

I

TWO ESSAYS ON EARLY INDIAN CHRONOLOGY
AND LITERATURE

By HERMANN OLDENBERG

[THE following two articles, which appeared in the *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1911, seemed to me so important for the history of Buddhist literature that I was anxious to make them known to those of our readers who are not familiar with German. By the courtesy of Professor Oldenberg, and by the kind permission of the authorities of the Royal Academy at Göttingen, they have been translated into English, and now appear also in our Journal.—R.H. D.]

I

ON THE ERA OF KANIṢKA

THAT the question as to the date of the Kuṣana Kings will one day be settled by an archæological find is certain. It is none the less our duty to-day to make what we can out of such materials as we have. The question is of deep interest, not only for the epigraphist and the numismatist, but also for the historian of letters and the inquirer into Buddhism. It is my belief that we already have the true solution. But weighty opinions have pronounced in favour of other conclusions. Hence the need for fresh examination.

It was assumed some time ago by many that Kaniṣka was the founder of the Śaka era (A.D. 78). I shared with Fergusson¹ the responsibility for this view, the possibility of which has been but lately emphasized by Rapson.² I am now no longer disposed to hold this as pre-eminently probable. Not that it is opposed to the fact that Kaniṣka was not a Śaka, but a Kuṣana.³ The distinction between the various tribes coming in from Central Asia may well have

¹ *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, VIII, 292 ff.

² *Catal. of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty*, CVII.

³ The coins of Heraos or Miaos, on account of which I considered the Kuṣanas to be Śakas (*op. cit.* 295), are, it now appears, not to be read as von Sallet and P. Gardner deciphered them. Before the word ΚΑΙΙΑΝΟΥ, which probably means ΚΟΡΡΑΝΟΥ, stands not ΣΑΚΑ, as in Sallet's reproduction, but something more like ΣΑΝΑΒ. Cp. Cunningham, *Num. Chron.* 1890, 111 f.; Rapson, *Indian Coins*, 9 and pl. II, 1.

become obliterated in the imagination of the Indians, who probably only began some centuries later to connect the era with the name of the Śakas.¹ More significant than this is the fact of the very limited expansion of the Śaka era in North India.² Another point not exactly favourable to the association of the Śaka era with Kaṇiṣka, although it cannot claim to be a crucial one, is Kielhorn's indication that the word *varṣa* was later a favourite designation among the Śaka dates,³ whereas it was *saṃvatsara* that characterized the dates of the Kaṇiṣka series. The find of coins at Ahin Posh (to be presently dealt with) also makes me suspicious. It seems rather to suggest a moving of the era of Kaṇiṣka some decades forward.⁴

During recent years, in direct antithesis to such a moving forward, supporters have been won over to the view that the date of Kaṇiṣka is to be referred to the other widely distributed Indian era, the Vikrama era (57 B.C.). Lüders⁵ considers this hypothesis to be by far the most probable, "since Fleet and O. Franke, independently and by quite different ways, have come to the conclusion that both the Kadphises came not before but after Kaṇiṣka."

¹ Princes too, like the Western Kṣatrapas, who made use of the era without having founded it, might, as Rapson points out, have found mention in this connection. The idea that the era was called in its 169th year the Śaka era is an error, based on a forged inscription (Kielhorn, *Ep. Ind.* VII, 171; Fleet, *JRAS.* 1910, 818).

² Kielhorn, *Ind. Ant.* XXVI, 148.

³ *Ibid.* 153. Kielhorn also refers there to the standing use of *varṣa* among the western Kṣatrapas. It is approximately certain that the latter used the Śaka era.

⁴ On the other hand, I doubt whether, for this question, too much importance ought to be attributed to the Chinese record, according to which the King of the Yüe-chi (the nation to which Kaṇiṣka belongs) suffered in the year A.D. 90 a defeat at the hands of the Chinese, and paid the latter a yearly tribute (S. Lévi, *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes*, II; Boyer, *Journ. as.* 1900, I, 54, 9 f.). As a matter of fact, this does fall, by the adoption of the Śaka era, in the time of Kaṇiṣka. Is this adoption therefore impossible? The Chinese story may be coloured, and, finally, K. may also have suffered defeats.

⁵ *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*, 11.

From a note by Fleet,¹ we may expect from this eminent epigraphist a discussion on the Kadphises question. May I express the wish that he will examine the points dealt with below, which seem to me to throw doubts on such a solution ?²

As is well known, the chronological order of the Kuṣana princes generally accepted has been :

Kujula Kadphises.³

V'ima⁴ Kadphises.

Kaṇiṣka.

Huviṣka.

Vāsudeva.⁵

To date Kaṇiṣka's accession 57 B.C. renders necessary the relegating Kujula Kadphises to an age, which is at variance with Chinese records (see below) and numismatic facts, according to which he is definitely placed in the first century after Christ.⁶ The objection is overcome by placing

¹ *JRAS*, 1910, 1316.

² V. Smith, in *ZDMG*. LX, 65 n. 1, LXI, 406 n. 1 ; *Catal. of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, 63, has already expressed doubts about this. I refer especially to the same investigator's *Early History of India*, where several points are touched upon (p. 241 ff.), which I also consider to be decisive. Unfortunately, I did not notice the last-named disquisition till I had finished my task. Perhaps the agreements between two investigations conducted independently of each other will lend weight to the conclusions drawn in them.

³ With Boyer (*Journ. as.* 1900, 1, 554 ff.) and others, I consider Kujula Kadphises to be identical with the Kozola Kadaphes of certain coins. Is he also identical with Kujula Kara Kadphises (cp. Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 17) ?

⁴ So I spell it instead of Hima, because of Rapson's evidence in the *Transactions of the Oriental Congress in Algiers*, I, 219.

⁵ For our purpose we need not examine the newly discovered Vāsiṣka ; see recently Vogel, *JRAS*. 1910, 1311 ff. ; Fleet, *ibid.* 1315 ff.

⁶ Mention should here be made of the frequently noted similarity between his copper coins (KOZOAA KAΔAΦE□) and coins of the later Augustan era. Prof. Dressel says that the head certainly recalls Augustus : " There is, however," he adds, " nothing amounting to a portrait-likeness, which would anyway only be accidental . . . but if the evidence points that way, the Kozola coins could be referred to a somewhat later date, for the heads of Gaius (Caligula), of Claudius,

the two Kadphises after the Kaniska-Huviska-Vāsudeva series, which is firmly fixed in this order by epigraphic and numismatic evidence.

Now, is this transposition plausible?

O. Franke¹ gives his reasons in the following observations:

The Buddhists relate, as a highly significant event, that Kaniska was converted to their faith after he had been an unbeliever and had trodden underfoot the law of Buddha. Now the Chinese, on the other hand, mention, as one of the first associations of their nation with Buddhism, that, in the year 2 B.C., a Chinese official had learnt to know Buddhist sūtras by oral transmission, through the agency of an ambassador of the king of the Ta Yüe-chi—*i.e.*, of Kaniska's people, as has been stated. How, asks Franke (p. 93), are we to explain that Kaniska was the first among the kings of the Yüe-chi to be converted to Buddhism, although he is supposed to have reigned *after* the Kadphises in the second century A.D., and this conversion was celebrated with great jubilation, when, as early as the first century B.C., a king of the Yüe-chi was anxious for the spread of Buddhism? The problem is supposed to be solved by the inverted order suggested above. In that case Kaniska reigned before the event related of 2 B.C., from about the time of the Vikrama era (p. 99).

I cannot really see the difficulty which is here to be overcome by a procedure overturning so much. The passage translated by Franke does not speak at all of a

and even of Nero during the early part of his reign show points of contact with those of Kozola." For the second Kadphises (and equally for Kaniska and his followers) we have to take into account the approximation of his gold coinage to that of the Roman *aurei*, first minted in any considerable numbers under Augustus. See Percy Gardner, *The Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India* in the Brit. Museum, LIII; Rapson, *Indian Coins*, 17 f. V. Smith, *Early History of India*, 239 note.

¹ "On the Turkish Nations and Scythians of Central Asia" (*Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1904), 90 ff.

king of the Yüe-chi who about 2 B.C. worked for the spread of Buddhism; it only speaks of an ambassador who knew Buddhist sūtras and communicated them to the Chinese.¹ That happened perhaps a century before Kaṇiṣka's time, if the date to be fixed for him, which I shall presently support, is the correct one. It very probably happened even before the expansion of the Yüe-chi dominion in India proper (see below). Now it is alleged to be very difficult to reconcile this episode with the records that Kaṇiṣka should first be hostile, and then a convert to Buddhism, and that this event should have been regarded by the Buddhists as of great significance. Yet it should be considered how confusedly the most varied forms of belief, originating in quite different lands, were in those times intermixed one with another. The coins of Kaṇiṣka bear witness themselves as to that with a clearness that cannot be surpassed. Franke observes (p. 93) that "Kaṇiṣka was the first to be converted to Buddhism." I find in the sources no support for this "first." The great weight which the Buddhists laid on his conversion is sufficiently explained, even if, in the fluctuations of religious movements, Buddhist currents of varying strength should have existed among the Yüe-chi already before Kaṇiṣka—long before him, outside India.²

¹ Elsewhere, it is true, a different conception of the Chinese story is given; see Franke, 92 n. 1. For our purpose it is of no great importance.

² That coins testify to matters of that kind for the time of Kadphises I certainly consider very doubtful. Rapson's (*JRAS.* 1897, 319 ff.) identification of the *σθηροσσυ* of the Hermaios-Kadphises coins with *sthavira, thera*, is not for me convincing (cp. also Boyer, *Journ. as.*, 1900, I, 529 ff.). Is it plausible to separate the *σθηρος* of these badly written legends (or occasionally even *σθηρς*; cp. v. Sallet, *Nachfolger Alexanders*, 119) from the *σωρηρος*, occupying a corresponding place and elsewhere used by Hermaios? It should be considered that about this time—i.e., of Gondophares—both *[σω]ρηροσ* and *σωρηροπος* are found (Smith, *Catal. of Coins in the Ind. Museum*, 56). The fact that the Indian translation gives *mahatasa* hardly precludes acceptance of *σ[ω]ρηρος*. The agreement between the Greek and Indian text is not always absolute; and especially here, at the very close of the Greek dominion, an inaccurate translation would be scarcely surprising.

Kaniška was after all, as a second Asoka, of pre-eminent significance for the history of the faith. Would they not as a matter of course commemorate the conversion of such a man, or even—but that must remain matter of conjecture—invent a conversion on the analogy of that of Asoka?"¹

Now it is by our efforts to evade the presumptive difficulty of the existence of Buddhism among the Yüe-chi before Kaniška, that actual and most serious difficulties are created.

Let the reader recall the main facts which the annalists of the later Han dynasty give in a much-discussed passage (Franke, 66; Chavannes, T'oung Pao, 1907, 189 ff.). Long before the Yüe-chi invaded India, they are found under the rule of five princes. One of them, K'iu-tsiu-k'io, the prince of Kuei-shuang, subjugates the other four. He establishes himself as King of Kuei-shuang. He conquers parts of Parthia, Kipin, etc., and

Even should a "great" be implied in *σθηροσσι*, *sthavira* would not seem to me quite to correspond with the sense which *mahatasa* implies (it would rather perhaps suggest an expression from the language of Kadphises). And finally, even if *sthavira* was meant, it would be, in my judgment, rash to ascribe to the word, as such and especially in view of the *mahatasa*, a Buddhist-ecclesiastical sense. The *dhramathitasa*, sometimes *sacadr*^o, certainly contains no Buddhist confession either, but belongs to the *dhramikasa* (= *δικαιου*) so often found on coins. Similarly it seems to me doubtful to find Buddhist tendencies in interpreting the symbol *nandipada*, which is found frequently on the Vima Kadphises coins (see, e.g., B. v. Sallet, *Nachfolger Alexanders*, 165; Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1892, pl. XV, 1, 2, 3, 5, reverse). This symbol, it is true, plays a noteworthy rôle on Buddhist monuments (cf., among others, Cunningham, *The Bhilsa Topes*, 357, and pl. XXXII; also Foucher, *L'art gréco-bouddhique*, I, 428 ff.; Hardy, *König Asoka*, 53 [bas-relief of the eastern gate of Sanchi]). But as *nandipada* (Bhagvānlāl Indraji, *J. Bombay Br. R.A.S.* XV, 320) the symbol is just as much Saivite, and being found just on the coins mentioned close to Śiva and the Bull Nandi, may well be interpreted in this sense (cf. Rapson, *Catal. of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty*, p. CLXXV).

¹ So also Smith, *Early History of India*, 246.

dies over eighty years of age.¹ He is succeeded by his son, Yen-kao-chên, who subjugates India and rules it through a vice-regent. "The Yüe-chi became thereafter exceedingly rich and flourishing. In every land they were known as the Kings of Kuei-shuang, but the Chinese kept to the old name, and spoke of them as Ta Yüe-chi." I will not repeat here the reasons for identifying Kuei-shuang with Kuṣana, and K'iu-tsiu-k'io and his son with the two Kadphises. Franke, with Chavannes and many others, regards these identifications as certain; and, indeed, no serious doubt seems to be called for. If, then, the Kuṣana dominion, expanding from the north-west, reaches the gates of India under the first Kadphises, and then, under the second Kadphises, penetrates far into India, we must ask: What becomes of Kaṇiṣka, Huviṣka, and Vāsudeva, if we are to place them *before* the Kadphises?

We know that Kaṇiṣka extended his rule very far into India. The great monuments, such as Mathurā, and much besides, convince us that the accounts of a reign of remarkable brilliance are not merely the phantasies of Buddhist enthusiasm. Then come after him, still, as alleged, before the Kadphises, Huviṣka and Vāsudeva, with the stately series of epigraphic and numismatic documents telling of them. How can all that be pushed back to a time before the *beginnings* of the Indian dominion of the Kuṣanas to which the Chinese testify?² Does it not rather distinctly correspond to the passage from the Chinese Chronicle given above, which shows how, after the conquest of India by the son of K'iu-tsiu-k'io, the Kuṣana rule became "exceedingly rich and flourishing," to which the gold coins of these Kings might serve as an illustration?

¹ Chavannes, *op. cit.* 191 n. 1, gives reasons for placing the victories of K'iu-tsiu-k'io between A.D. 9 (the end of the earlier Han dynasty) and A.D. 92 (death of Pan-ku). Franke, *op. cit.*, gives as *terminus post quem* and *ante quem* A.D. 25 and 81.

² What Franke says, p. 96 ff., seems to be based on a consciousness of this difficulty, but not to overcome it.

My objection to the inversion suggested by Fleet and Franke is, in my opinion, very greatly strengthened by the series of coins of the kings in question. It seems to me that an examination of the coins will lead in exactly the same direction as that in which the examination just carried out has led. From the beginning the numismatists have placed the Kadphises group before the Kaṇiṣka-Huviṣka-Vāsudeva group. I believe they were perfectly right.

Let us for the moment leave Kadphises I (Kujula), and give our attention only to Kadphises II (V'ima) and the Kaṇiṣka group. There is no need to demonstrate that these kings belong together. It is quite sufficient to look at their coins.¹

But, within this series, there is a clear distinction between Kadphises on one side, and Kaṇiṣka-Huviṣka-Vāsudeva on the other. It is sufficient to indicate, among other evidence, the title PAONANO PAO, which is common to the last-named kings, and does not appear in connection with Kadphises; and, on the other hand, the Kharoṣṭhī script, which is used by Kadphises alone, not by the others.²

Which, now, comes earlier, which later? Observe how the series fits on to what precedes, and prolongs itself into that which follows. Kadphises bears the title βασιλευς βασιλεων σωτηρ μεγας (and correspondingly the Indian equivalents).³ That clearly connects him with the preceding times. Kaṇiṣka comes next to him, because he also is called βασιλευς βασιλεων on some of his coins. On others, however, he has had inscribed PAONANO PAO. Huviṣka and his successors have no longer the Greek,

¹ Besides the publications of v. Sallet and P. Gardner, Cunningham's *Num. Chron.*, 1892, and V. Smith's *Catal. of Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, may be mentioned.

² The only exception is a coin of Huviṣka? Cp. Fleet, *JRAS.* 1908, 183 n. 1.

³ He shares this title with the "unnamed king," who must have stood to him in a nearer relation, which we cannot define with certainty.

but exclusively the middle Persian intitulation.¹ If those coins are examined which come after Vāsudeva, and which connect his stamp with that of the Guptas and the so-called Skytho-Sāsānides ("Later Kushans," Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1893, pl. VIII f.; cp. Smith, *Catal.*, 87 ff.), I think it will be acknowledged to be impossible to find among them where to locate a βασιλευς βασιλεων σωτηρ μεγας.

Similar observations may be made with regard to the character of the script in the coin legends. Kadphises has the Kharoṣṭhī script in common with the Greek and Indo-Parthian princes; it connects him with them. Then this script is no longer found on the coins of these regions.² The Greek script, on the other hand, with Kadphises—and also somewhat further with Kaṇiṣka—has preserved a tolerably correct appearance.³ With Vāsudeva it is slovenly. After the time of Vāsudeva it is lost in disfigured, more or less unrecognizable, repetitions of forms, the meaning of which, it may be, had become partly no longer understood. Next, let us follow the details in the figure of the depicted King—say, nose and mouth, cap or helmet, coat or armour, the appearance of the saint-like halo round his head. I make no attempt at more detailed descriptions, for to look at Gardner's, Cunningham's, and Smith's beautiful reproductions will show, more clearly than I can describe, how the chronological series here runs. The appearance of the variegated mass of divinities of divers origins on the reverse of the coins leads to the same result. Beside them, as is well known, appears the figure of Buddha. The great number

¹ Exception: the coin of Huviṣka (Smith, *Catal.*, p. 81, No. 39), with the remains of a legend ΑΙΩΝ, part of βασιλεων? Smith remarks: "I suspect that this coin is double struck." Cp. Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1892, 107 f.

² For the only known (questionable) exception, see p. 8, n. 2. Among the western Kṣatrapas the Kharoṣṭhī ceases with Caṣṭana, some decades later than with the Kuṣanas, if the place which I maintain for them is right; towards 200 years later, if Kaṇiṣka's date is the Vikrama era!

³ Cp. Rapson's (*J.R.A.S.* 1905, 812 f.) remarks on the form of the A.

of the divinities of Kaṇiṣka and Huviṣka diminishes during the time immediately following. In the time of Vāsudeva there are only three left (Fleet, *JRAS.* 1908, 178); later on only two (OHPO, evidently = Śiva, and the goddess with the horn of plenty, APΔOXpO, the Avestan Ashi Vanuhi), these being then traceable for a long time; they hold their ground until quite late, the one among the Skytho-Sāsānides, the other among the Guptas (Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 19). If we try to insert into this series, after the coins of Vāsudeva, the Śiva which occurs only among those of Kadphises, we shall understand that, by such an insertion, the continuity is broken. This Śiva looks very different from the OHPO of Vāsudeva, and later. Kadphises has nothing that we can place beside the APΔOXpO.

The monograms of the coins are also significant. On the one hand, Kadphises has the monogram *nandipada* already mentioned (above p. 6, *n.*). This appears also in the time of Kadphises I (see below), on certain coins belonging to Gondophares (see below), or closely connected with his.¹ It also appears on those of Zeionises, and, with a variant, also with the "Stratega" Aspavarma;² but to Kaṇiṣka and his followers it seems, at least in this form, to be approximately unknown.³ On the other hand, that monogram, which is characteristic of the Kuṣanas, begins with Kadphises; but it exhibits, on closer examination, a

¹ Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1890, pl. XIV, 8. Cp. v. Sallet, *Nachfolger Alexanders d. Gr.*, 165; V. Smith, *ZDMG.* LX, 71 *n.* 2.

² *Num. Chron.*, 1890, pl. XV, 6. Further, see Rapson, *Catal. of the Coins of the Andhra Dyn.*, index III under Nandipada, and in the index of Smith's *Catalogue* (p. 342).

³ I find it, again, in Cunningham, on the coins of Vāsudeva (*Num. Chron.*, 1892, pl. XIV, E, F) and of the "later Kushans," as well as on the Kuṣana-like coins of the Sāsānid Ormazd II (beginning of the fourth century; *ibid.*, 1893, pl. XIV) in a more developed form, and distinct from the form which we find at the time of Kadphises. The symbol, it is true, is found once in its old form at the time of Huviṣka, according to Gardner, 155 (No. 159). Might this possibly be the later form?

remarkable development. At the time of Kadphises it has the form which we recognize, *e.g.*, from Cunningham's impressions, *Num. Chron.*, 1892, pl. XV, 2, 3, obverse, XVI, 1, 2, reverse; (in von Sallet, 186, key-shaped symbol 7¹). Just so, it continually recurs under Kaṇiṣka, if only, as a matter of course, the "later Kushans," who to a certain extent repeat that King's name, are kept distinct (Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1893. Cp. Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 19).²

Huviṣka follows. Cunningham gives several times the same monogram for him too. But, beside this, a somewhat more complicated form frequently appears; a horizontal stroke has appeared between the upper and the lower parts (see *e.g.*, Cunningham, *op. cit.*, 1892, pl. XIX, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc.).³ Next, Vāsudeva, keeping this (or a very similar?) form of monogram in some cases, changes it in the rest, in that he closes the opening at the bottom in various ways (*e.g.*, *op. cit.*, pl. XXIV., 1, 2, 3, reverse, 6, 7, etc.). In this changed form, then, the monogram passes over to the "later Kushans," and appears also among the Guptas (V. Smith, *Coinage of the Gupta Dynasty*, *JRAS.* 1889, pl. V).

Here, too, anyone with this series of forms before his eyes will note that the natural sequence is quite severed if Kadphises is placed later than Vāsudeva. Kadphises comes, clearly, close to Kaṇiṣka, *i.e.*, since Huviṣka immediately follows, *he* immediately precedes Kaṇiṣka. Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 17, says, when he comes in his description to Kad-

¹ Among the impressions of Cunningham, which I refer to here, there is only one variant, pl. XV, 12.

² Exceptions, with the form of monogram belonging to Vāsudeva, would appear at the time of Kaṇiṣka, *Num. Chron.*, pl. XVII, 7, 8. But it seems to me certain that No. 8 ought to be ascribed to the "later Kushans," because of the general appearance of the King and the inscription (I think the coin which Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1893, pl. VIII, 1, ascribes to the "later Kushans" is identical with this). In the same way, it seems, No. 7 should be judged.

³ According to Smith, *Catal.*, p. 74, No. 67 ff., some cases of this monogram would seem to have been found already at the time of Kaṇiṣka. Gardner does not assign it to Kaṇiṣka.

phises II: "The order of succession of the Indian Kuṣāna monarchs from this point to the last quarter of the second century, A.D., is certain." Whether the date here stated is exact—he evidently means the end of Vāsudeva's reign—we must for the moment reserve. As to the rest, I believe that, as against the new hypothesis, Rapson will be found to be right.

Beside the kings thus far discussed, Kadphises I stands in a certain peculiar position. In their case, the mintage remains practically unchanged, the gold mintage—a novelty not found before—being especially important. But there is no impression of Kadphises I on gold coins. The very characteristic appearance of the kings represented, which is seen on all coins from the time of Kadphises II and Kaṇiṣka, is not to be found on the coins of Kadphises I; nor do we see on these coins the divinities we see on the others; nor has Kadphises the Kuṣāna-monogram.¹

It will not surely occur to anyone to move him further back alone, without V'ima Kadphises, from the place hitherto assigned to him. Such an idea has never yet to my knowledge been suggested. The fact that the name Kadphises appears to unite him chronologically with Kadphises II might, it is true, lead us astray. But the characteristics of his coins, which we have just mentioned, will certainly not permit us to place him behind or among the $\rho\text{AONANO}\rho\text{AO}$, for instance, near Vāsudeva. His Kharoṣṭhī legend refers him rather to a place near his namesake Kadphises II, where there can only be the question of the place before Kadphises II, since the place after the latter is occupied by Kaṇiṣka. But, above all, his connection with the Greek king Hermaios secures him this place. The coins with Hermaios alone, those with Hermaios on the obverse, and with Kujula Kadphises on the reverse, then those with Kadphises alone, enable us to trace clearly—as has long been known—the stadia of the course of events, in

¹ The *Nandipadam*, however, on several of his coins associates him with Kadphises II (Smith, *Catal.*, 67).

which the Kuṣana dominion drove out that of the Greek.¹

If we take, in addition, the close affiliation of the types in Kadphises coins to classic types, whereby their appearance is seen to be clearly distinct from that of the remote offshoots and depraved styles, if again we take the Chinese statements discussed above (p. 4), we are not likely still seriously to doubt that Kujula Kadphises cannot be removed from the place formerly assigned him at the beginning of the series.²

To confirm this conclusion, we may recall the combinations of the coins of different kings in the finds made. We can, it is true, only arrive at a conclusive judgment when we have before us a description of all discoveries, a task which, it seems, the Royal Asiatic Society has in view. I should like, however, to draw attention here to some significant facts which happen to be at hand.

First of all there is the discovery in a Stūpa of Manikyala (Cunningham, *Achæol. Survey*, II, 162). Together with worn-out Roman coins of the end of the

¹ The following is also worthy of notice: Numismatists differ in their accounts of the forms of the Sigma found on the coins. Only renewed examinations of the originals can give any certainty. What is said here is entirely of a provisional nature. With this safeguard, then, I notice that Gardner as well as Cunningham (*Num. Chron.*, 1892, 63 ff., 98 ff.) nowhere show with Kaṇiṣka and Huviṣka the form Σ, but always C. Is Smith, *Catal.*, 71, right in ascribing the legends HAIΘΣ to Kaṇiṣka? Cunningham's (*op. cit.*, pl. XVI, 1, 3) impressions give HAIΘC most clearly. Let the scripts of these Kings be now laid beside the ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΤΗΡΟΣΣΤ ΕΡΜΑΙΟΥ of the Hermaios-Kujula coins.

² "Beginning" might so far be taken *cum grano salis* that the appearance of smaller rulers of the same family, outside India, and coming before or near to the founder of the great rule of the Kuṣanas, is not precluded. Such a position may be assigned to that Heraos or Miaos mentioned above (p. 1, n. 3), of whom ΚΟΡΡΑΝΟΥ appears to be said, and on whose relation to Kujula Kadphises, and to the unnamed *σωτηρ μέγας*, compare Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, Chr. 1890, 112 f.; Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 16. Smith, *Catal.*, 94, locates him in Western Afghanistan.

Republic there were found gold coins of Kaṇiṣka, copper coins of the same and of the two Kadphises, but none of Huviṣka or Vāsudeva. The inscription of the Stūpa (see recently Lüders, *JRAS.* 1909, 645 ff.) leaves hardly any doubt that it was erected under Kaṇiṣka. The inferences with regard to the position of the two Kadphises in the series of kings are clear.

Wilson (*Ar. Antiqua*, 358) testifies that coins of Kaṇiṣka have been met with almost everywhere mixed with those of his predecessors (that is, the two Kadphises). He also says (373, cp. 20) that those of "Kenorano" (*i.e.*, Huviṣka; Oer Kenorano is a misread legend of this king) are found generally with those of Kadphises and Kaṇiṣka. Hoernle (*Proc. As. Soc. Beng.*, 1895, 82) reports on a discovery (in the territory of Paṭiālā) of masses of coins of the second Kadphises and of Kaṇiṣka (cp. also Thomas, *JRAS.* 1877, 219 n. 3). With regard to the simultaneous appearance of coins of Kadphises II, Kaṇiṣka, Huviṣka, cp. also Smith, *Early Hist.*, 253 n. 2. All these accounts speak in the most decided manner against placing Kadphises (especially the second Kadphises) later than Vāsudeva; they support rather the placing of him next to (which must then mean, before) Kaṇiṣka.

Finally, I will mention the find at Ahin Posh, of which I have to speak more in detail presently. There was found, together with Roman coins, one of Huviṣka, and a number of Kaṇiṣka and V'ima Kadphises coins. If Kadphises came at the end of the series, the absence of Vāsudeva coins would be curious. Though one such discovery may accidentally lead astray, we shall nevertheless be bound to give weight to the unanimous testimony of the whole of them, which exactly tallies with the result of our other arguments.

I will draw attention further to the difficulty which arises, if we accept the Vikrama era for Kaṇiṣka, with reference to Gondophares, who, as is known, appears in the Christian tradition. If the latter reigned, as all no doubt rightly believe, about the middle of the first century A.D., he would collide with Vāsudeva or the later Kuṣanas.

In point of fact, he is to be assigned to about the beginning of the Kuṣana time—to about the same time as Kujula Kadphises (I). The places where his coins were discovered, compared with those of Kujula, seem to bring both kings near together; and Masson's discovery of some coins of Gondophares with many of Kujula, and some of the unknown king, in the Stūpas near Jelalabad, point to contemporaneity.¹ Kaṇiṣka and his followers have then extended their rule over wide regions which had belonged to Gondophares, leaving him no longer any space for his kingdom.²

It is all in keeping herewith when v. Sallet emphasizes the priority of Gondophares to Vāsudeva on numismatic grounds (*Nachf. Alexanders*, 52); and when Bühler (*Ind. Palæog.*, 25) declares his priority to Kaṇiṣka on palæographic grounds. We may repeat again that the Fleet-Franke theory on the Kuṣanas does not agree with the clues by which we must try to let ourselves be led.

Of such clues I will, in conclusion, adduce the following:

Firstly, the localizing of the older Vikrama-dated records by Kielhorn (*Ind. Ant.*, XX, 403 f.): the oldest being all from Eastern Rajputana—*i.e.*, the parts adjacent or belonging to Malwa; then, up to about 1300, from a square, the corners of which lie at the mouth of the Narbada, at Gaya, Delhi, and the Runn of Cutch. For an era founded by Kaṇiṣka we should have expected more northerly discoveries.³

Then I should like to refer to the expressions of opinion which, quite lately, the excavation of the so-called house of Nāgadeva at Bhitā near Allahabad have elicited from the director of Indian archæological research, J. H.

¹ See on all this P. Gardner, *op. cit.*, L; Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1890, 123. Also what the same *Archæol. Survey*, II, 168, and Hoernle, *Proc. As. Soc. Beng.*, 1895, 88, say agrees with it.

² Cp. in this connection Vinc. Smith, *ZDMG*. See also what Cunningham says on the spread of Vāsudeva's coins, *Num. Chr.*, 1892, 50.

³ What Fleet says, *JRAS.* 1905, 232, does not seem to me to do away with the doubt.

Marshall. The materials upon which the observations of this eminent archæologist are based are not accessible to me. I can only quote his words:¹

“One fact . . . which seems to assert itself on this site, as well as elsewhere, is that a considerable period must have elapsed between the art epoch associated with the dynasty of the Śuṅgas and the epoch of the Kushaṇas. The art of the former was widespread and deeply rooted throughout Northern and Central India, and must have flourished well on towards the close of the first century B.C., if not longer. Yet, when we come to the well-defined Kushaṇa strata among the buildings on this site, we find no objects whatever even in the most decadent Śuṅga style. How is their absence to be explained if we place the beginning of the Kushaṇa era in the first century B.C.? . . . Certainly the date of A.D. 78 for Kanishka’s accession seems to suit much better the date obtainable here.”²

Now against the date named by Marshall in the

¹ *JRAS.* 1911, 134 f. Compare also the words of the same investigator, *ibid.*, 1909, 1059 f. Further, the remark of M. Foucher might be considered (*L’Art gréco-bouddhique*, I, 623), according to which “le témoignage des bas-reliefs rapporte le *Buddha-carita* au II^e siècle de notre ère.” One might, however, hesitate to draw too readily any conclusions for the time of Kaṇiṣka, since the chronology of the monuments is partly very uncertain and partly itself depends upon the view taken of Kaṇiṣka.

² In conclusion, I will sum up here scattered remarks on the difficulties that arise by placing Kaṇiṣka in the Vikrama era :

1. Between the coins of Vāsudeva and the Skytho-Sāsānid coins formed on the model of the former there would be, as Smith, *Catal.*, 64, has already noticed, a surprisingly wide interval. Also between the former and the Gupta coins.

2. What applies to Kadphises II (above, p. 3, n. 6) applies, of course, also to Kaṇiṣka, that his gold coinage very probably presupposes the Roman aurei (Gardner, LIII). It becomes thereby very difficult to place the beginning of Kaṇiṣka’s reign towards the middle of the first century B.C.

3. The form of the Sigma C prevailing with K. raises doubt. Cp. above, p. 13, n. 1; Rapson, *JRAS.* 1905, 811.

last sentence, and which I used to support, some arguments were touched upon at the beginning of this article. I here come back to one of them, to that which rests upon the frequently mentioned discovery at Ahin Posh. There in one stūpa have been found coins of Domitian, Trajan, and Sabina (the last A.D. 128-136), together with some of Kadphises II., Kanīṣka, and a single coin of Huviṣka. Smith (*JRAS.* 1903, 35) will probably be right when he remarks thereupon: "The presumption, of course, is that the monument was erected in the reign of Huviṣka, the latest Indian Sovereign whose coinage is included in the deposit." The positive dates of Huviṣka which we possess reach from the year 33 to 60.¹ If we refer them to the era of A.D. 78, the latest gives A.D. 138.

The coin of Sabina must thus have been pretty quick in reaching India. This is indeed possible, but it is surely more credible² that the era lies later. How much later? The question will scarcely be answered by the thought of the Seleucid era, with the hundreds omitted—a very improbable hypothesis. From the Sinological side it has been pointed out, that the Chinese account of Po-t'iao, the King of the Ta-Yüe-chi, who in A.D. 230 sent an ambassador to China, might possibly refer to Vāsudeva. M. Chavannes has kindly referred me to a remark of his own on the subject (*T'oung Pao*, 1904, 489 f.): Po-t'iao, he suggests, may be a permissible transcription of the name Vāsudeva. Since, however, in this series of kings, several Vāsudevas are met with, he holds it improbable that the successor of Kanīṣka and Huviṣka is meant. Hereon, the eminent Sinologist confesses to me, that he would express himself less positively to-day than in the words of the last of these sentences.

With the identification of Po-t'iao with the Vāsudeva of the inscriptions, we should now arrive at about A.D. 130-150. That is perhaps later than is probable. The beginnings of

¹ Lüders, *Ind. Ant.*, 1904, 39, 106.

² The difficulties would be greater if that coin had been described as worn out. Yet P. Gardner denies this (*op. cit.*, LI, n. 2).

the Kuṣāna rule will thereby be pushed back further than is desirable—from events close to which, according to what has been discussed, they would appear to fall. We may recall (a) the Chinese dates for the victories of the K'io-tsiu-k'io (above p. 7, *n.* 1), which accord less with that allocation than with one of some decades earlier; then (b) the point as to Gondophares (p. 14 f.). Above all, difficulties arise in connection with the statement of Franke, that the Chinese testimony to the florescence of the Kuṣāna dominion after the conquest of India by the son of K'iu-tsiu-k'io (above p. 6) is to be carried back to a source at the latest in A.D. 124.¹ In connection with that florescence, it is Kaṇiṣka's time that will above all be recalled to mind; it seems improbable that he should only succeed to the throne several years after the compilation of the Chinese information alluded to. Taking all in all, then, I would prefer—as compared with an assignment based on that statement about Po-t'iao—the estimate of Boyer (*Journ. As.*, 1900, I, 579), which fixes the Kaṇiṣka era towards the end of the first century A.D.—a slight readjustment, earlier or later, remaining of course conceivable.

¹ Franke, *op. cit.*, 71. I can, of course, only quote, not prove. After what Chavannes has made out, *T'oung Pao*, 1907, 150 (but see also p. 191, *n.* 1), a somewhat later date for the statement referred to might not be wholly inadmissible.