros, son of Theoros.

Also part of the same hoard were a *phiale mesomphalos* and a rectangular silver tray belonging, apparently, to the same person. It is not clear what, if any, purpose the tray would have served in connection with wine, but it is included in this treatment because of the connection of owner and inscriptional formula between these two objects.

The *phiale mesomphalos* measures 22.2 cm in diameter, weighs 486 g,<sup>23</sup> and bears on its side an inscription (CKI 91) that Konow read:<sup>24</sup>

*miṃjukritasa sa 20 10 dha 1 1*

The silver tray with three (out of an original four) short legs measures 22.4 × 15.5 cm and weighs, in its current state, 348 g.<sup>25</sup> On its underside, it is inscribed (CKI 90) with:<sup>26</sup>

*muṃjukritas[y]a s[y]a 20 dra 1*

Konow reasonably suggested that both objects belonged to the same owner, and took the variation in spelling as the result of a non-Indian origin of at least the first part of his name, with the same foreign sound represented once as *i* and once as *u*. The second part, Konow tentatively proposed, could be the Greek name element -kritos. A number of such partially Greek hybrid names occur in Gandhāran inscriptions, including Avakhazada (CKI 178),<sup>27</sup> Helaūta (CKI 564), and Theūta (CKI 969),<sup>28</sup> though it is maybe significant that in all the clear cases, the Greek element comes first. Brough took a different

---

<sup>22</sup> Baums 2018b, 37, 38; 2023, 115, 117.

<sup>23</sup> Marshall 1951, 157, no. 23, 612-13, no. 10.

<sup>24</sup> Konow 1929, 99, no. 4.

<sup>25</sup> Marshall 1951, 157, no. 25, 613, no. 13.

<sup>26</sup> In the reading of Konow 1929, 98, no. 3.

<sup>27</sup> Baums 2018b, 37.

<sup>28</sup> Baums 2018b, 40.

approach and suggested that the first element of the owner's name was Indian Mañju-, with the vowel of the initial syllable variously assimilated to preceding *m* or following *ñ*, and that the second element could be Indian -kīrti with the common Gāndhārī methathesis of *r*.<sup>29</sup>

It would be wise, however, not to consider the name on these two objects in isolation from several other phonetically similar names that occur in Gāndhārī inscriptions. In Taxila itself, this includes Maṃjumina (CKI 189), left unexplained by Konow, but compatible with Brough's etymology. Fussman similarly explains Muṃji in CKI 328 with explicit reference to Brough.<sup>30</sup> On the other hand, Konow connected Muṃjavaṃda in the inscription on the Bimaran casket (CKI 50) with the Vedic Mūjavat tribe, and Falk invokes the same tribe in his discussion of a further group of phonetically related names in inscriptions from Kashmir Smats, to which he later added the name Miṃjaka in a seal inscription (CKI 1038) from Taxila.<sup>31</sup> While at least for some of these names a connection with Indian Mañju- can thus not be ruled out, others point to different, non-Indian etymologies, and it remains unclear into which of these categories the owner of the silver objects falls.

Both inscriptions contain, in addition to the name of their owner, an indication of their weight. In contrast to the *askos* inscription with its *kārṣāpaṇa*, here a different and more widespread system of measurement is used. By comparing the combinations of units on different silver and gold objects from Taxila, from Dalverzin-tepe in Uzbekistan, and from unknown findspots (more on these below), and comparing them to the weights of the preserved objects, the following system combining Greek and Indian units could be worked out,<sup>32</sup> with one stater corresponding to between 14.57 g and 18.03 g:

1 stater = 4 drachms  
1 drachm = 6 dhānaka  
1 dhānaka = 4 aṇḍikā

We may then translate the inscription on the *phiale mesomphalos* as:

Of Miṃjukrita. 30 staters, 2 dhānaka.

and that on the tray as:

Of Muṃjukrita. 20 staters, 1 drachm.

---

<sup>29</sup> Brough 1962, 84.

<sup>30</sup> Fussman 1985, 39-40.

<sup>31</sup> Konow 1929, 51; Falk 2003, 6-10; ur Rahman, Falk 2011, 182.

<sup>32</sup> Marshall 1951, 609-10; Pugachenkova 1976; Salomon 1990; Falk 2001.

According to Sircar, *dhānaka* could also be used synonymously with *aṅḍikā*, and could correspond to 4 *kārṣāpaṇa*, neither of which is borne out by the Gandhāran evidence.<sup>33</sup> Rather, if, as mentioned above, one *kārṣāpaṇa* weighed approximately 2.6 g, then it would have corresponded to (approximately or precisely) 4 *dhānaka* in the system. This raises the possibility that *kārṣāpaṇa* could serve as an alternative to the stater-based system, and that their use in the inscription on the *askos* does not necessarily indicate a non-local origin of the object.

The final object from Sirkap to be discussed here is a silver *phiale* discovered in the 1929 season in a separate hoard in house 3D', on the other side of the main street from the apsidal temple.<sup>34</sup> It measures 15.5 cm (6.12 in) in diameter, weighs 169 g (2,603.7 grains), and has the following inscription (CKI 190) on its base:

*aśpavarmasa strategasa sa 10 1 dra 2 [dha] 2*

The final unit of the weight specification presents a problem. Marshall first read 'o',<sup>35</sup> and then,<sup>36</sup> rather cryptically, 'ζ=0', taking this sign to stand for the Greek obol. In light of later discoveries, however, Salomon suspects that Marshall here mistook a Kharoṣṭhī *dha* for a similarly-shaped Greek Z, and that the intended unit is the *dhānaka*.<sup>37</sup> Unfortunately, this still pends verification since no image of the inscription is available. In the owner of this *phiale*, Aśpavarma, another well-known Indo-Scythian ruler joins Jihonika and his *askos*, and we can translate:

Of General Aśpavarma. 11 staters, 2 drachms, 2 *dhānaka*.

Two further inscribed utensils from Taxila, a copper ladle (CKI 66, with a dedication to the Buddhist Kāśyapiya school) and a silver sieve (CKI 92), have no clear connection to wine, but may be mentioned in passing.

### 3 A Silver Hoard of Unknown Findspot

The next major discovery of inscribed, wine-related utensils from Gandhāra was the result of looting, allegedly around the year 1980 or earlier in the border region of Pakistan and Afghanistan,<sup>38</sup> and the items were apparently split up and sold separately soon after their discovery.

<sup>33</sup> Sircar 1965a, 90.

<sup>34</sup> Marshall 1951, 188, no. 4, 613, no. 11.

<sup>35</sup> Marshall 1935, 62; 1951, 613.

<sup>36</sup> Marshall 1935, 63.

<sup>37</sup> Salomon 1990, 154.

<sup>38</sup> Baratte 2001, 250.

The first of them was published by Salomon and was, at that time, in an unspecified “private collection”.<sup>39</sup> It is a different type of vessel from those discussed so far: a so-called ‘Parthian’ goblet that may, in turn, go back to the Greek *kantharos* under subtraction of the latter’s handles.<sup>40</sup> The object is 10.8 cm high, 8.3 cm in diameter, and weighs 134.75 g.

Around its rim runs an ownership inscription (CKI 173) containing a proper name read by Salomon as *jīvatmevosa* followed by the weight specification *sade 4 4 dra 1 1 1 dha 4 a 1 1*. Salomon derives the name as read by him from Skt. *Jīvātmabodha*, noting the absence of a genitive ending (explained as haplography) as the main problem. Other problems include, however, the preservation of *tm* (which regularly develops to *tv* in Gāndhārī), the *e* in the third syllable,<sup>41</sup> the weakening of *b* to *v* in the beginning of a compound member, and the awkward semantics of the otherwise unattested name itself. The word *jīvātman* ‘living individual soul’ only appears to occur in Brahmanic philosophical contexts,<sup>42</sup> and would be quite out of place in combination with the Buddhist concept of enlightenment.

Instead, I propose to read *jivasre[ṭha]sa*. The third akṣara does look more like a *sre* than a *tme*, with its top identical to the two following *sa* and joining the stem on the left (whereas *ta* would meet *ma* in the middle). In *ṭha*, the middle stroke to the left is usually parallel to the top stroke, but examples with slanted middle stroke do occur, and the engraver of the vessel under discussion was not always accurate (as shown, for instance, by the double line on the immediately following *sa*). The name would then correspond to Skt. *Jīvasreṣṭha*, and falls within a pattern of Gāndhārī names ending in *sreṭha*: *Dharmaśreṭha* at Hadda (CKI 1081) and in Central Asia (CKD 204, CKD 605, CKD 609, CKD 614), *Savaseṭha* in Jamalgarhi (CKI 117), and *Sreṭha* on its own at Hadda (CKI 361) and in an unprovenanced Apraca inscription (CKI 265). That *Jiva-* was exchangeable with *Dhamma-* as first element of compound names is further shown by the pairs *Jivanaṃda* : *Dhammananḍi* and *Jivasena* : *Dhammasena*.<sup>43</sup>

The entire inscription on the goblet can then be read and translated as follows:

*jivasre[ṭha]sa sade 4 4 dra 1 1 1 dha 4 a 1 1*

Of *Jivasreṭha*. 8 staters, 3 drachms, 4 dhānaka, 2 aṅḍikā.

<sup>39</sup> Salomon 1990, 149.

<sup>40</sup> Marshall 1951, 612; Goldman in Salomon 1990, 155-6.

<sup>41</sup> Brough (1962, 81) does not, as claimed by Salomon, describe palatalisation of *a* outside palatal environments, and such would be highly unusual.

<sup>42</sup> Böhtlingk, Roth 1855-75 s.v.

<sup>43</sup> Baums, Glass 2002a s.vv.



Other items from apparently the same hoard that reached a different (one presumes) private collection were published and studied in a pair of articles by Baratte and Falk, the former focussing on the objects, the latter on the inscriptions on some of them.<sup>44</sup> Unfortunately, maybe due to a miscommunication in the publication process, the two companion articles use different numbering systems for the objects, so that we can only partly reconstruct which inscriptions were attached to which object, and even the precise number of inscriptions remains uncertain. Baratte provides the following information and measurements for his ten items nos. 1, 2, 8, 21, 22, 23, 35, 36, 37, and 38:

1: "Or la discussion pourrait être relancée par l'inscription en karoshthi qui à été gravée en lettres pointillées au-dessus du premier groupe. Elle donne le poids de la coupe complète, avec ses deux anses, semble-t-il, en drachmes et en statères." Body: 11.5 × 11.8 cm, 435 g; handle: 140 g. Foot 2.3 × 4.5 cm.<sup>45</sup>

2: "Une inscription pointillée en karoshthi court le long du rebord de la coupe, dont elle donne le poids." 4.2 × 19 cm, 381 g.<sup>46</sup>

8: "Sous le rebord court une inscription en karoshthi, qui donne le poids de la coupe et le nom d'un de ses possesseurs." 5.4 × 20 cm, 267 g.<sup>47</sup>

21: "Sous la lèvre une inscription en karoshthi est tracée en lettres pointillées : elle donne le nom du propriétaire et le poids de l'objet." 13.2 × 8.2 cm, 203 g.<sup>48</sup>

22: "Sous la lèvre, une inscription karoshthie est tracée en lettres pointillées." 13.2 cm high.<sup>49</sup>

23: "Sous le rebord, une inscription karoshthie en lettres pointillées." 8.8 × 8 cm.<sup>50</sup>

35-8: "Tous offrent sous le rebord une inscription karoshthie en lettre pointillées, qui donne le poids de l'objet et le nom de leur

---

<sup>44</sup> Baratte 2001, 250; Falk 2001, 310.

<sup>45</sup> Baratte 2001, 252, 257-8.

<sup>46</sup> Baratte 2001, 259, 263.

<sup>47</sup> Baratte 2001, 282, 284.

<sup>48</sup> Baratte 2001, 293-4.

<sup>49</sup> Baratte 2001, 294.

<sup>50</sup> Baratte 2001, 294.

propriétaire [...]” 35: 24 cm wide; 36: 5 x 23.5 cm, 417 g; 37: 4 x 19.1 cm, 205 g; 38: 4.5 x 20.6 cm, 272 g.<sup>51</sup>

Falk, on the other hand, provides the following physical information for his nine item nos. 1, 3, 9, 17, 18, 19, 37, 40, and 41:

1: “the magnificent centaur goblet”; “goblet, foot reattached, one handle preserved”; “the weight of the goblet alone (435 g.) [...] the 80 g. of one preserved handle”.<sup>52</sup>

3: “phiale, complete. Its ‘sa 20 1 1 dra 1 1’ correspond to a weight of 381 g.”.<sup>53</sup>

17: “‘sa 10 1 1’”, stater 12, goblet, cup 187 g., base 16 g.”.<sup>54</sup>

18: “carinated gold, foot missing”; “weight of 311 g.”.<sup>55</sup>

37: “the 417 g. of the object”.<sup>56</sup>

40: “shallow bowl, repaired and complete. Its 205 g. with a given weight of 13 stater [...]”.<sup>57</sup>

41: “shallow bowl, intact. Its 272 g. [...]”.<sup>58</sup>

In addition, some Kharoṣṭhī signs can be made out in Baratte’s illustrations 22 and 23 (293, 295). Combining this information, we can reconstruct the following certain correspondences.<sup>59</sup>

Baratte no. 1 = Falk no. 1 (*kantharos*, CKI 721)

Baratte no. 2 = Falk no. 3 (*phiale*, CKI 722)

Baratte no. 21 = Falk no. 17 (goblet, CKI 724)

---

<sup>51</sup> Baratte 2001, 300.

<sup>52</sup> Falk 2001, 308, 311.

<sup>53</sup> Falk 2001, 311.

<sup>54</sup> Falk 2001, 311.

<sup>55</sup> Falk 2001, 313.

<sup>56</sup> Falk 2001, 313.

<sup>57</sup> Falk 2001, 311.

<sup>58</sup> Falk 2001, 313.

<sup>59</sup> With added information on the object type and item numbers in Baums, *Glass* 2002b.

Baratte no. 22 = Falk no. 18 (goblet, CKI 725)

Baratte no. 36 = Falk no. 37 (*phiale*, CKI 727)

Baratte no. 37 = Falk no. 40 (*phiale*, CKI 728)

Baratte no. 38 = Falk no. 41 (*phiale*, CKI 729)

Less certain are the following two correspondences:

Baratte no. 8 = Falk no. 9 (*phiale*, CKI 723)

Baratte no. 23 = Falk no. 19 (goblet, CKI 726)

The difference in the total number given for the inscribed items (Baratte: ten, Falk: nine) can be reconciled if we assume in light of the above that Baratte's no. 35 (a *phiale*) is not actually inscribed. The correspondences between the objects and their inscriptions reconstructed from the published information as above thus remain partially uncertain, and it is to be hoped that eventually they can be verified on the actual objects, if and when the identity of the private collection housing them is revealed and general access to the objects granted.

The readings and interpretations provided by Falk for the nine inscribed objects are solid, and there are only a few places where I would like to suggest improvements or proceed more cautiously. Of the three goblet inscriptions in this collection, CKI 724<sup>60</sup> follows the same pattern as the goblet inscription allegedly from the same hoard and edited eleven years earlier by Salomon (CKI 173) – the name of the owner in the genitive is followed by the weight:

*anaṃtasenaṃputrasa dhr[u]jaseṇasa sa 10 1 1*

Of Dhruaseṇa, son of Anaṃtasena. 12 staters.

Falk suggested, no doubt correctly, that the name of the owner corresponds to Skt. Dhruvasena, but read *dhraaseṇasa*.<sup>61</sup> I think the small horizontal projection at the bottom left of the akṣara can be interpreted as a vowel sign *u* and therefore read *dhr[u]jaseṇasa*. The name of the owner's father is interpreted as Skt. Anantasena by Falk.<sup>62</sup> This is possible, but it seems more likely that it corresponds to Skt.

---

<sup>60</sup> Baratte 2001, 293-4, no. 21; Falk 2001, 316, no. 17.

<sup>61</sup> Falk 2001, 309.

<sup>62</sup> Falk 2001, 309.

Ānandasena, which is attested in the form Anamdasena in the Central Asian Gāndhārī documents (CKD 345, CKD 403, CKD 703; cf. also Namdasena in CKD 68, CKD 385, CKD 399, spelled Namtasena in the last), notwithstanding the Aṃtasena (apparently Skt. Antasena) that is also attested there (CKD 400, CKD 462, CKD 463).

The same owner's name occurs (without that of his father or a weight specification) in the second goblet inscription, CKI 726:<sup>63</sup>

*dhr[u]aseṇasa*

Of Dhruaseṇa.

Here the vowel sign *u* is even more distinct.

The third goblet inscription, CKI 725,<sup>64</sup> follows the same pattern as the first, but combines an Indian owner's name with the non-Indian name of his father:

*ru[b]leaputrasa budhavalasa sa 20 dhanea 1 1*

Of Budhavalā, son of Rubea. 20 staters, 2 dhānaka.

Here Budhavalā corresponds to Skt. Buddhapāla, while Rubea remains etymologically unclear.<sup>65</sup>

The most spectacular of the vessels from this hoard is a silver *kantharos* decorated with a scene from Greek mythology involving centaurs. Two handles that were originally attached to it (maybe secondarily, since no room had been left for them in the mythological scene) have fallen off, though one of them appears to have entered the collection in question together with it. The beginning of the inscription on the *kantharos*, CKI 721, has been damaged.<sup>66</sup> Falk reads and interprets it as follows (question marks mine):

*arṣaṇobhaḍusa Mogasa todirasa dra 20 10 4 ½ tra 1*

Of Moga(?), the brother(?) of the prince(?), the todira(?). 34 ½ drachms(?), 1 drachm.

and attempts to connect *arṣaṇo* to the title *erzuṇa* (maybe corresponding to Khotanese *alysānai*) in CKI 53 from Takht-i-Bahi. Considering not only the physical damage that this word has undergone,

---

<sup>63</sup> Baratte 2001, 294, no. 23; Falk 2001, 316, no. 19.

<sup>64</sup> Baratte 2001, 294, no. 22; Falk 2001, 316, no. 19.

<sup>65</sup> It could, as Falk (2001, 308, 316) notes, also be read Rurea.

<sup>66</sup> Baratte 2001, 252-9, no. 1; Falk 2001, 314-15, no. 1.

but also the unexplained difference in sibilant between *ṣ* in the inscription and [z] in Takht-i-Bahi and Khotanese, this can, however, not be considered certain. Similarly, both the reading *bhaḍusa* and its interpretation as the genitive of the word for ‘brother’ (which is well-attested in Gāndhārī, but never with retroflex *ḍ*, however motivated such might be by the *r* of its Skt. correspondent) cannot be considered certain, nor can the name Moga (with the stroke interpreted as *o* pointing in the wrong direction, and a *ga* that could also be read as *ṣa*). While none of these readings can be definitely ruled out, it would be unwise to base any historical conclusions on their aggregate. The word (or partial word) *todirasa* (possibly *todorasa*) is clearly visible, but of unknown significance, and in view of the uncertain beginning of the inscription, it may well represent the name (or part of the name) of the owner of the vessel. In the specification of the weight, it seems to me that *dra*, considered a mistake for *sa* by Falk, can be read as the top of the expected *sa*. The rare sign for ‘½’ is noteworthy, but could conceivably also be ‘2’, which would yield a total weight of 36 staters and 1 drachm for the vessel.

The remaining inscribed vessels from this hoard are five *phialai*. Four of these inscriptions follow the by now familiar patterns. CKI 727<sup>67</sup> has the Indian owner’s name Budhila (Skt. Buddhila; Falk reads Budhala and interprets it as Skt. Buddhala) together with the Greek name Theudama (which also occurs in the seal inscriptions CKI 34 and CKI 978, and probably stands for Theodamas)<sup>68</sup> of his father:

*theudamaputrasa budh[i]lasa sa 20 4 ½ dha 1*

Of Budhila, son of Theodamas. 24 ½ staters, 1 dhānaka.

The symbol for ‘one half’ looks noticeably different here than in CKI 727, casting further doubt on its presence in the latter.

Both the owner and his father in CKI 728 bear Indian names:<sup>69</sup>

*biśpelaputrasa budharakṣidasa sa 10 1 1 1*

Of Budharakṣida, son of Biśpela. 13 staters.

The same is true of CKI 723,<sup>70</sup> though here the owner’s name is clearly Hastiṇaṃda rather than Falk’s Hastidasa:

---

<sup>67</sup> Baratte 2001, 300-2, no. 36; Falk 2001, 317, no. 41.

<sup>68</sup> Baums 2018b, 37-8; 2023.

<sup>69</sup> Baratte 2001, 300-2, no. 37; Falk 2001, 317, no. 41.

<sup>70</sup> Baratte 2001, 282-4, no. 8; Falk 2001, 316, no. 9.

*viradasaputrasa hastiṇaṃdasa*

Of Hastiṇaṃda, son of Viradasa.

The owner in inscription CKI 729<sup>71</sup> has the Iranian-Indian hybrid name Tiraghoṣa (compared by Falk with Iranian Tiravharṇa in CKI 179, to which we may add Tiravhara in CKD 582 and CKD 732, as well as uncompounded Tira in CKI 564 and Tiraka in CKI 1060):

*tiraghoṣasa sa 10 4 1 dra 1 1 dha 1 1 1 a 1 1*

Of Tiraghoṣa. 15 staters, 2 drachms, 3 dhānaka, 2 aṇḍikā.

Finally, the *phiale* inscription CKI 722 appears to consist only of a specification of the weight of the vessel.<sup>72</sup> Falk reads the preceding signs as *ma[n]a* meaning ‘measure’, i.e., ‘weight’, but the first sign is not oriented the correct way for *ma*, and the second is missing the characteristic head of *na*, so this is less than certain:

*ma[n]a sa 20 2 dra 2*

The measure is(?) 22 staters, 2 drachms.

#### 4 Another Silver Hoard of Unknown Findspot

All of the inscriptions on the drinking or libation vessels discussed so far only specify owners and weights, without providing any information about their intended uses and the larger ritual or ideological complexes that they belonged to. In the case of the two Taxila hoards, contextual information can partly fill this lacuna. When the hoard in house 2D behind the Sirkap apsidal temple was found, Marshall originally surmised that it constituted donations made to the temple and subsequently hidden in the adjacent building. This is, as discussed, not supported by the inscriptions, where one would then have expected some word denoting the act of donation, such as *danamuha* or *deyadhaṇṇma*. After the discovery of the second hoard in house 3D', at a remove from the apsidal temple, Marshall too changed his mind and considered both hoards the result of private wealth hidden away in a time of danger. No contextual information is, of course, available for the looted objects, possibly from the same hoard, published by

---

<sup>71</sup> Baratte 2001, 300-2, no. 38; Falk 2001, 317, no. 41.

<sup>72</sup> Baratte 2001, 259-63, no. 2; Falk 2001, 316, no. 3.

Salomon in 1990 and by Baratte and Falk in 2001. Baratte did, however, observe similar marks on several of the vessels that to him indicated that in spite of the multiple owners' names, at least some of them had had at some point been consolidated into a single treasure.

Another set of silver drinking vessels, also unprovenanced, but allegedly from just north of the Khyber Pass in Pakistan, were published in Falk from a private collection in the United Kingdom.<sup>73</sup> Three of these (one *phiale*, one *mastos*, and one bowl) were inscribed, and in this case the inscriptions do shed light on a ritual use of the bowls. Most informative is the *phiale*, which has two inscriptions in Greek and Gāndhārī (CKI 552) running around its edge. The Greek one is clear and was read and interpreted by Falk as follows:

Καλλιφῶν μεριδάρχης εὐξάμενος ἀνέθηκεν τῷ ΧΑΟΣΕΙ

Kalliphon the meridarch made a vow and dedicated (the vessel) to Khaos.

Rougemont was not willing to follow Falk in accepting ΧΑΟΣΕΙ as an irregular dative of the name Khaos, and instead built on Falk's alternative suggestion of a stem \*Khaosis or \*Khaoseus (adding the possibility \*Khaoses), interpreting them as the name of a divinised local river.<sup>74</sup> In any case, the *phiale* was dedicated to a deity in fulfilment of a vow, reflecting an entirely Greek ritual practice. The Gāndhārī inscription, commencing on the left of the Greek one, can therefore be considered a secondary version of the latter and can be interpreted in its light, even though several linguistically difficult points remain (reading by Falk, uncertainty marks added):

*kaliphonena meridarkhena [prati]śunita nirakaṭe [bo]asa*

Kalliphon the meridarch made a vow and repaid(?) it to Boa(?).

The Indian verb *prati-sru-* is semantically a perfect fit for εὐξάμενος, and it is likely that the corresponding Gāndhārī gerund *[prati]śunita* should be read. The spelling of the prefix is peculiar, however (it should, counter to Falk, be either *paḍi-* or *pradi-* and the root would normally be spelled either *ṣu-* or *śru-* (though *śu-* also occurs).<sup>75</sup> The main verb *nirakaṭe* may phonetically well correspond to Skt. *nirākṛta-* but this means (as Falk notes) 'removed', and is thus a rather indirect way at best to render ἀνέθηκεν. Finally, the name of the deity Boa is

---

<sup>73</sup> Falk 2009a.

<sup>74</sup> Rougemont 2012, 269-70.

<sup>75</sup> Falk 2009a, 27.

not easily derived from Bhava (proposed by Falk as an *interpretatio Indica* of Khaos). The word *bhava* is well-attested in Gāndhārī, and only once (in the verse-commentary manuscript CKM 11) is it spelled *ba-va* with unmotivated loss of aspiration. Since the vowel mark *o* is not actually very distinct on the *phiale*, one should maybe read [*ba*]vasa to agree at least with this single parallel, if one is willing to follow Falk's identification of Khaos.

The bowl from the same hoard bears the Gāndhārī inscription (CKI 553):<sup>76</sup>

*samagakeṇa epesukupēṇa karavite ye aīmukhe sajate*

Samagaka, the overseer, had it made, who became an adorant(?).

Here the main doubt rests on the word *aīmukhe*, which is not otherwise attested in Gāndhārī and should, if indeed it corresponds to Skt. *abhimukha-*, rather be spelled *avhimukhe*.

A *mastos* from the same hoard has a Greek inscription specifying owner and weight in the familiar way:<sup>77</sup>

διὰ Φοιτο[κ]λέ[ο]υς τοῦ μεριδάρχου· δρ ν´

For Phoitokles, the meridarch. 50 drachms.

The hoard that these three vessels came from thus clearly held a connection to a sanctuary, and the inscriptions hint in the barest of outlines at a ritual act of depositing these valuable objects in gratitude to the local deity, who appears to have fulfilled a wish. What remains unclear, however, is whether the drinking or libation of wine was in any way involved in the ritual.

## 5 The Dasht-e-Nawur Inscriptions

The ritual consumption of wine may, however, be attested in one inscription from the western fringe of the Gandhāran world. A boulder on a high mountain plateau at Dasht-e-Nawur in Afghanistan has recorded on its upper surface five inscriptions, three of which (nos I, III, and IV) appear to carry the main text and be translations of each other. No. I is in the Bactrian language; no. III in what has been called the 'unknown script', writing a language that has only very recently begun to be deciphered; and no. IV is in Gāndhārī.

<sup>76</sup> Falk 2009a, 29-31.

<sup>77</sup> Falk 2009a, 34-5; revised reading by Rougemont 2012, 270-1.



Documentation for all five inscriptions and a first decipherment attempt were published by Fussman, which for the Bactrian inscription no. I was improved upon by Sims-Williams and Cribb:<sup>78</sup> the inscription is dated on day 15 of the month Gorpaios of year 279 of an unspecified era (probably the Greek era of 175 BC, placing the inscriptions in AD 104-105) and names the Kushan emperor Vima Takto with a long list of his titles, but the second part of the inscription remained obscure. Fussman had reported extensive damage to the inscription at the time of his last visit to the site, and no further documentation has been produced since.

Recently, however, a previously unpublished colour image of the Bactrian inscription from the estate of Fussman was made available, prompting two new decipherment attempts, one of the Bactrian as well as the Gāndhārī inscriptions,<sup>79</sup> another of the Bactrian inscription only.<sup>80</sup> While the new reading of the Gāndhārī inscription proposed in the former remains highly speculative and, as admitted by its authors, strongly inspired by their reading of the Bactrian, there are now three phrases in the second half of the Bactrian inscription that both groups of authors agree on, and that do provide intriguing information about the acts carried out in the aforementioned year of Vima Takto, and maybe even in his presence. These phrases are: l. 11 αβο ι βαγανο ‘to the gods’, l. 12 καρανο ‘of the people’, and l. 13 μολο χοαρδο ‘drank wine’. Taken together, they appear to suggest a public ritual involving wine-drinking at this remote mountain-top location, and thus possibly a Kushan-era continuation of the type of indigenous Gandhāran wine ritual reported by the Greek historians.<sup>81</sup>

## 6 Wine and Buddhism in Gandhāra

One of the key questions that remains, however, is the possible involvement of Gandhāran Buddhist institutions in wine-related activities. The depictions of wine-drinking scenes in Gandhāran art are well-known, but usually interpreted as a reference to worldly activities of pleasure that are to be overcome on the Buddhist path, rather than something engaged in or even endorsed by Buddhist monastics.<sup>82</sup> Buddhist prohibitions against the consumption of alcohol were, of course, known in Gandhāra, and are directly attested in one Gāndhārī manuscript fragment of the Dakṣiṇāvibhaṅgasūtra

<sup>78</sup> Fussman 1974; Sims-Williams, Cribb 1995-96, 95-6.

<sup>79</sup> Palunčić, Palunčić, Maharaj 2023.

<sup>80</sup> Halfmann et al. 2024.

<sup>81</sup> Carter 1992, 51-3.

<sup>82</sup> Rosen Stone 2008, 84.

(CKM 264)<sup>83</sup> as part of the five precepts undertaken by the aspiring nun Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī:

*(panadi)[pa](tade pradi)[vira]da adiṃnadanade prativirada  
(kameṣu michacarade prativirada mu)[ṣa]vadade pradivirada  
suramereamajapramati[tha>(\*nade prativirada)*

She has abstained from killing living beings, has abstained from taking what is not given, has abstained from wrong conduct with regard to desires, has abstained from false speech, has abstained from the bases of negligence grain liquor, sugar-and-spice liquor, and (other) intoxicating drinks.

But precept is of course one thing, and practice another, and in view of the evident popularity of wine festivals in Gandhāra from ancient times, up to the present day among the Kalash,<sup>84</sup> accommodations and interactions cannot be ruled out. The question is whether there is any positive evidence for such, and in particular – for purposes of this article – whether such evidence can be found in the epigraphy of Gandhāra. Falk argued that Buddhist monastics, while (at least initially) abstaining from any wine-related vinaya violations themselves, ‘organised’ wine festivals for the local population in order to engage them and, potentially, win them over to Buddhism.<sup>85</sup> Falk sees the physical evidence for this in large stone bowls with lotus-petal decorations on their outside that have been found at monastic sites in Gandhāra and beyond, and that Falk himself originally interpreted differently as representations of the begging bowl of the Buddha that were meant to be worshipped as a type of relic and in which devotees could deposit food donations for the monastery.<sup>86</sup> Falk’s reinterpretation is based partly on the depiction of similarly sized and adorned bowls in wine-production scenes in Gandhāran art, partly on the inscriptions on three of these monumental bowls.

One of these bowls was found in 2000 near Charsadda and has, on the outside of its rim, the following donative inscription (CKI 367):<sup>87</sup>

*saṃ 20 20 10 1 kartaasa masasa divasaṃmi 10 1 1 1 iṣe kṣuṇaṃmi  
saṃghe caūḍisami kridaṅkae puyakaviharami acaryaṇa kaśaviaṇa  
parigrahaṃmi vairasa daṅamukhe ṣaveasa uvajayasa arogadakṣiṇe  
sarva(sa)tvaṇa puyae*

---

<sup>83</sup> Strauch 2014, 29.

<sup>84</sup> Edelberg 1965.

<sup>85</sup> Falk 2009b, 76.

<sup>86</sup> Falk 2005, 451.

<sup>87</sup> Falk 2005, 448-51.

In the year 51, on the 13th day of the month Kārttika, at this time, donation of Vāira to the community of the four directions, at Kridaṅaka, in the Puyaka Monastery, in the possession of the Kāśyapīya masters, for the gift of health of the novice Uvajaya, in honour of all beings.

The inscription contains no explicit mention of the practical purpose of the vessel, though we may note with a view to the following that its donation is supposed to further the health of Uvajaya.

Already in 1972, a comparable bowl had been found in Termez in Uzbekistan, and was interpreted by its first editor as a water container.<sup>88</sup> It has an incompletely preserved inscription (CKI 234) on top of its rim that reads:

*ayaṃ suyikuḍa ... ṅatisalohidaṇo puyaa sarvasatvana hidaye suhaye saṃp(u)[r]yadu ○*

This pure bowl ... shall be filled in honour of relatives and kinsmen, for the well-being and happiness of all beings.

Falk's new interpretation of this bowl as a receptacle for wine hinges on the understanding of *suyikuḍa*. The most straightforward parsing of the compound is as above, as a karmadhāraya meaning 'pure bowl', possibly with an implication of the bowl being pure due to its content. Falk prefers to take the compound as a tatpuruṣa meaning 'bowl for cleaned or filtered (liquid)',<sup>89</sup> namely wine, and refers to the Vedic term *śucipā* 'drinker of what is pure' (there meaning Soma).

To close his argument, Falk refers to a third large vessel found in or before 2005 in Takht-i-Bahi, with two incompletely preserved copies of what appears to have been the same inscription (CKI 545) on its inside and its outside:

*bhavāiraevasami nigadaka kha ///*

*// ? ? [n]i[gadaka kha]rarakṣidasa vavamukhe*

Combining these, one can tentatively translate:

At *bhavāiraevasa*, the *nigadaka*(?) is a donation(?) of Khararakṣida.

The word division and interpretation of *bhavāiraevasami* are, in my opinion, unclear, but in any case it appears to designate the place

---

<sup>88</sup> Vorob'eva-Desiatovskaia 1974, 177.

<sup>89</sup> Falk 2009b, 72.

of the donation. (Falk divides and translates *bhavaī raevasami* “at Bhava, at the residence of the king”, which, one may note, would appear to designate a non-Buddhist context.) The key term is *nigadaka*, taken by Falk as “(vessel) with salubrious (content)” from Skt. *nir-gada* ‘healthy’. This is phonetically possible (though one might have preferred *nigadaga*), and no other plausible interpretation (always assuming the word division at the beginning of the string is correct) comes to mind. If it is correct, then the content of this vessel is ‘healthy’, just as that of the preceding one is ‘pure’.

Falk’s argument is ingenious, but even combining the inscriptions with the similarly-looking vessels depicted in wine-production scenes, I am not entirely convinced that the three inscribed large bowls (and similar other ones) must have been used as wine containers in monastic contexts, as Falk argues. This shape and size of vessel (whether with common lotus ornamentation or without) lends itself to the processing or temporary storage of any liquid. In the reliefs, this is evidently wine, but notably without any other indications of a monastic presence in its processing. In the case of the three inscribed large bowls, at least two of which are from Buddhist contexts, it could have been any other liquid, such as simply water for the purpose of drinking which, if it was kept clean (*suyi*) would certainly be conducive to health (*aroga*, *nigada*), or maybe water for cleaning oneself externally before entering the monastery, such as the water troughs provided at the entrance of any Japanese Buddhist temple. A globular clay water pot was certainly considered a suitable donation to a Buddhist monastery in Termez, and an elaborate, metrical donative inscription running around its shoulder (CKI 841)<sup>90</sup> explicitly refers to its ‘beryl-coloured water’ content.

## 7 The Goblet of Kharayosta and Indravarma

Keeping all this in mind, one inscribed vessel of the goblet type discussed earlier in this article, whose original purpose was certainly the consumption of wine, was in fact converted to a decidedly Buddhist purpose: the famous silver reliquary of the Apraca prince Indravarma (CKI 241; Salomon 1996). In contrast to all the vessels discussed so far, the Indravarma reliquary consists of two parts: a base of the same shape as the goblets already discussed, and a similarly-styled lid crowned by the figure of an ibex. Both pieces appear to have been produced at the same time and from the same raw material, to fit each other for the original use of the vessel as a drinking

<sup>90</sup> Scherrer-Schaub, Salomon, Baums 2012, 159-68.

cup.<sup>91</sup> If the lid had been added only later, on conversion of the vessel to a reliquary,<sup>92</sup> then one might further have expected a Buddhist subject in place of the ibex. Base and lid of the vessel together are 28.5 cm high, measure 12.3 cm in diameter, and weigh 1,155.9 g. The findspot of the object is unknown.

The original inscription on the goblet, attached upside down on the outside of the rim of its lid, is:

*mahakṣatrapaputrasa [ya]guraṃṇa khara[yosta]sa [śa] 20 4 4 ana  
4 ma 2*

Of the *yagu* king Kharayosta, son of the great satrap. 28 staters, 4 dhānaka, 2 māṣa.

In place of the title *yaguraṃṇa*, Falk suggests reading *egaraṃṇo*,<sup>93</sup> but Salomon's reading is borne out by his fig. 12.<sup>94</sup> Conspicuous is the mistake in the abbreviation for stater, *śa* instead of *sa*, *ana* instead of *dha* for dhānaka, as well as the use of the smallest unit māṣa, unique among the vessels discussed in this article. The weight specification refers to the lid alone.

The bottom of the base bears the single akṣara *naṃ*, presumably an artisan's mark and therefore also original, but it originally lacked any indication of ownership or weight.

At a later point in time, and following the change of ownership to Indravarma, the following two inscriptions were added on the rim of the lid (upside down) and on the rim of the base (right side up):

*idravarṃsa kumarasa sa 20 4 4 dra 1*

Of prince Idravarma. 28 staters, 1 drachm.

*iṃdravarṃsa kumarasa sa 20 20 1 1 1*

Of prince Iṃdravarma. 43 staters.

Finally, after the conversion of the goblet into a reliquary, a relic-donation inscription in the name of Indravarma and his wife was added, in one copy each on the lid and the base, both right-side up. As they do not concern the topic of the present article, the reader is

---

**91** Salomon 1996, 435.

**92** As Baratte 2001, 297-8 suggests.

**93** Falk 2001, 311.

**94** Salomon 1996, 426.

referred to Salomon, and to Baums for them in the context of other Gandhāran relic inscriptions.<sup>95</sup>

The conversion of a wine-drinking vessel into a Buddhist reliquary is remarkable, and it is tempting to see in it a conscious symbolism of conversion similar to the often remarked-upon arrangement of wine-drinking scenes in the lower registers of a Buddhist stūpa, followed by properly Buddhist motifs in the higher registers as one ascends. On the other hand, it must also not be forgotten that the repurposing of vessels originally intended for more mundane purposes to become containers for Buddhist sacred content is widespread. One example are the water pots that contained the Buddhist manuscripts of the British Library and Robert Senior collections,<sup>96</sup> another the vase from Merv with hunting and banquet scenes that contained Buddhist Sanskrit manuscript fragments.<sup>97</sup>

## 8 A Third Silver Hoard of Unknown Findspot

Finally, yet another hoard of unprovenanced inscribed silver vessels and utensils, photographed in 1996 in the collection of Aman ur Rahman, but now in unknown hands, contained a further three goblets of the type discussed above (in addition to a bowl, a cup, and two ladles). In contrast to the objects discussed so far, these three goblets do not bear any inscriptions related to an original use as drinking vessels, but only donative inscriptions to monastic recipients of the same type as on the large stone bowls investigated in section 6. Salomon read these as follows:<sup>98</sup>

*saghami [cadu]diśa[mi kuṇa](śi)[iami] viharaṃmi u[ta]rode[a]mi  
pa[r]ṇavaḍi[e] dhama[ka]bharyae daṇamu[khe] sarvasatva puyāi-  
ta ? ? [mavi] ? ? (CKI 1182)*

*sagha(mi) caūdi(śami) [utaro]de[vami vi]harami [k](oṇa)śilie [a]ca(r)  
ya(ṇa sar)va[sti]vada parigrahami [avhe]mi[trae] bhikkuṇie [daṇa]  
mukhe (madapi)[da pu]yāita (CKI 1183)*

*(saghami) caūdiśami [u]tar[o]deva[mi ko]ṇaśi[li]e (viha)[ra](mi) [a]  
(car)yana sarva[stivadana] (pa)[r](i)g(rahami) ?.i ? (bhi)kh(u)ni[ye]  
(da)ṇamu[khe] (CKI 1184)*

---

<sup>95</sup> Salomon 1996; Baums 2012, 233-4, no. 25.

<sup>96</sup> Salomon 1999, 214-17; 2003, 74-8.

<sup>97</sup> Koshelenko1966.

<sup>98</sup> Salomon 2022, 273-6.

All are donations (*danamukhe*) by one laywoman (Parṇavaḍi, wife of Dhamaka) and two nuns (Avhemitra and one whose name is damaged) to the Utarodeva monastery in an unknown location Konaśīlia, in the possession of a Sarvāstivāda community, in one case in honour of all beings, in another in honour of the donor's parents. The inscriptions are entirely typical of the Gandhāran Buddhist donation formula, and as in the case of the goblet of Kharayosta and Indravarma, these are thus drinking vessels put to a Buddhist religious use. What remains unclear in this case is whether any use as ordinary drinking vessels (and thus a repurposing) preceded their donation, and what precisely their function (if any) was to be after their donation. Again, we thus have wine-related utensils in a Buddhist context that do not, however, constitute any direct evidence for wine production or consumption in monasteries.

## 9 Conclusion and Outlook

As we have seen, the inscriptions on vessels actually used for wine-drinking in Gandhāra limit themselves to naming their owners and specifying their weight (and thus value). The main result that may be drawn from them is that the population engaging in wine-drinking in Gandhāra (whether recreational or ritual) bore Indian as well as Greek, Iranian, and etymologically opaque 'local' names and one Iranian-Indian hybrid name. This reflects the onomastic composition of the wider Gāndhārī epigraphic corpus and, as shown elsewhere,<sup>99</sup> little can be deduced from this state of affairs about the ethnic composition behind the names. With Jihonika, Aśpavarma, Kharastotes, Indravarma, and possibly Maues, the nobility is well-represented. There are also three Buddhist names among the owners: Budhavaḷa, Budhila, and Budharaḷṣida, who may have been lay followers rather than monastics. One object has been converted from a wine goblet into a Buddhist reliquary, and three other wine goblets were the objects of donation to a Buddhist monastic community, without any necessary connection between original and ultimate purposes other than the fine quality and value of the vessels. Whether large stone bowls found in Buddhist monasteries were used in wine festivals organised by monastics, or simply served as containers for more innocuous liquids such as water, remains unclear.

A conspicuous absence from the Gandhāran epigraphic corpus, including manuscripts as well as inscriptions, are documents relating to viticulture. Such documents are, in contrast, richly attested from the Central Asian kingdoms of Krorayina and Kucha. These

<sup>99</sup> Baums 2018b.

are outside the geographical scope of the present article, and significant climatic and cultural differences doubtless prevailed between the two regions. The Central Asian documents give a general indication, however, of what the concerns of viticulture were, and of some Gāndhārī technical terms relating to it. Thus Niya document CKD 565 tells us that that vineyards were called *masuśaḍa* (Skt. *madhuśāla*; a very frequent term in the Niya documents), and were to be ploughed (*kriṣana*), sowed (*vāvana*), and tilled (*ukṣivana*) under the Zodiac sign Pīg. From CKD 586, we learn that vines were propped (*ṣgabhana*) and knocked down (*nihanaṃna*), grapes (*trakṣi*) were cut (*chinaṃna*), and wine was, naturally, drunk (*pivaṃna*). Wine was measured in *khi* (Greek *khous*; a term attested in numerous distribution lists), and several varieties of wine were distinguished using unclear terms such as *śuka* and *potgoña*.<sup>100</sup>

Documents such as these must have existed in Gandhāra as well. Their absence among the currently known manuscripts, most of which come from monastic contexts that did preserve some legal and accounting documents (such as CKM 278 and CKM 297), would seem to indicate that Gandhāran monasteries did not in fact have any major involvement in the wine business (whether or not wine was consumed in Buddhist contexts), though further discoveries of monastic documents may change this picture. Meanwhile, an increasing number of Gandhāran manuscripts with unknown findspots, but from apparently non-monastic contexts, is coming to light and is gradually being studied. It is possible that some of these will cast further light on the wine culture of ancient Gandhāra more generally.

---

**100** Burrow 1937, 107, 125-6 lists three possible Indian derivations for the former, each with phonetic difficulties, and can only note that the latter appears to be of non-Indian (possibly Iranian or Tocharian) origin.



## Bibliography

- Allon, M. (2019). "A Unique Gāndhārī Monastic Ledger Recording Gifts by Vima Kadphises (Studies in Gāndhārī Manuscripts 2)". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 42, 1-46. <https://doi.org/10.2143/JIABS.42.0.3287476>.
- Baratte, F. (2001). "Orient et Occident: Le témoignage d'une trouvaille d'argenterie d'époque parthe en Asie centrale". *Journal des savants*, 249-307. <https://doi.org/10.3406/jds.2001.1645>.
- Baums, S. (2012). "Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions". Jongeward, D. et al. (eds), *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*. Seattle: Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, 200–251. Gandharan Studies 1.
- Baums, S. (2018a). "A Framework for Gandhāran Chronology Based on Relic Inscriptions". Rienjang, W.; Stewart, P. (eds), *Problems of Chronology in Gandhāran Art = Proceedings of the First International Workshop of the Gandhāra Connections Project* (University of Oxford, 23rd-24th March 2017). Oxford, 54-70. <https://doi.org/10.32028/9781784918552P53-70>.
- Baums, S. (2018b). "Greek or Indian? The Questions of Menander and Onomastic Patterns in Early Gandhāra". Ray, H.P. (ed.), *Buddhism and Gandhara: An Archaeology of Museum Collections*. London, 33-46. Archaeology and Religion in South Asia.
- Baums, S. (2023). "The Phonology of Greek Names in Kharoṣṭhī Script". Wang, H.; Bracey, R. (eds), *Look at the Coins! Essays in Honour of Joe Cribb on His 75th Birthday*. Oxford, 115-18.
- Baums, S.; Glass, A. (2002a). *A Dictionary of Gāndhārī*. <https://gandhari.org/dictionary>.
- Baums, S.; Glass, A. (2002b). *Catalog of Gāndhārī Texts*. <https://gandhari.org/catalog>.
- Böhtlingk, O.; Roth, R. (1855-75). *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg.
- Bopearachchi, O. (2012). s.v. "Jihonika". *Encyclopædia Iranica*. <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/jihonika>.
- Bracey, R. (2009). "The Coinage of Wima Kadphises". *Gandhāran Studies*, 3, 25-74.
- Brough, J. (1962). *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London. London Oriental Series 4.
- Burrow, T. (1937). *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*. Cambridge.
- Carter, M.L. (1992). "Dionysiac Festivals and Gandhāran Imagery". Gyselen, R. (ed.), *Banquets d'Orient*. Bures-sur-Yvette, 51-60. Res Orientales 4.
- Cribb, J. (1999). "The Early Kushan Kings: New Evidence for Chronology: Evidence from the Rabatak Inscription of Kanishka I". Alram, M.; Klimburg-Salter, D.E. (eds), *Coins, Art, and Chronology: Essays on the Pre-Islamic History of the Indo-Iranian Borderlands*. Wien, 177-205. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 280 / Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 31 / Veröffentlichungen der numismatischen Kommission 33.
- Edelberg, L. (1965). "Nuristanske sølvpokaler". *Kuml: Årbog for Jysk Arkæologisk Selskab*, 15, 153-201.

- Falk, H. (2001). "Names and Weights Inscribed on Some Vessels from the Silver Hoard". *Journal des savants*, 308-19. <https://doi.org/10.3406/jds.2001.1646>.
- Falk, H. (2003). "A Copper Plate Donation Record and Some Seals from the Kashmir Smast". *Beiträge zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Archäologie*, 23, 1-19.
- Falk, H. (2005). "The Buddha's Begging Bowl". Jarrige, C.; Lefèvre, V. (eds), *South Asian Archaeology 2001*. Vol. 2, *Historical Archaeology and Art History*. Paris, 445-52.
- Falk, H. (2009a). "Greek Style Dedications to an Indian God in Gandhara". *Indo-asiatische Zeitschrift*, 13, 25-42.
- Falk, H. (2009b). "Making Wine in Gandhara under Buddhist Monastic Supervision". *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, 23, 65-78.
- Fussman, G. (1974). "Document épigraphiques kouchans". *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*, 61, 1-66.
- Fussman, G. (1985). "Nouvelles inscriptions śaka (III)". *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*, 74, 35-42.
- Halfmann, J. et al. (2024). "A New Reading of the Bactrian Part of the Dašt-i Nāwūr Trilingual (DN I)". *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 67, 5-51. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15728536-06701005>.
- Konow, S. (1929). *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*. Vol. 2, Part 1, *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka*. Calcutta.
- Konow, S. (1931-32). "Kalawan Copper-Plate Inscription of the Year 134". *Epigraphia Indica and Record of the Archaeological Survey of India*, 21, 251-9.
- Koshlenko, G.A. Кошеленко, Г.А. (1966). "Unikal'nāṭa vaza iz Merva" Уникальная ваза из Мерва (A Unique Vase from Merv). *Вестник древней истории*, 92, 92-105.
- Luschey, H. (1939). *Die Phiale*. Bleicherode am Harz.
- Marshall, J. (1935). "Excavations at Taxila". Sahni, D.R. (ed.), *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India: 1929-30*. Delhi, 55-97.
- Marshall, J. (1951). *Taxila: An Illustrated Account of Archaeological Excavations Carried Out at Taxila Under the Orders of the Government of India Between the Years 1913 and 1934*. Cambridge.
- Palunčić, F.; Palunčić, D.; Maharaj, B.T. (2023). "Revisiting the Bactrian and Gāndhārī Bilingual Inscriptions from Dasht-e Nāwūr". *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 66, 333-83.
- Pugachenkova, G.A. Пугаченкова, Г.А. (1976). "K otkrytiiu nadpisei kharoṣṭhi na zolotykh predmetakh dal'verzinskogo klada" К открытию надписей ххарошти на золотых предметах дальверзинского клада (On the Discovery of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions on Gold Objects from the Dalverzin Treasure). *Вестник древней истории*, 135, 65-71.
- ur Rahman, A.; Falk, H. (2011). *Seals, Sealings and Tokens from Gandhāra*. Wiesbaden. Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 21 / Studies in the Aman ur Rahman Collection 1.
- Rosen Stone, E. (2008). "The Adaptation of Western Motifs in the Art of Gandhara". Luczanits, C. (ed.), *Gandhara: The Buddhist Heritage of Pakistan: Legends, Monasteries, and Paradise*. Mainz, 80-5.
- Rougemont, G. (2012). *Inscriptions grecques d'Iran et d'Asie centrale. Corpus inscriptionum Iranicarum, Part II: Inscriptions of the Seleucid and Parthian Periods and of Eastern Iran and Central Asia*. Vol. I, *Inscriptions in Non-Iranian Languages*. London.

- Salomon, R. (1990). "A Kharoṣṭhī Inscription on a Silver Goblet". *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, 4, 149-57.
- Salomon, R. (1996). "An Inscribed Silver Buddhist Reliquary of the Time of King Kharasta and Prince Indravarman". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 116, 418-52.
- Salomon, R. (1999). *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle.
- Salomon, R. (2003). "The Senior Manuscripts: Another Collection of Gandhāran Buddhist Scrolls". *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 123, 73-92.
- Salomon, R. (2005). "The Indo-Greek Era of 186/5 B.C. in a Buddhist Reliquary Inscription". Bopearachchi, O.; Boussac, M.-F. (éds), *Afghanistan: Ancien carrefour entre l'Est et l'Ouest = Actes du colloque international organisé par Christian Landes & Osmund Bopearachchi* (Musée archéologique Henri-Prades-Lattes, 5-7 mai 2003). Turnhout, 359-401.
- Salomon, R. (2022). "A Hoard of Inscribed Gandharan Metalware". *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 45, 253-90.
- Scheibler, I. (2000a). "Aryballos". Cancik, H.; Schneider, H. (Hrsgg), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Band 2, Ark-Ci. Stuttgart, 69.
- Scheibler, I. (2000b). "Askos". Cancik, H.; Schneider, H. (Hrsgg), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Band 2, Ark-Ci. Stuttgart, 100-1.
- Scheibler, I. (2000c). "Phiale". Cancik, H.; Schneider, H. (Hrsgg), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Band 9, Or-Poi. Stuttgart, 774.
- Scheibler, I.; Lohmann, H.; Michel, R. (2000). "Kantharos". Cancik, H.; Schneider, H. (Hrsgg), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Band 6, Iul-Lee. Stuttgart, 253.
- Scherrer-Schaub, C.; Salomon, R.; Baums, S. (2012) "Buddhist Inscriptions from Termez (Uzbekistan): A New Comprehensive Edition and Study". *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 55, 139-170. <https://doi.org/10.1163/001972412X620204>.
- Schütte, A. (1994). *Die Phiale: Zur zeichenhaften Funktion eines Gefäßtyps* [PhD Dissertation]. Münster: Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität zu Münster.
- Senior, R. (2001). *Indo-Scythian Coins and History*. Vol. 1, *An Analysis of the Coinage*. Lancaster.
- Sims-Williams, N.; Cribb, J. (1995-96). "A New Bactrian Inscription of Kanishka the Great". *Silk Road Art and Archaeology*, 4, 75-142.
- Sircar, D.C. (1965a). *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*. Delhi.
- Sircar, D.C. (1965b). *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization*. Vol. 1, *From the Sixth Century B.C. to the Sixth Century A.D.* 2nd ed. Calcutta.
- Strauch, I. (2014). "The Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts: Mahā-prajāpatī Gautamī and the Order of Nuns in a Gandhāran Version of the Dakṣiṇāvibhaṅgasūtra". Collett, A. (ed.), *Women in Early Indian Buddhism: Comparative Textual Studies*. New York, 17-266. South Asia Research.
- Thomas, F.W. (1931). "Review of *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka*". Konow, S., *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1-15.
- Vorob'eva-Desiatovskaia, M. I. Воробьева-Десятовская, М.И. (1974). "Новые надписи римом kharoshtkhi iz Termeza" Новые надписи письмом кхароштхи из Термеза (New Inscriptions in Kharoṣṭhī Script from Termez). *Вестник древней истории*, 127, 116-26.

