



ABSTRACTS

Kanishka's Bactrian Pantheon in the Rabatak Inscription: The Numismatic Evidence

Martha L. Carter Ph.D., F. A. N. S.

In the Rabatak Inscription of Kanishka I the deities cited present a number of problems in relation to what is known of the Kushana pantheon from its coin reverse types. The goddess Nana is well-represented there as an important dynastic deity, and is fittingly characterized in the inscription as the deity from whom Kanishka obtained kingship. Another deity, Omma, whose identity is problematic, precedes her in the list of gods of the royal house, which follows with two deities rarely seen on Kushana coin reverses, Oromozdo and Mazdooano. The last three listed are a triad: Sroshardo, Narasao, and Miuro. Miuro is one of the most popular Kushana coin deities, both the names Narasao and Sroshardo are absent on coin reverses. Thanks to an added line in the inscription we find the names Maaseno and Bizago. From this explanation it is possible to equate Maaseno with Sroshardo and Bizago with Narasao. In this paper I will attempt to analyze Kanishka's Rabatak deities from a numismatic perspective, and provide some hypotheses regarding their significance.

Elymaean and Parthian Inscriptions from Khuzestan: a Survey **HARUTA Seiro (Tokai University, Hiratsuka, JAPAN)**

Kingdom of Elymais is a local dynasty in Khuzestan, contemporary with the Arshakids. The history of the kingdom can be divided into two periods: Period I, prior to c. 45 C.E. and Period II, posterior to 45 C.E. 45 C.E. is the year that the latest issues of Parthian coins at Susa (Šuš) are attested. Period II can also be divided into two sub-periods: Period IIA and IIB. Elymaean coins in Period IIA consist of copper tetradrachms and of copper drachms, while those in Period IIB of copper drachms and of smaller coins. Here inscriptions of the kingdom of Elymais, written in Elymaean Aramaic or in Parthian (under Arshakid rule?) will be treated.

1. To Unfasten the Entangled Knots Before discussing the inscriptions, we should list up the outdated or groundless theories and assertions on the Elymaean coins, because, in the studies of the Elymaeans, outdated articles in one field has often been quoted as "accepted theory" in articles of another fields.

First, as for the successive order of coins in Period IIA, Allotte de la Fuÿe's order, accepted before Augé 1979 and still quoted in "Elymais", in *Encyclopædia Iranica*, VIII, 1998, has no ground at all. This order first appeared in Allotte de la Fuÿe 1905, when he thought that Wrwd and Pr't of Elymaean coins are Arshakid rulers of 1st century B.C.E. Thus, the order that Pr't comes after Wrwd had lost basis at all after 1919 when Allotte de la Fuÿe clarified these Elymaean coins issued after 1st century C.E. Curiously, however, even after 1919, scholars including Allotte de la Fuÿe himself did not raise doubt on the basis of his order. This order also gave influence on Henning (1952)'s interpretation on Tang-e Sarvak inscriptions; then, Henning's article caused the very late dating of nearly all Elymaean rock reliefs by various scholars. Second, we should not follow the fantasy of Kahrstedt (1950); he asserted that all the coins of Period IIA were issued during 18-50 C.E. and the first king of these coins was a son of Artaban II, Arshakid ruler. Le Rider's minute study (Le Rider 1965) rooted this fantasy. Even after Le Rider's study, however, many articles mentioning Kahrstedt's theory affirmative, e.g., "Artabanus" in *Encyclopædia Iranica*, II, 1986. Third, the difference of Aramaic scripts on copper tetradrachms and on copper drachms, stressed by Henning, has often been underestimated by numismatists, while Henning's interpretation on Tang-e Sarvak inscriptions has repeatedly been quoted even after Shaked's important correction (Bivar - Shaked 1964). There are more groundless assertions on the Elymaeans. Haruta (1990) discussed all these points, but, written in Japanese, has not given a least influence. Here we should summarize his article: 1) As for the successive order (relative chronology) of coins in Period IIA, we should follow Augé's proposal: (No Legend) - Wrwd/Yrodes I - Pr't/P(h)raates - Wrwd/Wrwd II - Kbnškyrwrwd/Kwmškyrwrwd (or /Knmškyrwrwd). The order proposed by Vardanian (1984), adopted by Potts (1999), has little evidence and fatally contradicts the palaeographic study. 2) As for mints of Period IIA, we should follow the assumption of Le Rider (1965) in many points: copper tetradrachms were not issued at Šuš, while many of copper drachms were issued at Šuš. Hansman (1990), not available for Haruta then, was not correct because he did not utilize the coins found at Šuš. 3) As for the two Aramaic scripts on the legends of coins of Period IIA, we should follow Henning's statement: the legends on copper tetradrachms are written in Aramaic with Elymaean Aramaic scripts, while those on copper drachms are not in Aramaic, very probably in Parthian. In Period IIB, the legends on copper drachms are in Aramaic.