



INDOLOGICA TAURINENSIA

THE JOURNAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SANSKRIT STUDIES

Founded by Oscar Botto

Edited by Comitato AIT

Scientific Committee

John Brockington, *Edinburgh, U.K. (President)*; Nalini Balbir, *Paris, France*; Giuliano Boccali, *Milano, Italy*; Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, *Paris, France*; Minoru Hara, *Tokyo, Japan*; Oskar von Hinüber, *Freiburg, Germany*; Romano Lazzeroni, *Pisa, Italy*; Georges-Jean Pinault, *Paris, France (Treasurer IASS)*; Irma Piovano, *Torino, Italy*; Saverio Sani, *Pisa, Italy*; V. Kutumba Sastry, *Delhi, India (President IASS)*; Jayandra Soni, *Innsbruck, Austria (Secretary General IASS)*; Raffaele Torella, *Roma, Italy*

Editorial Board

Gabriella Olivero, Irma Piovano, Stefano Turina

Indologica Taurinensia was founded in 1973 by the eminent scholar Oscar Botto; it publishes articles, reviews and research communications concerning India, Central Asia and South-East Asia.

In 1976 the International Association of Sanskrit Studies selected it as its Official Organ (then Journal) on the occasion of the 30th International Congress of Human Sciences of Asia and Northern Africa (Mexico City, August 3rd-8th, 1976). It publishes also the report of the World Sanskrit Conferences and the minutes of the meetings of the I.A.S.S. (International Association of Sanskrit Studies). In 1996 it was acknowledged as a “Journal of High Cultural Value” by the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities.

It is edited by the non-profit Editorial Board “Comitato AIT”, that in the year 2016 was awarded the prize “Ikuro Hirayama” Prize by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres of the Institut de France, Paris, for its publishing activity.

INDOLOGICA TAURINENSIA

THE JOURNAL OF THE
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SANSKRIT STUDIES

VOLUME XLIII-XLIV

2017-2018

EDIZIONI AIT

Publisher:
Comitato AIT
corso Trento 13
10129 Torino (Italy)
Email: irmapiovano@hotmail.com; indologica@asiainstitutetorino.it
www.asiainstitutetorino.it
Printer: Edizioni ETS, Pisa (Italy)
Annual Subscription (1 issue): € 40,00
Desktop publishing: Tiziana Franchi
Electronic version: www.asiainstitutetorino.it/indologica.html
Sole Agents: Comitato AIT

Copyright © 2018 Comitato AIT per la promozione degli Studi sull'India e sul Sud-Est Asiatico
Satya Vrat Shastri (Honorary President) - Irma Piovano (President) - Saverio Sani (Vice President) - Victor Agostini (Secretary)
Corso Trento 13 – 10129 Torino (Italy)
C.F. 97651370013 – R.E.A. Torino, n. 1048465 – R.O.C., n. 14802

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Torino N. 4703 del 21/7/1994
I.S.N.N. 1023-3881

The printing of this volume of *Indologica Taurinensia* has been realized thanks to the contribution of the Embassy of India in Rome to celebrate the 70th anniversary of Italy-India relations.

The AIT – *Asia Institute Torino* would like to express its most sincere gratitude to the Ambassador, H.E. (Mrs.) Reenat Sandhu.

CONTENTS

PART ONE

Articles

PRADIP BHATTACHARYA

Revising the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata: An Approach Through the Attempt to Strip Draupadī p. 11

MARCO FRANCESCHINI

Recasting Poetry: Words, Motifs and Scenes Borrowed from the Raghuvamśa and Reshaped in Buddhaghoṣa's Padyacūḍāmaṇi p. 43

MASSIMILIANO A. POLICHETTI

Understanding the Indo-Tibetan Sacred Music. An Introductory Note p. 67

NIELS SCHOUBBEN

'À la grecque comme à la grecque' – The Greek Kandahar Inscriptions as a Case Study in Indo-Greek Language Contact During the Hellenistic Period p. 79

VERONICA ARIEL VALENTI

Homo loquens e desiderio nel mondo vedico p. 119

VERONICA ARIEL VALENTI

RV X, 95, 1 e lo scambio amebeo primo p. 151

List of contributors p. 181

Reviews

PRADIP BHATTACHARYA, trans. from Sanskrit, *The Mahābhārata of Vyasa: The Complete Shantiparva Part 2: Mokshadharmā*, Writers Workshop, Kolkata, 2016 (Indrajit Bandyopadhyay) p. 185

V. ADLURI and J. BAGCHEE, <i>Argument and Design – the Unity of the Mahābhārata</i> , Brill, Leiden, 2016 (Pradip Bhattacharya).....	p.	195
KEVIN MCGRATH, <i>Rāja Yudhiṣṭhira-Kingship in Epic Mahābhārata</i> , Orient Blackswan, Hyderabad, 2017 (Pradip Bhattacharya).....	p.	209
STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT, <i>Collected Papers in Dravidian Studies</i> , Kaviri Pathippakam, Chennai, 2017 (Gabriella Olivero)	p.	225
PRADIP BHATTACHARYA, <i>Narrative Art in the Mahābhārata: The Ādi Parva</i> , Dev Publishers & Distributors, New Delhi, 2012 (Shekhar Sen).....	p.	231
Obituaries	p.	235
 PART TWO		
A Selection of the Papers Presented at the Meeting of the Associazione Italiana di Studi Sanscriti (Rome, Università La Sapienza, 26th-28th October 2017).....		
RAFFAELE TORELLA (A.I.S.S. President) Editorial	p.	259
CHIARA LIVIO <i>Cosmic Pūjā Śivabhakti in Śrīkaṇṭhacarita V</i>	p.	261
CINZIA PIERUCCINI <i>Hunting, Farming and Protecting Animals. Remarks on Migadāya and Mṛgavana</i>	p.	285
PAOLA PISANO <i>Vīryaśulkāḥ Kanyāḥ: Aspects of Women's Dependence in the Mahābhārata and in Old Greek Sources</i>	p.	305

MARGED FLAVIA TRUMPER	
<i>The Impact of the Arrival of Sound Technology on Hindustani Vocal Music and on the Role of Women in North Indian Art Music</i>	p. 321
MASSIMO VAI	
<i>Some Questions about Vedic Subordination</i>	p. 337

NIELS SCHOUBBEN

‘À LA GRECQUE COMME À LA GRECQUE’ –
THE GREEK KANDAHAR INSCRIPTIONS AS A CASE
STUDY IN INDO-GREEK LANGUAGE CONTACT
DURING THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD¹

Abstract

This paper deals with the cultural and linguistic contacts that once existed between Greece and India, after the conquests of Alexander the Great in the regions of Bactria and the Indus Valley. I focus on the Kandahar Inscriptions, which are the Greek translations of some of the Aśoka-inscriptions, thus being a case study of the contacts between these two fundamental linguistic and cultural traditions. I will reconsider several features of these (bilingual) inscriptions, using, in particular, the recent achievements and rich apparatus of the academic fields of contact linguistics and sociolinguistics. Doing so, this paper will also contribute to the study of Indo-Greek cultural contact in general. I will argue that Indo-Greek contact during the Hellenistic Period, for the most time, needs to be interpreted as

¹ Firstly, I would like to express my gratitude towards the many people who assisted in creating this paper: Mark Janse and Leonid Kulikov, who were my supervisors while writing my BA paper at Ghent University, which formed the basis for this article. Their everlasting interest in my research proposal and valuable comments were indispensable for the successful outcome of the paper. Gunnar De Boel for providing me with the PhD of Eddy Seldeslachts. Irma Piovano for her interest in the topic and considering publishing my article in *Indologica Taurinensia*. Sophie Verhaeghe and Marina Schoubben for correcting the original Dutch version. Anouk Jacobs, Inge Bleyweert and again Leonid Kulikov for helping me with the English translation.

an *adstratum* relationship. Based on my analysis of the Middle Indo-Aryan borrowings in the Greek texts and some grammatical phenomena I will investigate, I will argue that the inscriptions are a good example of the sociolinguistic *adstratum* relationship between Greek and Middle Indo-Aryan.

1. Introduction: *Fashionable but not practicable?*

Cosmopolitanism is often considered a phenomenon typical, first of all, of the modern world. This is not true. The Ancient World offers a very broad range of examples proving the cosmopolitan character of non-modern societies, for example one can think of the conquests of important empires, like those of the Persians or the Romans. In peacetime, major trading routes connected the outer parts of the known world. These networks were a place of mutual encounter for different cultures, a confrontation between different religions and – especially – between languages. These inter-linguistic encounters are the framework of this article. Over the last decades, scientific research has put forward the importance of the sociolinguistic context for the evolution of languages. The study of ancient languages has undergone a so called sociolinguistic shift. This paper intends to contribute to this growing field of research and wants to demonstrate the use of the Kandahar Inscriptions, the Greek translations of a few Aśoka-inscriptions, for the study of the linguistic contacts between Ancient Greek and Old and Middle Indo-Aryan during the Hellenistic Period.²

The Kandahar Inscriptions consist of a corpus of two Greek texts based on the Middle Indian inscriptions, produced by Aśoka to promote his doctrine of *dhamma* among the inhabitants of his vast empire. The first one was discovered in

² Middle Indian is used as a covering term for the different spoken Indo-Aryan dialects of the Indian subcontinent, thus being used as synonym with Prakrit. Old Indian (Sanskrit) had already developed into a codified language by that time, but was as such also important in the contact situation.

1958 and almost immediately published by Scerrato (1958). The text can be considered as a summary of the most important elements of Aśoka's ideology. An Aramaic translation of the text was found on the same stone. The second inscription was discovered in november 1963 and edited by Schlumberger (1964), this time without an Aramaic version and consists of a (non-literal) translation of Rock Edict XII and XIII. Previous scholarship focussed on text criticism, the translation process from Prakrit to Greek and some philological problems inherent in the text. The many papers by Christol, written between 1980-1998, offered fundamental new linguistic insights and were an inspiration for my own research.

The choice for a sociolinguistic study of these engravements was made because of a double observation. Firstly, these inscriptions are one of the most noteworthy epigraphical findings of 20th century and definitely some of the most important documents concerning Indo-Greek contact in Antiquity. Secondly, although much has already been written on the subject, the last extensive research on the whole corpus of Kandahar Inscriptions dates back as far as 1998 (Christol 1998). Therefore, it seems appropriate to restudy these notable inscriptions, using a modern linguistic paradigm, namely contact linguistics, which has never been done before for this inscriptions.

This paper is organized as follows. Firstly, I offer a brief survey of the most pressing methodological problems inherent in the sociolinguistic research, based on written corpora. They are typically more formal than the spoken conversation corpora that are available for modern languages and therefore, require a sophisticated methodology. As a short introduction to the historical context of the inscriptions, I will present a sociolinguistic description of Indo-Greek contact in the Hellenistic Period. Based on the kind of borrowings from Indian to Greek and from Greek to Indian, I will argue that, chronologically, this contact situation has to be divided in several periods, which differ slightly sociolinguistically. Generally regarded, Greek and Middle Indian were in an *adstratum* relation with each other. At the end of the Hellenistic

Period, due to invasions from China and Central Asia, Greek became a *substratum* language and later on disappeared from the sociolinguistic scene in India.

In Section three, which deals extensively with the Kandahar Inscriptions, this sociolinguistic perspective is applied to the material of these (bilingual) engravements. After an overview of the historical context of the inscriptions, I present the Greek texts of the inscription with a translation and my philological and linguistic analysis, paying special attention to the linguistic phenomena that can be accounted for in terms of language contact. I offer some remarks on the explanation of specific phrases, evaluating earlier conjectures and interpretations and, where appropriate, provide my own analysis. The aim of this section is to answer the following two questions: (i) where can Middle Indo-Aryan influence be found in the Greek text? and (ii) how can we interpret these influences on a sociolinguistic level? Firstly, I will discuss the Indian loanwords in the Greek texts and argue that, due to their political nature, they reflect an *adstratum* relationship. Addressing grammatical and, especially, syntactic issues, I will demonstrate that the abundant use of parataxis in the inscriptions, the limited use of definite articles and some other concrete translation interferences can be explained as a result of Middle Indo-Aryan influence and the linguistic background of the translators. Analysing the differences between the first and second Kandahar Inscriptions and discrepancies within the second inscription, I will demonstrate, following Christol (1998), that three translators with different knowledge of the languages were involved in the process.

As a conclusion, I want to evaluate the Kandahar Inscriptions as a case study in Indo-Greek language context. Such research does not only look fashionable, but is in my opinion also practicable (cfr. Mullen & James 2012: 11).

2. Preliminary paragraphs

2.1 *Some methodological remarks*

Before going into the actual analysis of Indo-Greek contact and the Kandahar Inscriptions, I will first shortly review the methodological problems of sociolinguistic research based on written corpora and briefly present the main concepts I am going to use in my analysis. Because we are dealing with documents that are written, not spoken, we always have to realize that, as a rule, they tend to be more formal, because a written utterance of language is generally more conscious than a spoken one (Adams *et al.* 2002: 2). Moreover, we are dealing with an inscription, in which different people were involved in the process: the person who orders the text, Aśoka in our case, the maker of the text and the stonecutter. Therefore, we always have to keep in mind who is responsible for a grammatical phenomenon in the text. To me, it seems reasonable that orthographic faults are the result of limited literacy on the stonecutter's part and that the Middle Indo-Aryan influences in the Greek text are to be considered as a manifestation of the linguistic (in)abilities of the translators. Although Adams (2003: 5) denies the importance of translations in the study of language contact, because this is not what he calls 'positive linguistic performance', I do believe this kind of text to be of considerable importance for contact linguistic research. When you translate a text, both languages are working together in your head, to such a degree mutual influence can be argued for. From this perspective, the Kandahar Inscriptions are an ideal object of study for contact linguistics, even more so because the inscriptions are not-literally translated as we will see further on.

In the course of the paper, two important concepts of contact linguistics will mainly be used. The first concept pertains to the three possibilities within linguistic contacts: *adstratum*, *superstratum* and *substratum*. The first refers to a contact situation where both languages are equal in prestige. Mostly, such a situation implies good neighbours. Long term *adstratum* relationships can cause the growth of a *Sprachbund*, a linguistic area. The two other concepts mostly exist in the contexts of war

and (societal) minorities (Thomason 2005: 34). When invaders occupy a certain country, the language of the invaders is most likely to become the *superstratum* language, especially during a long reign. *Substratum* refers to the language of the indigenous population. This language has the potential to survive as a minority language, but can nevertheless obtain the status of dominant language. In the worst case scenario the *substratum* language will eventually die.

The second concept concerns linguistic hierarchization: in fact all linguistic elements are prone to be borrowed in a contact situation, but lexical elements, borrowings, are most likely to do so (Matras 2009: 146-148). You do not necessarily need to learn a new language complete, to be able to use a loanword. Morphological and syntactic borrowings require a higher level of multilingualism. However, as Thomason (2005: 63) argues correctly, if a speaker is not fluently bilingual, he is more apt to use structures of his own language in the target language. Therefore, we have to be careful not to confuse these two manifestations of language contact.³ I assume that concerning the Kandahar Inscriptions, the semantic and cultural character of the borrowings can be put to use to illuminate the societal level of multilingualism and that grammatical interferences can give information about the contact linguistic situation of individuals, the translators.

2.2 A sociolinguistic discussion of Indo-Greek language contact

The Kandahar Inscriptions are one of the most tangible manifestations of the contacts that existed between Greece and India after the conquests of Alexander the Great. The purpose of this paragraph is to ask how we have to conceptualize the

³ Borrowings and syntactic interferences are not seen as two independent outcomes of language contact, rather one has to envisage a continuum with both kinds at the opposite end.

contacts on a sociolinguistic level:⁴ an *adstratum*, a *substratum* or a *superstratum*?

An important factor in contact situations is the multilingualism of the speakers. Seldeslachts (1998) underlined on the basis of certain loan translations, the existence of (partial) bilingualism in Greek and Middle Indo-Aryan languages throughout Antiquity. How is this individual bilingualism related to the societal context? In my opinion, we have to distinguish between the contact occurring in trading context on one hand and in the Hellenistic kingdoms on the other. The Indo-Greek contact originated in a commercial context, as is proven through the existence of borrowings concerning exotic products.⁵ Seldeslachts (2002: 88) points to the bilingualism that must have existed between the traders. The same is to be conjectured for the contacts between Greeks and Indians in the army of the Achaemenids. Some warriors will have learnt at least some words in the other language. To focus again on the trading contacts, we can postulate an *adstratum* relation, but over a large geographical area. This situation originated in the Classical Period, but continued throughout Hellenistic and Roman times.

During the Hellenistic Period, the contact situation underwent some developments and became more immediate. This also had its consequences on a sociolinguistic level. The campaigns of Alexander could have resulted in a Greek *superstratum* in India. However, because of the Indian resistance Greek was not able to become so. As the official language in the Seleucid Empire, Greek became an *adstratum*

⁴ I am not going to give a historical sketch about Indo-Greek contact in Antiquity. Interested readers are referred to the standard historical works, like Tarn (1951), Narain (1957) and Karttunen (1997).

⁵ The Indo-European background and the probable language contact in protohistoric times between Greek and Indo-Iranian are neglected in this survey. A good survey of Indian loanwords in Greek is given by Christol (2007) and Benedetti (2014). These borrowings were also the subject of two PhD's in the last decade: by Seldeslachts (2002) and Brust (2007). Exotic borrowings include for instance the Greek words *πέπερι* ('pepper') from MIA *pīpparī*, *ῥρυζα* ('rice') from OIA *vṛīhi* or *σάκχαρις/σάκχαρον/σάκχαρ* ('sugar') from Pāli *sakkharā* (OIA *śarkharā*).

language next to the Indian dialects, which can also be observed in the diplomatic contact reflected in the figure of Megasthenes.

The separation of Bactria triggered new developments. On one side, we perceive the existence of a Greek population alongside the Iranian and Indian ones, resulting in bilingualism (Christol 1999: 108). The *adstratum* is preserved, but Greek gained a political function as well. This does not imply that Greek evolved into a *superstratum*, because Iranians remained important inside the ruling class. The different populations lived next to each other,⁶ so a limited form of bilingualism was sufficient (Tarn 1951: 376).

In Bactria, Iranian dialects were the dominant modes of communication. After Demetrius' and/or Menander's conquests in India, the Greeks came into direct contact with Indian languages.⁷ One would expect Greek to be a *superstratum* due to the conquests, but this is not the case. The Greeks became the political upper class of a federal empire, but the Indian culture remained dominant (Tarn 1951: 255-260). Therefore, we perceive a preservation of the situation in Bactria, but with a higher intensity.⁸ The few sources we have at our disposal, underline this interpretation: Indian and Greek were both used on coins, political and military encounters are reflected in the loan words, there was mutual interest on the levels of philosophy, science etc.

The Iranian and Chinese raids during the first century BC alter the situation. The Greeks lose their power and were assimilated into Indian culture (Tarn 1951: 352-353). At the end of the century, the remaining Greeks must have been bilingual (Tarn 1951: 389). Greek became a *substratum* language and would eventually disappear. Every new generation assimilated

⁶ Inscriptions show the existence of a restricted amount of Greek inhabitants in Bactria (Karttunen 1997: 47). The Greek population constituted an important minority within the cities (Karttunen 1997: 292).

⁷ Tarn (1951) and Narain (1957) differ in their opinions about the invasion of India by Bactrian Greeks. Narain does not believe Tarn that Demetrius reached India, according to him only Menander played a major role in conquering parts of Northern India.

⁸ Unfortunately, due to the lack of many sources, the sociolinguistic situation sketched above, remains somewhat hypothetical.

further into Indian culture and caused the language death of Greek. The *communis opinio* stresses the velocity of the process (Tarn 1951: 354-355). Greek names remained for a long time and, even though it no longer was a living language, Greek remained on coins.

3. The Kandahar Inscriptions: *A case study*

Queste brevi considerazioni sulle iscrizioni di Aśoka, analizzate dal punto di vista del bilinguismo e del biculturalismo miravano a far vedere come esse mettano in luce un incontro di tre culture, l'indiana, la greca e l'iranica che nel III sec. a.C. convivevano e si integravano vicendevolmente in quella zona dell'Afghanistan, là ai confini tra l'India e l'Iran. E questa convivenza e integrazione era favorita e incoraggiata dal re Aśoka che vedeva in ciò realizzarsi la sua predicazione del dharma. (Sani 1988: 163).

3.1 *Historical Sketch*

When Tarn (1951) and Narain (1957) were writing their histories of Indo-Greek contact, they did not have the opportunity to use epigraphical material. It was not until 1958 that the first Greek inscription was discovered in the Far East, in the old city of Kandahar.⁹ It turned out to be a bilingual inscription with a Greek and an Aramaic text. This was a big surprise in the academic world, especially when it became apparent that the text is part of the wondrous Aśoka-inscriptions.

The Greek and Aramaic texts can be considered as a summary of Aśoka's guidelines for life, *e.g.* respect for other people or

⁹ Probably, the city has to be identified with *Alexandria in Arachosia* (Karttunen 1997: 47).

vegetarianism.¹⁰ Scerrato (1958) was appointed to clarify the discovery of the engravement as soon as possible. For this reason, his research contains many factual details. He recounts, among others, that the text was originally placed at the entrance of the old city (Scerrato 1958: 4). The inscription was engraved on a limestone bloc covered by a layer of basalt. The Greek text was engraved at the top and consists of 13.5 lines. 2 cm below the Greek text, we find the Aramaic text, which consists of 7.5 longer lines.¹¹ The Greek letters are clearly carved and their size varies between 0.7 and 1.5 cm. After the paleographic analysis, we can conclude that the text dates back to the third century BC (Scerrato 1958: 4-6).¹² Robert extended the paleographic analysis on its own, where he emphasizes the different forms of certain letters. In contrast with Scerrato, he stresses the fact that some letters reach a height of 2,2 cm, while on the other hand, some other letters, mostly round forms as omicron or omega, are especially small. The form of the theta is an exception to this rule. He explains these differences with reference to the kind of stone used for the engravement: limestone is more difficult to handle than marble (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 7-12).

In 1963 another Greek inscription was discovered in Kandahar. One year later, the text was published by D. Schlumberger (1964). There are many differences between the two discoveries. Again, the text needs to be included in the corpus of Aśoka, but instead of a summary, it happened to be a translation of Rock Edict XII and XIII. Unfortunately, only the end of the first and the beginning of the last inscription was

¹⁰ Scerrato denotes it, in his introduction to Pugliese Carratelli's study, an *editio brevis* of the salvation text of Rock Edict XIV (Pugliese Carratelli 1964: 24).

¹¹ The Aramaic text will not be discussed in my paper, only when it offers some interesting point on the Indo-Greek contact. I only want to highlight the importance of Aramaic as a chancery language, during the Achaemenid period and slightly after. Therefore the existence of Aramaic in Kandahar is not to be considered as evidence this language was actually spoken in the region. The real spoken languages were Greek and Indo-Iranian dialects. Readers with an interest in the Aramaic inscription can benefit from Schlumberger *et al.* (1958), Altheim & Stiehl (1959) and Pugliese Carratelli & Garbini (1964).

¹² These general remarks are also to be found in more recent papers, namely Schlumberger *et al.* (1958: 1-3; 6-10), Galavotti (1959: 185), Pugliese Carratelli & Garbini (1964: 1-5), Harmatta (1966: 77), Pepermans (1976: 127), Tola & Dragonetti de Tola (1977-1979: 258-259), Sani (1988: 155) and Christol (1980: 63; 1983: 25; 1998: 67).

preserved and the hope of many scientists to discover translations of other Rock Edicts was never fulfilled.

Also notable is the fact that this inscription is entirely written in Greek without an Aramaic counterpart. Perhaps, an Aramaic version existed, but has vanished through time. The text is carved on a block of spongy limestone, measuring 45 cm x 69.5 cm x 12 cm. Only the angles contain some deviations (Schlumberger 1964: 129-130). It was fixed to a building. Unfortunately, we can only guess which kind of building it was fixed to, perhaps a *stūpa*, a palace, a temple or a defence wall (Schlumberger & Benveniste 1968: 196). This form of inscription is unique for the Maurya Empire. Therefore, a Greek and/or Iranian influence seems probable. On the other hand, the tradition of carving in rocks is considered to be an Indian influence on Greek practice. The paleography and style of the letters are very much the same as in the first inscription (Schlumberger 1964: 135).¹³

In what follows, I refer to the engravements as Kandahar 1 (Kd1) and Kandahar 2 (Kd2), following the example of A. Christol. For both inscriptions, I present the Greek text with translation, an overview of the most important philological problems and an analysis of Indian influences on the Greek. In Section 3.4, I evaluate the value of the inscriptions as a case study for the Indo-Greek language contact, during the Hellenistic Period.

¹³ General information also to be found in Harmatta (1966: 77), Norman (1972: 111), Tola & Dragonetti de Tola (1977-1979: 258-259), Sani (1988: 155-156), Christol (1980: 63; 1983: 25; 1998: 67) and Cassio (2016: 39-44).

3.2 KANDAHAR I (1958)

3.2.1 Greek text and translation

Summary edict¹⁴

δέκα ἐτῶν πληρη[.(.)]ων βασιλεὺς
 Πιοδασσης εὐσέβεια[ν] ἔδειξεν τοῖς ἀν-
 θρώποις, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου εὐσεβεστέρους
 τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐποίησεν καὶ πάντα
 εὐθηνεῖ κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν, καὶ ἀπέχεται
 βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐμψύχων καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ δὲ
 ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὅσοι θηρευταὶ ἢ ἀλιεῖς
 βασιλέως πέπαινανται θηρεύοντες, καὶ
 εἴ τινες ἀκρατεῖς, πέπαινανται τῆς ἀκρα-
 σίας κατὰ δύναμιν, καὶ ἐνήκοοι πατρὶ
 καὶ μητρὶ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων παρὰ
 τὰ πρότερον, καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ λώϊον
 καὶ ἄμεινον κατὰ πάντα ταῦτα
 ποιῶντες διάξουσιν.

Summary edict

After a period of ten years, king Piodasses (Asoka) introduced dhamma alongside his people and he succeeded in urging them to live according to the rules of dhamma. Everything prospers on the whole earth. The king has adopted vegetarianism and the other people - hunters and fishermen of the king - stopped hunting. When some people were not able to control themselves, they distanced with great commitment from this lack of self-control. In opposition with previous times, they are obedient to their father, mother and people with a respectable age. Always doing these things, they will obtain a better and more prospering life in the future.

¹⁴ The Greek text is borrowed from the paper of Schlumberger *et al.* (1958), but without the conjecture concerning πληρη[.(.)]ων. I mainly agree with the reading πληρη[θέντ]ων (... which were fulfilled), I will not further explore the philological debate about this peculiar form (cf. Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 13-14; 46; Galavotti 1959: 186; Pepermans 1976: 128). On other points, the text editions differ only on some details, pertaining punctuation. The translation is my own and is not intended to be a very literate rendering of the Greek, but to transmit the overall thought and purpose of the text to English readers. The choice for some translations and the name of Asoka will be discussed later on.

3.2.2 Discussion of a philological problem

To draw a correct picture of (possible) Indian influences on the Greek text, there has to be dealt with a philological problem concerning this inscription first.¹⁵ In past research, much debate arose about the concrete meaning of the verb ἔδειξεν, which literally means 'he showed'. The standard article of Schlumberger and his contributors explains it as a religious proclamation (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 14). I wonder how such a connotation could be detected in a common word as δείκνυμι ('to show'). Galavotti considers it as a causative meaning, using the Aramaic version as an argument (Galavotti 1959: 187). Such a causative meaning for δείκνυμι is confirmed by the *LSJ* and the *Montanari*. The Aramaic version does not constitute a persuasive argument, because the different studies emphasized the fact that it was written independently from the Greek version. Nonetheless, this remark formed the basis for an interesting hypothesis by Christol (1998). He interprets the verb as denoting literally the power of *dhamma*, namely by organising spectacular parties. *Dhamma* is used by Aśoka as a broad philosophical concept, which incorporates aspects of justice, a good life etc. I agree with most researchers that Aśoka's interpretation of the concept is not specifically Buddhist, but rather pan-Indian in its approach.¹⁶ Aśoka thus wanted to teach them his doctrine of *dhamma* (Christol 1998: 86). This hypothesis could even be broadened in my opinion, namely as a reference to the *dharmamahāmātrās*, the functionaries who were appointed by Aśoka to promote *dhamma*. The fact that these functionaries were known by the Greeks, is shown by a gloss from Hesychius (a sixth-century lexicographer). Aśoka wants to tell he taught his subjects the doctrine of *dhamma* through his functionaries and his parties.¹⁷

¹⁵ There are different problems inherent in the text, e.g. the interpretation of the Greek *genitivus absolutus*, or the meaning of the last sentence. I will limit myself to the problem that requires reassessment in my opinion.

¹⁶ Linguistically, *dhamma* is the Prakrit version of Sanskrit *dharma*, with the typical assimilation of /-rm-/ to /-mm-/.

¹⁷ Discussing Kd2, I will give further arguments for this explanation and a discussion of the Hesychian gloss.

The compactness of the phrase can further be explained with reference to the aim of producing an *editio brevis*.

3.2.3 Discussion of Indian influences

Before pointing to (possible) Indian influences on the Greek text, we first have to be aware of the high level of Greek used in the inscription. The kind of Greek used points towards the living language of a population with a relatively high level of education.¹⁸ This is reflected in the use of a philosophical vocabulary. For example, a big surprise for the early researchers was that the Indian term *dhamma* was transferred by the Greek εὐσέβεια. We can consider this as a target-oriented translation.

The use of an extensive philosophical vocabulary shows the fact the Greek text is not a literal translation of the Indian *Vorlage*. This does not mean that no Indian influence is to be found in the text. When we search for Indian borrowings, the lowest level of language contact, only one personal name catches our attention: Πιοδασσης (‘Piodasses’). In the previous sections of my paper, I always referred to king Aśoka, but in the Greek version he is actually named Πιοδασσης. This can be explained by means of the Indian versions, because they also do not use the name Aśoka. Instead, they depict their king as *devānāmpriya* (‘friend of the gods’)¹⁹ and use different dialect forms of Sanskrit *priyadarśi* (‘with a gentile glance’). From the paper of Schlumberger *et al.* onwards, the dialectal form *Piyadassi* is considered as the source for the Greek word.²⁰

¹⁸ In general, the text is to be interpreted as a well-written form of hellenistic koinè. Apart from the possible Indian influences, no morphological or syntactic deviations, except the Ionism εὐθηνεῖ (‘he prospers’), are to be remarked. Nonetheless, I do not want to denote it as Attic, because Kd2 will offer more clues towards koinè and I treat both inscriptions within one and the same framework. Readers interested in the philosophical vocabulary used in the Greek text, are referred to the discussions by Schlumberger *et al.* (1958) and other secondary literature.

¹⁹ A literal translation from Greek φίλος τῶν θεῶν (‘friend of the gods’) (Seldeslachts 2002: 77). The name Aśoka finds its origins in the *avadāna*’s.

²⁰ The form in Aśoka’s own dialect, Magadhī. The original sound /r/ assimilated with the /s/, it is a general tendency from the region to have problems with the sound /r/ (Cfr. the labdacism of whole East Asia). This does not occur in North-Western dialects, so Greek

Benveniste remarks in the 1958 article that the omicron of the Greek is due to a velar pronunciation of /a/, or more probable, because Greek prefers compounds with /o/ (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 4; 37).²¹ Other Indian loans in Greek like Ταπροβάνη ('Sri Lanka', modelled on *Tāmraparṇī*) or Σανδρόκοτος ('Candragupta') display the same tendency. This remark built the basis for further interpretations of the name. Pugliese Carratelli (1964) interprets it as an official name for the king (Pugliese Carratelli 1964: 35). Benveniste (1964) strengthens his arguments in a second article. According to his view, we have to interpret *Piyadassi* as a personal name and the more well-known 'Aśoka' as a nickname. He argues for this interpretation as follows: first, this title is only attested during Aśoka's reign. In the Indian inscriptions it is combined with *devānāmpriya* or with *rājā/lājā* ('king'), but these two terms are never combined together. Therefore, they are to be seen as denoting 'majesty' and not as personal names. When we accept this hypothesis, it constitutes a calque of the Achaemenid titulary, an extra argument. Finally, it seems probable that a king presents his own name in an inscription addressed to his subjects. Therefore, this name was borrowed in Greek and in Aramaic (Benveniste 1964: 143-145). Harmatta (1966) uses this hypothesis as a foundation for conclusions about the origin of the Greek and Aramaic text. Because the Greek adopts the assimilation of /r/ and /s/, as already discussed, the model was probably written in an eastern Prakrit. The good relations between the Greeks and Pāṭaliputra point even more to this direction. Sanskrit is linguistically impossible, in spite of the thoughts of L. Renou. Aśoka clearly wanted to use vernaculars to promote his ideas. The Aramaic version on the other hand, can be traced back to a northwestern Prakrit, where the

cannot have borrowed it there. The Aramaic version *pydrš* was on the other hand borrowed from Sanskrit or NW-Prakrit.

²¹ The borrowings *σραμεναι* ('śramaṇa's') and *βραμεναι* ('brahmins') in the second Greek inscription are an important argument against this hypothesis. They rather points towards a more palatal pronunciation. Apart from that, the word forming rules of Chantraine (1933) and Schwyzer (1959-1968) argue for the second hypothesis. Seldeslachts (2000: 126) equally highlights the importance of Greek morphology in the borrowing process.

assimilation does not occur.²² Therefore, we have to separate the Greek and Aramaic version from one another (Harmatta 1966: 82-83).

Apart from the one Indian borrowing in the inscription, certain constructions point to structural interference from Indian on Greek. We saw that a higher level of bilingualism is required for this process. But because the text is to be considered as a translation, it is more likely on a cognitive level that interference from one language on the other occurs in the text. My analysis aims to prove that the Greek text is influenced in two general features and in one particular phrase.

Firstly, the Greek text very frequently uses the conjunction *καί* ('and').²³ Greek texts, like Vedic, are characterized by extensive use of particles. For a continuative enumeration, Greek language normally uses the particle *δέ*, possibly in combination with *μέν*, but in this inscription it occurs only once. Some scholars explained it as a religious feature (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 12; Galavotti 1959: 189). To build their arguments, they make references to the Biblical Greek of the *Septuagint* or the *New Testament*. A Hebrew and/or Aramaic influence seems unlikely in their opinion. L. Robert interprets the use of paratactic *καί*'s as a general feature of religious and popular texts (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 12). The text discussed here is more likely to be interpreted as a philosophical, rather than a religious text, comparable, for instance, to Plato's philosophical dialogues, which are characterized by abundance of particles. L. Robert's (1958) reference to the *New Testament* is also untenable. For, a few decades later (1984: 510-511), when he criticizes the hypothesis of A. Christol on the expression *ἵνα διαμεινωσιν* in Kd2,²⁴ he declares the *New Testament* as an untrustworthy argument for the Kandahar Inscriptions, which makes me wonder why he used it himself in his previous arguments. With reference to Biblical Greek, one has argued

²² Sanskrit could also be a possible source of the form, but this explanation appears less likely, due to the positive attitude of Aśoka towards vernaculars.

²³ 11 times on a total amount of 71 words, being 15,5%.

²⁴ I will further discuss it in the section about Kd2. Christol (1998) only mentions that the *καί*'s render a monotone character to the text.

that the use of parataxis can be explained as a feature of a lower diastatic level.²⁵ This interpretation does not fit for the Kandahar Inscriptions. The use of a rich, philosophical vocabulary points towards a high register. Apart from that, when one reads the Middle Indian inscriptions or Old Indian texts in general, it is remarkable that conjunctions like *ca* ('and') or *vā* ('if') are frequently used.²⁶ Furthermore, non-native speakers are more apt to construct unnecessary conjunctions between their sentences. Therefore, Indian influence seems probable, interpreting the *καί*'s as a kind of sampler, in contrast to the high lexical level of the text.

A second feature of structural Middle Indian influence to be discussed in this paper, is the limited use of definite articles in the text. Not only are these kind of grammatical words not used in Indian, but the lack of articles is even a shared feature of the contemporary linguistic area of South Asia (Matras 2009: 270). Articles as such are normally not borrowed, but language contact can explain some common patterns of their use. In Central Europe we see for instance a common lack of articles (Matras 2009: 251). Dealing with Latin influence on Ancient Greek and Turkish influence on the Cappadocian language (a mixed Greek-Turkish language formerly spoken in Asia Minor), researchers arrived at the same conclusions. Thus, the lack of articles in Latin and Turkish influenced the Greek (Adams 2003: 515 ff.; Dawkins 1916: 87). Therefore, it will be useful to analyse the most important occurrences. A first example is offered by βασιλεύς ('king'), three times attested in the text, constantly without a definite article. But we can leave it out of consideration, because eastern monarchs generally do not receive an article in Ancient Greek (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 45). Other examples include εὐσέβειαν ('piety'), κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν ('across the whole world') and πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ ('for father and mother'). Galavotti elucidates the lack of articles referring to the compactness of the text and he thinks that the phrase

²⁵ Cf. Moulton (1906-1976) in his grammar of New Testament Greek.

²⁶ *Ca* and *vā* both are translated with *καί* in the Greek text. See for example the Magadhī reconstruction by Schneider (1978).

πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ is a more refined manner of expression (Galavotti 1959: 189). Alongside with Christol (1998: 81), I interpret it as an Indian influence. Some limited corpus research with the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) learns the term εὐσέβεια occurs both with and without the article, but there seems to be a preference for the one with the article.²⁷ The same is true for πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ ('for father and mother'). The most remarkable expression is built by κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν, which literally means 'across the whole world'. The rules of Greek grammar require an article after quantifiers like πᾶς ('every, all'). The only possible exception would be when it denotes 'every country'. But the content does not support this vision. Aśoka does not rule over the whole world and therefore, is not able to promote his *dhamma* in every country. Consequently, we have to read 'in his whole country', where Greek would require an article.²⁸ As a conclusion, I explain the low frequency of definite articles in the text as an Indian influence. Unfortunately, the corpus of text available is too small to offer statistical surety.

Yet another example of Indian influence can be found in the expression ἐνήκοοι πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ('obedient to their father, mother and people with a respectable age'). Of course a copula like ἐγένοντο ('they became') is to be added for a correct translation. The word ἐνήκοοι ('obedient') is a hapax,²⁹ formed analogically on the basis of ἐπήκοος, εὐήκοος, ὑπήκοος or κατήκοος, all meaning more or less 'obedient' (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 17). According to Benveniste, it can be considered as a local form (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 42). Syntactically, it is noteworthy that both a dative and a genitive are used as complements. Both patterns are possible, but the

²⁷ With article for example in E., *Ion*, v. 1045, Plu., *Num.*, 12,3, Isoc., *Hel. Enc.*, 31, ... Without e.g. in Isoc., *Panath.*, 204, line 6, S., *El.*, v. 464. A full statistical research was not the aim of this study, but I clearly marked a preference for forms with the article.

²⁸ Kd2 uses the article: κατὰ πάσας τὰς διατριβὰς ('among all the philosophical schools').

²⁹ Pugliese Carratelli (1964: 31) denotes that it is known from manuscripts of the *Onomasticon* by Pollux, where it is regarded as an incorrect reading. The *DGE* speaks about an adverb ἐνηκόως by Iust. Phil., *Dial.*, 137, 4.

combination of the two is remarkable, as L. Robert declares (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 17). Pepermans (1976: 129) searches for another explanation and tries to interpret the genitive πρεσβυτέρων as a partitive genitive ('who belong to the old people'). This renders the construction too severe and offers the impression that only aged people will receive a better life in the future, opposite to the aim of Aśoka to promote morality alongside all his subjects.³⁰ Galavotti (1959: 189) and Pugliese Carratelli (1964: 31) offer a more probable explanation, namely by pointing towards Indian influence. The expression is in fact very similar to a passage of the fourth Rock Edict. Because of the geographical nearness, I quote from the version of Shābāzgarhī: *matapituṣu vuḍhanam suśruṣa* 'who has to obey to their mother, their father and the elder people' (Schneider 1978: 116 ff.). It is remarkable that a locative (*matapituṣu*) is used firstly, agreeing with the datives πατρὶ καὶ μητρὶ. The following word (*vuḍhanam*) is a genitive like τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. *Suśruṣa* is a desiderative form of the root *śru* ('to listen, to obey'), and corresponds to the adjective ἐνῆκοοι. Therefore, the switch in cases in the Greek version is to be explained through influence of the Indian original. Christol (1998: 83) agrees with this hypothesis and explains it as follows. Firstly, a linear translation was made from Indian to Greek, which later on was converted into better Greek. The most important argument for it, lies in the change of the order of mentioning the father and the mother. In the Greek version, the father is mentioned first, and then the mother. L. Robert explains it as due to the normal hierarchy in Greek (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 13), as opposed to the Indian and Aramaic version, which place the mother on the first position (Schlumberger *et al.* 1958: 42). In fact, Robert's claim is exclusively based on his intuition. I statistically verified his hypothesis with a limited statistical research with the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG)*, proving that in ca. 80% of the instances the father is mentioned first. This research offered objective evidence that his statement was correct and therefore,

³⁰ This preference for searching the solution on the Greek side, is probably caused by his limited knowledge of the Indian context.

I can also agree with Christols hypothesis about a linear intermediate stage.

3.2.4 Preliminary conclusions

The analysis of the Kd1 demonstrated that, on a general level, the Greek version does not contain gross errors. It is written by and for people who knew the Greek language sufficiently. At the same time, we notice that the Indian concepts are well-understood. Therefore, it seems probable that the translator was at least partially bilingual and had a sufficient knowledge of both languages. The fact we are dealing with a translation, is responsible for the limited Indian influence we can perceive in the Greek text. Firstly, we find the transcription of Aśoka's name comparable to the many Indo-Aryan personal or geographical names that were rendered in Greek (and also Latin). The question remains whether the structural interferences we found in Kd1, were also part of the daily speech in the Indo-Greek contact regions. This is very difficult to answer. But perhaps, it was also a feature of the daily speech in these regions that less definite articles were used than in standard Greek. As already said, the modern linguistic area of South Asia points towards this hypothesis. The inscription is a good example of the *adstratum* relation of Greek and Indian language and culture. The philosophical terms are replaced by good equivalents etc. As such, the sociolinguistic model, presented in Section 2, is supported by the analysis of Kd1. Therefore, we have to explore these contact phenomena in the analysis of Kd2, paying special attention to further examples of and arguments for Indian influence on Greek.

3.3 KANDAHAR 2 (1964)

3.3.1 Greek text and translation

Rock Edict XII³¹

(...) [Εύ]σέβεια καὶ ἐγκράτεια κατὰ πάσας τὰς διατριβάς· ἐγκρατῆς δὲ μάλιστα ἐστὶν ὅς ἂν γλώσσης ἐγκρατῆς ᾖ. Καὶ μήτε ἑαυτοὺς ἐπα[ι]νῶσιν, μήτε τῶν πέλας ψέγῳσιν περὶ μηδενός· κενὸν γάρ ἐστιν· καὶ πειρᾶσθαι μᾶλλον τοὺς πέλας ἐπαινεῖν καὶ μὴ ψέγειν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. Ταῦτα δὲ ποιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς αὐξοῦσι καὶ τοὺς πέλας ἀνακτῶνται· παραβαίνοντες δὲ ταῦτα, ἀκ(λ)εέστεροι τε γίνονται καὶ τοῖς πέλας ἀπέχθονται. Οἱ δ' ἂν ἑαυτοὺς ἐπαινῶσιν, τοὺς δὲ πέλας ψέγῳσιν φιλοτιμότερον διαπράττονται, βουλόμενοι παρὰ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐγλάμψαι, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον βλάπτου[σι] ἑαυτοὺς. Πρέπει δὲ ἀλλήλους θαυμάζειν καὶ τὰ ἀλλήλων διδάγματα παραδέχεσθαι[ι]. Ταῦτα δὲ ποιοῦντες πολυμαθέστεροι ἔσονται, παραδιδόντες ἀλλήλοις ὅσα ἕκαστος αὐτῶν ἐπίσταται. Καὶ τοῖς ταῦτα ἐπ(α)σκοῦσι ταῦτα μὴ ὀκνεῖν λέγειν ἵνα δειαμεινῶσιν διὰ παντός εὐσεβοῦντες.

Text Criticism:

ἀκ(λ)εέστεροι *corr.* L. Robert, ΑΚΑΕΕΣΤΕΡΟΙ *ac.*,
δειαμεινῶσιν A. Christol, δειαμείνωσιν *cett.*

Rock Edict XII

... Dhamma and self-control among all philosophical schools. Who is able to control himself with his tongue, especially this person controls himself. They are not able to glorify themselves and to criticize their neighbours. Because that is in vain. Rather, they have to try to glorify their neighbours and in all manners not to criticize them. Doing that, they will place themselves on a higher rank

³¹ The Greek text is based on the article of E. Benveniste (1964), in fact being a transcription of L. Robert. Orthographical deviations in the Greek text, like iotacism are not corrected. I do not always agree with Benveniste, e.g. the hypothesis of Christol (1983) (ἵνα δειαμεινῶσιν) is incorporated in my text. Indian loans are not accentuated. More text criticism is discussed in the *apparatus criticus* and in my survey of philological problems. As with the first inscription my translation is not intended to be a very literal translation. Rock Edict will be abbreviated as RE in the rest of the paper.

and as such be able to have them on their side. When they break those rules, they will lose honour and become hated by their neighbours. But those who praise themselves and criticize their neighbours, they act out of ambition. It is their aim to excel above the rest, but in fact they injure themselves. It is strongly recommended to admire each other and to learn from each others opinions. Doing that, they will become much wiser, because everyone transmits his knowledge to everyone. Do not hesitate to speak to such people, in order that they improve themselves choosing dhamma as an example for everything.

Rock Edict XIII

ὀγδόωι ἔτει βασιλεύοντος Πιοδασσου κατέστρεπται τὴν Καλιγγην. ἦν ἐζωγρημένα καὶ ἐξηγμένα ἐκεῖθεν σωμαίων μυριάδες δεκαπέντε καὶ ἀναιρέθησαν ἄλλοι μυριάδες δέκα καὶ σχεδὸν ἄλλοι τοσοῦτοι ἐτελεύτησαν. ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου ἔλεος καὶ οἶκτος αὐτὸν ἔλαβεν καὶ βαρέως ἤνεγκεν. δι' οὗ τρόπου ἐκέλευεν ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἐμψύχων σπουδῆν τε καὶ σύνταξιν πεποίηται περὶ εὐσεβείας. καὶ τοῦτο ἔτι δυσχερέστερον ὑπέιληφε ὁ βασιλεύς· καὶ ὅσοι ἐκεῖ οἴκουν βραμεναὶ ἢ σραμεναὶ ἢ καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς οἱ περὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν διατρίβοντες, τοὺς ἐκεῖ οἰκοῦντας ἔδει τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως συμφέροντα νοεῖν, καὶ διδάσκαλον καὶ πατέρα καὶ μητέρα ἐπαισχύνεσθαι καὶ θαυμάζειν, φίλους καὶ ἐταίρους ἀγαπᾶν καὶ μὴ διαψεύδεσθαι, δούλοις καὶ μισθωτοῖς ὡς κουφότατα χρᾶσθαι, τούτων ἐκεῖ τῶν τοιαῦτα διαπρασσομένων εἴ τις τέθνηκεν ἢ ἐξῆκται, καὶ τοῦτο ἐμ παραδρομῆι οἱ λοιποὶ ἡγεῖνται, ὁ δὲ [β]ασιλεύς σφόδρα ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐδυσχέρανεν. καὶ ὅτι ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰσιν... (lacuna in textu)

Text Criticism:

κατέστρεπται *inscr.*, κατέστραπται *corr.* L. Robert
 σύνταξιν *inscr.*, σύντα(σ)ιν *corr.* L. Robert
 ἡγεῖνται *corr.* L. Robert, ἡγῆνται *inscr.*

Rock Edict XIII

During the eighth year of his rule king Piodasses (Aśoka) subjected the region Kalinga. 150 000 people were

captured and taken away from there, 100 000 people were executed and an almost equal amount fell in battle. From that time onwards, Piodasses was captured by condolence and reflection. He suffered greatly and therefore, he promoted a vegetarian way of life and organised a propaganda program for dhamma. The king understood this to be even more offensive. The brahmins, living there (in Kalinga), the śramans, other people dealing with dhamma and the layman had to realize that the king brought them advantages, they had to respect their teacher, their father and their mother and they had to admire them. They had to love their friends and comrades and not to deceive them, to give their slaves and servants duties as light as possible. If someone from them, who did such things, died or was taken away, and the other people sympathized with that, the king became even more furious. And because among the other people are... (Rest of the text is missing)

3.3.2 Linguistic and philological analysis of the text³²

I found numerous orthographical deviations from standard Attic Greek. I note certain orthographies occurring from the koinè onwards: iotacistic faults in δειαμεινῶσιν (= διαμεινῶσιν) ('they remain') and ἡγιῆνται (= ἡγεῖνται) ('they think'), the loss of the double consonant in γλώσης (= γλώσσης) ('of the tongue') and διαπράτονται (= διαπράττονται) ('they accomplish'), and phonological orthographies due to assimilation in κενὸν γὰρ (assimilation of ν (nu) to the following γ (gamma)) ('because it is in vain'), ἐγλάμψαι (κ (kappa) becomes γ (gamma) due to following λ (lambda)) ('to shine') and ἐμ παραδρομῆ (the dental nasal ν (nu) becomes the bilabial nasal μ (mu) because a π (pi) follows) ('in running by') (Cfr. Harmatta 1966: 79-80). A noteworthy phonetic feature is the confusion of double sigma (σσ) and double tau (ττ). Remark for instance, the contrast between διαπράτονται and

³² As for Kd1, I do not present a total overview of the Indian text. See e.g. Benveniste (1964: 147-149) or Norman (1972).

διαπρασσομένων. With regard to the personal name Πιοδάσσου no choice was available, because the voiceless alveolar fricatives, that is /ss/, were borrowed from Indian, as Christol remarks (Christol 1998: 82).

On the morphosyntactic level, the form ἀναιρέθησαν ('they were murdered') is remarkable because of the absence of the augment, while the verb γίνεται ('he becomes') is the normal koine form of γίγνεται. The participle construction ἦν ἐξωγρημένα καὶ ἐξηγμένα ('they were captured and taken away') is noteworthy because the gender does not agree with the feminine μυριάδες ('thousands of'), but with the neutral σωμάτων ('of the corpses'), a partitive genitive justly before it. A final morphological peculiarity concerns the verb κατέστρεπται ('he subjected (for himself)'). L. Robert corrected it into Attic κατέστραπται. Yet I rather ascribe Harmatta (1966: 80) in following the original form. Harmatta remarks that a similar form is found on a papyrus and explains it as due to confusion with the passive aorist: ἐστράφθην in Doric and ἐστρέφθην in Attic. I, on the other hand, think that the present forms with e-grade (ie. στρέφω) are a more likely explanation than the aorist forms.

The passage σπουδῆν τε καὶ σύνταξιν (literally 'the diligence and the composition') is particularly debated in the scholarship. Robert advocates the reading σύντασιν ('vehement effort'), explaining it as a tautology with σπουδῆν (Schlumberger 1964: 131).³³ Harmatta wants to preserve the original reading. The possibility of a simple fault, while cutting down the engraving, does not fit in his opinion, because of the specific form of the letter ξ (ksi). Therefore, he relies upon a phonological evolution in Greek: /-ks-/ > /-ss-/ > /-s-/. This shift was not fixed in orthography, but can be an explanation for the confusion between σύνταξις and σύντασις, the first one giving the orthography and the second one the meaning. As an extra argument, he refers to the Bactrian language, which used the Greek alphabet but lacked the letter ksi, using the digraph <χβ> to denote Iranian /χš/. Christol (1998: 89) rightly criticizes this

³³ Based on Pl., *Smp.* 206β.

hypothesis. Such mistakes normally occur the other way around: a phonological orthography instead of an etymological one. Therefore, he links it to his interpretation of ἔδειξεν in the first edict and reads the construction as depicting the parties, which were organised for the propaganda of *dhamma*. As such, he preserves the original reading of the inscription σύνταξις, a substantive derived from the verb συντάττω ('to put in order together' (mostly in military sense)) (Christol 1998: 89).

Drawing upon Christol's remark, I propose the following explanation. I stick to the original reading, σύνταξις, which is mostly used in military contexts. Therefore, I think that we also have to understand σπουδή ('diligence') with a warlike connotation. This is supported by the Greek lexicon of Montanari (2015: 1950), who offers 'dispute, context, rivalry, intrigue' as possible translations. In my opinion, the collocation σπουδὴν τε καὶ σύνταξις, refers to the past Kalinga wars. Aśoka realised that his bloody war with the Kalinga's was a wrong decision and therefore, wants to alter the situation now by promoting his new doctrine of *dhamma*. Saying it otherwise, this is his new war, but a war which is intended to stop all previous wars. One question comes to mind in this interpretation: who are his warriors? In my opinion, these are the *dharmamahāmātrās*, mentioned in my analysis of Kd1. I refer again to the gloss of Hesychius: μαμάτραι· οἱ στρατηγοί, παρ' Ἰνδοῖς ('the *dharmamahāmātrās*: the warriors, by the Indians'). Gray and Schuyler (1901: 199) explained it by the Sanskrit word *marmatra* ('breastplate'). However, it seems much more plausible to consider the *dharmamahāmātrās* as the source for our gloss.³⁴ The translation of Hesychius refers to people, not to objects. Another argument to link these civil servants with this passage is formed by the end of RE XII. In the Indian version, the *dharmamahāmātrās* are explicitly spoken of in their function to promote *dhamma* (cf. Cassio 2016: 40). Benveniste (1964: 150) highlights the remarkable fact of their disappearance in the Greek version. Did the

³⁴ With syncopation of the *-hā-* from Indian to Greek. For the interpretation, see for example Christol (1999: 112), Seldeslachts (2002: 88) or Brust (2007: 414-416).

translator not understand it well or are other explanations equally possible? We saw already the tendency of the Greek text to deviate from the Indian *Vorlage*. This can also be observed in this peculiar passage. The Indian text highlights the study and the love for *dhamma*.³⁵ The Greek text preserves only partially the aspect of study, using the term σπουδῆν, but the love element is not to be found in the Greek version. Therefore, it does not seem improbable that the Greek translator wanted to put emphasis on the military aspect. Another advantage gained by this analysis, is that it presents a more natural interpretation of the passage that otherwise might appear a mere tautology. Finally, it allows to preserve the original reading of the inscription without abandoning the core meanings of the forms.

The interpretation of ἵνα δειαμεινῶσιν ('in order that they remain...') poses yet another important problem. Earlier studies interpreted it as a purpose clause introduced by ἵνα and analysed the form δειαμεινῶσιν as a conjunctive of διαμένω, thus in fact διαμείνωσιν. Christol (1983) offers an alternative explanation. He analyses the verb as a conjunctive of *διαμεινώ ('to ameliorate'), a non-attested verbal derivative of the comparative ἀμείνων ('better'). To account for such a non-attested verb, he refers to similar derivatives like βελτιώ ('to ameliorate' from βελτίων 'better') and ἐλαττώ ('to reduce' from ἐλάττων 'smaller'). Apart from that, a verb ἐξαμεινώ ('to amend') is attested in a fragment of Cratinus (*Ploutoi*, v. 16). With respect to the content, he cites the Indian passage *sālavadhī* (the increase of *sāla*), an amelioration in fact (Christol 1983: 32-33).³⁶ Secondly, he remarks the fact that in Post Classical Greek ἵνα can also introduce a noun clause. He considers it more fitting in the context and translates 'that they...' (Christol 1983: 35). Robert (1984: 510-511) criticized these hypotheses with a double argument. The first one was already cited in my paper: the limited value of Biblical Greek for our understanding of

³⁵ Schneider (1978: 116) reconstructs the original from Pāṭaliputra and reads: *dhammāvāye, dhammakāmatā dhammānusathi*. The Indian tricolon is rendered by two forms in Greek.

³⁶ The word *sāla* is unknown and the different hypotheses lack persuasiveness. In all cases, it denotes a moral quality. For a possible hypothesis, see Norman (1972: 112).

Hellenistic Greek (*cfr. supra* for criticism). On the other hand, he made enquiries about the value of the Indian original, because the Greek handles it creatively. The text is indeed to be considered as a free translation, but remaining a translation, the original *Vorlage* forms the point of departure. Furthermore, we noted for Kd1 that Indian syntax can even influence the Greek text in an *editio brevis*. Therefore, I agree with Christol in reading the verb as a form of διαμεινῶ. Further argumentation is given by the end of Kd1, which ends with a very similar formula: λαῖτον καὶ ἄμεινον ... διάξουσιν ('they will become better and more prosperous'). The fact that the verb is not attested, does not constitute a big problem. Kd1 also offers Greek words, like ἐνήκοος, which were never attested before. Christol's syntactic analysis seems equally possible, but the same is true regarding the interpretation with a purpose clause. The difference is only a matter of detail.

3.3.3 Discussion of Indian influences

Again, I first have to emphasize that the Greek text is not to be considered a literal translation, but a text which does its utmost to exploit its philosophical vocabulary.³⁷ On the one hand, we rediscover some terms from Kd1: εὐσέβεια ('piety') as a translation of *dhamma*, the ἀποχή τῶν ἐμψύχων (literally 'the abstention from animals', referring to a vegetarian way of life) and ἐγκρατής ('self-controlled') as an antonym of ἀκρατής ('without self-control') in Kd1. But on the other hand, the researchers were again surprised when they discovered that the Indian term *pāśaṃdā* (religious sect) was rendered by Greek διατριβή, a philosophical school (Schlumberger 1964: 133).³⁸ The Greek translator sought for a word in his own philosophical tradition. However, I have to remark that in the rest of the text Indian *pāśaṃdā* is not always translated with the same word.

³⁷ I do not present an exhaustive list. See L. Roberts contribution to Schlumberger (1964: 134-138).

³⁸ Cassio (2016: 45-46) argues against this equation. In general, his paper wants to prove that the Greek version highlights the individual aspect of philosophy, whereas the Indian originals refer to philosophical encounters between different schools.

We also find ὁ πέλας ('the neighbour') and the more religious διὰ παντὸς εὐσεβοῦντες ('observing piety in every circumstance') (Christol 1983: 33-34; 1998: 82). L. Robert admires the beautiful *iuncturae verborum*, for instance ἔλεος καὶ οἶκτος ('pity and compassion') and σπουδὴν ποιεῖσθαι ('to make efforts') (Schlumberger 1964: 137). However, this high linguistic level does not exclude Indian influence.

Firstly, we remark four Indian borrowings in the inscription. We meet again the personal name Πιοδασσης, this time in the genitive clause. This inflection shows that the word was morphologically integrated in Greek language among the masculine inflection of the first declension. A second personal name is to be found in the borrowing Καλιγγην. Benveniste (1964: 150) justly highlights the fact that a switch happened from Indian to Greek. The original *Kaliṅgā* refers to the inhabitants of the country. But the translator interpreted Indian /ā/ as a feminine form like in Doric Greek. Furthermore, it is common practice in Greek to denote countries with feminine substantives. On a formal level we want to stress the rendering of the velar nasal with common Greek <γγ>.

The two remaining borrowings will be discussed together. Βραμεναι ('brahmins') and σραμεναι ('śramaṇa's') denote two groups in Indian society.³⁹ The brahmins are of course the Indian priests and the term śramans can refer both to ascetics or more specifically to buddhists or jains. The Greek language retains the ambiguity. Benveniste (1964: 152-153) was the first researcher to analyse βραμεναι, linking it with Sanskrit *brāhmaṇa*. He explains the difference between <α> and <ε> in Greek through the Indian difference in quantity. /ā/ is rendered by <α> and /a/ evolved into <ε>. In his opinion, the form σραμεναι is to be seen as an analogical formation. Harmatta (1966: 83) justly criticizes Benveniste, because his account fails to explain the disappearance of Sanskrit /h/ in Greek, even

³⁹ Other borrowings, attested in Greek literature, prove that the Greeks were acquainted with these concepts. For a detailed survey of the forms in Greek, Old Indian, Middle Indian, Middle Iranian and Tocharian, cfr. A. Christol (1984; 1990). This specific form in Greek is only attested here. Quite strikingly, Burst (2007) found it unnecessary to discuss these forms in his lexicon of Indian and Iranian borrowings in Greek.

though the Greek borrowing βραχυᾶνες retains it with <χ>. This last borrowing also offers a second objection against Benveniste's hypothesis. The /ā/ of Βραχυᾶνες clearly shows that the Indian difference in quantity does not matter in Greek. Therefore, I follow Harmatta (1966: 83), who declares that the form was borrowed from a northwestern Prakrit. He identifies the version of Shābāzgarhī as the source, with the forms *bramaṇa* and *śramaṇa*.⁴⁰ The switches between <α> and <ε> are not discussed in his work. Christol (1984: 39) agrees with him and highlights the fact that the preservation of /sr/ points towards a northwestern Prakrit. His enlarged article (1990: 61) tries to explain the <ε> with regard to the more closed pronunciation of the /a/ in Middle Indo-Aryan. This closed pronunciation is a possible explanation, but I want to present another hypothesis. When we look closer at the Greek side, a folk etymological explanation can be expected. For example, a word like εὐμενής ('well-disposed, kindly'), perfectly fitting with the positive Greek conception of Indian ascetics, could have triggered Greek <ε>. Seldeslachts's PhD (2000: 89-92; 98) offers an extensive list of borrowings from Indian into Greek, where Indian /a/ is rendered by <α>. Transcription with <ε> also occur, but in much lesser quantities, not more than 24 words.⁴¹ Concerning this limited amount of words, one can wonder if some examples are not influenced through folk etymology, for example Μέθορα (a place name) under influence of Greek μεθόριος ('lying between as a boundary') or Πέτροι (a place name) by Greek πέτρος ('stone'). The form of the word πέπερι ('pepper') can be caused by vocal harmony.

Finishing my discussion about the borrowings in Greek I want to focus on the participle τοὺς οἰκοῦντας (literally 'all those who inhabit...'), which is in fact to be understood as a wrong calque from Indian. This vision was gradually developed in scholarly literature. Benveniste (1964: 153) interprets it as a readmission of ὅσοι ἐκεῖ ὄκουν, but he is not able to explain

⁴⁰ As such without Sanskrit /h/ and without a difference in vowel length.

⁴¹ See Seldeslachts (2000: 98). The forms discussed here are incorporated in the given amount.

how this participle can translate Indian *grahatha* (masters of the house).⁴² However, this Indian word offers the real explanation. Norman on the other hand (1972: 115-116), equally fails to recognize the right solution and combines it with Indian *ye tatra vasati* ('they who dwell there'). Christol (1980: 63) gives a better interpretation. In his opinion, we have to detect the real meaning in the etymology of Indian *grahatha* ('masters of the house'). The basic meaning with 'house' caused the Greek word on the basis of the equivalence *grha* = οἶκος. Though, in the Indian version *grahatha* is here used to denote 'layman' as opposite with the brahmins and the śramans, previously mentioned.⁴³ The Indian context escaped the translator's mind, alongside with the syntax. Therefore, we find a *nominativus pendens* within the relative clause in opposition with the accusative οἰκοῦντας, both dependent from ἔδει ('it was necessary').

Two other constructions equally deserve our attention. First, the translator adapted the Indian construction of RE XIII. The Indian version uses a passive construction, namely *kaligā vijitā* ('the inhabitants of Kalinga were conquered').⁴⁴ Greek translates it with a medial form κατέστρεπται, with the non-expressed subject Πιοδασσης. As such, the subjects of the *genitivus absolutus* and the main clause become the same in Greek. The Indian object *piyadasine lājine* ('by king Piyadassi') is replaced by a non-expressed Πιοδασσης.⁴⁵ Therefore, we can conclude that the translator sought for a construction, which better suits the Greek language. The same is to be said about διδάσκαλον καὶ πατέρα καὶ μητέρα ἐπαισχύνεσθαι ('to revere his teacher,

⁴² The version of Shābāzgarhī is consequently used in my citations of the Indian text, otherwise it will be mentioned.

⁴³ Pāli *gahaṭṭha* underwent the same evolution in meaning.

⁴⁴ Here we use the reconstructed version in Magadhī by Schneider (1978), probably the chancery model used as the source of translations.

⁴⁵ A *genitivus absolutus* is characterized in prescriptive grammars as an error, but it occurs already during the Classical Period, e.g. Thuc. 3.13. But the choice to use here the form with a same subject, can be influenced by the translation from Indian into Greek.

his father and his mother').⁴⁶ As we saw about Kd1, the order is reversed from Indian to Greek.

To finish my discussion about Indian influences, I want to analyse the conjunctions and the articles, in comparison with Kd1. Therefore, I first want to stress the difference in style between the two Rock Edicts (Harmatta 1966: 80). Harmatta characterized the Greek of RE XII as Attic, but RE XIII as koinè. I do not agree with his description, because RE XII can also be characterized as koinè. This becomes obvious from the fact that it is also influenced by iotacism, because it has an ionism γίνονται etc. As such, I rather want to denote it as a difference in register, or more specifically about a difference in susceptibility to the contact situation. Reconsidering the use of paratactic constructions, we observe a remarkable reduction of καί's in RE XII. Having an entire amount of 113 words, only eight times a καί is used, or 7% in opposition with the 15,5% in Kd1. Corresponding with this fact, the use of particles is much richer in RE XII. Eight times, we encounter the continuative particle δέ and one time the explanatory particle γάρ ('for'). Kd1 used only one time the particle δέ. The translator of RE XII attempts high level Greek in his text. Using the same statistics on RE XIII, we perceive a remarkable difference. The amount of καί's has again raised until 18 times on a total amount of 136 words, or 13,2%. Particles disappeared from the text, only one δέ is found. A similar difference is to be noted with reference to the articles, again a possible Indian influence of the text. RE XII uses a sufficient amount of Greek articles. Only in the beginning of the text, it is noteworthy that εὐσέβεια ('piety, dhamma') and ἐγκράτεια ('self-control') lack an article.⁴⁷ Although, the lack of an article can here be regarded as an attempt to give them a universal meaning. The Greek of RE XIII again lacks articles, we can think of βραμεναι, σραμεναι, διδάσκαλον, πατέρα, μητέρα etc. The cases where an article is used, are very specific occasions. Firstly, a considerable amount of the attestations of the

⁴⁶ The reconstructed version reads: *mātāpitusu susūsā gulususūsā* ('obeying the mother, the father and the teacher'). Remark that the Greek version also alters the place of the teacher.

⁴⁷ With regard to εὐσέβεια we are not sure because the preceding text is lost.

article occur with substantivized participles, where an article cannot be omitted.⁴⁸ Apart from that, the article λουπός ('remaining') receives two times an article as does βασιλεύς ('king'). Remarkably, this title was in Kd1 used without an article, the typical Greek manner to denote an eastern monarch. This refined expression is omitted here.

These observations support the hypothesis of Christol (1998: 82) that two different editors were responsible for Kd2. RE XII was translated by a bilingual, with a profound knowledge of both Indian and Greek language and culture, RE XIII on the other hand was transferred by a technical translator, who lacked knowledge about the context and was not acquainted with the nuances of the language. Also remarkable is the fact that the borrowings all occur in RE XIII, while the other (parts of the) inscriptions (RE XII and Kd1) search for Greek equivalents. Furthermore, the structure of the first sentence provides problems, the wrong calque occurs here as the *nominativus pendens*. They also can be an argument for my hypothesis. The switch in the order of father and mother is an exception, where the translator search for a target oriented translation, possibly influenced by Kd1?⁴⁹

3.3.4 Preliminary conclusions

Generally spoken, this second inscription confirms my conclusions concerning Kd1. The Indian version is not literally followed and we encounter Greek language of a high level. This fact does not exclude Indian influence in the text. Firstly, we can think of the four borrowings in RE XIII, where we re-encounter the personal name Πιοδασσης. These borrowings are especially borrowed from the political context, whereas the religious and philosophical terms are transferred with a Greek alternative. Apart from that, we remarked important differences

⁴⁸ Notice for instance 'οἱ περὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν διατρίβοντες' ('those who are dealing with *dhamma*'), 'τοὺς ἐκεῖ οἰκοῦντας' ('those who dwell there') and 'τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως συμφέροντα' ('the advantages of the king').

⁴⁹ We do not know the relative chronology of both inscriptions, thus this remains a mere possibility.

between RE XII and RE XIII. I explained this with reference to a different level of bilingualism. Christol (1998: 84) proposes the hypothesis that the editor of RE XIII was a merchant, who knew Greek technically, but was not able to grasp all the finesses of the language. Nor was he experienced with the Indian context. The analysis of this second inscription fortified my hypotheses about paratactic construction and articles. However, we always have to remember that we are dealing with a very limited corpus to postulate absolute conclusions. It can be uttered as a possibility that paratactic conjunctions and a reduction of articles were features of daily Greek speech in Bactria and India, during the Hellenistic Period.

3.4 Evaluation of the Kandahar Inscriptions

Concluding my case study, I present an overview about the most important observations concerning Indo-Greek language contact we can make on the basis of an analysis of the Kandahar Inscriptions. Methodologically, we became aware that inscriptions give rise to some difficulties for contact linguistic research. Indeed, it is very difficult to know who is responsible for certain interferences in the text: the translator or the stone cutter? The inscriptions point towards the translator as the responsible. However, the stone cutter could be responsible for the orthographic faults we encountered in Kd2. Aśoka is to be considered as the orderer of the translations into Greek, but this is only of minor importance for the language contact or the bilingualism of certain people, we cannot deduce whether Aśoka actually knew Greek or not.

The inscriptions offer us two interesting insights. Firstly, my research proved the fact that Adams (2003: 5) is not correct in his negative judgement about translations as a source for contact linguistic research. The Kandahar Inscriptions have the advantage that they are to be considered as a not-literal translation, therefore, also a form of *positive performance*. The translation remains however responsible for the cognitive processes in the head of the translator which caused some

interferences. Secondly, the Kandahar Inscriptions are to be denoted as *cripto-bilingui*.⁵⁰ We are dealing with bilingual texts, knowing (parts of) the original texts, but which are not cut on the same stone.⁵¹

Apart from that, the inscriptions confirm certain observations about language contact in general. Firstly, we remarked the importance of individual multilingualism (Matras 2009: 3). Kd2 is a good example. I maintained that two editors, with a different level of bilingualism, were responsible for its production. Such instances are the clues for our understanding of the societal level of language contact. Secondly, I fortified a comment by Thomason (2005: 3) that language contact can occur at a distance. The Greek language of Arachosia came in contact with the Magadhī dialect of Pāṭaliputra, thousands of miles away.⁵² At the same time, contacts existed between neighbours. To demonstrate this, we can remember the borrowings, which entered into Greek from NW-Prakrit. Thirdly, the inscriptions present clues that both languages have prestige in the contact situation. The Greek language uses its own philosophical vocabulary, but the political terms are borrowed from the Indian language. The political power of the Maurya's reached also Arachosia. Therefore, regarding this specific period we can postulate a stable language contact. The Greeks are well-established in the East and India is powerfully ruled by Aśoka. Later on, during the Indo-Greek kingdoms there will be a peak in the Indo-Greek contact, especially during Menander's reign. When these Indo-Greek kingdoms collapse, the Greek language disappears, the contact loses its stability and Greek is absorbed by the Indian languages, which re-establish themselves as the dominant languages.

Specifically about the Indo-Greek contact, a couple of conclusions can be formulated. First, we discover both borrowings and structural interference. The borrowings include mainly political terms: a king, a country and two groups of

⁵⁰ Term borrowed from Sani (1988: 155).

⁵¹ Fortunately, we know that the Indian version was the first to be made.

⁵² In the probable case that the original was written in the dialect of Aśoka's court.

people in Indian society. These borrowings aimed to fill a lexical gap in Greek, the recipient language. The words were adapted to agree with the morphology and phonology of the Greek language, therefore, they are not to be conceptualized as code-switching. However, it remains impossible to find out the extent to which these borrowings were incorporated in Greek language. As a matter of fact, they are only attested in the Kandahar Inscriptions. Nonetheless, it is perfectly possible these borrowings were used frequently, but in other inscriptions nor in the literature are these specific forms to be found. This fact can be caused due to the loss of much material dealing with Indo-Greek language contact.

Concluding, we can be rather positive in our evaluation of the Kandahar Inscriptions as a case study in Indo-Greek language contact. They offer hapax legomena, they contain information about the bilingualism of the translator and they are a unique source for Indian inferences in Ancient Greek syntax. It remains problematic that the material is limited, statistic certainty is therefore excluded. It demands for a sophisticated analysis to detract interesting conclusions from this limited corpus. But on the whole, the Kandahar Inscriptions offer the possibility for doing so.

4. Conclusion: A battle for enlightenment

*dharmah tasmād dharmāt param nāsti |
 atho abalīyān balīyām samāsamśate dharmeṇa |
 yathā rājñāivam | yo vai sa
 dharmah satyaṃ vai tat |
 tasmāt satyaṃ vadantam āhur dharmam vadatīti |
 dharmam vā vadantam satyaṃ vadatīti |
 etad dhyevaitad ubhayaṃ bhavati ||*

(Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 1.4. xiv)⁵³

⁵³ 'Nothing is higher than Dharma. The weak overcomes the stronger by Dharma, as over a king. Truly that Dharma is the Truth (*Satya*); Therefore, when a man speaks the

I reached the place to conclude my paper. My aim was to discuss the value of the Greek Kandahar Inscriptions as a case study in Indo-Greek language contact, during the Hellenistic Period. Therefore, I began my paper with a brief discussion of the methodological problems for sociolinguistic research based on written corpora. Keeping this in mind, I offered an overview of the sociolinguistic situation of Indo-Greek contact in Antiquity. I argued that for most of the time Greek and Middle Indo-Aryan were in an *adstratum* relationship. This hypothesis needed to be proven by an in-depth contact linguistic analysis of the Kandahar Inscriptions, the most important primary sources concerning Indo-Greek contact.

It became obvious that the Greek text does not constitute a literal translation of the Indian original, but the translators sought for a text which could exploit the Greek philosophical vocabulary at its best. Nevertheless, I was able to point towards certain Indian interferences. First, the inscriptions are a unique source concerning four Indian (political) borrowings into Greek: the name of a king, a geographical region and two societal groups in Indian society. On the syntactic level, I focused on the use of paratactic constructions and the limited use of definite articles, both features where Indian influence is plausible. Certain phrases in the Greek version also could be explained as an interference from Indian or as a target oriented translation from Indian into Greek. Based on these observations I deduced several conclusions concerning the bilingualism of the translators. I argued that two editors were involved in the translation of Kd2. RE XII is written by a person with a high degree of bilingualism, RE XIII by a technical translator, maybe a merchant who was not fully bilingual and who only knew the basics about Indian culture. The inscriptions are an example of the *adstratum* between Greek and Indian, both languages stand alongside each other. The texts avoid a blending of both

Truth, they say, "He speaks the Dharma"; and if he speaks Dharma, they say, "He speaks the Truth!" For both are one.' (Sanskrit text based on the edition by Olivelle (1998); own translation).

languages, because the translators search for Greek philosophical equivalents.

Further research can confirm or nuance these conclusions, always keeping in mind the limitedness of the material. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to study the other epigraphical rests from the Far East, like the inscriptions of Aī Khanoum on a sociolinguistic level. The Greek loan words in Indian and the rather extended corpus of Greek and Indian names on coins are other research possibilities. As such, they can provide further clues for the sociolinguistic discussion of the contact during the Hellenistic Period. This sociolinguistic framework can more generally be applied on other Indian texts. To name only a few examples, social variation in Sanskrit drama (*e.g.* female speech) can be further discussed on a sociolinguistic level. Contact linguistics can be used in the encounters between different Middle Indian languages. On the other hand, the Aśoka Inscriptions can further be discussed as a source for Indo-Greek language contact, by comparing the description of the Maurya administration by Megasthenes and the Indian inscriptions, both historically and linguistically (*cfr.* Seldeslachts 1998: 285).

My paper was intended to be an impulse for such sociolinguistic research. I discussed briefly the framework for doing so and made a comprehensive sociolinguistic analysis of the Greek Kandahar Inscriptions. I wanted to deliver my own contribution to Aśoka's objective to deal with *dharma*. Aśoka wanted to extend his *guerre sainte* towards the Greeks. However, how could it be different? The Greeks found their own, philosophical way for dealing with it, their interpretation was *à la grecque*.

References⁵⁴

- Adams, James Noel, Janse, Mark, Swain, Simon (Edd.). (2002). *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adams, James Noel (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Altheim, Franz & Stiehl, Ruth (1959). The Greek-Aramaic Inscription of Kandahar and its Philological Importance. *E&W*, 10, 243-260.
- Benedetti, Marina (2014). Greek and Indian Languages. In Gianakkis, Georgios (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (Vol. 2: G-O), 59-62, Leyden: Brill Publishers.
- Benveniste, Emile (1964). Edits d'Aśoka en traduction grecque. *JA*, 262, 137-157.
- Brust, Manfred (2005). *Die indischen und iranischen Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft 118. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Cassio, Albio Cesare (2016). *The Koine in the East: Aśoka's Rock Edict 12 in Greek Dress*. In Di Giovine, P., & Gasbarra, V. (Edd.), *Dinamiche sociolinguistiche in aree di influenza greca: mutamento, variazione e contatto; atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 22-24 settembre 2014*. Pisa: Fabrizio Serra Editore.
- Christol, Alain (1980). Les édits grecs d'Aśoka: problèmes de traduction. *Lalies*, 1, 63-65.
- Christol, Alain (1983). Les édits grecs d'Aśoka: étude linguistique. *JA*, 271, 25-42.
- Christol, Alain (1984). Le nom des bouddhistes en grec. *Lalies*, 3, 37-43.
- Christol, Alain (1990). Les édits grecs d'Aśoka: étude linguistique II. *JA*, 278, 45-70.
- Christol, Alain (1998). Edits grecs d'Ashoka et Koinè. In Brixhe, Claude (Ed.), *Koinè grecque antique* (Vol. III: Les contacts), 67-

⁵⁴ Text Editions of Classical/Sanskrit literature and main reference works like dictionaries or grammars are not listed under 'references'.

- 98, Nancy: Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche sur l'Antiquité.
- Christol, Alain (1999). Le grec au contact des Iraniens et des Indiens. In Blanc, Alain & Christol, Alain (Edd.), *Langues en contact dans l'Antiquité: aspects lexicaux*, 107-123, Nancy: Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche sur l'Antiquité.
- Christol, Alain (2007). Greek and Indian Languages. In Christidis, Anastasios Fivos (Ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek from the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, 836-843, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dawkins, Richard McGillivray (1916). *Modern Greek in Asia Minor. A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa, with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Galavotti, Carlo (1959). The Greek Version of the Kandahar Bilingual Inscription of Aśoka. *E&W*, 10, 185-191.
- Gray, Louis H. & Schuyler, Montgomery (1901). Indian Glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychios. *AJPh*, 22, 195-202.
- Harmatta, János (1966). Zu den griechischen Inschriften des Aśoka, *AAntHung*, 14, 77-85.
- Karttunen, Klaus (1997). *India and the Hellenistic World*. Studia Orientalia 94. Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society.
- Matras, Yaron (2009). *Language Contact. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullen, Alex & James, Patrick (Edd.). (2012). *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Narain, Awadh Kishore (1957). *The Indo-Greeks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy (1972). Notes on the Greek Version of Aśoka's Twelfth and Thirteenth Rock Edicts. *JAS*, 2, 111-118.
- Pepermans, Ger M. A. (1976). Een Griekse inscriptie uit Afghanistan. *Hermeneus*, 45, 127-129.
- Pugliese Carratelli, Giovanni Pugliese & Garbini, Giovanni (1964). *A Bilingual Graeco-Aramaic Edict by Aśoka: The First Greek Inscription Discovered in Afghanistan*. Roma: Istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo oriente.
- Robert, Louis & Robert, Jeanne (1984). Bulletin épigraphique: 496. Alexandre d'Arachosie. *REG*, 97, 510-511.

- Sani, Saverio (1988). Bilinguismo e biculturalismo nelle iscrizioni di Asoka. In Campanile, Enrico, Cardona, Giorgio Raimondi, Lazzeroni, Romano (Edd.), *Bilinguismo e biculturalismo nel mondo antico*, 151-166, Pisa: Giardini editori e stampatori.
- Scerrato, Umberto (1958). An Inscription of Aśoka Discovered in Afghanistan. The Bilingual Greek-Aramaic of Kandahar. *E&W*, 9, 4-6.
- Schlumberger, Daniel, Robert, Louis, Dupont-Sommer, André, Benveniste, Emile (1958). Une bilingue gréco-araméenne d'Aśoka. *JA*, 246, 1-48.
- Schlumberger, Daniel (1964). Une nouvelle inscription grecque d'Açoka. *CRAI*, 108, 126-140.
- Schlumberger, Daniel & Benveniste, Emile (1968). A New Greek Inscription of Aśoka at Kandahar. *EI*, 37, 193-200.
- Schneider, Ulrich (Ed.) (1978). *Die Grossen Felsen-Edikte Aśokas: Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Analyse der Texte*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Seldeslachts, Erik (1998). Translated Loans and Loan Translations as Evidence of Graeco-Indian Bilingualism in Antiquity. *AC*, 67, 273-299.
- Seldeslachts, Erik (2000). *Indo-Arische eigennamen en soortnamen in het Grieks: een taalkundige, filologische en historische analyse* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Ghent University.
- Seldeslachts, Erik (2002). Grieks-Romeinse wereld en India. *Tetradio*, 11, 73-104.
- Tarn, William Woodthorpe (1951). *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomason, Saray Grey (2005). *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tola, Fernando & Dragonetti de Tola, Carmen (1977-1979). Las inscripciones griegas del emperador indio Ashoka. *AHAM*, 20, 251-264.