CHAPTER VII. THE FALL OF THE MAGADHAN AND INDO-GREEK POWERS

SECTION I. THE KĀNVAS, THE LATER ŚUŃGAS AND THE LATER MITRAS

Vasudeva at whose instance the "over-libidinous Śuṅga" was "reft of his life" founded about 75 B.C. a new line of kings known as the Kānva or Kānvāyana dynasty. The Purāṇas give the following account of this family. "He (Vasudeva), the Kānvāyana, will be king 9 years. His son Bhūmimitra will reign 14 years. His son Nārāyana will reign 12 years. His son Suśarman will reign 10 years. These are remembered as the Śuṅga-bhṛtya Kānvāyana kings. These four Kānva Brāhmaṇas will enjoy the earth.¹ They will be righteous. In succession to them the 'earth' will pass to the Andhras." Bhūmimitra may have been identical with the king of that name known from coins.²

The chronology of the Kānva dynasty is a matter of controversy. In his Early History of the Deccan, Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observes, the founder of the Andhra-bhṛtyas is said to have uprooted not only the Kānvas,

¹ Possibly only Eastern Mālwa where stood the later "Śuṅga" capital Vidiśā or Besnagar, and some adjoining tracts.
² Mr. J. C. Ghosh is inclined to include among the Kānva kings a ruler named Sarvatāta who is known (from the Ghosundī Inscription, Ind. Ant., 1932, Nov., 203ff; Ep. Ind., xxii. 198ff) to have been a devotee of Saṅkar-śaṇa and Vāsudeva and a performer of the horse-sacrifice. But the identification of the Gājāyana family, to which the king belonged, with the Gāḍāyanas or Gudāyanas (cf. IHQ, 1933, 797ff) does not seem to be plausible. There seems to be no more reason to identify the Gājāyanas with the Gāḍāyanas than with the Gāḍāyanas or Gāṅgāyanas of the Śunaka or Kaśyapa group (Caland, Baudh. Srauta Sūtra III, 423-454). It is important to remember the fact that the Hariwāṃsa refers to a Kaśyapa dvaīja as the reviver of the Ātvamedha in the Kaḷi Age. The Gāṅgāyanas no doubt also recall the Gāṅgas of Mysore who claimed to belong to the Kānvāyana gotra (A New History of the Indian People, Vol. VI, p. 248). But the equation Gājāyana = Gāṅgāyana is not proved.
but 'whatever was left of the power of the Śuṅgas'. And the Kāṇvas are pointedly spoken of as Śuṅga-bhrityas or servants of the Śuṅgas. It, therefore, appears likely that when the princes of the Śuṅga family became weak, the Kāṇvas usurped the whole power and ruled like the Peshwas in modern times, not uprooting the dynasty of their masters but reducing them to the character of nominal sovereigns. Thus then these dynasties reigned contemporaneously, and hence the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śuṅgas include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas.

Now, the Purānic evidence only proves that certain princes belonging to the Śuṅga stock continued to rule till the so-called "Andhra-bhritya" conquest and were the contemporaries of the Kāṇvas. But there is nothing to show that these rois faineants of the "Śuṅga" stock were identical with any of the ten "Śuṅga" kings mentioned by name in the Purānic lists, who reigned 112 years. On the contrary, the distinct testimony of the Purāṇas that Devabhūti, the tenth and last "Śuṅga" of the Purānic lists, was the person slain by Vasudeva, the first Kāṇva, probably shows that the rois faineants, who ruled contemporaneously with Vasudeva and his successors, were later than Devabhūti, and were not considered to be important enough to be mentioned by name. Consequently the 112 years that tradition assigns to the ten "Śuṅga" kings from Pushyamitra to Devabhūti do not include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to accept with slight modifications the views of Dr. Smith regarding the date of the family. According to the system of chronology adopted in these pages, the period of Kāṇva rule extended from cir. B.C. 75 to cir. B.C. 30.

Very little is known about the history of Magadha proper after the Kāṇvas. To reconstruct the history of the province from the fall of the Kāṇvas to the rise of the Gupta dynasty is a difficult task. The so-called Andhras or Śātavāhanas who are represented as destroying the Kāṇva sovereignty, apparently in Eastern Mālwa, do not
appear to have ruled in Magadha proper.¹ The greatest among them are called ‘Sovereigns of the Deccan’ (Dakshināpathapati) and an accurate idea of the field of their political and military activities may be obtained from the epithets ‘tisamuda-toyapītavāhana’, ‘whose chargers had drunk the water of the three oceans’, and ‘trisamudrā-dhipati’, ‘overlord of the three seas’ occurring in epigraphic and literary records. The sway of rulers like the Guptas, on the other hand, is said to have extended as far as the four seas.

The discovery of a clay seal with the legend Mokhalinam² suggests that at one time the Gayā region was under the sway of Maukhari chiefs. But the precise date of the record is not known. Equally uncertain is the date of Mahārāja Trikamala who ruled in the same region in the year 64 of an unspecified era. Epigraphic evidence of a late date points to some connection between the Lichchhavis and Pushpapura (Pātaliputra). But it is difficult to say how far the tradition is genuine. The only rulers of note in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era, whom we know from epigraphic evidence to have ruled in Magadha and the neighbouring provinces, are the so-called ‘Mitras’. The prevalence of ‘Mitra’ rule is also hinted at by references in Jaina literature to Balamitra and Bhānumitra among the successors of Pushyamitra. From a study of available epigraphs Dr. Barua has compiled a list of ‘Mitra kings’.

¹ There is no valid reason for connecting the Nāruruvar Kannar (Silapadukaram, xxvi, Dikshit’s trans. 996f.) either with the Sātakarnis or with Magadha. The expression “Kannar” sometimes stands alone proving that Nāruruvar is only a qualifying adjective, not a part of the name. The Ganges, even if it be the Bhāgirathī, and not Gataū Ī Gāṅgā or the Godāvari, with which the family is associated, flows through other territories besides Magadha, showing that there is no necessary connection between that province and the kings in question.

² Fleet, CII, 14. The legend is written in Mauryan Brāhmī. The Maukhari kings may have exercised sway over some little principality under the suzerainty of the Mauryas or the Śuṅgas. Three inscriptions have recently been discovered at Bādā in the Kotah State in Rājputāna recording the erection of sacrificial pillars by Maukhari Mahāsenapatis (generals or military governors) in the third century A.D. (Ep. Ind., XXIII, 54).
It includes the names of Bṛihatsvātimitra, Indrāṅgmitra, Brahmanitra, Bṛhaspatimitra, (Dhar)mamitra and Vishnumitra. To these should perhaps be added the names of Varuṇamitra and Gomitra. Of these only Indrāṅgmitra, Brahmanitra and possibly Bṛhaspatimitra are definitely associated with Magadha in addition to other territories. The rest are connected with Kauśāmbi and Mathurā.

It is not known in what relationship most of these "Mitra" kings stood to one another or to the celebrated families of the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas.

In Pātaliputra as well as in Mathurā the "Mitra" seem to have been replaced eventually by the Scythian 'Murunḍas' and Satraps who, in their turn, were supplanted by the Nāgas and the Guptas. Some scholars place immediately before the Guptas a family called Kota which may have ruled in Pātaliputra.  

SECTION II. THE ŚATAVĀHANAS AND THE CHETAS

While the Śuṅgas and Kāṇvas were engaged in their petty feuds, new powers were rising in trans-Vindhyān India. These were the Śatavāhana (the so-called Andhra or Andhra-bhṛitya) kingdom of Dakṣiṇāpatha and the Cheta or Cheti kingdom of Kaliṅga.

1 Allan refers to kings Brahmanitra, Drīdhamitra, Suryamitra and Vishnumitra who issued coins identical in type with those of Gomitra. They were followed by rulers whose names ended in—datta,—bhūti and—ghoṣa.

2 For statements in this section see Ep. Ind., VIII, 60ff; Harshacharita VIII, (p. 251); Cunn., Mahābodhi, ASI, 1908-9, 141; IHQ, 1926, 441; 1929, 398, 595ff; 1930, 1ff. 1933, 419; Kielhorn, N. I. Inscriptions, No. 541; Indian Culture, 1, 695; EHI, 3rd ed. 227ff; JRAS, 1911, 122; Smith, Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum, 185, 190, 194; Allan, CICAI, pp. xcv-xcvi, cx, 150ff, 150ff, 173ff, 195ff, 202ff.

3 The form Śattrāhana is found in the Bhāgalpur Grant of Nārāyaṇapāla and the form Śālivāhana in literature. See also Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, EHD, Section VII.

4 The designation 'Andhra-bhṛitya' or 'Andhra' is found in the Purāṇas which represent the founder as a bhṛitya or servant of the last Kāśya king. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, following apparently the Vīśṇu Purāṇa, styles the dynasty founded by Simuka Andhra-bhṛitya, i.e., Andhras who were once servants. But that designation should properly be applied to the seven Ābhīrās who are mentioned as the successors of the line of Simuka on page 45 of Pargiter's Dynasties of the Kali Age (cf. Vīshṇu P., IV, 44, 15).
The founder of the Śātavāhana dynasty was Simuka whose name is misspelt as Śiśuka, Sindhuka and Śipraka in the Purāṇas. Those works state that the “Andhra” Simuka will assail the Kāṇvāyanas and Suśarman, and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas’ power and will obtain this “earth”. If this statement be true then it cannot be denied that Simuka was for some years a contemporary of Suśarman (40-30 B.C.) and flourished in the first century B.C. Rapson, Smith and many other scholars, however, reject the unanimous testimony of the Purāṇas. They attach more importance to a statement about which there is not the same unanimity, that the “Andhras” ruled for four centuries and a half. Accordingly, they place Simuka towards the close of the third century B.C., and say that the dynasty came to an end in the third century A.D.

A discussion of Simuka’s date involves the consideration of the following questions:—

1. What is the age of the script of the Nānāghāṭ record of Nāyanikā, daughter-in-law of Simuka (or of his brother and successor, Kṛishṇa)?

2. What is the actual date of Khāravela’s Hāṭhīgumpha Inscription which refers to a Śatākarni, who was apparently a successor of Simuka?

3. What is the exact number of the so-called Andhra kings and what is the duration of their rule?

As to the first point we should note that according to Mr. R. P. Chanda the inscription of Nāyanikā is later than the Besnagar Inscription of Bhāgavata, possibly the penultimate king of the “line” of Pushyamitra mentioned in the Purāṇas. Consequently Simuka may be placed in

1 MAST, No. 1, pp. 14-15. In IHQ, 1929 (p. 601) Mr. Chanda points to the agreement of the Nānāghāṭ script with the Besnagar Inscription of the time of Antialkidas. But the exact date of Antialkidas is uncertain. He may have belonged to the latter half of the second century B.C. or the first half of the next century.

Mr. R. D. Banerji, while disagreeing with the views of Mr. Chanda in regard to certain points, admits, after a detailed examination of certain epigraphs, that “the Nānāghāṭ inscriptions show the use of a very large number of Ksatrapa or early Kusāṇa forms side by side with older ones” (Mem. Asiat
the Kāṇva period, i.e., in the first century B.C.—a date which accords with Purānic evidence.¹

As to the second point Mr. R. D. Banerji gives good grounds for believing that the expression Ti-vasasata occurring in the passage “Paṁchame che dāñi vāse Namdarāja ti-vasa-sata..............” of the Hāthigumpha Inscription means not 103 but 300.² This was also the view of Mr. Chanda and, at one time, of Dr. Jayaswal.³ If Ti-vasa-sata means 300, Khāravela and his contemporary Śātakarni may have flourished 300 years after Nandarāja, i.e., in or about 24 B.C. This agrees with

Soc., Bengal, Vol. XI, No. 3, p. 145). According to Rapson (Andhra Coins., lxxvii) the form of the aksara-'da' found in the Nānāgahr record resembles that of a coin-legend which is assignable to the first or second century B.C.

It is not suggested that either Bauerji or Rapson placed the Nānāgahr record in the first century B.C. But some of the facts they have placed before us do not preclude the possibility of a date in the first century B.C. The theory that the record belongs to the second century B.C. rests in some measure on the assumption tacitly accepted by the older generation of scholars that Khāravela's thirteenth year corresponds to the year 165 of the time of the Maurya kings (Bühler, Indian Palaeography, 39; Rapson, xvii).

¹ Buhler also observes (ASWI., Vol. V, 65) that the characters of the Nānāgahr inscriptions belong to a period anterior by about 100 years to that of the edicts of Gautamiputra Śātakarni and his son Pulmāyi. Scholars who place the Nānāgahr record in the first half of the second century B.C., and the epigraphs of the time of Gautamiputra Śātakarni in the second century A.D., will have to account for the paucity of Śātavāhana records during a period of about three hundred years (if that be the actual length of the interval between the age of the husband of Nāganiṅkā and the reign of the son of Balasi). Mr. N. G. Majumdar (The Monuments of Sāṇchi, Vol. I, pt. iv, p. 277) places the Nānāgahr record during the period 100-75 B.C.

² JBORS, 1917, 495-497.

³ JBORS, 1917, 432; cf. 1918, 377, 385. The older view was changed in 1927, 238, 244. According to the usually accepted interpretation of a passage in the Hāthigumpha record Khāravela, in his fifth year, extended an aqueduct that had not been used for “ti-vasa-sata” since Nandarāja. If “ti-vasa-sata” is taken to mean 103 years, Khāravela's accession must be placed 103-5 = 98 years after Nandarāja. His elevation to the position of Yuvaraṇa took place 9 years before the date, i.e., 98-9 = 89 years after Nandarāja (i.e., not later than 224 B.C.—89 = 235 B.C.). Khāravela's father was apparently on the throne at that time, and he seems to have been preceded by his father. But we learn from Aśoka's inscriptions that Kaliṅga was actually governed at that time by a Maurya Kumāra under the suzerainty of Aśoka himself. Therefore “ti-vasa-sata” should be taken to mean 900, and not 103 years. The figure 'three hundred' (a round number) is in substantial agreement with the Purānic tradition about the interval between the Nandas and Śātakarni I, 137 (period of the Mauryas)+112 (of the Śuṅgas)+45 (of the Kāṇvas)+23 (of Simuṇa)+10 (of Kṛishṇa)=337.
the Purānic evidence according to which Śatakarni's father (or uncle) Simuka assailed the last Kāṇva king Suśarman (c. 40-30 B.C.).

We now come to the third point, viz., the determination of the exact number of Śatkavāhana kings, and the duration of their rule.

Regarding each of these matters we have got in the Purāṇas quite a number of different traditions. As to the first the Matsya Purāṇa says—

"Ekona-vimāsatirḥ hyete Andhrā bhoṣkhyanti vai mahīṃ," but it gives thirty names.

The Vāyu Purāṇa, with the exception of the 'M' manuscript, says—

"Ityete vai niṣpās trimśad Andhrā bhoṣkhyanti ye mahīṃ" (these thānty Andhras will enjoy the earth); but most of the Vāyu manuscripts name only seventeen, eighteen, or nineteen kings.

As to the duration of the Andhra rule several Matsya manuscripts assign to them a period of 460 years.

"Teshām varsha satāni syuṣ chatvāri shastir eva-cha."

Another Matsya manuscript puts it slightly differently:—

"Dvādaśādhikam eteshāṁ rājyaṁ sata-chatushṭayam" i.e., the period of their sovereignty is 412 years; while the reigns of kings mentioned in certain Vāyu Mss. amount, according to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, to only 272 years and a half.

Obviously according to one tradition there were about seventeen, eighteen or nineteen kings, whose rule lasted some three centuries, while according to another tradition there were thirty kings, the length of whose reigns covered

---

1 Simuka may have ascended the throne (in the Deccan) several years before the date 40-30 B.C. when he assailed the Kāṇvāyas possibly in Central India. The period of his rule after the defeat of the Kāṇvas may have been less than 25 years. Thus the actual interval between the Nandas and Śatakarni may well have been a little less than 927 years.

2 Variant ekona-navaṭiṁ (DKA, 45).

3 Pargiter points out (p. 36) that 3 Matsya Mss. name 90 and the others vary the number from 28 to 21.
a period of more than 400 years. In the opinion of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar the longer list includes the names of princes belonging to all the branches of the so-called Andhra-bhritya dynasty, and that the longer period represents the total duration of all the princes belonging to the several branches. The period of about three centuries, and the seventeen, eighteen or nineteen names given in the Vāyu Purāṇa, and hinted at in the Matsya, refer to the main branch. That there were several families of Śātavāhanas or Śātakarnīs, distinct from the main line that had its principal seat in the upper Valley of the Godāvarī, cannot be denied. The Kāvyā Mīmāṁsā of Rājaśekhara and several other works as well as epigraphs in the Kanarese country and elsewhere testify to the existence of Śātavāhanas and Śātakarnīs who ruled over Kuntala (the Kanarese districts) before the Kadambas. The fullest Matsya list includes a group of kings (Nos. 10-14), including one named “Kuntala” Śātakarnī, who are, generally speaking, passed over in silence by the Vāyu. Skandavāti, No. 11 of the full list, reminds one of Skandavāga-Śātaka, a prince of a Kanarese line of Śātakarnīs mentioned in a Kanheri inscription. As to Kuntala Śātakarnī (No. 13), the commentary on Vātsyāyana’s Kāmasūtra takes the word “Kuntala” in the name Kuntala Śātakarnī Śātavāhana to mean “Kuntala-vishaye jātatvāt tat samākhyāh.” It is, therefore, fair to conclude that the Matsya MSS. which mention 30 Śātavāhana kings

---

1 A Śātavāhana of Kuntala is referred to by the Kāvyā-Mīmāṁsā (1934, Ch. X, p. 50) as having ordered the exclusive use of Prākrit in his harem. He may have been identical with the famous king Hāla (cf. Kuntala-janavaya-rāṇena Hālena, ibid., Notes, p. 197).

2 Even Hāla (No. 17) is omitted in the Vāyu Ms. (DKA, p. 96) and the Brahmaṇḍa P. (Rapson, Andhra Coins, Ixvii).

3 Rapson, Andhra Coins, iiii. The fact that he was a prince at the time of the record need not prove that he never came to the throne. The Purānic lists themselves often include names of princes (e.g., Arjuna, Abhimanyu, Siddhārtha) who never ruled as kings. Certain Matsya MSS. insert the group to which Skandasvāti belongs after No. 29, i.e., Chandaśī (DKA, p. 96).

4 He was so named because he was born in the Kuntala country. Cf. names like Uruvela-Nadi-and Gayā Kassapa (Dialogues of the Buddha, I, 194).
include not only the main group of kings but also those who were closely associated with Kuntala.

On the other hand, the Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa and certain Matsya MSS., generally speaking, show a tendency to omit the Śatavāhanas of Kuntala and the rulers of the period of Śaka revival under Rudra-dāman I, and mention only about 19 kings most of whom belonged to the main line whose rule may have lasted for about three centuries. If the main line of Śatavāhana kings consisted only of about nineteen princes, and if the duration of their rule be approximately three centuries, there is no difficulty in accepting the Purāṇic statement that Simuka flourished in the time of the later Kāṇvas, that is to say, in the first century B.C., and that his dynasty ceased to rule in the Northern Deccan in the third century A.D. The sovereignty of the Śatavāhanas and Śatakarnis of Kuntala lasted longer and did not come to an end probably before the fourth century A.D., when it was ended by the Kadambas. Thus the total duration of the rule of all the lines of Śatakarnis is really more than 400 years1. The kings of the Kuntala group (Nos. 10-14 of the DKA list) are no doubt usually placed before the great Gautamiputra and his successors. But Pargiter points out that in certain Matsya MSS. Nos. 10-15 are placed after the penultimate king of the line (No. 29). As to Hāla (No. 17) if he is really the author of the Gāthāsaptasatī, he could hardly have flourished before the fourth century A.D. The references to Vikramāditya-charita, Aṅgāraka-vāra and Rādhikā make it difficult to assign to him a date before the Great Gautamiputra. We have many other

1 The period '300 years' (Vāyu P.) may refer to the rule of the Śrīparvataiya Andhras (DKA, 46). Even then it is important to remember that the cessation of 'Andhra' rule in the upper Deccan in the third century A.D. is not incompatible with a date for the founder in the first century B.C. For the rule of the Śatakarnis survived in Kuntala till the rise of the Kadambas. Thus the Purāṇas are right in assigning to the entire line of 30 kings a period of about four centuries and a half.

2 DKA, p. 36. On pp. 20, 35, Pargiter gives other instances of 'misplacement' of kings by the Purāṇic MSS.
instances of the inversion of the order of kings in the Purāṇas. The fact that the extant Purānic texts do misplace kings appears abundantly clear from the important discovery of a coin of Śiva Śri Āpilaka whom Mr. Dikshit connects with the later Śatavāhanas though the Purāṇas place him early in the list.²

¹ See pp. 104, 115f ante.

² See Advance, March 10, 1935, p. 9. The coin belongs to the Mahākosala society of Raipur (C.P.). It bears the figure of an elephant with Bāhmi legend on the obverse. The reverse is blank. On numismatic grounds the place of this ruler is according to Mr. K. N. Dikshit, more with the later kings of the dynasty than with the earlier ones as indicated in the Purāṇas. For the late date of Hāla of the Kuntala country see R. G. Bhand. Com. Vol., 189. Cf. Reference to Rādhā in the Saptáśatākam (Ind. Ant., III. 25n).

Mr. K. P. Chattopadhyāya deduces from the discrepant lists of the Matsya, and Vāyu Purāṇas and from epigraphic and numismatic evidence, certain theories about (1) the existence of two contemporary Śatavāhana kingdoms ruled by son and father respectively, (2) cross-cousin marriages and (3) matrilineal succession, which he discusses in JASB, 1927, 503ff and 1939, 317-339. In his opinion the discrepancies in the Purānic lists cannot be due to any oversight or slip on the part of the editors (1927, p. 504). They are to be explained by the theory of an original version (that contained in the Matsya) which gives the full list of Gautamiputras as well as Vāsiṣṭhiputtas, and a "revised text" (contained in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa) which retains the Gautamiputras but from which certain names were deliberately expunged as the rulers in question were not considered by the revising authorities to possess the privilege of having the names preserved in the Purāṇas (ibid., p. 505). Kings (e.g., Vāsiṣṭhiputra Pulumāvi), whose names are "expunged" from the "revised text" of the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas, belong to a "set" which is genealogically connected with the other, viz., the Gautamiputra group, whose names are retained in the revised versions, but "the succession did not coincide with the mode of descent". For instance, Gautamiputra Śatākarni, according to the revised list, was succeeded not by his son Pulumāvi, but by another Gautamiputra, viz., Yajña Śri (p. 509). It is further added that "on the coins of the Śatavāhanas the royal prefix and the mother’s clan-name are associated together and also disappear together except in the case of the third king of the line". In the inscriptions also the association is unvariable (excluding the doubtful case of Śivamakasada), except in the case of the third king, Śri Śatākarni of the Nānāghāt Cave Inscriptions. It is, therefore, to be concluded that, except for the third king of the line, the royal title and relationship to the mother went together. In other words, the succession was matrilineal (p. 518): "The son succeeded to the conquered realm, and the sister’s son to the inherited kingdom" (p. 547).

This footnote cannot afford space for an exhaustive review of the dissertation of Mr. Chattopadhyāya. Nor is it concerned with theories and speculations about social organisation based on ‘mother right or father right’, cross-cousin marriage in general, and royal successions, that are not germane to the discussion about the Śatavāhana dynasty. We shall try to confine ourselves to the points that are really relevant to an enquiry about that illustrious line itself. A study of the Purānic lists analysed by Pargiter (Dynasties of the Kali Age, pp. 35ff) would show that the discrepancies in the Purānic lists
Regarding the original home of the Śatavāhana family there is also a good deal of controversy. Some scholars are not capable of as simple a solution as that proposed by Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya. It cannot be said, for example, that Gautamiputra (No. 29) is mentioned in all Matsya texts and retained in all Vāyu MSS., and that his son Pulumāvi (No. 24) of the so-called “Vāishishṭiputra group” is always mentioned in the Matsya and omitted only in “later revised versions” of the Vāyu, etc. Gautamiputra is omitted in Matsya MSS., styled e, k and l by Pargiter (p. 96), and also in the e Vāyu MSS., while his son Pulumāvi is omitted in Matsya e, f and l MSS., but mentioned in the Vishnu and Bhāgavata lists, notwithstanding the activities of the so-called revisers. The theory of succession of sisters’ sons in the so-called revised list of the Vāyu, Brahmanda, etc., is clearly negatived by numerous passages where a successor is distinctly referred to even in these Purānas as the son of a predecessor (cf. the cases not only of the first Śrī Śatākarni but also of Śatākarni II, Lambodara, and even Yaṭa śṛ (DKA, p. 99, fn. 40, 44; p. 42, fn. 12.). The use of the expression tato (DKA, 99) in the Matsya Purāṇa to indicate the relationship between Śatākarni I and Purnotsagha when taken along with the words tasyaḥ Purnotsagha (Vishnu IV. 24, 12), and Paurṇamāstasa tat sītāḥ (Bṛhad. XII. 1, 21) leaves no room for doubt that Purānic evidence represents Purnotsagha—Paurṇamāsa, as the son and immediate successor of Śatākarni I and not a ‘distant’ offspring or a remote offspring of a ‘cross-cousin marriage’, who got the throne by the rule of matrilineal succession. There may be no valid reason as asserted by Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya for identifying him with Vedīśri of the Nāṅgāḥāt record. But the reading Vedīśri as pointed out by K. Sāstrī is wrong. The proper reading is Khandasiri—Skanḍasrī. This prince has been plausibly identified with Purnotsagha’s successor, the fifth king of the Purānic list. He is, therefore, difficult to agree with the view (JASB, 1933, 32%) that the prince in question (the so-called Vedīśri) ‘never came to the throne’. Purnotsagha may have been some other ‘kumāra’. Cf., the nameless prince (kumāra) ‘Śatavāhana’ of the Nāṅgāḥāt record who is mentioned along with ‘Hakusiri’ (Saktīsri). It is also to be noted that even the so-called older version of the Matsya speaks of only 19 kings in one passage.

The Gautamiputras and the Vāishishṭiputras did not rule over distinct regions. Gautamiputra Śatākarni is represented as the Rāja of Mūlaka, i.e., the district round Paithan, along with other territories. Pulumāvi, too, ruled over Paithan as we learn from the Geography of Ptolemy. The epithets “Pijha,... Malaya-Mahida,... pavaṇa pati” and “tisamudatovapita-vāhana” applied to Gautamiputra suggest that he was as much entitled to the designation Daksha-patikapati as his son.

The statement that, except for the third king, the royal title and relationship to the mother went together, is not borne out by recorded facts. In the Myakadoni Inscription, for example (EP. Ind., XIV, pp. 158ff.), we have the passage—Raño Śatavāhananāh s (i) ri-Pulum (a) visa without any mention of the metronymic Cf. also the passage Rañō Sirichada-sātisa (Rapson, Andhava Coins, p. 92). As to cross-cousin marriages, several recorded cases, e.g., those of the wives of Śrī Śatākarni I and Vāishishṭiputra Śrī Śatākarni of the Kanheri Inscription, do not support the theory propounded by Mr. Chaṭṭopādhyāya. The kings in question may, doubtless, have been polygamous. But that the extra queens, if any, included cousins is only a guess. The marriages actually hinted at in the epigraphic records of the Śatavāhanas (unlike those of the
think that the Śātavāhanas were not Andhras (Telugus) but merely Andhra-bhṛityas, servants of the Andhras, of Kanarese origin. Mr. O. C. Gangoly points out that in some class of literature a distinction is suggested between the Andhras and the Śātavāhanas. In ‘the Epigraphia Indica,’ Dr. Sukṭhankar edited an inscription of Siri-Pulumāvi, ‘‘king of the Śātavāhanas,’’ which refers to a place called Śātavahanihāra. The place finds mention also in the Hirahadagalli copper-plate inscription of the Pallava king Siva-skandavarman in the slightly altered form of Śātāhānirattha. Dr. Sukṭhankar suggests that the territorial division Śātavahani-Śātāhāni must have comprised a good portion of the modern Bellary district of the Madras Presidency, and that it was the original home of the Śātavāhana family. Other indications point to the territory immediately south of the Madhyadesa as the original home of the Śātavāhana-Śātakarnīs. The Vinaya Texts mention a town called ‘‘Setakhanika’’ which lay on the southern frontier of the Majjhima-desa. It is significant that the earliest records of the Śātakarnīs are found in the Northern Deccan and Central India; and

Ikṣvākus) are not of the ‘cross-cousin’ type. Indian history knows of cases where a queen or other royal personage takes as much pride in the mother’s family as in that of the father (cf. ubhayakulālaihārābhūtā Prabhavati, JASB, 1924, 58). Does Nāyanikā lay any claim to a Śātavāhana origin? The table of cross-cousin marriage on p. 325 of JASB, 1939, would make Śātakarnī (No. 6 of the list) a brother of Nāyanikā and a brother-in-law of Śātakarnī (No. 3 of the list) and a son of Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro. This is negatived by the Nānāgāṭ epigraph which refers to the Mahāraṭhi as Amgiya (or Ambhiya) kulavardhana, whereas both the Śātakarnīs belong to the family of Simuka Śātavāhana according to Purānic evidence. Gautami-Balāśri who is turned into a sister or clan sister of Śivasvāti (JASB, 1927, 590) refers merely to her position as a baddha, mātā, and pīṭāmaḥ, but never for once suggests that she herself sprang from the family restoration of whose glory is referred to in exulting terms.

1 JAHRS, XI, pp 1 and 2, pp. 14-15. The Andhras contributed one melody which is recognised in the musical literature of India as Andhri, while the Śātavāhanas contributed another named after them as Śātavāhanī according to the text of the Brīhat-Desi.

2 Vol. XIV (1917).

3 See also Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute, 1918-19, p. 101, ‘On the Home of the so-called Andhra Kings.’—V. S. Sukṭhankar, Cf. JRAI, 1925, 89 f.

4 SBE, XVII, 38.
EXTRACTION OF THE ŚĀTAVĀHANAS

the Hāthīgumpha Inscription of Khāravela, king of Orissa, refers to the family as 'protecting the West'. The name ‘Andhra’ probably came to be applied to the kings in later times when they lost their northern and western possessions and became a purely Andhra power, governing the territory at the mouth of the river Kṛishṇā. The Śātavāhanas themselves never claim an ‘Andhra’ ancestry.

There is reason to believe that the so-called "Andhra," "Andhra-bhṛitya" or Śātavāhana kings were Brāhmaṇas with a little admixture of Nāga blood. The Dvātrimśat-puttalikā represents Sālivāhana (Prākrit form of Śātavāhana) as of mixed Brāhmaṇa and Nāga origin. The Nāga connection is suggested by names like Nāga-nikā and Skanda-nāga-śātaka, while the claim to the rank of Brāhmaṇa is actually put forward in an inscription. In the Nāsik praśasti of Gautamiputra Śātarkaṇi the king is called "Eka Bhamhaṇa," i.e., the unique Brāhmaṇa. Some scholars, however, are inclined to take Bhamhaṇa to mean merely a Brāhmaṇical Hindu, but this interpretation cannot be accepted in view of the fact that Gautamiputra is also called "Khatiya-dapa-māṇa-madana," i.e., the destroyer of the pride and conceit of Kshatriyas. The expression "Eka Bhamhaṇa" when read along with the passage "Khatiya-dapa-māṇa-madana" leaves no room for doubt that Gautamiputra of the Śātavāhana family not only claimed to be a Brāhmaṇa, but a Brāhmaṇa like

---

1 Cf. The transformation of the Eastern Chālukyas into Cholas from the time when Kulottuṅga I mounted the Chola throne. For the origin and meaning of the names Śātavāhana and Śātarkaṇi see also Camb. Hist. Ind., Vol. I, p. 599; JBORS, 1917, December, p. 442; IHQ, 1929, 388; 1935, 88, 256 and JRAS, 1929, April; also Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London, 1938, IX, 2. 327f. Both Barnett and Jayaswal connect them with the Śātiya-putas. Prizeulski thinks that the names may have been Sanskritised from Austro-Asiatic terms signifying, "Son of horse". For other interpretations see Aravamuthan, The Kaveri, the Maukharis, p. 51n (karni-ship; Vāhana = Oar or Sail); Dikshitur, Indian Culture, II, 549f.

2 Cf. EHD, Sec. VII.


4 In Indian Culture, I, pp. 515ff. and Ep. Ind., XXII. 32ff. Miss Bhramar Ghosh and Dr. Bhandarkar seem to reject the interpretation of the expressions "Eka Bhamhaṇa" and "Khatiya-dapa-māṇa-madana" proposed by Senart and Bührer. It is suggested that the word bhamhaṇa may stand for
Paraśurāma who humbled the pride of the Kshatriyas. As a matter of fact in the *praśasti* the king is described as “the unique Brāhmaṇa in prowess equal to Rāma.”

According to the Purāṇas Simuka (c. 60-37 B.C.) gave the final *coup de grace* to the Śuṅga-Kāśva power. He was succeeded by his brother *Krīṣna* (c. 37-27 B.C.). This king has been identified with Kanha “Rājā of the Sādavāhana-kula” mentioned in a Nāsik Inscription. The record tells us that a certain cave was caused to be made by a high official (*Śramaṇa Mahāmātra*) of Nāsik in the time of King Kanha.

*Brahmaṇya*, that *Khatiya* may refer to the Nāthroi or Khattriapūr tribe mentioned by classical writers, and that the expression *Rājārīsi-vadhū* used in reference to Gautami Balaśrī is enough to show that the Sātavāhana rulers never claimed themselves to be *Brahmarshis* or Brāhmaṇa sages. It is nobody’s case that the Sātavāhanas claimed to be mere “Brāhmaṇa sages.” But is it not a bit too ingenious to imagine that the well-known terms Brāhmaṇa and Khatiya are not to be taken in their ordinary sense, and that they really stand for non-Brāhmaṇas and non-Kshatriyas? As to the use of the expression *Rājārīsi-vadhū*, would not *Brahmarshi* be a singularly inappropriate description of a family of kings even though they were Brāhmaṇas? The term *Rājārīsi* is not used exclusively to denote non-Brāhmaṇa rulers. In the *Padma Purāṇa* (Pāṭalā-khaṇḍam, 61, 73), for instance, Dadhichi is styled a *Rājārīsī*. In the Vāyu *Purāṇa* (57, 121ff.) the epithets “Rājārīshya mahāśaktivā” are used in reference to *Brahma-Khatrīramaṇāḥ nṛṣṭāḥ*, (Brahma-khatrīrādayo nṛṣṭāḥ, according to the reading of the Matsya text, 143, 37: 40). In the Matsya *Purāṇa* (50, 5: 7) the epithet *Rājārīshi* is applied to a king who sprang from the family of the Maudgalyas who are called *Kshatrīpetā duṇḍāyaḥ* and one of whom is styled *Brahmīschthāḥ*. The *Annadaṁśaṇgha* refers to *Krīṣṇa* Chandra as *Rāja-Rājachakravartti Rishi-Rishīrāja*.

Attention may no doubt be invited to the Purānic idea that the founder of the “Andhra” dynasty was a *vṛshala* (DKA, 98). But the explanation will be found in the *Mahābhārata*. The great epic (XII. 63, 1ff.) informs us that ‘drawing the bowstring, destruction of enemies... are not proper (aṅkāreyam paramam) for a Brāhmaṇa. A Brāhmaṇa should avoid royal service (rāja-śreshṭhya). A Brāhmaṇa who marries a Vṛṣali and takes to royal service (rāja-śreshṭya) and other work not legitimate for him is akhara, a Brāhmaṇa so-called (Brahma-bandhu). He becomes a Śūdra. The Sātavāhanas actually drew the bowstring and intermarried with Dravidians and Śakas as the Mauryas had intermarried with Yavanas.

1 A pun is here intended as Rāma seems to refer to Bala Deva as well. The use of the name of Rāma instead of Bala (cf. Bala-Keśava in *Hariv., Vishṇuparva*, 52. 20) is significant. Taken in conjunction with *ekabhamhāṇa* it undoubtedly implies comparison with Bṛhgu-Rāma or Paraśu-Rāma as well. The comparison of a militant ruler claiming Brāhmaṇahood and fighting against Kshatriyas, with Paraśu-Rāma is a favourite theme of writers of *Praśastis*—cf. Bṛhgu-śatiriva *dripta kṣhatrasāṅkhāra-kārin* which is applied to Ambāprasad in the Chitor-gadh Ins. of 1874 A.D.
Kanha-Krishṇa was succeeded according to the Purāṇas by Sātakarni (c. 27-17 B.C.). This Sātakarni has been identified with—

(1) King Sātakarni Dakshināpatha-pati (lord of the Deccan), son (or nephew) of Simuka Sātavāhana, mentioned in the Nānāghat Inscription of Nāyanikā;

(2) Sātakarni, lord of the west, who was defied (or rescued?) by Khāravela, king of Kaliṅga;

(3) Rājan Śri Sātakarni of a Sāñchī Inscription;

(4) The elder Saraganus mentioned in the Periplus;

(5) Sātakarni, lord of Pratishṭhāna, father of Sakti-kumāra, mentioned in Indian literature; and

(6) Siri-Sāta of coins.²

The first, fifth and sixth identifications are usually accepted by all scholars. The second identification is also probable because the Purāṇas place Sātakarni, the successor of Krīshṇa, after the Kāṇvas, i.e., in the first century B.C., while the Hāthīgumpha Inscription seems to place Khāravela 300 years after Nanda-rāja, i.e., possibly in the first century B.C.

Marshall objects to the third identification on the ground that Śri Sātakarni who is mentioned in the Nānāghat and Hāthīgumpha Inscriptions reigned in the middle* of the second century B.C.; his dominions, therefore, could not, in his opinion, have included Eastern Mālwa (the Sāñchī region) which, in the second century B.C., was ruled by the Śuṅgas and not by the "Andhras".³ But we have seen that the date of the Hāthīgumpha Inscription is possibly the first century B.C. (300 years after Nanda-rāja). The Purāṇas, too, as is well known, place the kings mentioned in the Nānāghat Inscription

---

1 The usual view among scholars is that Sātakarni I is a son of Simuka. If he is a nephew (son of Krīshṇa, brother of Simuka) as the Purāṇas assert, it is difficult to explain why Krīshṇa's name should be omitted from the family group, mentioned in the Nānāghat records, while the name of Simuka as well as that of the father of Sātakarni's queen should find prominent mention. The final decision must await future discoveries.

2 Andhra Coins, Rapson, p. xciii. CHI, 591.

not earlier than the Kāṇvas, *i.e.*, in the first century B.C. As Śuṅga rule had terminated about this time the identification of the successor of Krishṇa of the Śatavāhana family with Śatakarṇi of the Sāñcī Inscription, therefore, does not conflict with what is known of the history of Eastern Mālwa in the second century B.C. Lastly, it would be natural for the first Śatakarṇi to be styled simply Śatakarṇi or the elder Śatakarṇi (Saraganus, from a Prākrit form like Sādaganna), while it would be equally natural for the later Śatakarṇis to be distinguished from him by the addition of a geographical designation like Kuntala, or a metronymic like Gautamiputra or Vāsishṭhiputra.

We learn from the Nānāghat Inscriptions that Śatakarṇi, son (?) of Simuka, entered into a matrimonial alliance with the powerful Amgiya or Ambhiya family, the scions of which were called Mahāraṭhi, and became sovereign of the whole of Dakshināpatha. He seems also to have controlled Eastern Mālwa and undoubtedly performed the Aṣvamedha sacrifice. The conquest of Eastern Mālwa by his family is possibly implied by coins and the Sāñcī Inscription when read along with the Purānic statement that in succession to the Śuṅgabhṛitya Kāṇvāyana kings, the ‘earth’ will pass to the ‘Andhras’. The inscription records the gift of a certain Ānaṁda, the son of Vasiṭhi, the foreman of the artisans of Rājan Śiri-Śatakarṇi. Śatakarṇi seems to have been the first prince to raise the Śatavāhanas to the position of paramount sovereigns of Trans-Vindhyā India. Thus arose the first great empire in the Godāvari valley which rivalled in extent and power the Śuṅga empire in the Ganges valley and the Greek empire in the Land of the Five Rivers. According to the

---

1 *ASI*, 1923-4, p. 88.
2 I.e., the Vidiśā, region, etc., in Eastern Mālwa. For the connection of the Śuṅgas with Vidiśa, see Pargiter, DKA, 49. The Kāṇvāyanas had become king ‘among the Śuṅgas’ (Śuṅgesha, DKA, 34), apparently in the Vidiśa territory. Cf. also Tewar Coins, IHQ, XXVIII, 1952, 68f.
3 The conquest of West Mālwa is probably suggested by round coins of Śrī Sāta (Rapson, Andhra Coins, xcii-xciii).
evidence of Indian as well as classical writers,' the principal capital of the Śatavāhana Empire was at Pratishṭhāna, "the modern Paiśhan on the north bank of the Godāvari in the Aurangabad District of Hyderabad."

After the death of Śatakarnī his wife Nāyānikā or Nāganikā, daughter of the Mahāraṭhi Tranakayiro Kalaḷāya, the scion of the Amgiya (?) family, was proclaimed regent during the minority of the princes Vedaśrī (?) Khandasiri or Skandaśrī and Śakti Śrī (Sati Sirimat) or Haku Śrī. The last-mentioned prince is probably identical with Śakti-kumāra, son of Śālivāhana, mentioned in Jaina literature.²

Early Śatavāhanas

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Śatavāhana-kula} & \quad \text{Amgiya (Ambhiya) kula} \\
\text{Rāvā (Rājā) Simuka Śatavāhana Krishna} & \quad \text{Kalaḷāya Mahāraṭhi} \\
\text{Son or nephew} & \\
\text{Śatakarnī I, King of Dakshmāpatha} & \quad \text{Devi Nāyānikā} \\
\quad & \quad \text{Devī Nāyānikā} \\
\quad & \quad \text{Kumāras Vedaśrī (?) Khandasiri or Śakti Śrīmat} \\
\quad & \quad \text{Śatavāhana and Bhāya²} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The Śatavāhanas were not the only enemies of the decadent Magadha empire in the first century B.C. We learn from the Hāthīgumpha Inscription that when Śatakarnī was ruling in the west, Khāravela of Kaliṅga

---

1 Cf. Jinaprabhasuri, Tirthakalpa JBBRAS., X. 123; and Ptolemy, Geography, vii. 1. 82. See also Aṣṭāṅga Sūtra, JBORS., 1990, 290; Sir R G. Bhandarkar, EHD, Sec. VII.

2 Viracharitra Ind., Ant., VIII, 201. ASWI., V, 621.

3 On page 57 of Rapson's Andhra Coins Kalalīya Mahāraṭhi bears the name "Sadakana" (=Śatakarnī). His other name or epithet "Tranakayiro" reminds us of "Tanaka" which occurs as a variant of the name of the 18th "Andhra" king of Pargiter's list (DKA, 36, 41).

4 ASI, AR, 1923-24, p. 88; A. Ghosh, History of Central and Western India, 140. Mr. Ghosh identifies him with the fifth king of the Purānic list.
carried his arms to Northern India and humbled the king of Rājagriha.

Khāravela belonged to the Cheta dynasty. Mr. R. P. Chanda points out that Cheta princes are mentioned in the Vessantara Jātaka. The Milinda-pañho contains a statement which seems to indicate that the Chetas were connected with the Chetics or Chedis. The particulars given in that work regarding the Cheta king Sura Parichara agree with what we know about the Chedi king, Uparichara.

Very little is known regarding the history of Kaliṅga from the death of Aśoka to the rise of the Cheta or Cheti dynasty probably in the first century B.C. (three hundred years after the Nandas). The names of the first two kings of the Cheta line are not clealy indicated in the Hāthīgumpha Inscription. Lüders Ins. No. 1347 mentions a king named Vakradeva (Vakadepasiri or Kūdepasiri?). But we do not know for certain whether he was a predecessor or successor of Khāravela.

During the rule of the second king, who must have reigned for at least 9 years (c. 37-28 B.C.), Khāravela occupied the position of Crown Prince (Yuvarāja). When he had completed his 24th year, he was anointed Mahārāja of Kaliṅga (c. 28 B.C.). His chief queen was the daughter of a prince named Lalāka, the great-grandson (according to some) of Hathisimha. In the first year of his reign he repaired the gates and ramparts of his capital, Kaliṅganagara. In the next year (c. 27 B.C.), without taking heed of Sātakarnī, he sent a large army to the west and with its aid, having reached the Krishnavena, struck terror into the hearts of the people (or city) of Musika (Asika?)-

---

1 No. 547.
3 For Purusha-Yuga (generation) see Hemachandra, Purishta-parvan, VIII, 326 gāmi purusha-yugāni nava yāvattavānayaḥ.
According to another interpretation, “he went to the rescue of Śātakarni and having returned with his purpose accomplished, he with his allies made gay the city.” He followed up his success by further operations in the west and, in his fourth year, compelled the Raṭhikas and Bhojakas to do him homage. In the fifth year (c. 24 B.C.) he had an aqueduct, that had been opened out 300 years back by Nandarāja, conducted into his capital.

Epholdened by his successes in the Deccan the Kaliṅga king turned his attention to the North. In the eighth year he stormed Gorathagiri (Barābar Hills near Gayā) and harassed (the king of?) Rājaṅgriha. If Dr. Jayaswal is right in identifying this king with Bṛhaspatimitra, then king Bṛhaspati must have ruled over Magadha after the Kānya dynasty.

The attack on Northern India was repeated possibly in the tenth and certainly in the twelfth year. In the tenth year the Kaliṅga king, in the opinion of some scholars, overran countries in Bhārat-varsha, which are surmised to refer to those in Upper India. In the twelfth year he claims to have terrified or harassed the kings of Uttarāpatha and watered his elephants in the Gaṅgā (Ganges). The north-western expeditions apparently led to no permanent result. But in north-eastern India the Kaliṅga king was more successful; the repeated blows certainly “struck terror into the Magadhas,” and com-

---


2 Some scholars find in line 8 of the Hāṭhīgumpha Ins. a reference to the Yavana-ṇa (Di) ma (ta), i.e., Demetrios who “went off to Mathurā in order to relieve his generals who were in trouble” (Acta Orientalia, I. 27; Cal. Rev., July, 1926, 153). But the reading is doubtful (cf. Barua, Old Brāhmi Inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khandagiri Caves, pp. 17-18; IHQ, 1929, 594). Even if the reading Dimata be correct, the reference may be to Diyumeta or Diomedes (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, p. 36) and not necessarily to Demetrios.

3 Some scholars find here a reference to the Sagarāṭiya palace (Ep. Ind., xx. 88).
pelled the Magadha king (Brhaspatimitra?) to bow at his feet.

Having subjugated Magadha, and despoiled An̄ga, the invader once more turned his attention to Southern India. Already in his eleventh year “he had had Pithuda ploughed with a plough drawn by an ass.”1 Levi2 identified this city with Pihunda of the Uttaraādhyaayana (21), and ‘Pitunda metropolis’ of Ptolemy in the interior of the country of Masulipatam (Maisoloi). The conqueror seems to have pushed further to the south and made his power felt even in the Tamil country by princes amongst whom the most eminent was the king of the Pāṇḍyas. In the thirteenth year Khāravela erected pillars on the Kumārī Hill (Udayagiri in Orissa) in the vicinity of the dwelling of the Arhats (Khanḍagiri?).

SECTION III. THE END OF GREEK RULE IN NORTH-WEST INDIA

While the remnant of the Magadhan monarchy was falling before the onslaughts of the Śatavāhanas and the Chetas, the Greek power in the North-West was also hastening towards dissolution. We have already referred to the feuds of Demetrios and Eukratides. The dissensions of these two princes led to a double succession, one derived from Demetrios holding for a time Kāpiśā and then Śākala (Śiālkot) with a considerable portion of the Indian interior, the other derived from Eukratides holding Nicaea,3 Takshasilā and Pushkarāvatī as well as Kāpiśā (which was conquered from Apollodotos) and Bactria. According to Gardner and Rapson, Apollodotos, Anti-

2 Ind. Ant., 1926, 145. Sea-faring merchants are represented as going by boat from Champā to Pihunda in the days of Mahāvīra, the Jina. Cf. Mbh. 1. 65, 67, 186, VII. 50.
3 It lay on the Jhelum between that river and the Chenāē and was probably conquered by Heliokles in the reign of Strato I (CHI, 553, 699).
machos, Pantaleon, Agathokles, Agathokleia,\(^1\) the Stratos, Menander, Dionyssios, Zoilos,\(^2\) Hippostratos and Apollophanes\(^3\) probably belonged to the *house of Euthydemos* and Demetrios. Most of these sovereigns used similar coin-types,\(^4\) specially the figure of the goddess Athene hurling the thunderbolt, which is characteristic of the Euthydemian line. Pantaleon and Agathokles strike coins with almost identical types.\(^5\) They both adopt the metal nickel for their coins, and they alone use in their legends the *Brāhmī* alphabet. They seem, therefore, to have been closely connected probably as brothers. It is not improbable that Agathokleia was their sister.\(^6\) Agathokles (and possibly Antimachos) issued a series of coins\(^7\) in commemoration of Alexander, Antiochos Nikator (Antiochos III

\(^1\) According to some numismatics (*IHH*, 552) she was probably Menander’s queen. But the theory has to explain why the ‘evidence’ regarding the supposed relationship is so vague (*contra* Hekisodes and Laodike, Heimaioi and Kalypso). Cf. Whitehead in *Numismatic Chronicle*, Vol. XX (1940), p. 97, 1950, 216. Whitehead in JAOS, 1950, 216, throws doubt on the conjecture that Agathokles was the mother and not the wife of Strato I. In that case the theory of her marriage with Menander requires more convincing proof than that adduced by Rapson and Tarn.

\(^2\) Apollodotos Philopator, Dionyssios and Zoilos show a common and peculiar monogram struck probably by the same moneystriker in one mint.”

Hoard of coins of these three princes have been found on the upper Sutlej. Coins of Zoilos have also been found at Pathankot and near Sākala (*JRAS*, 1913, 645n1; *JASB*, 1897, 8; Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 316f).

\(^3\) Apollophanes shares a monogram with Zoilos and Strato (Tarn, *Greeks*, 317). Polyxenos, too, belongs to this group (p. 318). Whitehead considers him a close relation of Strato I (*Indo-Greek Coins*, 54n1). The later kings of this group are connected with the Eastern Pañjāb (*EH*, 4th ed., pp. 257-58).

Tarn infers from a statement of Plutarch that after the death of Menander the eastern capital was shifted from Sākala to Bukephala (on the east bank of the Jhelum, Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, Sources and Studies, 236).

\(^4\) For an interesting account of Indo-Greek coin-types see H. K. Deb, IHQ, 1934, 509 ff.


\(^6\) Agathokleia is also closely connected with the Stratos, being probably mother or queen of Strato I, and great (?) grandmother of Strato II of the *JRNS*, 1950, 216.

\(^7\) According to Tarn (447f) the fictitious Seleukid pedigree is the key to the (pedigree) coin series of Agathokles, the Just.
Megas according to Malala), Diodotos Soter, Euthydemos and Demetrios Aniketos (the Invincible).

Apollodotos, the Stratos, Menander and some later kings used the Athene type of coins. Apollodotos and Menander are mentioned together in literature. The author of the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* says that “to the present day ancient *drachmae* are current in Barygaza (Broach) bearing inscriptions in Greek letters, and the devices of those who reigned after Alexander, Apollodotos and Menander.” Again, in the title of the lost forty-first book of Justin’s work, Menander and Apollodotos are mentioned as Indian kings.1 It appears from the *Milinda-pañho* that the capital of the dynasty to which Menander belonged was Sākala or Sāgala.2 We learn from Ptolemy, the Geographer, that the city had another name Euthymedia or Euthydemia, a designation which was probably derived from the Euthymedian line. An inscription on a steatite casket which comes from Shinkot in Bajaur territory refers to the 5th regnal year of Mahārāja Minadra (Menander). The record proves that in the 5th year of his reign the dominions of Menander probably included a considerable portion of the Trans-Indus territory. The Kāpiśa and Nicaea coins indicate how some of the rulers of the Euthymedian group were gradually pushed to the Indian interior. They had to remove their capital to Sākala.

To the rival *family of Eukratides* belonged Heliokles and probably Antialkidas who ruled conjointly with Lysias. A common type of Antialkidas is the Pilei of the Dioscuri, which seems to connect him with Eukratides; his portrait according to Gardner resembles that of

---

2 "*Atthi Yonahanaṃ nānāputabhedanam Sāgalannāma nagaram,∗
"Jambudīpe Sāgala nagare Milindo nāma Rājā ahosi." "*Atthi kho Nāgasena Sāgalaṃ nāma nagaram, tattha Milindo nāma Rājā rajjam kāreti." The form *Yonaka* from which chronological conclusions have been drawn in recent times, is comparable to *Madhava Vṛjjika* (Pārini, IV. 2. 191). The form *Yona* is also found in the Post-Aśokan period (cf. the Besnagar inscription of Heliodoros). Doubts were raised by Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, 2nd. ed., 538.
Heliockles. It is not improbable that he was an immediate successor of Heliockles.\(^1\) A Besnagar Inscription makes him a contemporary of Kāsī (Kośī = Kautsi?) putra Bhāgabhadra of Vidiśā who ruled some time after Agnimitra probably in or about the latter half of the second century B.C. The capital of Antialkidas was probably at Takshaśilā or Taxila, the place from which his ambassador Heliodoros went to the kingdom of Bhāgabhadra. But his dominions seem also to have included Kāpiśa or Kāpiśa.\(^2\) After his death the western Greek kingdom probably split up into three parts, viz., Takshaśilā (ruled by the line represented by Archebios\(^3\)), Pushkalāvatī (governed by Diomedes, Epander,\(^4\) Philoxenos, Artemidoros, and Peukolaos), and Kāpiśa with the Kābul region held successively by Amyntas and Hermæus (Hermæos). With Hermæos was associated his queen, Kalliope. Kāpiśa was, according to Chinese evidence, probably occupied by the Sai-wang (śāka lord) some time in the latter part of the second century B.C. But the barbarian chieftain, like the Kushān Yavuga of later times, may have acknowledged the nominal suzerainty of the Greek Basileas, as Teutonic chieftains in Europe were, during the fifth century A.D., sometimes content with the rank of 'patrician' and 'consul,' under the nominal authority of the titular Roman emperor.

The Greek power must have been greatly weakened by the feuds of the rival lines of Demetrios and Eukratides. The evils of internal dissension were aggravated by foreign inroads. We learn from Strabo\(^5\) that the Parthians deprived Eukratides (and the Scythians) by

---

\(^1\) Gardner, Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum, p. xxxiv.
\(^2\) Camb. Hist., 558.
\(^3\) A copper piece of this king is restruck, probably on a coin of Heliockles (Whitehead, p. 89).
\(^4\) The 'Pallas and thunderbolt' type of his silver coins, probably connects him with the śākala group, ibid., 64. Among the rulers of the Gandhāra region we should perhaps also include Telephos whose coinage resembles that of Maues, ibid., 80. A prince named Nikias apparently ruled in the Jhelum District (EHI, 4th ed., 258), and perhaps other tracts (Num. Chron., 1930, p. 199). But the story of his naval victory over Maues is based on inadequate evidence.
force of arms of a part of Bactriana, which embraced the satrapies of Aspionus and Turiva (possibly Aria and Arachosia according to Macdonald). There is reason to believe that the Parthian king Mithradates I penetrated even into India. Orosius, a Roman historian, who flourished about 400 A.D., makes a definite statement to the effect that Mithradates (c. B.C. 171-138) subdued the natives between the Hydaspes' and the Indus. His conquest thus appears to have driven a wedge between the kingdom of Eukratides and that of his rival of the house of Euthydemos.

The causes of the final downfall of the Bactrian Greeks are thus stated by Justin: "the Bactrians harassed by various wars lost not only their dominions but their liberty; for having suffered from contentions with the Sogdians, the Drangians and the Indians (?) they were at last overcome as if exhausted by the weaker Parthians." 1

The **Sogdians** were the people of the region now known as Samarkand and Bukhārā. They were separated from Bactriana by the Oxus and from the Śakas by the Jaxartes or the Syr Daria. 2 By the term Sogdian Justin probably refers not only to the Sogdiani proper but also to the well-known tribes which, according to Strabo, 3 deprived the Greeks of Bactriana, viz., the Asii, Pasiani, Tochari, Sacarauli and the Sacae or Śakas. The story of the Śaka occupation of the Indo-Greek possessions will be told in the next chapter. The Latin historian Pompeius Trogus describes how Diodotos had to fight Scythian tribes, the Sarancae (Saraucæ) and Asiani, who

---

1 *In the Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I, p. 568, however, this river has been identified with a Persian stream, the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil.

2 Sten Konow translates the passage from Justin thus: The Bactriaps lost both their empire and their freedom, being harassed by the Sogdians (beyond the Oxus), the Arachoi (of the Argandāb valley of S. Afghanistan), the Drangae (lake-dwellers, near the Hamun Lake) and the Areci (of Herat), and finally oppressed by the Parthians (*Corpus*, ii. 1, xxi-xxii).

3 Strabo, XI. 8. 89.

finally conquered Sogdiana and Bactria. The occupation of Sogdiana probably entitled them to the designation Sogdian used by Justin. Sten Konow suggests the identification of the Tochari of the Classical writers with the Ta-hia of the Chinese historians. He further identifies the Asii, Asioi or Asiani with the Yüe-chi. We are inclined to identify the Tochari with the Tukhāras who formed an important element of the Bactrian population in the time of Ptolemy and are described by that author as a ‘great people.’ They are apparently “the war-like nation of the Bactrians” of the time of the Periplus.

The Drangians, literally ‘lake dwellers,’ referred to by Justin, inhabited the country about the Hamun lake (Zareh) between Areia (Herat), Gedrosia (Baluchistān) and Arachosia (Kandahār) and the desert of Eastern Persia, close to and perhaps including at times within its political boundaries the neighbouring province now called Sīstān or Seistan (Sakasthāna). Numismatic evidence indicates that a family whose territory lay mainly in southern Afghanistān, viz., the so-called dynasty of Vonones, supplanted Greek rule in a considerable part of the Helmund valley, Ghazni and Kandahār (Arachosia). Vonones is a Parthian (Imperial) name. Hence many scholars call his dynasty a Parthian family, and some go so far as to assert that this Vonones is the Arsakid king of that name who reigned from A.D. 8 to 14. But names are not sure proofs of nationality. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar calls the dynasty Śaka. The best name for the family would be

1 Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 404. Corpus, II. i, xxii, lvii f.
2 Táhia is apparently different from the “Dahae” of the classical writers which, says Maegovern, lay far to the west. According to Trogus the Asiani were the lords of the Tochari (Reges Thocarorum Asiani, JAOS, 61. 246ff; 65, 71ff).
3 Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 395-96.
4 Schoff, Parthian Stations, 32.
5 Corpus, vi; Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, 92; MASi, 34. 7. Isidore, places Drangiana (Zargangiana) beyond Phra (Farah), and locates Sākasthāna beyond this territory (Schoff, 9). But Herzfeld points out that Sīstān is the Achaemenian ‘Zrang’.
6 Camb. Short Hist., 69.
7 Isidore of Charax who mentions the revolt of Tiridates against Phraates
Drangian, because the chief centre of their power probably lay in the Helmund valley, Arachosia being ruled by a viceroy. On coins Vonones is associated with two princes, viz.,

(i) Śpalahora (Spalyris) who is called Mahārāja bhrāṭa (the king’s brother).

(ii) Śpalaga-dama, son of Śpalahora.

There is one coin which Edward Thomas and Cunningham attributed to Vonones and Azes I. But the coin really belongs to Maues. There is a silver coin of a prince named Spalirises which bears on the obverse the legend Basileus Adelphoy Spalirisoy, and on the reverse “Mahārāja bhrāṭa dhramiasa Spalirišasa,” i.e., of Spalirises the Just, brother of the king. This king has been identified by some with Vonones and by others with Maues. Vonones was succeeded as supreme ruler by Spalirises. The coins of Spalirises present two varieties, viz.,

1. Coins which bear his name alone in both the legends.

2. Coins on which his name occurs on the obverse

(26 B.C.) and is quoted by Pliny (Schoff, Parthian Stations, pp. 5, 13 ff, 17; JRAS, 1904, 706; 1906, 180; 1912, 990) refers (Parthian Stations, 9, para. 18, ZDMG, 1906, pp. 57-58; JRAS, 1915, p. 831; Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, 55) to Sigal in Sacastene (near Kandahar?) as the royal residence of the Śakas (not Parthians) about the beginning of the Christian era. The names of the brother or brothers and nephew of Vonones (or Maues) ruling in southern Afghanistan seem to be Scythian (cf. Rapson quoted in Corpus II, 1, xlii). Thus the local rulers of southern Afghanistan about B.C. 26 or a little later were probably Śakas. It is, however, possible that they acknowledged the supremacy of the great king of Parthia.

1 Corpus, xlii.


3 Herzfeld identifies the royal brother of Spalirises with Maues (Camb. Short Hist., 69).

4 It should be noted that certain coin-types of Spalirises are found re struck on coins of Vonones (CHI, 574) and on a copper coin of Spalyris and Spalagadam (Corpus, II, 1, xlii). This proves that Spalirises was later than Vonones, Spalyris and Spalagadam. The square Omicron on a coin of Spalyris probably points to a date not earlier than Orodes II (55 to 98/7 B.C.). Tarn, Greeks, 346.
in the Greek legend, and those of Azes on the reverse in the Kharoshṭhi legend.

The second variety proves that Spalirises had a colleague named Azes who governed a territory where the prevailing script was Kharoshṭhi. This Azes has been identified with king Azes of the Pañjāb about whom we shall speak in the next chapter.

As regards the Indian enemies of the Bactrian Greeks we must refer in the first place to the prince of the house of Pūshyamitra who is represented in Kālidāsa’s Mālavikāgnimitram as defeating the Yavanas on the Sindhu. An Indian named Bhadrayaśas seems to have had some share in the destruction of the Greek kingdom of the Eastern Pañjāb. The Nāsik praśasti of Gautamīputra Śātakarni represents that king as the destroyer of the Yavanas, apparently of Western India.

The final destruction of Greek rule was, as Justin says, the work of the Parthians. Marshall tells us⁵ that the last surviving Greek principality,² that of Hermaios in the Kābul valley, was overthrown by the Parthian king Gondophernes.³ The Chinese historian Fan-ye also refers to the Parthian occupation of Kābul.⁴ “Whenever any of the three kingdoms of Tien-tchou (India Proper), Ki-pin (Kāpiśa) or Ngansi (Parthia), became powerful, it brought Kābul into subjection. When it grew weak it lost Kābul . . . . . . Later, Kābul fell under the rule of Parthia.”⁶

---

² Among the latest Greek rulers of the Kābul Valley we have to include Theodamas whose existence is disclosed by a Bajaur Seal Inscription (Corpus II, i. xv, 6).
³ In ASI, AR, 1929-30, pp. 56 ff., however, Marshall modifies his earlier views in regard to the conquest of the Greek kingdom of Kābul by the Parthians. He suggests that the Kābul Valley became a bone of contention between Parthians and Kushāns and changed hands more than once before the final eclipse of the Parthian power.
⁵ Cf. Thomas JRAS, 1906, 194. For the results of India's contact with the Hellenic world in the domains of religion, administration, literature, science and art see Bhandarkar, “Foreign Elements in the Hindu Population” (Ind. Ant., 1911); Raychaudhuri, “Early History of the Vaishnava Sect, 1st ed.”
The real conquest of Kabul by the Parthians could hardly have taken place till after the time of Isidore (last quarter of the first century B.C.), because the writings of that geographer do not include the Kabul valley in the list of the eastern provinces of the Parthian Empire. By A.D. 43-44, however, Parthian rule had extended to this region as we learn from Philostratos.


1 Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India, 53; Schoff. The Parthian Stations of Isidore of Charax, 17.
CHAPTER VIII. SCYTHIAN RULE IN NORTHERN INDIA

SECTION I. THE ŚAKAS

In the second and first centuries B.C., Greek rule in parts of Kāfīristān, Gandhāra and possibly the Hazāra country, was supplanted by that of the Śakas. In the days of Darius, the Achaemenid king of Persia (B.C. 522-486), the Śakas lived beyond Sogdiana (para-Sugdām) in "the vast plains of the Syr Darya, of which the modern capital is the town of Turkestan." But already towards the end of the first century B.C. they were established at Sigal in modern Sistān. The story of their migration from central Asia has been recorded by Chinese historians. The Annals of the First Han Dynasty (Ts’ien Han-Shu) states "formerly when the Huung-nû conquered the Ta-Yüe-chi the latter emigrated to the west, and subjugated the Tahia: whereupon the Sai-wang went to the south, and ruled over Kipin." Sten Konow points out that the Sai-wang refer to the same people which are known in Indian tradition under the designation Śaka-muruṇḍa; Muruṇḍa being a later form of a Śaka word which has the same meaning as Chinese "wang," i.e., king, master, lord. In Indian inscriptions and coins it has frequently been translated with the Indian word Svāmin.

The name of the Śaka king who occupied Kipin is

1 For the Scythian Period, see now a monograph by Johanna Engelberta von Lohuizen de Leeuw.
2 E. Herzfeld, MASI, 34. 3.
3 Schoff, Isidore, Stathmos Parthikoi, 17.
4 C. 174-160 B.C. according to some scholars.
5 JRAS, 1903, p. 22; 1932, 958; Modern Review, April, 1921, p. 464. The Śaka occupation of Kipin must be posterior to the reign of Eukratides and his immediate (Greek) successors.
6 Professor Hermann identifies the Sai-wang with the Sakarakouloi or Sakarakouloi of Strabo and other classical authors. Corpus, II. 1, xxv. For Muruṇḍa see pp. xx.
not known. The earliest ruler of that region mentioned in Chinese records is Wu-t'ou-lao whose son was ousted by Yin-mo-fu, the son of the prince of Yung-k'ü,\(^1\) with Chinese help. Yin-mo-fu established himself as king of Kipin during the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-ti, which lasted from 73 to 48 B.C., and killed the attendants of an envoy sent in the reign of the Emperor Yüan-ti (B.C. 48-33). In the reign of Chéng-ti (32-7 B.C.) the support of China was sought without success by the king of Kipin, probably the successor of Yin-mo-fu, who was in danger from some powerful adversary, apparently a king of the Yue-chi, who had relations with China about this time as is proved by the communication of certain Buddhist books to a Chinese official in 2 B.C.\(^2\)

S. Lévi at first identified Kipin with Kaśmīra. But his view has been ably controverted by Sten Konow\(^3\) who accepts the identification with Kāpiśa.\(^4\) Gandhāra was at one time the eastern part of the realm of Kipin. A passage of Hemachandra’s *Abhidhāna-Chintāmaṇi* seems to suggest that the capital of the Sai-wang (Śaka-Muraṇḍa) was Lampāka or Laghman (*Lampākāstu Muraṇḍāh syuh*).\(^5\) Sten Konow says that according to the *Ts'ien Han-shu*, or *Annals of the First Han Dynasty*, the Sai, i.e., the Śakas, passed the Hientu (the hanging passage), i.e., the gorge

---

\(^1\) The identification of Yung-k’ü with Yonaka (Tarn, 297; and that of Yin-mo-fu with Hermaios (Tarn, 346) are purely conjectural. Mention may be made in this connection of Zonkah in Ti-bat (JASB, 1895, 97). But the problem of identification must await future discoveries.


\(^3\) Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 291.

\(^4\) The country drained by the northern tributaries of the river Kábul, *ibid.*, p. 290; cf. Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, Vol. I, pp. 259-60. The city of Kāpiśa probably stood at the junction of the Ghorband and the Panjshir (Foucher, *Indian Studies presented to Prof. Rapson*, 345). Kipin according to the *Ts'ien Han-shu* joins Wu-i-shan-li (Arachosia and Persia according to Schoff, *Parthian Stations*, 41) on the south-west. *Corpus*, II, 1, xxiv; JRAS, 1912, 684n. Cf. Dr. Hermann (JRAS, 1913, 1088n.) who holds that Ki-pin was Gandhāra. The reference to a gold as well as a silver currency in Ki-pin is worthy of note (*Corpus*, II, 1, xxiv). Cf. the gold coin of the city of Pushkālāvatī (*CHI*, 587), and the coin of Aṭhama (*AGI*, 49).

\(^5\) Lampāka (Laghman) is 100 miles to the east of Kapisene (*AGI*, 49).
west of Skardu on their way to Kipin. Though the Šakas wrested parts of Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra) from the hands of Greek meridarchs (governors) they could not permanently subjugate Kābul, where the Basileus (king) maintained a precarious existence. They were more successful in India. Inscriptions at Mathurā and Nāsik prove that the Šakas extended their sway as far as the Jumna in the east and the Godāvari in the south, and destroyed the power of the ‘Mitras’ of Mathurā and the Śātavāhanas of Paiṭhan.

No connected or detailed account of the Šaka potentates of Kipin is possible. Šakas are mentioned along with the Yavanas in the Rāmāyana, the Mahābhārata, the Manusamhitā and the Mahābhāṣya. The Harivamśa informs us that they shaved one half of their heads. The Jaina work Kālakāchārya-kathānaka states that their kings were called Śāhi. Some of these ‘Śāhis’ are said to have been induced by a Jaina teacher to proceed to Suraṭṭha (Surāśṭra) Vishaya (country) and Ujjain in Hindukadeśa (India) where they overthrew some local chiefs and ruled for four years till they were themselves ousted by the founder of the era of 58 B.C.

The Šakas are also mentioned in the Praśastis of Gautamiputra Śatakarnī and Samudra Gupta. Their kingdom or empire “Šakasthāna” is probably mentioned in the Mahāmāyūri (95), in the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscription and in the Chandravalli Stone Inscription of

---

1 Ep. Ind., XIV, 291. Corpus, II. 1, xxii. For possible alternative routes of conquest, see JRAS, 1913, 929, 959, 1008, 1023.
3 Some of the Šakas seem to have penetrated to the far south of India. A Nāgārjunikonda Inscription refers to a Šaka named Moda and his sister Budhi.
5 I. 54. 22; IV. 43. 12.
6 II. 32. 17.
7 X. 44.
8 Ind. Ant., 1875, 244.
9 Chaps. 14, 16. JRAS, 1906, 204.
the Kadamba Mayūraśarman. The passage in the Mathurā inscription containing the word Šakasthāna runs thus:

Sarvasa Sakastanasā puṇyaṃ.

Cunningham and Bühler interpreted the passage as meaning "for the merit, or in honour, (of the people) of the whole of Šakasthāna." Dr. Fleet, however, maintained that "there are no real grounds for thinking that the Šakas ever figured as invaders of any part of northern India above Kathiawā尔 and the western and southern parts of the territory now known as Mālwa." He took Sarva to be a proper name and translated the insessional passage referred to above as "a gift of Sarva in honour of his home."

Fleet's objection is ineffective. Chinese evidence clearly establishes the presence of Šakas in Kipin, i.e., Kāpiśa-Gandhāra.1 As regards the presence of the tribe at Mathurā, the site of the inscription, we should note that the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa2 refers to a Šaka settlement in the Madhyaedesa. Dr. Thomas3 points out that the epigraphs on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Šaka and Persian nomenclature. The name Mevaki for instance, which occurs in the inscription, is a variant of the Scythian name Mauakes.4 The termination "-ūś" in Komūsā and Šamūšo seems to be Scythic. Dr. Thomas further points out that there is no difficulty in the expression of honour to the "whole realm of the Šakas" since we find in the Wardak, Sui Vihār and other inscriptions even more comprehensive expressions, e.g., Sarva

1 JRAS, 1904, 703f.; 1905, 155, 643f.; Mr. N. G. Majumdar (JASB, 1924, 17) takes Sakastana, to mean Šakrasthāna. i.e., 'the place of India.' Cf Fleet in JRAS, 1904, 705.
2 Note also the Kāpiśa types of the coins of Maues and Spalhises (CHI, 501f., 582, 591) and the foundation of a Kāpiśa satrapy (Corpus, ii. 1, 150ff.).
3 Chapter 58.
5 Cf. Maues, Moga, and Mavaces, the commander of the Šakas who went to the aid of Darius Codomannus (Chinnock, Arrian, p. 142). Cf. also the coin-name Mevakus (S. Konow, Corpus, xxxiii n.). In the period 106 to 101 B.C. the king of Ferghana bore the Šaka name of Mu-ku'a (Targ. Greeks, 308 f.).
sattvanam—‘of all living creatures.’ As regards Fleet’s renderings “svaka” and “sakaṭṭhāna,” one’s own place, Dr. Thomas says that it does not seem natural to inscribe on the stone, honour to somebody’s own home. A pūjā addressed to a country is unusual, but inscription G of the Lion Capital contains a similar pūjā addressed to the chief representatives of the Śaka dominions.

Śakasthāna, doubtless, included the district of Scythia mentioned in the Periplus, “from which flows down the river Sinthus (Indus) the greatest of all the rivers that flow into the Erythraean Sea (Indian Ocean).” The metropolis of “Scythia” in the time of the Periplus was Minnagara; and its market town was Barbaricum on the seashore.

Princes bearing Śaka names are mentioned in several inscriptions discovered in Taxila, Mathurā and Western India. According to Dr. Thomas “whatever Śaka dynasties may have existed in the Pañjāb or India, reached India neither through Afghānistān nor through Kaśmīra but, as Cunningham contended, by way of Sindh and the valley of the Indus.” This theory cannot be accepted in its entirety in view of the inadequate representation of Sind by Śaka coins, the Chinese account of the Śaka occupation of Kipin and the epigraphic evidence regarding the existence of a Scythian Satrapy at Kāpiśi and a Śaka principality in the Hazāra country. We cannot also overlook the fact that some of the Śaka names hitherto discovered are those of the Northern Śakas who lived near the Sogdianoī. The names Maues, Moga and Mevaki,

1 JRAS, 1906, p. 216.
2 CHI, 589n. JASB, 1924, p. 14; S. Konow, Corpus, II. i. 13f. The Śaka conquest of Kipin did not mean the total extinction of the Greek principality in the Kābul region. The History of the Later Han Dynasty (A.D. 25-220) refers to the existence, side by side, of the kingdoms of Kipin and Kābul before the conquest of the latter state by the Parthians. Like the Śātavāhanas, the Greeks of the Kābul territory may have restored their fallen fortunes to a certain extent after the first rush of barbarian invasion had spent its force. It is also possible that Scythian chiefs for a time acknowledged the nominal suzerainty of the Greek Basileus.
3 Ind. Ant., 1884, pp. 399-400.
4 Taxila plate.
5 Mathurā Lion Capital.
for instance, are variants of the Śaka name Mauakes. We learn from Arrian that a chief named Mauakes or Movaces led the “Saciens (Śakas), a Scythian tribe belonging to the Scythians who dwelt in Asia,” who lived outside the jurisdiction of the Persian governor of the Bactrians and the Sogdianians, but were in alliance with the Persian king. Chhaharata, Khaharakāta or Kshaharakāta, the family designation of several satrapal houses of Taxila, Mathurā, Western India and the Deccan, is perhaps equivalent to Karatai the name of a Śaka tribe of the North.¹

The Conquest of the Lower Indus Valley, Cutch and parts of Western India may, however, have been effected by the Śakas of Western Śakasthāna (Sīstān) who are mentioned by Isidore of Charax. The name of the capitals of “Scythia” (which embraced the Lower Indus Valley) and of the kingdom of Mambarus (Nambanus?) in the time of the Periplus was Minagara, and this was evidently derived from the city of Min in Śakasthāna mentioned by Isidore.² Rapson points out that one of the most characteristic features in the names of the Western Kshatrapas of Chashtana’s line, viz., “Dāman” (-dama) is found also in the name of a prince of the Drangianian house of Vonones. Lastly, the Kārddamaka family from which, according to a Kanheri Inscription, the daughter of the Mahākshatrapa Rudra claimed descent, apparently derived its name from the Kārddama river in the realm of the Persians.³

The earliest Śaka kings mentioned in Indian inscrip-

---

¹ Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 400; cf. Corpus, II, I. xxxvi: “Kharaosta and Mauaes would belong to the north-western Śakas of Ki-pin and not to the branch which came to India from Sīstān.” Cf. xxxiii (case of Liaka).
² JRAS, 1915, p. 830.
³ Shāmasastry’s trans. of the Arthaśāstra, p. 86, n. 6. cf. Artemis (Ptolemy, 324), Gordomaris, Loeb, Marcellinus (ii, 389). For another view see Ind. Ant., XII. 273 n. The word Kārdamika occurs in the Mahābhāṣya (IV. 2. 1. Word Index, p. 275); Kramadīśvara, 747; and Kardamila in Mbh. III. 135. 1. The Kārddama river may be identified with the Zarafshan which flowed through the old Achaemenian Satrapy of Bactria or Balkh. The Uttarākhaṇḍa of the Rāmāyana (Chs. 100 and 102) connects a line of Kārddama kings with Bāhli or Bahlīka (IHK, 1933, pp. 97 ff).
tions are, perhaps, Damijada\(^1\) and Maues. The latter is usually identified with Moga of the Taxila plate. He is possibly mentioned also in the Maira Inscription.\(^2\) Maues Moga was a mighty sovereign (Maharaya). His dominions included Chuksha near Taxila which was ruled by a satrapal, *i.e.*, a viceregal, family. Numismatic evidence points to his sway over Kāpiṣi\(^3\) and Pushkarāvatī as well as Taxila.\(^4\) His satrapas probably put an end to Greek and Indian rule in the country round Mathurā. In parts of the Eastern Pañjab and certain adjacent tracts indigenous tribes like the Audumbaras, Trigartas, Kunindas, Yaudheyas, Ārjunāyanas had begun to assert their independence probably after the collapse of the Euthydemian monarchy. Maues struck coins with the types of Eukratides and Demetrios. But the absence of the *Athena Alkis* type leads Tarn to surmise that he did not annex Menander’s home kingdom (*i.e.*, the district round Sākala).\(^5\)

The dates assigned to Maues by various scholars range from B.C. 135 to A.D. 154. His coins are found ordinarily in the Pañjab, and chiefly in the western portion of the province of which Taxila was the ancient capital. There can thus be no doubt that Maues was the king of Gandhāra. Now, it is impossible to find for Maues a place in the history of the Pañjab before the Greek king Antialkidas who was reigning at Taxila when king Bhāgabhadrā was on the throne of Vidiśā in Central India for fourteen years. The date of Bhāgabhadrā is uncertain but he must be placed later than Agnimitra, son of Pushyamitra, who ruled from *cir.* B.C. 151 to 143. The fourteenth year of Bhāgabhadrā, therefore, could not have fallen before c. 129 B.C. Consequently Antial-

\(^1\) Or Namijada, Shadbaur Ins., *Corpus*, II. i. 14, 16.

\(^2\) At Maira in the Salt Range, a *Kharoshthi* Inscription has been found in a well which seems to be dated in the year 58 and possibly contains the word Moasa, *of Moa or Moga*.

\(^3\) *Camb. Hist.* (Ind.), I. 590 f.

\(^4\) Ibid., 701.

\(^5\) Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, 322-330. The conquest of this kingdom may have been effected by Azes I. Whitehead, *Indo-Greek Coins*, 112; Tarn, *GBI*, 349; or by Rājuvula, Allan *CICA*, 185.
kidas could not have been ruling earlier than the second half of the second century B.C., and his reign could not have ended before 129 B.C. The Śaka occupation of Gandhāra must, therefore, be later than 129 B.C. All scholars except Fleet identify Mauves with Maharaya Moga of the so-called Sirsukh or Taxila plate, dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era. The generally accepted view is that the era is of Śaka institution. As the era is used only in Northern India and the borderland, it is permissible to conjecture that it came into existence after the Śaka occupation of those regions. We have already seen that this occupation could not have taken place before 129 B.C. The era used in the Taxila plate could not, therefore, have originated before 129 B.C. The year 78 of the era could not have fallen before B.C. (129−78=) 51. Consequently the rule of Mauves-Moga cannot have ended before B.C. 51. He must be placed even later, because we learn from Chinese records that Yin-mo-fu was in possession of Kipin or Kāpiśa-Gandhāra about 48-33 B.C., and he was preceded by Wu-tou-lao and his son. As there is no real ground for identifying Mauves-Moga with any of these rulers he will have to be placed after 33 B.C. He cannot perhaps be placed later than the middle of the first century A.D., because we learn from Philostratos and the author of the Periplus that about the time or a little later both Taxila and Minagara, the metropolis of Scythia, i.e. the Śaka kingdom in the Indus valley, had passed into the hands of the Parthians. It seems, therefore, that Mauves-Moga ruled after 33 B.C., but before the latter half of the first century A.D. According to Fleet, Moga flourished in the year 22 A.D.—the year 78 of the era commencing 58 B.C. which afterwards came to be known as the Kṛita-Mālava-Vikrama era. But the matter must be regarded as not definitely settled. The Khalatse Inscription of the year 187 (?) of Uvima (?) Wema Kadphises) and the Taxila

1 Cf., now Marshall, Monuments of Sāñchi, I, 268n.
2 Leeuw suggests that the era of the old Śaka inscriptions began from the Yue-chi conquest of Bactria c. 129 B.C.
Silver Vase Inscription of the year 191 of Jihonika possibly suggest that the era to which the dates of these inscriptions, and presumably that of the so-called Sirsukh (Taxila) plate of Moga, are to be referred, began much earlier than B.C. 58.

Numismatists say that Maues was succeeded on the throne of Gandhāra by Azes who put an end to the remnant of Greek rule in the Eastern Pañjāb by annexing the kingdom of Hippostratos. In the opinion of Marshall he also conquered the Jumna valley where the Vikrama era was in use.¹ The coins of Azes are very closely related to the issues of the rulers of the Vonones group, and the assumption has always been made that Azes, the king of the Pañjāb, is identical with Azes, the colleague of Spalirises. Some scholars think that there were two kings of the name of Azes and that the first Azes was the immediate successor, not of Maues, but of Spalirises and that Maues came not only after Azes I, but also after Azes II. But the last part of the theory cannot be accepted in view of the synchronism of Gondophonernes and Azes II proved by the fact that Aspavarman served as Strategos, i.e., general or governor, under both the monarchs.² As Gondophonernes ruled in the year 103,³ while Maues-Moga ruled in the year 78,⁴ and as both these dates are usually referred by scholars to the same era, both Gondophonernes and his contemporary Azes II must be later than Maues-Moga. There is no room for Maues-Moga between Azes I and Azes II, because we shall see presently that the succession from Azes I to Azes II is clearly established by numismatic evidence. Maues came either before Azes I or after Azes II; but we have already seen that he could not have reigned after Azes II. He must, therefore, be placed before Azes I. He may have been ruling in the Pañjāb when Vonones was ruling in Sīstān. When Vonones was

¹ JRAS, 1947, 22.
³ Cf. the Takht-i-Bāhī Inscription.
⁴ Cf. the Taxila Plate of Patika.
succeeded by Spalirises, Mauces was succeeded by Azes I. We have already seen that Spalirises and Azes I issued joint coins. The relationship between the two monarchs is not known. They may have been related by blood, or they may have been mere allies like Hermaios and Kujula Kadphises.

King Azes I struck some coins bearing his own name in Greek on the obverse, and that of Azilises in Kharoshti on the reverse. Then again we have another type of coins on which the name in Greek is Azilises, and in Kharoshti is Aya (Azes). Drs. Bhandarkar and Smith postulate that these two joint types, when considered together, prove that Azilises, before his accession to independent power, was the subordinate colleague of an Azes, and that an Azes similarly was subsequently the subordi-

1 Rapson on pp. 573-574 of CHI, identifies Azes, the colleague of Spalirises, with Azes II, and makes him the son of Spalirises. On page 572, however, the suggestion is found that Azes II was the son and successor of Azilises. It is difficult to see how the two views can be reconciled. For an inscription of Azes see Corpus, II. 1. 17 (Shahdaur Inscription of Sivarakshita). The name of Aja or Aya (Azes) has also been recognised by certain scholars in the Kalawán Inscription of the year 134 and in the Taxila silver scroll record of the year 136. The absence of any honorific title before the name makes it difficult to say whether it refers to a king, and, if it does refer to a king, whether the ruler in question was Azes I or Azes II. Moreover, if Aja or Aya is a royal name, then it would seem, from the analogy of other early Indian epigraphs, that the years 134 and 136 actually belonged to his reign; not years of an era which he founded but of an era which he used. The absence of any honorific title has, however, led some writers to suggest that Aja-Aya was the founder of the reckoning mentioned in the epigraphs, and not the reigning sovereign in the years 134 and 136. The identity of the reckoning with the era of 58 B.C. cannot be regarded as certain, though the theory has many advocates. Another thorny problem is the relation between this reckoning and the reckoning or reckonings used by Moga and Gondophernes. For the Kalawán Inscription see Ep. Ind. XXI. 251 ff.; IHQ, 1932, 825; 1933, 141; India in 1932-33, p. 182.

2 Cf. Whitehead, p. 178; Marshall, Taxila, p. 16.

3 Coins of Azilises are imitated by Mahâdeva Dharaghoṣha Audumbara (CHI, 549). Along with certain caskets discovered in Taxila (ASI, AR, 1934-35, pp. 29, 30) was a silver coin of the diokhouri type of Azilises and a Roman coin issued by Augustus. The deposit was probably made early in the first century A.D. We have here new data for settling the chronology of the Mauces-Azes group of kings. It may be remembered that Kadphises I copied the bust of Augustus or one of his immediate successors on his coins. Azilises should not be far removed in date from the Julian Emperors or from the period of Kushân invasion.
nate colleague of Azilises. The two princes named Azes cannot, therefore, be identical, and they must be distinguished as Azes I and Azes II. Whitehead, however, observes that the silver coins of Azilises are better executed and earlier in style than those of Azes. The best didrachms of Azes compare unfavourably with the fine silver coins of Azilises with Zeus obverse and Dioskouroi reverse, and with other rare silver types of Azilises. If Azilises preceded Azes, then following Dr. Smith we must have Azilises I and Azilises II, instead of Azes I and Azes II. In conclusion Whitehead says that the differences in type and style between the abundant issues of Azes can be adequately explained by reasons of locality alone, operating through a long reign.\textsuperscript{1} Marshall, however, points out that the stratification of coins at Taxila clearly proves the correctness of Smith's theory, according to which Azes I was succeeded by Azilises, and Azilises by Azes II.\textsuperscript{2}

A notable discovery has unearthed the unique gold coin of a king named Athama. Whitehead has no hesitation in recognising him as a member of the dynasty of Azes and Azilises. His date is, however, uncertain.

Unlike most of the Indo-Greek princes,\textsuperscript{3} the Śaka kings style themselves on their coins Basileus Basileon, corresponding to the Prākrit on the reverse Mahārājasa Rājarājas. They also appropriate the epithet Mahatasa, corresponding to the Greek Megaloy, which we find on the coins of Greek kings. The title Rājarāja—king of

\textsuperscript{1} Inferior workmanship according to some, is a sign of remoteness (from Gandhāra?) rather than of late date (cf. CHI, 569f). G. Hoffmann and Sten Konow not only reject the duplication of Azes, but suggest the identification of Azes with Azilises. According to Marshall Azilises ruled north-westwards as far as Kāpiši (JRAS, 1947, 25 ff).

\textsuperscript{2} The coins which Smith assigns to Azes II are found generally nearer the surface than those of Azes I (JRAS, 1914, 979). For Konow's view, see Ep. Ind., 1916, 274 and Corpus, II, 1. xxxix-xl. The name 'Azes' is found in association with several rulers of various dates, while that of Azilises is found only with one (viz., Azes). This possibly points to the plurality of the kings named Azes.

\textsuperscript{3} With the exception perhaps of Eukratides one of whose coins bears the legend Mahārajasa rajatarajas Evukratidasa (Corpus, II, 1. xxix n), and of a few other rulers including Hermiaios (Whitehead, p. 85).
kings—was not an empty boast. Moga had under him the viceroys (sartap) Liaka and Patika of Chuksha (Chach) in the Western Punjab. One of the kings named Azes had under him at least one subordinate ruler, e.g., the Stratagos Aspavarman. The title Satrap or Kshatrapa occurs in the Behistun Inscription of Persia in the form Khshathrapāvan which means 'protector of the kingdom.' "Strategos," a Greek word, means a general. It is obvious that the Scythians continued in North-Western Indiā the Perso-Hellenic system of government by Satraps and military governors. Coins and Inscriptions prove the existence of several other Satrapal families besides those mentioned above.

The North Indian Kshatrapas or Satraps may be divided into three main groups, viz.:—

1. The Satraps of Kāpiśi, Pusapāra and Abhisāraprastha,

2. The Satraps of the Western Pañjāb, and

3. The Satraps of Mathurā.

A Māṇikiālā inscription affords the bare mention of a Satrap of Kāpiśi, who was the son of the Satrap Grantavryaka. A Kābul Museum Stone Inscription of the year 83 discloses the name of a Satrap of Pusapāra named Tiravharna. ‘Pusapāra’, the city of flowers, may have reference to Pushkarāvatī (lotus-city). The name of Śivasena, ‘the Kshatrapa in the town of Abhisāraprastha’ occurs in the legend of a copper seal ring found in the Pañjāb. The territory of the three Satraps may have corresponded to Yona, Gandhāra and Kamboja of Aśokan epigraphs.

1 Cf. Ksha-pāvan of the Rig-veda (Vedic Index, i. 208). Rāṣṭra-pāla of the Arthaśāstra and Gopṭri or Deśa-gopṭri of the Mālavihāgnimitram and the Gupta inscriptions.

2 Rapson, Andhra Coins, ci; Ancient India, 14; JASB, 1924, 14, Corpus, II. i, 150-1.


4 Corpus, II. i. 103.
The *Pañjāb Satraps* belonged to three families, *viz.*—

(a) The *Kusulua* or *Kusuluka Group*—It consisted of Liaka and his son Patika, possibly of the Chbhararata or Kshaharāta family, who apparently governed the district of Chuksha.¹ According to Fleet there were two Patikas.² But in the opinion of Marshall there was only one viceroy of the name of Patika.³ The Satrapal line of Kusuluka was intimately connected with the Satraps of Mathurā.⁴ The coins of Liaka Kusuluka show the transition of the district to which they belonged, *i.e.*, a part of Eastern Gandhāra, from the rule of the Greek house of Eukratides to the Śakas.⁵ We learn from the Taxila, or the so-called Sirsukh plate, dated in the year 78, that Liaka was a Satrap of the great king Moga and that Patika, his son, was a great gift-lord (*mahādānapati*).⁶

(b) Manipuli and his son *Zeonises* or *Jihonika*—Numismatists consider them to be Satraps of Pushkalāvatī during the reign of Azes II. But the Taxila Silver Vase Inscription of the year 191 discovered by Marshall in 1927⁷ shows that Jihonika was a *Kshatrāpa* in Cukhsha near Taxila in the year 191 of an era of Śaka (or Parthian ?) institution whose exact epoch is not known.⁸ The successor of Zeonises was apparently Kuyula Kara.⁹

(c) The *House of Indravarman*¹⁰—It consisted of

² *JARS*, 1907, p. 1035. The existence of at least two Liakas is, however, proved by the Taxila plate and the Zeda inscription (*Corpus*, II, i. 145). A Lia(ka) appears also to be mentioned in the Mānsehrā inscription of the year 68. He may have been identical with the father of Patika, *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 257.
³ *JARS*, 1914, pp. 979 ff.
⁴ Cf. Inscription G on the Mathurā Lion Capital.
⁵ Rapsön's *Ancient India*, p. 154.
⁶ *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 257; *JARS*, 1931, 953n.
⁷ *JARS*, 1928 January, 197 f. *Corpus*, II, i. 81 f.
⁹ *CHI*, 582n, 588.
¹⁰ Indravarman has been identified by some scholars with Itravarma, son of Vijayamitra, who is known from certain coins. Vijayamitra is further
Indravarman, his son Aspavarman, and Aspa’s nephew Sasa(s) or Sasa(n). Aspavarman acted as governor of both Azes II and Gondophernes, while Sasa(s) served under Gondophernes and Pakores.

The Satraps of Mathurā

The earliest of this line of princes were once believed to be the rulers Hāgāna and Hāgamasha. They were supposed to be succeeded by Rājuvula, who may have governed Sākala at an earlier stage. According to Allan¹ he established himself in Mathurā late in life. The genealogical table of the house of Rājuvula or Rājula as arranged by Sten Konow² is given below in a foot-note.

Rājuvula or Rājula is known from inscriptions as well as coins. An inscription in Brāhmī characters at Mora near Mathurā calls him a Mahākshatrapa or Great Satrap (viceroy). But the Greek legend on some of his coins describes him as “king of kings, the Saviour” showing that he probably declared his independence.

Rājuvula was apparently succeeded by his son Śuḍāsa, Soṇḍāsa or Śodāsa. Inscription B on the Mathurā Lion Capital mentions him as a Kṣatrava (Satrap) and as the

regarded as identical with, or a successor of, Viyakamitra, a feudatory of Makedon (Menander). The importance of these identifications, in determining the chronological relation of the Indo-Greeks and the Sakas, is obvious.

¹ CIC, AI, CXV.
² Corpus II, i. 47.

Arta = Pišparsi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abuhola = Kharaosta Kamua</th>
<th>Khalamaša</th>
<th>Maja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayuara</td>
<td>Ayasi Komua =</td>
<td>Rajula =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hana</td>
<td>Nada Diak</td>
<td>Suḍasa Naūluda Kalui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
son of the Mahākṣhattravā Rajula (Rājuvula). But later inscriptions at Mathurā written in Brāhmī characters call him a Mahākṣhattrapa. One of these inscriptions gives a date for him in the year 72 of an unspecified era. It is clear that during his father’s lifetime he was only a Satrap. But on his father’s death some time before the year 72, he became a Great Satrap. Sten Konow adduces grounds for believing that Śoḍāsa dated his inscription in the so-called Vikrama era. Consequently the year 72, in his opinion, possibly corresponds to A.D. 15.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar refers the dates of the Northern Satraps (of Taxila and Mathurā) to the Śaka era, and places them in the middle of the second century A.D. But Ptolemy, who flourished about that time, places neither Taxila nor Mathurā within Indo-Scythia, i.e., the Śaka dominion. This shows that neither Taxila nor Mathurā was a Śaka possession in the second century A.D. The principal Indo-Scythian possessions in Ptolemy’s time were Patalene (the Indus Delta), Abiria (the Ābhira country in Western India), and Syrastrene (Kāṭhiāwād). This is exactly what we find in the Junāgadh inscription of the Śaka ruler Rudradāman I, who flourished in the middle of the second century A.D. In Ptolemy’s time Taxila was included within the Arsa (Sanskrit Uraśā) territory, and Mathurā belonged to the Kaspeiraioi. Dr. Majumdar suggests that Ptolemy probably noticed the Śaka empire of Mauēs and his successors (which included Taxila, Mathurā and Ujjayinī) under the name of ‘Kaspeiraioi’. But we

The genealogy, as reconstructed by Sten Konow, is not accepted by many scholars. An older view makes Kharoṣṭha the son of a daughter of Rājuvula. For Rājuvula’s connection with C. Pañjāb, see Allan, CCAI, 185. Cf. 438 ante.

1 42 according to Rapson. But 72 is preferred by most scholars.
2 Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, pp. 139-141.
3 Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 354.
5 Ind. Ant., 1884, p. 350.
should remember that far from including Taxila, Mathurā and Western India within one empire, Ptolemy sharply distinguishes the land of the Kaspeiraioi from Indo-Scythia which was the real Śaka domain in the middle of the second century A.D.\(^1\) Moreover, the territory of the Kaspeiraioi must have included the region below the sources of the Jhelum Chenab and the Ravi, i.e., Kaśmira and its neighbourhood;\(^2\) and there is no evidence that the dynasty of Maues ever ruled in Kaśmira. It was only under the kings of Kanishka's dynasty that Kaśmira and Mathurā formed parts of one and the same empire. As suggested by the Abbé Boyer the Kaspeiraioi of Ptolemy evidently referred to the Kushān empire.

We learn from the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscriptions that when Sudasa, i.e. Śoḍāsa, was ruling as a mere Kshatrapa, Kusuluka Patika was a Mahākshatrapa. As Śoḍāsa was a Mahākshatrapa in the year 72, he must have been a Kshatrapa before 72. Consequently Kusuluka Patika must have been reigning as a Mahākshatrapa contemporary of the Kshatrapa Śoḍāsa before the year 72. The Taxila plate of the year 78, however, does not style Patika as a Kshatrapa or Mahākshatrapa. It calls him Mahādānabati (great gift-lord) and gives the satrapal title to his father Liuka.\(^3\) Dr. Fleet thinks\(^4\) that we have to do with two different Patikas. Marshall and Sten Konow on the other hand, hold the view that the Mahādānapati Patika, who issued the Taxila plate, is identical with the Mahākshatrapa Kusuluka Patika of the Mathurā Lion Capital, but the era in which the inscription of Sam 72 is dated, is not the same as in the Taxila plate of Sam 78. In other words


\(^{2}\) Land of Kaśyapa? *Rājatarāṅgini*, 1, 27. IA. IV, 227. Stein accepts the identification of the territory of the Kaspeiraioi with Kaśmir, but rejects Wilson's assumption that Kaśmir was derived from Kaśyapa Puna (*JASB*, 1899, Extra 2, pp. 9-13). The evidence of Ptolemy seems to suggest that the city of Kaspeira stood close to Multan. Alberuni (I. 298) in a later age mentions Kaśyapapura as a name of Multan itself.


\(^{4}\) *JRAS*, 1913, 100n.
while Fleet duplicates kings, Marshall and Sten Konow duplicate eras. It is difficult to come to any final decision from the scanty data at our disposal. Fleet's theory is not improbable in view of the fact that we have evidence regarding the existence of at least two Liakas. But the duplication of kings is not absolutely necessary as the designation 'mahādānapati' given to Patika in the Taxila plate does not preclude the possibility of his having been a Mahākṣatrapa as well a few years back. We should remember in this connection that there are instances among the Western Kṣatrapas of Chashtana's line, of Mahākṣatrapas being reduced to a humbler rank while other members of the family held the higher office, and of a Kṣatrapa (Jayadāman) being mentioned without the satrapal title. It is, therefore, not altogether improbable that the inscription of Sam 72 and that of Sam 78 are dated in the same era, and yet the two Patikas are identical. If Sten Konow and Sir John Marshall are right in reading the name of Aja-Aya (Azes) in the Kalawān Copper-plate Inscription of the year 134 and the Taxila Inscription of 136, we have additional instances of a ruler of this age being mentioned without any title indicative of his rank.

Kharaosta was, according to S. Konow, the father-in-law, and according to Fleet, a grandson (daughter's son), of Rājjuvula and consequently a nephew of Śoḍāsa. The inscriptions A and E on the Mathurā Lion Capital mention him as the Yuvarāya Kharaosta. Sten Know thinks that he was the inheritor to the position as “king of kings”

---

1 Cf. Majumdar, *The Date of Kanishka*, *Ind. Ant.*, 1917.
2 Rapson, *Coron of the Andhra Dynasty*, etc cxxivf.
3 Andhau Inscriptions.
4 The Rājataśanghi furnishes an instance of a son being replaced by his father as king (cf. the case of Pārtha), and of a king abdicating in favour of his son and again resuming control over the kingdom; cf. the case of Kalasa who continued to be a co-ruler after the resumption of control by his father, and that of Rājā Mānsingh of Jodhpur (1804-43). The cases of Vijayādiya VII (*Eastern Chalukya*, D. C. Ganguli, p. 104 and of Zāfar Khān of Gujrat may also be cited in this connection (*Camb. Hist. Ind.*, III, 295).
5 *JRAS*, 1913, 919. 1009.
6 *Corpus*, 86.
after Moga. His known coins are of two types, presenting legends in Greek characters on the obverse and in Kharos̱ṭhī on the reverse. The Kharos̱ṭhī legend runs thus: Kshatrapasa pra Kharaostasa Artasa putrasa. 'Pra' according to Sten Konow, may be a reflex of Prachakshasa.¹

The coins of the family of Rājuvula are imitated from those of the Stratos and also of a line of Hindu princes who ruled at Mathurā. This shows that in the Jumna valley Scythian rule superseded that of both Greek and Hindu princes.

A fragmentary inscription found by Vogel on the site of Ganeshrā near Mathurā revealed the name of Satrap of the Kshaharāta family called Ghaṭāka.²

The Nationality of the Northern Satraps

Cunningham held that the inscription P on the Mathurā Lion Capital—Sarvasa Sakastanasas puyae—gave decisive proof that Rājuvula or Rājula, Soḍāsa and other connected Satraps were of Śaka nationality. Dr. Thomas shows, however, that the Satraps of Northern India were the representatives of a mixed Parthian and Śaka domination. This is strongly supported a priori by the fact that Patika of Taxila, who bears himself a Persian name, mentions as his overlord the great king Moga whose name is Śaka. The inscriptions on the Lion Capital exhibit a mixture of Persian and Śaka nomenclature.³ Attention may, however, be called here to the fact that in the Harīvamśa there is a passage⁴ which characterises the Pahlavas or Parthians as "śmaśrudhārīnāḥ" (bearded).

¹ Corpus, xxxv, 'prachakshasa' (= epiphanous, 'of the gloriously manifest one'), occurs on coins of Strato I and Polyxanos. It is, however, possible that the Sanskrit equivalent of the name of the Satrap is prakhara-ojas, 'of burning effulgence.'
² JRAS, 1912, p. 121.
³ Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, pp. 198 ff; JRAS, 1906, 215 ff. For Sten Konow's views see Corpus, II. i, xxxvii.
⁴ I., 14, 17.
⁵ The passage is also found in the Vāyu Purāṇa, Ch. 88, 141.
THE PAHLAVAS OR PARTHIANS

Judged by this test, kings of the family of Rājūvula and Nahapāna, who are not unoften taken to be Parthians, could not have belonged to that nationality as their portraits found on coins show no traces of beards and whiskers. They were, therefore, almost certainly Śakas.

SECTION II. THE PAHLAVAS OR PARTHIANS

Already in the time of Eukratides, Mithradates I, King of Parthia (c. 171-138/87 B.C.), had probably conquered portions of the Pañjāb or Sind, and in the days of the Śaka Emperors of the family of Maues-Moga, princes of mixed Śaka-Pahlava origin ruled as Satraps in Northern India. But it is important to note that Isidore of Charax, possibly a younger contemporary of Augustus, who wrote not earlier than 26 B.C. (reign of Phraates IV and the revolt of Tiridates) and is quoted by Pliny, does not include the Kābul Valley, Sind or the Western Pañjāb within the empire of the Parthians or Pahlavas. The easternmost provinces of the Parthian empire mentioned by that writer are Herat (Aria), Farah (the country of the Anauoi, a segment of Aria (i.e., the Herat Province), the districts between the Lake Hamun and the Helmund (Drangiana and Sakasthāna), and Kandahār (Arachosia or "White India"). Towards the middle of the first century A.D., however, Śaka sovereignty in parts of Gandhāra must have been supplanted by that of the Parthians. In 43-44 A.D., when Apollonios of Tyana is reputed to have visited Taxila, the throne was occupied by Phraotes, evidently a Parthian. He was however independent of Vardanes, the great King of Babylon and Parthia (c. 39-

---

1 The Parthians (Pārthava, Pahlava) were an Irānian people established on the borders of the district that is today Mazandarān and Khurāsān. About 249/8 B.C. they revolted against the Seleukids under the command of Arshaka (Arsaces), a leader of Scythia (Pope and Ackerman, A Survey of Persian Art, p. 71).

2 Apratihata (Gondophernes) according to Herford and Tarn (Greeks, 341).
47/48 A.D., and himself powerful enough to exercise suzerain power over the "Satrap of the Indus." Christian writers refer to a king of India named Gundaphar or Gudnaphar and his brother Gad who are said to have been converted by the Apostle St. Thomas and who, therefore lived in the first century A.D. We have no independent confirmation of the story of the biographer of Apollonios. But the "so-called" Takht-i-Bahā record of the year 103 (of an unspecified era) shows that there was actually in the Peshāwar district a king named Guduvhara (Gondophernes). The names of Gondophernes and, in the opinion of some scholars, of his brother Gad, are also found on coins. According to Rapson the two brothers were associated as sub-kings under the suzerainty of Ortaghes (Veuthragna). Sten Konow, however, identifies Ortaghes with Guduvhara himself, while Herzfeld suggests that he was the "unnamed son of Vardanes, mentioned by Tacitus, who claimed the throne against Volagases I about A.D. 55." Dr. Fleet referred the date of the Takht-i-Bahā (Bahā) inscription to the Mālava-Vikrama era, and so placed the record in A.D. 47. He remarked "there should be no hesitation about referring the year 103 to the established Vikrama era of B.C. 58; instead of having recourse, as in other cases too, to some otherwise unknown era beginning at about the same time. This places Gondophernes in A.D. 47 which suits exactly the Christian tradition.

1 Deboevois, A Political History of Parthia, 270
3 Whitehead, pp. 95, 155. Gondophernes = Vindapharna, "Winner of glory" (Whitehead, p. 146, Rapson and Allan). The king assumed the title of Devavrata. S. Konow, following Fleet, takes the word Guđana on the coins to refer to the tribe of Gondophernes (Corpus, II. i. xlvi).
4 Corpus, xlvi; The Cambridge Shorter History of India, 70.
5 JRAS, 1905, pp. 223-255; 1906, pp. 706-710; 1907, pp. 163-172; 1913-1914; 1913, pp. 999-1004. Cf. the views of Cunningham and Dowson (IA, 4, 307). The discovery of the Khilate and the Taxila silver vase inscriptions, however, makes the theory of Fleet less plausible unless we believe in the existence of a plurality of Saka-Pahlava eras. Dr. Jayaswal was inclined to place Gondophernes in 20 B.C. But this date is too early to suit the Christian tradition.
which makes him a contemporary of St. Thomas, the Apostle."

The power of Gondophernes did not probably in the beginning extend to the Gandhāra region. His rule seems to have been restricted at first to Southern Afghanistan. He succeeded, however, in annexing the Peshāwar district before the twenty-sixth year of his reign. There is no epigraphic evidence that he conquered Eastern Gandhāra (Taxila) though he certainly wrested some provinces from the A zes family. The story of the supersession of the rule of A zes II by him in one of the Scythian provinces is told by the coins of Aspavarman. The latter at first acknowledged the suzerainty of A zes (II) but later on obeyed Gondophernes as his overlord. Evidence of the ousting of Śaka rule by the P arthians in the Lower Indus Valley is furnished by the author of the Periplus in whose time (about 60 to 80 A.D.) Minnagara, the metropolis of Scythia, i.e., the Śaka kingdom in the Lower Indus Valley, was subject to Parthian princes who were constantly driving each other out. If Sten Konow and Sir John Marshall are right in reading the name of Aجا-Aya or A zes in the Kalāwān Inscription of 134 and the Taxila Inscription of 136, then it is possible that Śaka rule survived in a part of Eastern Gandhāra, while Peshāwar and the Lower Indus Valley passed into the hands of the P arthians. But the absence of an honorific title before the name of Aja-Aya and the fact that in the record of the year 136 we have reference to the establishment of relics of the Buddha in Takshashīla "for the bestowal of health on the Mahārāja Rājātitāja Devaputra Khushāna," probably suggest that the

1 JRAS, 1913, 1003, 1010.

2 For Fleet's interpretation of "Sa 136 ayasa ashadasa masasa, etc." see JRAS, 1914, 99ff; also Calcutta Review, 1922, December, 493494. S. Konow thought at one time that ayasa stood for ādyasa (= the first). He took the word as qualifying ashadasa. But he changed his views after the discovery of the Kalawān Inscription of 134. He now thinks that the addition ayasa, ajasa does not characterize the era as instituted by A zes, but simply as "connected with Parthian rulers" (Ep. Ind., xxi. 255f). He refers the dates 134, 156 to the era of 58 B.C.
years 134 and 136 belong, not to the pravardhamāna-vijayarājya (the increasing and victorious reign) of Azes, but to a period when his reign was a thing of the past (atitarājya), though the reckoning was still associated with his honoured name. The dating in the Jānībighā inscription (Lakshmāṇa-senasya =ātitarājye sam 83) possibly furnishes us with a parallel.¹

The Greek principality in the Upper Kābul Valley had apparently ceased to exist when Apollonios travelled in India. We learn from Justin that the Parthians gave the coup de grace to the rule of the Bactrian Greeks. Marshall says² that the Kābul valley became a bone of contention between the Parthians and the Kushāns. This is quite in accordance with the evidence of Philostratos who refers to the perpetual quarrel of the "barbarians" with the Parthian king of the Indian borderland in 43-44 A.D.

With Gondophernes were associated as subordinate rulers his nephew Abdagases (in S. Afghanistan), his generals Aspavarman and Sasa(s) or Sasa(n), and his governors Sapedana and Satavastra (probably of Taxila).

After the death of the great Parthian monarch his empire split up into smaller principalities. One of these (probably Sistan) was ruled by Sanabares, another (probably embracing Kandahār and the Western Pañjāb) by 'Pakores, and others by princes whose coins Marshall recovered for the first time at Taxila. Among them was Sasa(s) or Sasa(n) who acknowledged the nominal sway of Pakores. The internecine strife among these Parthian pricelings is probably reflected in the following passage of the Periplus:

"Before it (Barbaricum) there lies a small island and inland behind it is the metropolis of Scythia, Minnagara; it is subject to Parthian princes who are constantly driving each other out."

Epigraphic (and in some cases numismatic) evidence proves that the Pahlava or Parthian rule in Afghanistan,

¹ Raychaudhuri, Studies in Indian Antiquities, pp. 165f.
² ASI, AR, 1929-30, 56ff.
the Pañjāb and Sind was supplanted by that of the Kushaṇa, Gushaṇa, Khushaṇa or Kushān dynasty. We know that Gondophernes was ruling in Peshāwar in the year 103 (A.D. 47 according to Fleet, somewhat earlier according to others). But we learn from the Panjtār inscription that in the year 122 the sovereignty of the region had passed to a Gushaṇa or Kushān king. In the year 136 the Kushān suzerainty had extended to Taxila. An inscription of that year mentions the interment of some relics of the Buddha in a chapel at Taxila "for bestowal of perfect health upon the Mahārāja, rājātirāja devaputra Khushaṇa." The Sui Vihār and Mahenjo Daro Kharoshthī Inscriptions prove the Kushān conquest of the Lower Indus Valley. The Chinese writer Pan-ku, who died in A.D. 92, refers to the Yüeh-chi occupation of Kao-fou or Kābul. This shows that the race to which the Kushāns belonged took possession of Kābul before A.D. 92. It is, no doubt, asserted by a later writer that Kao-fou is a mistake for Tou-ni. But the mistake in Kennedy's opinion would not have been possible, had the Yüeh-chi not been in possession of Kao-fou in the time of Pan-ku. The important thing to remember is that a Chinese writer of 92 A.D., thought Kao-fou to have been a Yüeh-chi possession long before his time. If Sten Konow is to be believed, the Kushāns had established some sort of connection with the Indian borderland as early as the time of Gondophernes. In line 5 of the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription Sten Konow reads "erjhuṇa Kapasa puyae,"

1 For a note on the dynastic nomenclature, see R. Schafer, JAOS, 67, 4, p. 296ff; cf. AOS, 65, 71ff.
2 We learn from Philostratos that already in the time of Apollonios (A.D. 131-141) the barbarians (Kushāns?) who lived on the border of the Parthian kingdom of Taxila were perpetually quarrelling with Phraeots and making raids into his territories (The Life of Apollonius, Loeb Classical Library, pp. 18ff).
3 JRAS, 1912, pp. 676-678. Note also Pan-ku's reference to a man's head on the coins of Ki-pin (JRAS, 1921, p. 685n) which possibly suggests an acquaintance with the coinage of Kuyula Kaphsa (or Kasa?).
4 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 294; XVIII (1906), p. 282. Corpus, II, i, 62. Some regard this "Kapa" as a phantom. It is interesting to recall in this connection a statement of Philostratos (The life of Apollonius of Tyana, Loeb Classical
“in honour of prince Kapa,” i.e., Kujula Kadphises, the Kushān king, who is said to have succeeded Hermaios in the Kābul valley. Kujula Kadphises has been identified with the Kuei-shuang (Kushān) prince K’iu-tsiu-k’io who took possession of Kao-fou (Kābul) Po-ta and Ki-pin. It appears from numismatic evidence that this Kushān chief was possibly an ally of Hermaios with whom he appears to have issued joint coins. Kadphises seems also to have been at first on friendly terms with the Parthian rulers of Gandhāra. But the destruction of Hermaios’ kingdom by the parthians probably supplied him with a casus belli. He made war on the latter and eventually destroyed their power in the north-west borderland of India.

SECTION III. THE GREAT KUSHĀNS

We are informed by the Chinese historians that the Kushāns (chiefs of the Kuei-shuang or Kouei-chouang principality) were a section of the Yueh-chi (Yüe-chī) race. The modern Chinese pronunciation of the name according to Kingsmill is said to be Yué-tí. M. Lévi and other French scholars write Yue-tchi or Yué-tchi.

We learn from Ssū-ma-ch’ien (the Chinese annalist,
who recorded the story of the travels of Chang-k'ien, the famous envoy), that between B.C. 174 and 165 the Yueh-chi were dwelling between the Tsenn-hoang (Tun-huang) country and the K'i-lien mountains, or Tien-chan Range, south and east of Lake Issykul in Chinese Turkestan.1 At that date the Yueh-chi were defeated and expelled from their country by the Hiung-nû who slew their king and made a drinking vessel out of his skull. The widow of the slain ruler succeeded to her husband's power. Under her guidance the Yueh-chi in the course of their westward migration attacked the Wu-sun whose king was killed.2 After this exploit the Yueh-chi attacked the Sakas on the upper Ili and in the plains of the Jaxartes or the Syr Darya and compelled their king or 'lord' to seek refuge in Kipin (Kâpiśa-Lampâka-Gandhâra).3

Meantime the son of the slain Wu-sun king grew up to manhood and, with the assistance of the Hiung-nû drove the Yueh-chi further west into the Ta-hia territory washed by the Oxus. The Ta-hia, who were devoted to commerce, unskilled in war and wanting in cohesion, were easily reduced to a condition of vassalage by the Yueh-chi who established their capital or royal encampment to the north of the Oxus (Wei), in the territory now belonging to 'Bukhârâ (in ancient Sogdiana). The Yueh-chi capital was still in the same position when visited by Chang-kien in or about B.C. 128-26.4

The adventures of Chang-k'ien as related by Ssû-ma-ch'ien in the Sse-ke or Shi-ki (completed before B.C. 91)

---

1 Smith says (EHI4, p. 263) that they occupied land in the Kansuh Province in North-Western China. See also CHI, 565; Halfen, J. Am. Or. Soc., 65, pp. 71 ff. For the Hiung-nû-Hun Problem, cf. Stein, IA, 1905, 73 ff. 84.

2 The main section of the Yueh-chi passed on westwards beyond Lake Issykkül, the rest diverged to the South and settled on the frontier of Tibet. The latter came to be known as the "Little Yueh-chi". Eventually they established their capital at Purushapura in Gandhâra. Smith, EHI1, 264; S. Konow, Corpus, II, i. lxxvi.

3 A part of the Saka horde apparently seized Ferghana (Ta Yuan) c. 128 B.C. (Tarn, Greeks, 278 n. 4. 279).

were retold in Pan-ku's *Ts'ien Han-shu* or *Annals of the First Han Dynasty* that dealt with the period B.C. 206—
A.D. 9 or 24, and was completed by Pan-ku's sister after
his death in A.D. 92, with three important additions, namely:

1. That the kingdom of the Ta-Yueh-chi had for its
capital the town of Kien-chi (Kien-she), to the north of
the Oxus,\(^1\) and Kipin lay on its southern frontier.

2. That the Yueh-chi were no longer nomads.

3. That the Yueh-chi kingdom had become divided
into five principalities, *viz.* Hi (co)u-mi (possibly Wakhān\(^2\)
between the Pamirs and the Hindukush), Chouangmi or
Shuang-mi (Chitral, south of Wakhān and the Hindukush)
Kouei-chouang or Kuci-shuang, the Kusān principality,
probably situated between Chitral and the Panjshir
country, Hit(h)um (Parwān on the Panjshir) and Kao-fou
(Kābul).\(^3\)

We next obtain a glimpse of the Yueh-chi in Fan-Ye's
*Hou Han-shu* or *Annals of the Later Han Dynasty* which
cover the period between A.D. 25 and 220. Fan-Ye based
his account on the report of Pan-young (*cir.* A.D. 125) and
others.\(^4\) He himself died in 445 A.D. The capital of the
Yueh-chi was then probably the old Ta-hia (Bactrian) city
of Lan-shi, variant Ch'in-shi, to the north of the Oxus.

---

\(^1\) Cf. *Corpus*, II i. liv

\(^2\) A *Bakanapati*, apparently lord of Wakhān, figures in the inscription of
Mahārāja vajātraja devaputra Kushānaputra Shāhi Vanataksha(ma?) whose
identity is uncertain. The title *devaputra* connects him with the Kanishka
Group of Kusān kings, and not the Kadphises Group. *ASJ*, 1911-12, Pt. I. 15;
1919-21, Pt. 2. 288.

\(^3\) A later historian regards Kao-fou as a mistake for Tou-mi which, how-
ever, was probably not far from Kābul, *JRA*, 1912, 669. For the proposed
Ind.*, XXI. 278. Konow suggests the identification of Kuei-shuang with
Gandhāra on the country immediately to its north.

\(^4\) Cf. S. Konow, *Corpus*, liv: "It is accordingly the events of the period
A.D. 25-125 which are narrated by Fan-Ye, though there are some additions
referring to a somewhat later time in the case of countries which were near
eough to remain in contact with China after the reign of emperor Ng'an"
(107-25). See also *Ep. Ind.*, XXI. 258.

\(^5\) Alexandria = Zariaspa or Bactria (*Tarn*, *Greks*, 115, 298). *JAOS*, 61
(1941), 242 n.
Fan-Ye gives the following account of the Yueh-chi conquest:

"In old days the Yue-chi were vanquished by the Hiung-nû. They then went to Ta-hia and divided the kingdom among five Hsi-h(e)ou or Yabgous, viz., those of Hsiumi, Shuangmi, Kuei-shuang, Hsitun and Tumi. More than hundred years after that, the hsi-hou or Yabgou (Yavuga) of Kuei-shuang (Kushân) named K'iu-tsiu-k'tio attacked and annihilated the four other hsi-hou and made himself king or lord (Wang); he invaded Ngan-si (the Arsakid territory, i.e., Panthia) and took possession of the territory of Kao-fou (Kábul), overcame Po-ta² and Ki-pin and became complete master of these kingdoms. K'iu-tsiu-k'tio died at the age of more than eighty. His son Yen-kao-tchen succeeded him as king. In his turn he conquered T'ien-tchou (lit. 'India,' on the banks of a great river, apparently the kingdom of Taxila referred to by Philostratos), and established there a chief for governing it. From this time the Yue-chi became extremely powerful. All the other countries designated them Kushân after their king, but the Han retained the old name, and called them Ta-Yueh-chi."

"K'iu-tsiu-k'tio" has been identified with Kujula³ Kadphises (I),⁴ or Kozola Kadaphes, the first Kushân king who struck coins to the south of the Hindukush. Numismatic evidence suggests that he was the colleague or ally,⁵ and afterwards the successor, of Hermaios, the last Greek

---

¹ According to one view the five hsi-hou existed already in Ta-hia when the Yueh-chi invaded Bactria (JAOS, 65. 72 f.).
² Perhaps identical with the country of Po-tai which, in the time of Sung-yun, sent two young lions to the King of Gandhāra as present (Beal, Records of the Western World, Vol. I, ci). S. Konow (Ep. Ind., XVIII) identified P'ú-ta with Ghazni, but later on (Ep. Ind., XXI, 258) suggested its identification with Būrkāhāk, ten miles east of Kábul.
³ Cf. Kusuluka. The expression probably means 'strong' or beautiful (S. Konow, Corpus, i). According to Burrow (The Language of the Kharoshthi Documents, 82, 87) Kujula=Guṣūra=Vāzir. Dr. Thomas (possibly) thinks that the word Kujula has the sense of 'Saviour'.
⁴ Pahlavi Kad=chief+phises or pes=form, shape, JRAS, 1913, 632 n.
⁵ Fleet and Thomas, JRAS, 1913, 967, 1034; in the opinion of some scholars Hermaios was dead at the time of the Kushân conquest. Coins bear-
prince of the Kabul valley. The former view that Kadphises conquered Hermaios is, in the opinion of Marshall, wrong. Steen Konow finds his name mentioned in the Lakh-i-Bāhī inscription of the year 103 belonging to the reign of Gondophernes. The inscription probably belongs to a period when the Kushān and Parthian rulers were on friendly terms. But the Parthian attack on the kingdom of Hermaios apparently led to a rupture which ended in war. The result was that the Parthians were ousted by Kadphises I.

Marshall identifies Kadphises I with the Kushān king of the Panjtar record (of the year 122) and the Taxila scroll of the year 136. We should, however, remember that in the Taxila inscription of 136 the Kushān king is called Devaputra, a title which was characteristic of the Kanishka group and not of Kadphises I or II unless we identify Kadphises I with Kuyula Kara Kaphsa. The monogram on the scroll is by no means characteristic only of coins of the Kadphises group, but it is also found, in Marshall’s and S. Konow’s opinion, on the coins of Zeionises and Kuyula Kara Kaphsa. If, however, S. Konow and Marshall are right in reading the name of Uvima Kavitha in the Khalatse inscription of the year 184 or 187, and in identifying him with Vima Kadphises, the king of the Panjtar and Taxila records of 122 and 136 may have been a predecessor of Wema (Vima), and should preferably be identified with Kadphises I. But the reading ‘Uvima
Kadphises I probably coined no gold but only copper. His coinage shows unmistakable influence of Rome. He copied the issues of Augustus or those of his immediate successors preferably Claudius (A.D. 41-54), and used the titles Yavuga (chief), Mahārāja, Rājātirāja (the great king, the king of kings) and “Sachadhrama thita”, ‘Steadfast in the True Faith’ (of the Buddha).

“K’iu-tsiu-k’io,” or Kadphises I, was succeeded by his son Yen-kao-tchen, the Vima, Wima or Wema Kadphises of the coins, who is usually designated as Kadphises II. We have already seen that he conquered Tien-tchou or the Indian interior, probably Taxila, and set up a chief who governed in the name of the Yueh-chi. According to Sten Konow1 and Smith2 it was Kadphises II who established the Saka Era of A.D. 78. If this view be accepted then he was possibly the overlord of Nahapāna, and was the Kushān monarch who was defeated by the Chinese between A.D. 73 and 102 and compelled to pay tribute to the emperor Ho-ti (A.D. 89-105). But there is no direct evidence that Kadphises II established any era. No inscription or coin of this monarch contains any date which is referable to an era of his institution. On the contrary we have evidence that Kanishka did establish an

1 In one class of his copper coins appears a Roman head which was palpably imitated from that of Augustus (B.C. 27-A.D. 14), Tiberius (A.D. 14-37), or Claudius (A.D. 41-54). JRAS, 1912, 679; 1913, 912; Smith, Catalogue, 66; Camb. Short Hist., 74. Rome and its people, Romaka, first appear in the Mahābhārata (II. 51. 17) and occur not unfrequently in later literature. Diplomatic relations between Rome and India were established early as the time of Augustus who received an embassy from king ‘Pandion’ (JRAS, 1886, 399 ff. Camb. Hist. Ind., I. 597) about B.C. 27. 20. An Indian embassy was also received by Trajan (A.D. 98-117) shortly after A.D. 99. Strabo, Pliny and the Periplus refer to a brisk trade between India and the Roman Empire in the first century A.D. See JRAS, 1904, 591; IA., 5, 281; 1923, 59. Pliny deprecates the drain of specie (JRAS, 1912, 986; 1913, 644-1031). - 3 The Cambridge Shorter History, 74, 75.

2 Smith, Catalogue, 67 n.; S. Konow, Corpus, II. i. lxiv f.; Whitehead, 181.

4 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141.

5 The Oxford History of India, p. 128.
era, that is to say, his method of dating was continued by
his successors, and we have dates ranging probably from
the year 1 to 99. ¹

The conquests of the Kadphises kings opened up the
path of commerce between China and the Roman Empire
and India. Roman gold began to pour into this country
in payment for silk, spice and gems. Kadphises II began
to issue gold coins.² He had a bilingual gold and copper
coinage.³ The obverse design gives us a new lifelike
representation of the monarch. The reverse is confined to
the worship of Śiva, which was gaining ground since the
days of the Śiva-Bhāgavatas mentioned by Patañjali.⁴ In
the Khāroṣṭhī inscription Kadphises II is called "the
great king, the king of kings, lord of the whole world, the
Mahtisvara, the defender."⁵

We learn from Yu-Houan, the author of the Wei-lio⁶
which was composed between A.D. 239-265 and covers the
period of the Wei down to the reign of the emperor Ming
(227-239),⁷ that the Yueh-chi power was flourishing in
Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra), Ta-hia (Oxus valley), Kao-fou
(Kābul) and Tien-tchou (India) as late as the second
quarter of the third century A.D. But the early Chinese
annalists are silent about the names of the successors of
Yen-kao-tchen (Kadphises II). Chinese sources, however,
refer to a king of the Ta-Yueh-chi named Po-tiao or Puā-
d’ieu (possibly Vāsudeva) who sent an embassy to the

¹ For criticism of the "Omitted hundreds theory," see JNAS, 1915, 980 f.
² A gold coin of Wima or Vima (NC, 1934, 232), gives him the title
Basileus Basilewun Soter Megas (Tarn, Greeks, 354 n. 5). This throws welcome
light on the problem of the identification of the nameless king Soter Megas.
³ A silver piece resembling the ordinary small copper type of Vima Kad-
phises is also known (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, 174). Other silver coins
of the monarch are apparently referred to by Marshall (Guide to Taxila.
1918, 81). A silver coin of Kanishka is also known (ASI, AR, 1925-26, pl.
lxx). Smith (EHI, p. 270) and others make mention of silver coins of
Huvishka.
⁴ V. 2, 76; cf. Śaiva, Pāṇini, IV. 1. 112.
⁵ As already stated Sten Konow finds the name of Vima (Uvima) Kavthisa
(Kadphises?) in the Khalatse (Ladakh) inscription of the year 187(?). Corpus,
II. i. 81. The identity of the King in question is, however, uncertain.
⁶ A History of the Wei Dynasty (A.D. 120-264).
⁷ Corpus, II, 1. lv.
Chinese emperor in the year 230. Inscriptions discovered in India have preserved the names with dates of the following great Kushāṇ sovereigns besides the Kadphises group, viz., Kanishka I (1-23), Vāsishka (24-28), Huvishka (28-60), Kanishka II, son of Vā-jheshka (41), and Vāsudeva (67-98). Huvishka, Vā-jheshka and Kanishka II are probably referred to by Kalhana as Hushka, Jushka and Kanishka who apparently ruled conjointly. It will be seen that Kanishka II ruled in the year 41, a date which falls within the reign of Huvishka (28-60). Thus the account of Kalhana is confirmed by epigraphic evidence.

In the chronological order generally accepted by numismatists, the Kanishka group succeeded the Kadphises group. But this view is not accepted by many scholars. Moreover, there is little agreement even among scholars who place the Kanishka group after the Kadphises kings. The more important theories of Kanishka's date are given below:

1. According to Dr. Fleet, Kanishka reigned before the Kadphises group, and was the founder of that reckoning, commencing B.C. 58, which afterwards came to be known as the Vikrama Samvat. This view (held at one

---

1 Corbus, II, i. lxxvii.
3 If Vāsishka be identical with Vā Kushāṇa of a Sānchi epigraph, his reign (as sub-king) commenced not later than the year 22 as we learn from an inscription of that year on the pedestal of an image of the Buddha (Pro. of the Seventh Session of the I. H. Congress, Madras, p. 135).
6 For discussions about the origin of the so-called Vikrama era see JRAS, 1913, pp. 637, 694 ff.; Kielhorn in Ind. Ant. xx. (1891), 124 ff.; 397 ff.; Bhand, Com. Vol., pp. 187 ff. CHI, pp. 168, 533, 571; ZDMG, 1922, pp. 259 ff. Ep. Ind. xxiii. 48 ff.; xxvi. 119 ff.; Kielhorn (and now Altekar) adduce evidence which seems to show that the early use of the era, as may be inferred from records with dates that may be recognised to refer to this reckoning, was mainly confined to Southern and Eastern Rājputāna, Central India and the Upper Ganges Valley. The name of the era found in the earliest inscriptions recalls designations like that of king KRITA of Penzer, The Ocean of Story, III, 19.
time by Cunningham and Dowson, and maintained by Franke) was accepted by Kennedy, but was ably controverted by Dr. Thomas, and can no longer be upheld after the discoveries of Marshall. Inscriptions, coins as well as the testimony of Hiuen Tsang clearly prove that Kanishka’s dominions included Gandhāra, but we have already seen that according to Chinese evidence Yin-mo-fu, and not the Kushāns, ruled Kipin (Kāpiśa-Gandhāra) in the second half of the first century B.C. Allan thinks that “the gold coinage of Kanishka was suggested by the Roman solidus” and that the Kushān monarch can hardly

Kṛitiya rulers are mentioned by Fleet, JRAS, 1913, 998n. Kṛita may also have reference to the inauguration of a Golden Age after a period of toil and mod. From the fifth to the ninth century the reckoning was believed to be used especially by the princes and people of Malava. The connection of the name Vikrama with the era grew up gradually and was far from being generally adopted even in the ninth century A.D. The phraseology employed in the poems and inscriptions of the next centuries shows a gradual advance from the simple Saṃvat to Vikrama Saṃvat, Śrīnāśa Vikrama Saṃvat and so on. The change in nomenclature was probably brought about by the princes and people of Gujarāt whose hostility to the Mālavas is well known. The Sātavāhana could not have founded this or any other era because they always used reignal years, and Indian literature distinguishes between Vikrama and Sātavāhana. As to the claims of Aces, see Calcutta Review, 1922, December, pp. 193-194. Fleet points out (JRAS, 1914, 995 ff.) that even when the name of a real king stands before the statement of the years, so that the translation would be “in the year of such and such a king” he is not necessarily to be regarded as the actual founder of that particular reckoning. The nomenclature of an era, current in a comparatively late period, more than a century after its commencement, is no proof of origins. Therefore, the use of the terms Ayasa or Ayasa in connection with the dates 134 and 136 of the Kalawan and Laxila inscriptions, does not prove that Aces was the founder of the particular reckoning used. His name may have been connected with the reckoning by later generations in the same way as the name of the Valabhi family came to be associated with the Gupta era, that of Sātavāhana with the Śaka era, and that of Vikrama with the “Kṛita”-Mālava reckoning itself which commenced in 58 B.C. Regarding the claims of Vikrama see Bhand. Com. Vol. and Ind. Ant., cited above. The Purāṇa while mentioning Gardabhi are silent about Vikramaditya. Jaina tradition places Vikramaditya after ‘Nahavāhana’, or ‘Nahapāna’. Regarding the contention of Fleet that the Vikrama era is a northern reckoning attention may be invited to the observations of Kielhorn and to a note on Chola-Pāṇḍya Institutions contributed by Professor C. S. Srivivasachari to The Young Men of India, July, 1926. The Professor points out that the era was used in Madura in the 5th century A.D. Kielhorn proves conclusively that the area where the era of 58 B.C. was used in the earliest times did not include the extreme north-west of India.

1 Thomas, JRAS, 1913; Marshall, JRAS, 1914.
be placed before Titus (79-81 A.D.) and Trajan (98-117 A.D.).

2. According to Marshall, Sten Konow, Smith and several other scholars Kanishka’s rule began about 125 or 144 A.D., and ended in the second half of the second century A.D. Now, we learn from the Sui Vihār inscription that Kanishka’s dominions included a portion at least of the Lower Indus Valley. Again we learn from the Junāgadh inscription of Rudradāman that the Mahākshatrapa’s conquests extended to Sindhu and Sauvīra (which included Multān according to the Purāṇas and Alberuni) and even to the land of the Yaudheyas in the direction of the Sutlej. Rudradāman certainly flourished from A.D. 130 to A.D. 150. He did not owe his position as Mahākshatrapa to anybody else (svayam adhigata Mahākshatrapa nāma). If Kanishka reigned in the middle of the second century A.D., how are we to reconcile his mastery over the Sui Vihār region in the Lower Indus Valley with the contemporary sovereignty of Rudradāman? Again Kanishka’s dates 1-23, Vāsishka’s dates 24-28, Huvishka’s dates 28-60, and Vāsudeva’s dates 67-98, suggest a continuous reckoning. In other words, Kanishka was the originator of an era. But we know of no era ever current in, or

---

1 *Camb. Short History*, p. 77.
2 Recently Ghirshman suggested the period A.D. 144-72 for Kanishka (*Begram, Recherches Archaeologique et Historiques sur les Kouchans*). The argument that India was still in A.D. 125 governed by a Viceroy (and therefore, not by Kanishka or Huvishka) is effectively disposed of by Thomas in *JRAS*, 1913, 1024. He points out that the historian of the Later Han is obviously referring to the conditions at the time of the invasion of Wima Kadphises, and not to the state of things in A.D. 125.
3 Dr. Sten Konow’s views are difficult to ascertain. In the *Indian Studies in honour of C. R. Lanman* (Harvard University Press), p. 65, he mentions A.D. 184 as the initial point of the Kanishka reckoning which he and Dr. Van Wijk “have tried to establish” (*cf. Acta Orientalia*, III, 54 ff.). But in *IHQ*, III (1927), p. 851, he, along with Dr. Van Wijk, shows a predilection for A.D. 188-9 (cf. *Corpus*, lxvii; *Acta Orientalia*, V, 168 ff.). Professor Rapson (in *JRAS*, 1930, 186 ff.) points out the conjectural and inconclusive character of the two Doctors’ calculations. “The year 79”, says he “seems to be out of the running and a dark horse, the year 188-9, is the favourite.”
4 *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, 44.
5 *See IHQ*, March, 1930, 149.
known to, North-West India, which commenced in the second century A.D.

3. Dr. R. C. Majumdar thought that the era founded by Kanishka was the Traikuṭaka-Kalachuri-Chedi era of 248 A.D.¹ Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil points out that this is not possible.² “In fact, the reign of Vāsudeva, the last of the Kushāns, came to an end 100 years after the beginning of the reign of Kanishka. Numerous inscriptions prove that Vāsudeva reigned at Mathurā. It is certain that this country, over which extended the empire of Vāsudeva, was occupied about 350 A.D. by the Yaudheyas and the Nāgas and it is probable that they reigned in this place nearly one century before they were subjugated by Samudragupta. The capitals of the Nāgas were Mathurā, Kāntipura and Padmāvatī.” The Kushān (?) realm in the Indian borderland was, in A.D. 360, ruled by Grumbates³. The theory of Dr. Majumdar cannot, moreover, be reconciled with the Tibetan tradition which makes Kanishka a contemporary of king Vijayakīrti of Khotan,⁴ and the Indian tradition which makes Huvishka a contemporary of Nāgārjuna, and hence of a king of the Imperial Śatavāhana line, who can hardly be placed later than the second century A.D., as he is described as ‘lord of the three seas’ and sovereign of (South) Kośala (in the Upper Deccan).⁵ Lastly, the catalogues of the Chinese Tripitaka state that Au-Shih-Kāo (148-170 A.D.) translated the Mārgabhūmi Śūtra of Saṅgharaksḥa who was the chaplain of Kanishka.⁶ This shows conclusively that Kanishka flourished before 170

¹ For this era see JRAS, 1905, pp. 566-68.
² Ancient History of the Deccan, p. 91.
³ EHI⁴, p. 290. The Chionitai identified by Cunningham with Kushāns.
⁴ Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 142.
⁵ Rājatarangini, I, 173. Harsha-charita (Cowell), p. 252; Watters, Yuan-Chuang, II, p. 200. The epithet trisamudrādhīpatai which the Harsha-charita (Book VIII) applies to the Śatavahana friend of Nāgārjuna cannot fail to remind one of Gautamiputra Śātakarṇi ‘whose chargers drank the water of the three oceans’ (trisamudatoyaṇtipitavāhana), or one of his immediate successors.
A.D. 1 The arguments against the theory of Dr. Majumdar are equally applicable to the surmise of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar who placed Kanishka’s accession in A.D. 278.

4. According to Fergusson, Oldenberg, Thomas, Banerji, Rapson, J. E. Van Lohuizen-De Leeuw, Bachhofer and many other scholars Kanishka was the founder of that reckoning commencing A.D. 78, which came to be known as the Śaka era. This view is not accepted by Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil on the following grounds:—

(a) If we admit that Kujūla-Kadphises and Hermaios reigned about 50 A.D. and that Kanishka founded the Śaka era in 78 A.D. we have scarcely 28 years for the duration of the end of the reign of Kadphises I and the whole of the reign of Kadphises II.

(But the date, A.D. 50, for Kadphises I is uncertain.

---

1 According to the theory of Dr. Majumdar, Vāsudeva I ruled from (249+74) 323 to (249+98) 347 A.D. But Chinese evidence places a Po-t’iao (Vāsudeva?) in 290 A.D. The Khalatse Ins. also presents difficulties.

2 Bachhofer JAOS, 61, 242.

3 For the origin of the Śaka era see Fleet, CII, preface 56; JRAS, 1913, pp. 635, 650, 987 ff.; Dubreuil, AHD, 26; Rapson Andhra Coins, p. cv; S. Konow, Corpus, II. i. xvi f. Nahapāna, who was not even a Mahākshatrapa in the years 42-45, and who never became a paramount sovereign, could not possibly have been the founder of the era. The theory which represents Nahapāna as the founder of the era used in his inscriptions (dated 42-46) is also contradicted by a Jain tradition (relied on by Sten Konow, Corpus, II. i. xxxviii) which assigns to him (Nahavāhana) a period of only 40 years. Chashtāna has no better claims and the evidence of the Periplus shows that he could not have ruled at Ujjain in 78 A.D. As to the theory that Kadphises II founded the reckoning in question, it may be pointed out that no inscription or coin of this monarch contains any date which is referable to an era of his institution. The only Scythian king who did establish an era in the sense that he used a regnal reckoning that was continued by his successors, is Kanishka. And the only reckoning that is attributed by Indian writers, since the days of the early Chalukyas, to a Scythian king is the Śaka era of 78 A.D.

Regarding the objection that the Śaka era was foreign to the north it may be pointed out that the era of 58 B.C., was equally foreign to the extreme north-west of India. The assertion that the Śaka era was never used in the north-west simply begs the question. It assumes what it has got to prove, viz., that the reckoning used by the house of Kanishka does not refer to the Śaka era. The very name Śaka points to its foreign, and possibly north-western, origin, as the imperial Śakas resided in that region, and it is only the viceroys who dwelt in Mālwa Kāthiāwar and the Deccan. On the analogy of every famous Indian regnal reckoning it may be confidently asserted that the Śaka era, too, originated with a sovereign and not with a mere viceroy.
Even if we accept it as correct, the period of 28 years is not too short in view of the fact that Kadphises II succeeded an octogenerian. When Kadphises I died "at the age of more than eighty" his son must have been an old man. It is, therefore, improbable that "his reign was protracted."

(b) Marshall, says Prof. G. Jouveau-Dubreuil, has discovered at Taxila in the Chir Stūpa a document dated 136 which, in the Vikrama era, corresponds to 79 A.D., and the king mentioned therein is probably Kadphises I, but certainly not Kanishka.

(Now, the epithet Devaputra applied to the Kushāṇ king of the Taxila scroll of 136, is characteristic of the Kanishka group, and not of the Kadphises kings. So the discovery need not shake the conviction of those that attribute to Kanishka the era of 78 A.D. The omission of the personal name of the Kushāṇ monarch does not necessarily imply that the first Kushāṇ is meant. In several inscriptions of the time of Kumāra Gupta and Budha Gupta, the king is referred to simply as Gupta nyipa.)

(c) Professor Dubreuil says: "Sten Konow has shown that the Tibetan and Chinese documents tend to prove that Kanishka reigned in the second century."

(This Kanishka may have been Kanishka of the Ārā Inscription of the year 41 which, if referred to the Śaka era, would give a date in the second century A.D. Po-t’iao of Sten Konow, the king of the Yüeh-chi who sent an ambassador to China in A.D. 230, may have been one of the successors of Vāsudeva I. "Coins bearing the name of

---

1 I am glad to note that a somewhat similar suggestion is now made by Dr. Thomas in Dr. B. C. Law Volume, II. 312. It is, however, by no means clear why it is said that the possibility of the identification of Devaputra with Kanishka 'has been ignored'. The Kadphises kings meant here are Kujūla (Kadphises I), and Vima (Wema) and not Kuyula Kara Kaphsa whose identification with Kadphises I is a mere surmise. Kara or Kala probably means a Mahārājaputra, a prince (Burrow, The Language of the Kharoshṭhi Documents, 83). Even if Kuyula Kara be identical with Kujūla (cf. Corpus, II, i. lxxvii) and the Kushāṇ king of the Taxila inscription of 136, it may be pointed out that it is by no means certain that the date 136 refers to the Vikrama era.

Vāsudeva continued to be struck long after he had passed away." Dr. Smith, Mr. R. D. Banerji and Dr. S. Konow himself clearly recognise the existence of more than one Vāsudeva.)

(d) Sten Konow has also shown that the inscriptions of the Kanishka era and those of the Śaka era are not dated in the same fashion. (But the same scholar also shows that all the inscriptions of the Kanishka era are also not dated in the same fashion. In the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, Kanishka and his successors recorded the dates in the same way as their Śaka-Pahlava predecessors, giving the name of the month and the day within the month. On the other hand, in their Brāhmī records Kanishka and his successors usually adopted the Ancient Indian way of dating. Are we to conclude from this that the Kharoṣṭhī dates of Kanishka’s inscriptions are not to be referred to the same era to which the dates of the Brāhmī records are to be ascribed? If Kanishka adopted two different ways of dating, we fail to understand why he could not have adopted a third method to suit the local conditions in Western India. Sten Konow himself points out that in the Śaka dates we have the name of the month as in the Kharoṣṭhī records with addition of the Paksha. "The Śaka era which (the Western Kṣatrapas) used was a direct imitation of the reckoning used by their cousins in the north-west, the additional mentioning of the ‘paksha’ being perhaps a concession to the custom in the part of the country where they ruled." It is not improbable that just as Kanishka in the borderland used the old Śaka-Pahlava method, and in Hindusthan Proper used the ancient Indian way of dating prevalent there, so in Western India his officer added the ‘paksha’ to suit the custom in that part of the country.)

2 Ibid., pp. 272-78. Corpus, ii. i. lxxvii.
3 Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 141. For an exception see ibid., XXI, 60.
4 As to the statement of Fleet endorsed by S. Konow. Corpus, lxxxvii.
According to Sten Konow Kanishka came from Khotan\(^1\) and belonged to the Little Yüeh-chi. The theory presents many difficulties.\(^2\) It is certain that his successors in 230 were still known as the Ta (Great?) Yüeh-chi. The family name according to Kumāralāta's *Kālpanāmaṇḍitikā* was Kiu-sha.\(^3\)

Kanishka completed the Kushān conquest of Upper India and ruled over a wide realm which extended from Kāpiśa,\(^4\) Gaudhāra and Kaśmīra to Benares. Traditions of his conflict with the rulers of Soked (Sāketa) and Pātaliputra in Eastern India are preserved by Tibetan and Chinese writers.\(^5\) Epigraphic records give us contemporary notices of him, with dates, not only from Peshāwar and possibly from Zeda (near Uṇḍ) in the Yuzufzai country, but also from Mānikiāla near Rāwalpindi, from Sui Vihār about 16 miles south-west of Bahāwalpur (north of Sind), from Mathurā and Śrāvasti, and from Sārnāth near Benares.\(^6\) His coins are found

that the use of the Saka era was foreign to Northern India attention may be invited to Kielhorn’s *List of Ins of Northern India*, Nos 351, 352, 362, 364-365, 368, 379, etc. So far as North-West India is concerned there is as little positive proof of the early use of the Vikrama era as of the era of 78 A.D. The paucity of early records dated in the Saka era in the valley of the Upper Ganges and its tributaries is possibly due to the fact that the era of 78 B.C. already held the field. Later eras of undoubtedly northern origin, like those of the Guptas and Harsha, have practically been forgotten, but the era of 78 B.C. is still in use. In Southern India the case is different. The use of regnal years in the records of the Mauryas (many of which are located in the south) and those of the Śātavāhanas, Chetas, and other early dynasties, proves beyond doubt that there was no early reckoning in use that could compete with the new era that was introduced by the Saka satraps. The story of the foundation of the Chālukya Vikrama era suggests that the Saka reckoning was at times deliberately sought to be discontinued because of its foreign association. This might have happened in the north as well as in the south.

\(^1\) *Corpus*, II, i. lxxvi; cf. lxi; *JRAS*, 1905, 334.


\(^3\) *Cf.* Kuśa of *Kanika lekha* and Kuśadvīpa of the *Purāṇas*. See now Shafci, *Linguistics in History*, JAOS, 67, No. 4, pp. 246 ff.

\(^4\) *Cf.* The story of the Chinese hostage mentioned by H. Tsang.

\(^5\) *Ep Ind.*, xiv, p. 142; *Ind. Ant.*, 1903, p. 382; *Corpus*, II, i, pp. lxxii and lxxv. The reference may be to Kanishka II.

\(^6\) In recent years Mr. K. G. Goswami has drawn attention to a Brāhmaṇ Inscription of Kanishka, dated in the year 2 (?), which he found in the Municipal Museum at Allahabad (*Calcutta Review*, July, 1934, p. 83).
in considerable quantities as far eastwards as Ghāzipur and Gorakhpur. The eastern portion of his empire was apparently governed by the Mahā-Kshatrapa Kharapallāna and the Kshatrapa Vanashpara. In the northern portion we find the general Lala and the Satraps Vespasi and Liaka. He fixed his own residence at Peshāwar (Purushapura) and possibly established Kanishkapura in Kaśmīra. It is, however, more probable that Kanishkapura was established by his namesake of the Ārā inscription. After making himself master of the south (i.e., India) Kanishka turned to the west and defeated the king of the Parthians. In his old age he led an army against the north and died in an attempt to cross the Tsung-ling mountains (Tāghdūmbāsh Pāmīr) between the Pāmīr Plateau and Khotan. The Northern expedition is apparently referred to by Hiuen-Tsang who speaks of his rule in the territory to the east of the Tsung-ling mountains, and of a Chinese Prince detained as a hostage at his court.

It is not improbable that Kanishka was the Kushān king repulsed by general Pan-ch’ao during the reign of the Emperor Ho-ti (A.D. 89-105). It has no doubt been argued that Kanishka “must have been a monarch of some celebrity and if the Chinese had come into victorious contact with him, their historians would have mentioned it.” But if we identify Pan-ch’ao’s Kushān contemporary with Kadphises II, the silence of the Chinese becomes still more mysterious and inexplicable because he was certainly well-known to the annalists. On the other hand, Kanishka was not known to them and the non-mention of his name, if he were Pan-ch’ao’s contemporary, cannot be more surprising than that of

1 A gold coin from Mahāsthamā (Bogra) represents the standing bearded figure of Kanishka—possibly an imitation of the coinage of the great Kushān king.

2 Cunningham (AGF, 114) located it near Śrīnagar. Stein and Smith identify it with Kānispor, “situated between the Vitastā river and the high road leading from Varāhamūla to Śrīnagar” (EHII, p. 275).

3 Ind. Ant., 1905, p. 582.
his predecessor, Wema. In favour of Kanishka's identity with Pan-ch'ao's antagonist we may urge that Kanishka is known to have come into conflict with the Chinese, but the same cannot be said with regard to Wema, the events of whose reign, as recorded by Chinese annalists, do not include a first class war with China. The legend of Kanishka's death published by S. Lévi contains a significant passage which runs thus:—"I have subjugated three regions; all men have taken refuge with me, the region of the north alone has not come in to make its submission."

Have we not here a covert allusion to his failure in the encounter with his mighty northern neighbour?

Kanishka's fame rests not so much on his conquests, as on his patronage of the religion of Śākyamuni. Numismatic evidence and the testimony of the Peshāwar Casket inscriptions show that he actually became a convert to Buddhism possibly at the commencement of his reign, if not earlier. He showed his zeal for his faith by building the celebrated relic tower and Saṅghārāma at Purushapura or Peshāwar which excited the wonder of Chinese and Muslim travellers. He convoked the last great Buddhist council which was held in Kaśmīra or Jālandhar. But though a Buddhist, the Kushān monarch continued to honour the Greek, Sumerian, Elamite, Mithraic, Zoroastrian and Hindu gods worshipped in the various provinces of his far-flung empire.

1 EHI, p. 285; JIAS, 1912, 674.

2 The fame of the Kanishka Mahāvihāra remained undiminished till the days of the Pāla Kings of Bengal as is apparent from the Ghoshrāvan Inscription of the time of Devapāla. Kanishka's Chaitya is referred to by Alberuni.

3 One account possibly mentions Gandhāra as the place where the Assembly met. The earliest authorities seem to locate it in Kaśmīr. Kundalavana vihāra appears to be the name of the monastery where the theologians assembled probably under the presidency of Vasumitra. The chief business of the Synod seems to be the collection of canonical texts, and the preparation of commentaries on them (Smith, EHI, pp. 283 ff; Law, Buddhistic Studies, 71).

4 See JIAS, 1912, pp. 1003, 1004. The Elamite (Sumerian? Hastings, 5, 827) goddess Nana possibly gave her name to the famous Nānaka coins (cf. Bhand., Carm. Lect., 1921, p. 161). For the influence of the Mithra (Mihr,
of Kanishka was adorned by Pārśva, Vasumitra, Aśvaghoṣa,¹ Charaka, Nāgārjuna,² Saṅgharakṣha, Māṭhara, Agesilaos the Greek and other worthies who played a leading part in the religious, literary, scientific, philosophical and artistic activities of the reign. Excavations at Māt near Mathurā have disclosed a life-size statue of the great king.⁴

After Kanishka came Vāsishka, Huvishka and Kanishka of the Ārā inscription. We have got inscriptions of Vāsishka dated 24 and 28 which possibly prove his control over Mathurā and Eastern Mālwa.⁴ He may have been identical with Vājhesha, the father of Kanishka of the Ārā inscription, and Jushka of the Rājatarāṇīgīnī, the founder of the town of Jushkapur, modern Zukur to the north of Śrīnagar.⁵

Huvishka’s dates range from 28 to 60. A Mathurā Inscription⁶ represents him as the grandson of a king who has the appellation “Sacha dhramaṭhitā,” i.e., steadfast or abiding in the true Law, which occurs on the coins of Kuyula Kaphsā. Kalhana’s narrative leaves the impression that Huvishka ruled simultaneously with Jushka and Kanishka, i.e., Vājhesha and Kanishka of the Ārā inscription of the year 41. The Wardak vase

---

¹ Mithira, Miira) cult on Kushān India, see Sū R. G. Bhandarkar, Vāshyavasam, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems, p. 151. According to Professor Rapson (Ahuja Coins, xiii) the diversity of coin-types does not show religious eclecticism, but reflects the different forms of religion which prevailed in the various districts of the vast empire of the Great Kushāns. Cf., Asvāni and Bednur types of coins of the time of Ittumish and of Hyder Ah.

² For the legend about Kanishka and Aśvaghoṣa see a recent article by H. W. Bailey (JRAS, 1942, pt. I), trans. with notes of a fragment of a Khotan Ms. The king’s name is spelt Cadra (Chandra) Kanishka.

³ It is possible that Nāgārjuna was a contemporary, not of Kanishka I, but of Kanishka II and Huvishka.


⁵ As the Śāfchī images may have been brought from Mathurā, the finds spots need not be regarded as forming necessarily a part of the empire of the king mentioned on the pedestals.

⁶ EHI, p. 275.

⁷ JRAS, 1924, p. 402.

⁸ The epithet is also applied to Aṅgoka in the Kharoshṭhī documents (Burrow, p. 128).
inscription possibly proves the inclusion of Kābul within his dominions. But there is no evidence that he retained his hold on the Lower Indus Valley which was probably wrested from the successors of Kanishka I by Rudradāman I. In Kesāmīra Huvishka built a town named Hushkapura. Like Kanishka I, he was a patron of Buddhism and built a splendid monastery at Mathurā. He also resembled Kanishka in his taste for a diversity of coin-types. Besides a medley of Greek, Persian and Indian deities we have, on one of his coins, the remarkable figure of Roma. A Mathurā inscription refers to the restoration during his reign of a delapidated Devakula of his grandfather.

Smith does not admit that the Kanishka of the Ārā inscription of the year 41 was different from the great Kanishka. Lüders, Fleet, Kennedy and Sten Konow, on the other hand, distinguish between the two Kanishkas. According to Lüders, Kanishka of the Ārā inscription was a son of Vāsishka and probably a grandson of Kanishka I. Kanishka II had the titles Mahārāja, Rājātirāja, Devaputra and possibly Kausara (Caesar). It is probable that he, and not Kanishka I, was the founder of the town of Kanishkapura in Kesāmīra.

The last notable king of Kanishka's line was Vāsudeva I. His dates range from the year 67 to 98, i.e., A.D. 145 to 176 according to the system of chronology adopted

---

1 Cf. Lüders, List No. 62.
2 Camb. Short Hist., 79. Numismatic evidence possibly suggests that the "lion-standard" was to some of the Great Kushāns what the Garuda-dhūaja was to their Gupta successors. Cf. Whitehead, 196.
3 Cf. Corpus, II. i. lxxx; 169. Ep. Ind., XIV, p. 143. JRAS, 1913, 98. The mention of a distinguishing patronymic in the record of the year 41, and the fact that no inscriptions of Kanishka are known that are referable to the period 24 to 40 of the era used by the family (when the Kushān throne was occupied by Vāsishka and, possibly Huvishka as a junior partner), suggest that Kanishka of the year 41 is not to be identified with Kanishka of the years 1-28.
4 Mr. M. Nagor makes mention of an inscription incised on the base of a stone image of the Buddha acquired from Pālikherā (Mathurā Museum, No. 2907; which records the installation of the image in the year 67 during the reign of Vāsudeva.
in these pages. He does not appear to have been a Buddhist. His coins exhibit the figure of Śiva attended by Nandi. There can be no doubt that he reverted to Śaivism, the religion professed by his great predecessor Kadphises II. A king named Vāsudeva is mentioned in the Kārṣṇa Mīmāṃsā as a patron of poets and a Saṅhāpati, apparently ‘President of a Society’ (of learned men). That the Kushān Age was a period of great literary activity is proved by the works of Aśvaghosha, Nāgārjuna and others. It was also a period of religious ferment and missionary activity. It witnessed the development of Śaivism and the allied cult of Kārttikeya, of the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism and the cults of Mihira and of Vāsudeva-Kṛishṇa, and it saw the introduction of Buddhism into China by Kāśyapa Mātaṅga (c. 61-68 A.D.).

"The dynasty of Kanishka opened the way for Indian civilization to Central and Eastern Asia."

The inscriptions of Vāsudeva have been found only in the Mathurā region. From this it is not unreasonable to surmise that he gradually lost his hold over the northwestern portion of the Kushān dominions.

About the middle of the third century A.D., we hear of the existence of no less than four kingdoms all ‘dependent on the Yueh-chi,’ and ruled probably by princes of the Yue-chi stock.1

---

1 Cf. Kennedy, JRAS, 1915, 1060 f. Among the successors of Vāsudeva I may be mentioned Kanishka (III); Vasu (Whitehead, Indo-Greek Coins, pp 211-12; cf. RDB, JASB, Vol. IV (1908), 81 ff; Allgeier, NHIP, VI. 14 11) of Vāsudeva II, who is apparently to be identified with Po-ți-ao A.D. 280 (Corpus, II. i. lxvii); and Grumbates(?), A.D. 360 (Smith, EHI, p. 290). Kings claiming to belong to the family of Kanishka continued to rule in Ki-pin and Gandhāra long after he had passed away (Itinerary of Oukong, Cal. Rev., 1922, Aug.-Sept., pp. 193, 490). The last king of Kanishka’s race was, according to tradition, Lagatūrmān who was overthrown by his Brāhmaṇa minister Kallar (Alberuni, II, 13). For an alleged invasion of India in the later Kushān period by Ardeshir Bābāgān (A.D. 226-41), the founder of the Sassanian dynasty, see Ferishta (Elliot and Dowson, VI, p. 557). Varhrān II (A.D. 276-98) conquered the whole of Sakasthāna and made his son Varhrān III Governor of the conquered territory. Sakasthāna continued to form a part of the Sassanian empire down to the time of Shāpūr II. A Pahlavi Inscription of Persepolis, which Herzfeld deciphered in 1928, dated probably in A.D. 310-11, when Shāpūr II (309-79) was on the throne, refers to the Sassanian
These were Ta-hia (the Oxus region, i.e., Bactria), Ki-pin (Kāpiśa), Kao-fou (Kābul) and ‘Tien-tchou’ (lit. India, meaning probably the country on either side of the Indus with a vague suzerainty over a wider area). In 230 the Ta Yueh-chi, i.e., the Great (?) Yueh-chi king Po-tiāo sent an embassy to the Chinese Emperor. The Yueh-chi kingdom of ‘Tientchou’ began to fall to pieces some time after this date and probably disappeared as an important power in the fourth century A.D. having already lost some of the remotest provinces to the Nāgas. Those nearer the Indus emerged as petty states. Sakasthāna and parts of North-West India were conquered by the Sassanians in the days of Varhrān II (A.D. 276-93). During the early part of the reign of Shāpūr II (A.D. 309-79) the Sassanian suzerainty was still acknowledged in those regions.

SECTION IV. THE NĀGAS AND THE LATER KUŞHĀNS

The successors of the Great Kuśhāns in Mathurā and certain neighbouring tracts were the Nāgas. The prevalence of Nāga rule over a considerable portion of northern and central India in the third and fourth centuries A.D., is amply attested by epigraphic evidence. A Lahore copper seal inscription of the fourth century A.D. refers to a king named Maheśvara Nāga, the son of

ruler of Sakasthāna as “Sakānsūh, minister of ministers (dabīrān dabir) of Hind, Sakasthāna and Tulhārishthān” (MAS, 38, 36). The Paikuli Inscription mentions the Saka chiefs of North-Western India among the retainers of Varhrān III, Governor of Sakasthāna in the last quarter of the third century A.D. (JRAS, 1933, 219). The Ādhras of Western India seem also to have acknowledged the sway of the Sassanians (Rapson, Andhra Coins, cxxiv). J. Chardpentier points out (Aryanar Com., Vol. 16) that at the time of Kosmas Indikō-pleustes (c. 500 A.D.) the right side of the Indus Delta belonged to Persia. Persians figure also in early Chalukya epigraphs and the Raghuvamśa of Kalidāsa.

1 A Yūpa Inscription from Barnālā (in the Jaipur State) discloses the existence of a line of kings, one of whom bore a name that ended in—Vardāhana. They belonged to the Soharta or Sohartri gotra. But the dynastic designation is not known (Ep. Ind., xxvi. 126). The record is dated in Kṛita 284 corresponding to A.D. 227-28.
Nāgbhaṭṭa. The Allahabad Pillar inscription refers to King Ganapatī Nāga, while several Vākāṭaka records mention Bhava Nāga sovereign of the Bhāraśivas whose grandson’s grandson Rudraśena II was a contemporary of Chandra Gupta II, and who accordingly must have flourished before the rise of the Gupta Empire. Some idea of the great power of the rulers of Bhava Nāga’s line and the territory over which they ruled may be gathered from the fact that the dynasty performed ten Aśvamedha sacrifices and “were besprinkled on the forehead with the pure water of (the river) Bhāghnāthi (Ganges) that had been obtained by their valour.” The valiant deeds of the family culminating in the performance of ten Aśvamedha sacrifices indicate that they were not a feudatory line owing allegiance to the Kushāns. We learn from the Purāṇas that the Nāgas established themselves at Vidiṣā (Besnagar near Bhilsa), Padmāvatī (Padam Pawāyi, “in the apex on the confluence of the Sindhu and Pāra”), Kāntipuri (not satisfactorily identified), and even Mathūra which was the southern capital of Kanishka and his successors. The greatest of the Nāga Kings was perhaps Chandrāṁśa, “the second Nakhavant,” whose name reminds us of the great king Chandra of the Delhi Iron Pillar inscription. It is by no means clear that the two are identical. But if Chandra preceded the

---

1 Fleet, CII, p. 283.
2 CII, p. 241; AHD, p. 72.
3 Coins of a Mahārāja of Adhirāja named Bhavanāga have been found at this place. His identity with Bhavanāga of Vākāṭaka epigraphs proposed by Dr. Altakar (J Num. S I, V. pt II) must await future discoveries.
4 Mention is made of a Kāntipuri in the Shanda Purāṇa (Nāgarakhandha, ch. 47, 48). In the story narrated in the text a petty prince of Kāntipuri marries a princess of Daśārṇa, the valley of the Dhasan, in Eastern Malā which, in the time of the Meghadūta, included Vidiṣā. Kāntipuri probably lay not far from the last-mentioned city.
5 JRAS, 1905, p. 233.
6 “Nṛpāṁ Vidiṣākāṁśa c-āṁ bhavasyāṁstu nibodhatu
śeṣāya Nāga-śeṣasya putraḥ pari prāṇāyaḥ.
Bhoğī bhavasyate (?) rāja nṛpo Nāga-kul uḍvahaih
Sadācandras tu Chandrāṁśa dvitiyo Nakhavāṁs tathā.”
—Dynasties of the Kali Age, p. 49.
7 Devotion to Viṣṇu may suggest identification with Chandra-Gupta I, or
rise of the Gupta empire, it is natural to seek a reference to him in the Purānic texts which were not compiled till the Gupta-Vākāṭaka age.

The hand of a Nāga princess was sought by Chandra Gupta II in the fourth century, and a 'Nāga' officer governed the Gaugetic Doāb as late as the time of Skanda Gupta. The Kushāns, however, continued to rule in the Kābul valley and parts of the Indian borderland. One of them gave his daughter in marriage to Hormīsδas (or Hormuzd) II, the Sassanian King of Persia (A.D. 301-09). As already stated Varhrān II (A.D. 276-93) and his successors up to the time of Shāpur II seem to have exercised suzerainty over their Scythic neighbours. "When Shāpur II besieged Amida in A.D. 350, Indian elephants served under his command." Shortly afterwards the Sassanian supremacy was replaced by that of the Guptas, and the "Devagupta or Devarāja and not Dhāva. One should note also the claim to have acquired adhārāya and victory over a Trans-Indus people by his own prowess and not as a sequel to the power and prestige won by a line of distinguished ancestors. The Vrishnidevate association of this great King precludes the possibility of identification with Chandra Kanishka. Identification with the first Maurya is fantastic in view of the date of the epigraph and recorded achievements of the hero which do not include the overthrow of the Nandas and clash with the Yavanas.

preferably, Chandra II. But then we have to explain the significant omission of the termination-gupta in this memorable prāśasti and the epithet Dhāva, especially as Chandra-Gupta II is known as Devagupta or Devarāja and not Dhāva. One should note also the claim to have acquired adhārāya and victory over a Trans-Indus people by his own prowess and not as a sequel to the power and prestige won by a line of distinguished ancestors. The Vrishnidevate association of this great King precludes the possibility of identification with Chandra Kanishka. Identification with the first Maurya is fantastic in view of the date of the epigraph and recorded achievements of the hero which do not include the overthrow of the Nandas and clash with the Yavanas.

1 For later traces of Nāga rule, see B. G. J. 2, 281, 292, 318, 574.
2 J. R. B. S., 1913, p. 1062. Smith (E. H., p. 290) and Hertzfeld (MASI, 38, p. 30) give the date A.D. 360.
3 Cf. also J. A. B. S., 1908, 99.
4 Or probably earlier (about the middle of the fourth century according to Altekar, N. H., VI, 21).
ninth century A.D. a powerful Muslim dynasty, that of the Saffārids, was established in Sīstān (Seistan) and the sway of the family soon extended to Ghazni, Zābulistān, Herat, Balkh and Bamiyan. The later kings of the race of Kanishka seem to have had one residence in Gandhāra at the city of Uṇḍ, Ohind, Waihand or Udabhānda, on the Indus. Another capital was situated in the Kābul valley. The family was finally extinguished by the Brāhmaṇa Kallār or Lalliya who founded the Hindu Shāhiyya dynasty towards the close of the ninth century A.D. A part of the kingdom of Kābul fell into the hands of Alptigin in tenth century.

1 Nazim, The Life and Times of Sultan Maḥmud. 186.