JOURNAL

OF

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

ART. I.—*Bactrian Coins and Indian Dates.* By E. THOMAS,
Esq., F.R.S.

A SHORT time ago, a casual reference to the complicated Greek monograms stamped on the earlier Bactrian coins suggested to me an explanation of some of their less involved combinations by the test of simple Greek *letter* dates, which was followed by the curious discovery that the Bactrian kings were in the habit of recognizing and employing *curtailed* dates to the optional omission of the figure for *hundreds*, which seems to have been the immemorial custom in many parts of India. My chief authority for this conclusion was derived from a chance passage in Albírúní,¹ whose statement, however, has since been independently supported by the interpretation of an inscription of the ninth century A.D. from Kashmír,² which illustrates the provincial use of a cycle of *one hundred* years, and has now

¹ Albírúní, writing in India in 1031 A.D., tells us, "Le vulgaire, dans l'Inde, compte par siècles, et les siècles se placent l'un après l'autre. On appelle cela le Samvatsara du cent. Quand un cent est écoulé, on le laisse et l'on en commence un autre. On appelle cela Loka-kála, c'est-à-dire comput du peuple."—Reinaud's Translation, *Fragments Arabes*, Paris, 1845, p. 146.

² This second inscription ends with the words *Śaka Kālagatovdah* 726—that is, "Śaka Kāla years elapsed 726," equivalent to A.D. 804, which is therefore the date of the temple. This date also corresponds with the year 80 of the local cycle, which is the *Loka-kāla* of Kashmír or cycle of 2,700 years, counted by centuries named after the twenty-seven *nakshatras*, or lunar mansions. The reckoning, therefore, never goes beyond 100 years, and as each century begins in the 25th year of the Christian century, the 80th year of the local cycle is equivalent to the 4th year of the Christian century.—General A. Cunningham, *Archæological Report*, 1875, vol. v. p. 181.

been definitively confirmed by information obtained by Dr. Bühler¹ as to the origin of the Kashmīrī era and the corroboration of the practice of the omission of "*the hundreds in stating dates*" still prevailing in that conservative kingdom.²

Since Bayer's premature attempt to interpret the mint-monogram HP , on a piece of Eucratides, as 108,³ Numismatists have not lost sight of the possible discrimination of dates as opposed to the preferential mint-marks so abundant on the surfaces of these issues, though the general impression has been adverse to the possibility of their fulfilling any such functions.⁴

¹ "Dr. Bühler has found out the key to the Kashmīrean era: it begins in the year of the Kaliyug 25, or 3076 B.C., when the Saptarshis are said to have gone to heaven. The Kashmīr people often omit the hundreds in stating dates. Thus the year 24 (Kashmīr era) in which Kalhana wrote his Rājataranginī, and which corresponded with Śaka 1070, stands for 4,224."—*Athenæum*, Nov. 20, 1875, p. 675.

² Since this was written, General Cunningham's letter of the 30th March, 1876, has appeared in the *Athenæum* (April 29th, 1876), from the text of which I extract the following passages. These seem to establish the fact that the optional omission of the hundreds was a common and well-understood rule so early as about the age of Asoka. "The passage in which the figures occur runs as follows in the Sahasrām text:—

īyam cha savane vivuthena dutesa
pañnalāti satāvivuthati 252.

The corresponding passage in the Rūpnāth text is somewhat different:—

ahāle sava vivasetavāya ati vyathena
sāvane kaṭesu 52 satavivasāta.

The corresponding portion of the Bairāt text is lost. My reason for looking upon these figures as expressing a date is that they are preceded in the Rūpnāth text by the word kaṭesu, which I take to be the equivalent of the Sanskrit *krānteshu* = (so many years) 'having elapsed.'

I do not stop to follow General Cunningham's arguments with regard to the value of the figures which he interprets as 252. The sign for 50, in its horizontal form, has hitherto been received as 80, but that the same symbol came, sooner or later, to represent 50, when placed perpendicularly, is sufficiently shown by Prof. Eggeling's Plate, p. 52, in Vol. VIII. of our Journal. I should, however, take great exception to the rendering of the unit as 2, which, to judge by Mr. Bayley's letter, in the same number of the *Athenæum*, Gen. Cunningham and Dr. Bühler had at first rightly concurred in reading as 6.

³ *Hist. Reg. Græcorum Bactriani*, St. Petersburg, 1738, p. 92: "Numus Eucratidis, quem postea copiosius explicabo, annum 108. habet, sine dubio epochæ Bactrianæ, qui annus ex nostris rationibus A.V.C. 606. Septembri mense init. Igitur cum hoc in numo victoriæ ejus Indicæ celebrantur, quibus ut Justinus ait, *Indiam in potestatem redegit*." See also pp. 38, 56, 134.

⁴ H. H. Wilson, *Ariana Antiqua*, pp. 235, 238. General A. Cunningham, *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. viii. O.S. p. 175; and vol. viii. N.S. 1868, p. 183; vol. ix. N.S. 1869, p. 230.

In 1858 I published, in my edition of "Prinsep's *Essays on Indian Antiquities*," a notice of the detached letters *OT* as occurring on a coin of Eucratides (No. 3, p. 184, vol. ii.), and *ΠΓ* as found on the money of Heliocles (No. 1, p. 182), which letters, in their simple form, would severally represent the figures 73 and 83; but the difficulty obtruded itself that these numbers were too low to afford any satisfactory elucidation of the question involved in their application as dynastic dates.

Among the later acquisitions of Bactrian coins in the British Museum is a piece of Heliocles bearing the full trilateral date, after the manner of the Syrian mints, of *ΠΠΓ* or 183, which, when tested by the Seleucidan era (*i.e.* 311–183), brings his reign under the convenient date of B.C. 128, authorizing us to use the coincident *abbreviated* figures, under the same terms, as *OT* = 73 for 173 of the Seleucidan era = B.C. 138 for Eucratides, and the repeated *ΠΓ* = 83 for 183 Seleucidan = B.C. 128, for Heliocles,¹ a date which is further supported by the appearance of the exceptionally combined *open monogram* $\overline{\Pi A}$ (*ΠA*), or 81 for 181 = B.C. 130 on his other pieces.

The last fully-dated piece, in the Bactrian series, is the unique example of the money of Plato (bearing the figured letter date *PMZ* = 147 of the Seleucidæ, or B.C. 165). We have two doubtful dates *Ξ* = 60 and *ΞE* = 65, on the coins of Apollodotus; but if these letters were intended for dates, they will scarcely fit-in with the Seleucidan scheme. Menander dates his coins in *regnal* years. I can trace extant examples from 1 to 8. But this practice by no means necessitates the disuse of the Seleucidan era in ordinary reckonings, still less its abandonment in State documents where more formal precision was

¹ General Cunningham was cognizant of the date *ΠΓ* = 83 as found on the coins of Heliocles, which he associated with the year B.C. 164, under the assumption that he had detected the true initial date of the Bactrian era, which he had settled to his own satisfaction, "as beginning in B.C. 246."—*Num. Chron.* n.s. vol. viii. 1868, p. 266; n.s. vol. ix. 1869, pp. 35, 230. See also Mr. Vaux's note, *N.C.* 1875, vol. xv. p. 3.

required. Subjoined is a rough facsimile and technical description of the coin of Plato.¹

Silver. Size 1·2. Wt. 258 grains.

Obv. Head of king to the right, with helmet ornamented with the peculiar ear and horn of a bull, so marked on the coins of Eucratides.

Rev. Apollo driving the horses of the Sun. Monogram No. 46a, Prinsep's Essays.

Legend. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΠΑΤΩΝΟΣ.

Date at foot, PMZ=147 Selucidæ (or B.C. 165).

My first impression on noticing the near identity of the obverse head with the standard Numismatic portraits of Eucratides, and the coincidence of the date with that assumed, by our latest authority,² as the year of the decease of that monarch, was that Plato must have succeeded him; but the advanced interpretation of the dates, above given, puts any such assignment altogether out of court, and necessitates a critical reconstruction of all previous speculative epochal or serial lists of the Bactrian succession.

In the present instance the adoption of the helmet of the Chabylians³ by Eucratides and Plato may merely imply that

¹ The woodcut here given was prepared for Mr. Vaux's original article on this unique coin of Plato, in the Numismatic Chronicle, vol. xv. p. 1.

² Gen. Cunningham, N.C. vol. viii. o.s. 1843, p. 175, and vol. ix. n.s. 1869, p. 175.

³ "The Chabylians had small shields made of raw hides, and each had two javelins used for hunting wolves. Brazen helmets protected their heads, and above these they wore the ears and horns of an ox fashioned in brass. They had also crests on their helms."—Herodotus vii. 76; Rawlinson, vol. iv. p. 72; Xenophon Anab. v.

they both claimed kindred with that tribe, or at some time held command in their national contingent—and Plato may, with equal possibility, have introduced the device, in the first instance, as have copied the more abundant obverses of similar character from the coins of Eucratides. On the other hand, the identity of the helmet may indicate an absolute borrowing of a ready prepared device. The singular and eccentric combination of Bactrian Mint dies has from the first constituted a difficulty and a danger to modern interpreters. I have for long past looked suspiciously upon the too facile adaptations of otherwise conscientious mint masters, leading them to utilize, for reasons of their own, the available die-devices in stock for purposes foreign to the original intent under which they were executed. However, in the present instance, the imperfect preservation of the single coin of Plato available does not permit of our pronouncing with any certainty upon the identity of the features with those of the profile of Eucratides.

To revert to our leading subject. In addition to the value of the data quoted above as fixing definitively, though within fairly anticipated limits, the epochs of three prominent Bactrian kings, their conventional use of the system of abbreviated definitions points, directly, to the assimilation of local customs, to which the Greeks so readily lent themselves, in adopting the method of reckoning by the Indian *Loka Kāla*, which simplified the expression of dates, even as we do now, in the civilized year of our Lord, when we write 76 for 1876.

The extension of the Seleucid era eastwards, and its amalgamation of Indian methods of definition within its own mechanism, leads further to the consideration of how long this exotic era maintained its ground in Upper India, and how much influence it exerted upon the chronological records of succeeding dynasties. I have always been under the impression that this influence was more wide-spread and abiding than my fellow-antiquaries have been ready to admit,¹ but

¹ Journal Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XII. p. 41; Journal Asiatic Society Bengal, 1855, p. 565, and 1872, p. 175; Prinsep's Essays, vol. ii. p. 86; Journal Asiatique, 1863, p. 388.

I am now prepared to carry my inferences into broader channels, and to suggest that the Indo-Scythian "Kanishka" group of kings continued to use the Seleucidan era, even as they retained the minor sub-divisions of the Greek months, which formed an essential part of its system: and under this view to propose that we should treat the entire circle of dates of the "Hushka, Jushka, and Kanishka" *family*, mentioned in the Rája Taranginí, which their inscriptions expand from ix. to xcvi., as pertaining to the fourth century of the Seleucidan era; an arrangement which will bring them into concert with our Christian reckoning from 2 B.C. to 87 A.D. A scheme which would, moreover, provide for their full possession of power up to the *crucial* "Saka" date of 78-79 A.D., and allow for the subsequent continuance of a considerable breadth of sway outside the limited geographical range of Indian cognizance.

There are further considerations which add weight to the conclusion that the Kanerki Scythians adopted, for public purposes, the Seleucidan era; they may be supposed, like the Parthians and other Nomads, to have achieved but scant culture till conquest made them masters of civilized sections of the earth.

In the present instance, these new invaders are seen to have ignored or rejected the Semitic-Bactrian writing employed by the Kadphises horde in parallel concert with the traditional monumental Greek, and to have relied exclusively on the Greek language in their official records¹ till the later domestication of some of the members of the family, at Mathurá, led to an exceptional use of the Devanágari alphabet, in subordination to the dominant Greek, on the coins of Vásudeva. In no case do we find them recognizing the Semitic type of character, though the inscriptions quoted

¹ Prof. Wilson's Plates, in his *Ariana Antiqua*, arranged 35 years ago, and altogether independently of the present argument, will suffice to place this contrast before the reader. The Kadphises group extend from figs. 5 to 21 of plate x. All these coins are *bilingual*, Greek and Semitic-Bactrian. The Kanerki series commence with No. 15, plate xi., having nothing but Greek legends, either on the obverse or on the reverse, and follow on continuously through plates xii. xiii. and xiv. down to fig. 11. After that, the Greek characters become more or less chaotic, till we reach No. 19.

below will show how largely that alphabet had spread in some portions of their dominion. But beyond this, their adherence, or perhaps that of their successors, to Greek, continues mechanically till its characters merge into utter incoherence on the later mintages.¹ All of these indications lead to the inference that, as far as the Court influences were concerned, the tendency to rely upon Greek speech would have carried with it what remained *in situ* of the manners and customs of their Western instructors.²

There are two groups or varieties of Indo-Scythian Inscriptions of the Kanishka family. The one in the Indian *proper* or Lát alphabet, all of which are located at Mathurá. The published Mathurá inscriptions of this group (excluding the two quotations placed within brackets) number 20 in all; as a rule they are merely records of votive offerings on the part of "pious founders," and contain only casual references to the ruling powers. Twelve of these make no mention of any monarch, though they are clearly contemporaneous with the other dedicatory inscriptions. Throughout the whole

¹ Ariana Antiqua, pl. xiv. Nos. 12, 13, 14, 16, 17.

² The circumstances bearing upon the battle of Karór (or كدور) are of so much importance in the history of this epoch, that I reproduce Albírúni's account of that event: "On emploie ordinairement les ères de Sri-Harcha, de Vikramá-ditya, de Śaka, de Ballaba, et des Gouptas. . . . L'ère de Vikramá-ditya est employée dans les provinces méridionales et occidentales de l'Inde. . . . L'ère de Śaka, nommée par les Indiens 'Śaka-kála,' est postérieure à celle de Vikramá-ditya de 135 ans. Śaka est le nom d'un prince qui a régné sur les contrées situées entre l'Indus et la mer. Sa résidence était placée au centre de l'empire, dans la contrée nommée Aryavartha. Les Indiens le font naître dans une classe autre que celle des Sakya; quelques-uns prétendent qu'il était Soudra et originaire de la ville de Mansoura; il y en a même qui disent qu'il n'était pas de race indienne, et qu'il tirait son origine des régions occidentales. Les peuples eurent beaucoup à souffrir de son despotisme, jusqu'à ce qu'il leur vint du secours de l'Orient. Vikramá-ditya marcha contre lui, mit son armée en déroute, et le tua sur le territoire de Korour, situé entre Moultan et le château de Louny. Cette époque devint célèbre, à cause de la joie que les peuples ressentirent de la mort de Śaka, et on la choisit pour ère principalement chez les astronomes."—Reinaud's translation.

General Cunningham has attempted to identify the site of Karór with a position "50 miles S.E. of Multán and 20 miles N.E. of Baháwalpúr," making the "castle of Loni" into "*Ludhan*, an ancient town situated near the old bed of the Sutlej river, 44 miles E.N.E. of Kahrór and 70 miles E.S.E. of Multán."—*Ancient Geography of India* (Trübner, 1871), p. 241. These assignments, are, however, seriously shaken by the fact that Albírúni himself invariably places these two sites far north of Multán, *i.e.* according to his latitudes and longitudes, *Multán* is 91°—29° 30' N., while *Kadór*, as he writes it, is 92°—31° N., and *Loni* (variant *Loi*) is 32° N.—Sprenger's Maps, No. 12, etc.

series of twenty records the dates are confined to numbers below *one hundred*: they approach and nearly touch the end of a given century, in the 90 and 98; but do not reach or surpass the crucial *hundred* discarded in the local cycle.

The two inscriptions, Nos. 22, 23, from the same locality, dated, severally, Samvat 135 with the Indian month of Paushya, and Samvat 281, clearly belong to a different age, and vary from their associates in dedicatory phraseology, forms of letters, and many minor characteristics, which General Cunningham readily discriminated.¹

INDO-SCYTHIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

In the Indo-Pali Alphabet.

At Mathura.	{	KANISHKA.	<i>Mahārāja Kanishka. Samvat 9.</i> [<i>Kanishka. Samvat 28.</i>] [<i>Huvishka. Samvat 33.</i>] ²
		HUVISHKA.	<i>Mahārāja DEVAPUTRA Huvishka. Hemanta, S. 39.</i> <i>Mahārāja RAJATIRAJA DEVAPUTRA Huvishka. Grishma, S. 47.</i> ³ <i>Mahārāja Huvishka. Hemanta, S. 48.</i>
		VASUDEVA.	<i>Mahārāja Rājatirāja DEVAPUTRA Vāsu(deva). Varsha, S. 44.</i> <i>Mahārāja Vāsudeva. Grishma, S. 83.</i> <i>Mahārāja Rājatirāja, SHĀHI, Vāsudeva. Hemanta, S. 87.</i> <i>Rāja Vāsudeva. Varsha, S. 98.</i> ⁴

¹ Arch. Rep. vol. iii. p. 38.

² These two dates are quoted from Gen. Cunningham's letter to the *Athenæum* of 29 April, 1876, as having been lately discovered by Mr. Growse, B.C.S.

³ The 47th year of the Monastery of Huvishka.

⁴ I was at first disposed to infer that the use of the Indian months in their full development indicated a period subsequent to the employment of the primitive three seasons, but I find from the Western Inscriptions, lately published by Prof. Bhandarkar, that they were clearly in contemporaneous acceptance. While a passage in Hiouen Tsang suggests that the retention of the normal terms was in a measure typical of Buddhist belief, and so that, in another sense, the months had a confessed conventional significance.

"Suivant la sainte doctrine de Jou-lai (du Tathágata), une année se compose de trois saisons. Depuis le 16 du premier mois, jusqu'au 15 du cinquième mois, c'est la saison chaude. Depuis le 16 du cinquième mois, jusqu'au 15 du neuvième mois, c'est la saison pluvieuse (Varchās). Depuis le 16 de neuvième mois, jusqu'au 15 du premier mois, c'est la saison froide. Quelquefois on divise l'année en quatre saisons, savoir: le printemps, l'été, l'automne et l'hiver."—Hiouen Tsang, vol. ii. p. 63. The division into three seasons is distinctly *nor-Vedic*.—Muir, vol. i. p. 13; Elliot, Glossary, vol. ii. p. 47.

"There are two summers in the year and two harvests, while the winter intervenes between them."—Pliny vi. 21; Diod. Sic. I. c. i.

The parallel series are more scattered, and crop up in less direct consecutive association, these are indorsed in the *Bactrian* or Aryan adaptation of the Ancient Phœnician alphabet.

INDO-SCYTHIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

In the Bactrian-Pāli Alphabet.

- Bahāwalpūr. *Maharaja Rajadīraja DEVAPUTRA Kanishka.*
 Samvat 11, on the 28th of the (Greek) month of Dæsius.
- Manikyāla Tope. *Maharaja Kaneshka, GUSHANA vasha samvardhaka.*
 "Increaser of the dominion of the Gushans" (Kushans).
 Samvat 18.
- Wardak Vase. *Maharaja rajatiraja Huveshka. Samvat 51, 15th of Artemisius.*¹

¹ Besides these inscriptions, there is a record of the name of Kanishka designated as *Raja Gandharya*, on "a rough block of quartz," from Zeda, near Ohind, now in the Lāhore Museum. This legend is embodied in very small Bactrian letters, and is preceded by a single line in large characters, which reads as follows: *San 10 + 1 (=11) Ashadasa masasa di 20, Udeyana gu. 1. Isachlu nami.* I do not quote or definitively adopt this date, as the two inscriptions appear to me to be of different periods, and vary in a marked degree in the forms as well as in the size of their letters.—Lowenthal, J.A.S.B. 1863, p. 5; Gen. Cunningham, Arch. Report, vol. v. p. 57.

In addition to the above Bactrian Pāli Inscriptions, we have a record from Taxila, by the "Satrap Liako Kusuluko," in "the 78th year of the great king, the Great Moga, on the 5th day of the month Panæmus" (J.R.A.S. xx. o.s. p. 227; J.A.S.B. 1862, p. 40). And an inscription from Takht-i-Bahi of the Indo-Parthian king Gondophares, well known to us from his coins (Ariana Antiqua, p. 340, Prinsep's Essays, vol. ii. p. 214), and doubtfully associated with the *Gondoferus* of the *Legenda Aurea*, to the following tenor: "*Maharajasa Gudupharasa Vasha 20 + 4 + 2 (=26) San . . . Satimae 100 + 3 (=103) Vesakhasa masasa divase 4.*" (Cunningham, Arch. Rep. vol. v. p. 59.) And to complete the series of regal quotations, I add the heading of the inscription from Panjtar of a king of the Kushans: "*Sam 100 + 20 + 2 (=122) Sravanasa masasa di prathame 1, Maha rayasa Gushanasa Ra . . .*" (Professor Dowson, J.R.A.S. Vol. XX. o.s. p. 223; Cunningham, Arch. Rep. vol. v. p. 61.)

This is an inscription which, in the exceptional character of its framework, suggests and even necessitates reconstructive interpretations. The stone upon which it is engrossed was obviously fissured and imperfectly prepared for its purpose in the first instance; so that, in the opening line, Gondophares' name has to be taken over a broken gap with space for two letters, which divides the *d* from the *ph*. The surface of the stone has likewise suffered from abrasion of some kind or other, so that material letters have in certain cases been reduced to mere shadowy outlines. But enough remains intact to establish the name of the Indo-Parthian King, and to exhibit a double record of dates, giving his regnal year and the counterpart in an era the determination of which is of the highest possible importance. The *vasha* or year of the king, expressed in figures alone, as 26, is not contested. The *figured* date of the leading era presents no difficulty whatever to those who are conversant with Phœnician notation, or who may hereafter choose to consult the ancient coins of Aradus. The symbol for *hundreds*

✕ is incontestable. The preliminary stroke 1, to the right of the sign, in

The above collection of names and dates covers, in the latter sense, a period of from An. 9 to An. 98, or eighty-nine years in all. The names, as I interpret them, apply to two individuals, only, out of the triple brotherhood mentioned in the *Rāja Taranginī*. After enumerating the reigns of (1) Aśoka, (2) Jaloka, and (3) Dámódhara, Professor Wilson's translation of that chronicle continues:—

"Dámódhara was succeeded by three princes who divided the country, and severally founded capital cities named after themselves. These princes were called Hushka, Jushka, and Kanishka,¹ of Turushka or Tatar extraction. . . . They are considered synchronous, but may possibly be all that are preserved of some series of Tatar princes who, it is very likely, at various periods, established themselves in Kashmír."² I

the Western system, marks the simple number of *hundreds*; in India an additional prolongation duplicates the value of the normal symbol. Under these terms the adoptive Bactrian figures are positive as 103. Before the *figured* date there is to be found, in *letters*, the word *śatimae* "in one hundred" or "hundredth," in the reading of which all concur. It is possible that the exceptional use of the figure for 100, which has not previously been met with, may have led to its definition and repetition in *writing* in the body of the inscription, in order that future interpreters should feel no hesitation about the value of the exotic symbol. There was not the same necessity for repeating the 3, the three fingers of which must always have been obvious to the meanest capacity. I have no difficulty about the existence and free currency of the Vikramáditya era *per se* in its own proper time, which some archæologists are inclined to regard as of later adaptation. But I am unable to concur in the reading of *Samvatsara*, or to admit, if such should prove the correct interpretation, that the word *Samvatsara* involved or necessitated a preferential association with the Vikramáditya era, any more than the *Samvatsara* (J.R.A.S., Vol. IV. p. 500) and *Samvatsaraye* (*ibid.* p. 222), or the abbreviated *San* or *Sam*, which is so constant in these Bactrian Pali Inscriptions, and so frequent on Indo-Parthian coins (Prinsep's Essays, vol. ii. p. 205, Coins of Azas, Nos. 1, 2, 6, 7, 12; Azilisas, Nos. 1, etc.; Gondophares, p. 215, No. 4.

¹ Abulfazl says "brothers." Gladwin's Translation, vol. ii. p. 171; Calcutta Text, p. 574. هشتک - زشک - کنشک هر سه برادر آئین بوده داشتند.

General Cunningham considers that he has succeeded in identifying all the three capitals, the sites of which are placed within the limits of the valley of Kashmír, *i.e.*,

"*Kanishka-pura* (Kanikhpur) hod. Kámpur, is ten miles south of Sirinagar, known as Kámpur Sarai.

"*Hushka-pura*, the Hu-se-kia-lo of Hiuen Tshang—the Ushkar of Albírúni—now surviving in the village of *Uskara*, two miles south-east of Baráhmula.

"*Jushka-pura* is identified by the Brahmans with Zukru or Zukur, a considerable village four miles north of the capital, the *Scheeroh* of Troyer and Wilson."—Ancient Geography of India (London, 1871), p. 99.

² Prof. H. H. Wilson, "An Essay on the Hindu History of Kashmír," Asiatic Researches, vol. xv. p. 23; and Troyer's *Histoire des Rois du Kachmir* (Paris, 1840–52), vol. i. p. 19. See also Hiouen-Tsang (Paris, 1858), vol. ii. pp. 42, 106, etc.

assume *Vásu Deva* (Krishṇa's title) to have been the titular designation of Kanishka,¹ while *Devaputra* was common to both brothers, and the *Sháhi*² was perhaps optional, or devoted to the senior in the joint brotherhood³ or head of the more extensive tribal community of the Kanerki.

The Mathurá inscriptions, as we have seen, distinguish the subdivisions of the year by the old triple seasons of *Grishma*, *Varsha*, and *Hemanta*, while the Bactrian Páli inscriptions ordinarily define the months by their Macedonian designations;⁴ the question thus arises as to whether this latter

¹ Coin of *Vásu Deva* struck in his Eastern dominions. *Trésor de Numismatique*. Gold. Pl. lxxx., figs. 10, 11.

Obverse.—Scythian figure, standing to the front, casting incense into the typical small Mithraic altar. To the right, a trident with flowing pennons: to the left, a standard with streamers.

Legend, around the main device, in obscure Greek, the vague reproduction of the conventional titles of PAO NANO PAO KOPANO.

Below the left arm $\begin{matrix} \text{व} & \text{Va} \\ \text{सु} & \text{su} \end{matrix} \} = \text{VASU}$, in the exact style of character found in his Mathurá Inscriptions.

Reverse.—The Indian Goddess *Párvati* seated on an open chair or imitation of a Greek throne, extending in her right hand the classic regal fillet; Mithraic monogram to the left.

Legend, ΑΡΑΟΧΡΟ, Ard-Ugra = "half Siva," i.e. *Párvati*.

Those who wish to examine nearly exact counterparts of these types in English publications may consult the coins engraved in plate xiv., *Ariana Antiqua*, figs. 19, 20. The latter seems to have an imperfect rendering of the $\text{व} \text{va}$ on the obverse, with $\text{सु} \text{su}$ (formed like *pu*) on the reverse. [For corresponding types see also *Journ. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. v. pl. 36, and Prinsep's *Essays*, pl. 4. General Cunningham, *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. vi. o.s. pl. i. fig. 2.] The $\text{स} \text{s}$ is not curved, but formed by a mere elongation of the downstroke of the $\text{स} \text{s}$, which in itself constitutes the vowel. The omission of the consecutive *Deva* on the coins is of no more import than the parallel rejection of the *Gupta*, where the king's name is written *downwards*, Chinese fashion, in the confined space below the arm. See also General Cunningham's remarks on *Vásudeva*, *J.R.A.S.* Vol. V. pp. 193, 195. Gen. Cunningham proposes to amend Prof. Wilson's tentative reading of *Baraono* on the two gold coins, *Ariana Antiqua*, pl. xiv. figs. 14, 18 (p. 378), into PAO NANO PAO BAZOΔHO KOPANO. The engraving of No. 14 certainly suggests an initial B in the name, and the AZ and O are sufficiently clear. We have only to angularize the succeeding O into Δ to complete the identification. These coins have a reverse of *Śiva* and the Bull.—*Arch. Rep.* vol. iii. p. 42. Dr. Kern does not seem to have been aware of these identifications when he proposed, in 1873 (*Révue Critique*, 1874, p. 291), to associate the Mathurá *Vásudeva* with the Indo-Sassanian *Pehlvi* coin figured in Prinsep, pl. vii. fig. 6. *Journ. Roy. Asiatic Soc.* Vol. XII. pl. 3; *Ariana Antiqua*, pl. xvii. fig. 9.

² The full *Devaputra Shahán Sháhi* occurs in the *Samudra Gupta* inscription on the Allahábád Lát. It may possibly refer to some of the extra Indian successors of these Indo-Scythians.

³ Troyer translates paragraph 171, "Pendant le long règne de ces rois," vol. i. p. 19.

⁴ "The Macedonian months, which were adopted by the Syro-Macedonian

practice does not imply a continued use of the Seleucidan era, in association with which the names of these months must first have reached India?¹ and which must have been altogether out of place in any indigenous scheme of reckoning. Tested by this system, the years 9-98 of the fourth century of the Seleucidan era (B.C. 311-12) produce, as I have elsewhere remarked, the singularly suitable return of B.C. 2 to A.D. 87. And a similar process applied to the third century of the newly-discovered Parthian era (B.C. 248)² would represent B.C. 39 and A.D. 50. But this last method of computation seems to have secured a mere local and exceptional currency, and the probabilities of its extension to India are as zero compared with the wide-spread and enduring date³ of the Seleucidæ, which the Parthians themselves continued to use on their coinage in conjunction with the old

cities, and generally by the Greek cities of Asia, after the time of Alexander, were lunar till the reformation of the Roman calendar of *Cæsar* (by inserting 67+23 = 90 days in this year). After that reformation the Greek cities of Asia, which had then become subject to the Roman Empire, gradually adopted the Julian year. But although they followed the Romans in computing by the solar Julian year of 365d. 6h. instead of the lunar, yet they made no alteration in the season at which their year began ($\Delta\text{ΙΟ}\Sigma$ = Oct. Nov.), or in the order of the months."—Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* vol. iii. pp. 202, 347.

¹ Some importance will be seen to have attached to the use of the contrasted terms for national months in olden time, as we find Letronne observing: "Dans tous les exemples de doubles ou triples dates que nous offrent les inscriptions rédigées en Grèce, le mois qui est énoncé le premier est toujours celui dont fait usage la nation à laquelle appartient celui qui parle."—Letronne, *Inscriptions de l'Égypte* (Paris, 1852), p. 263.

² *Assyrian Discoveries*, by George Smith, London, 1875, p. 389. From the time of the Parthian conquest it appears that the tablets were dated according to the Parthian style. There has always been a doubt as to the date of this revolt, and consequently of the Parthian monarchy, as the classical authorities have left no evidence as to the exact date of the rise of the Parthian power. I, however, obtained three Parthian tablets from Babylon; two of them contained double dates, one of which, being found perfect, supplied the required evidence, as it was dated according to the Seleucidan era, and according also to the Parthian era, the 144th year of the Parthians being equal to the 208th year of the Seleucidæ, thus making the Parthian era to have commenced B.C. 248. This date is written: "Month . . . 23rd day 144th year, which is called the 208th year, Arsaces, King of kings."

Clinton, following Justin and Eusebius, etc., 250 B.C., *Fasti Romani*, vol. ii. p. 243, and *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. iii. p. 311; Moses Chorenensis, 251 or 252 B.C.; Suidas, 246 B.C.

³ "Antiochus, surnamed Epiphanes, son of Antiochus the king, . . . reigned in the 137th year of the kingdom of the Greeks."—*Maccabees I.* i. 10—ii. 70, et. seq. "In the 143rd year of the kingdom of the Seleucidæ."—*Josephus*, *Ant.* xii. 3. "It came to pass . . . in the 145th year on the 25th of that month which is by us called *Chasleu*, and by the Macedonians *Apellæus*,

Macedonian *months*,¹ whose importance in their bearing upon the leading era I have enlarged upon in the parallel Indo-Scythic instance immediately under review. So that, as at present advised, I hold to a preference for the Seleucidan test, which places the Indo-Scythians in so satisfactory a position both relatively to their predecessors and successors. I have at the same time no reserve in acknowledging the many difficulties surrounding the leading question; but if we can but get a second "pied à terre," a fixed date-point, after the classical testimony to the epoch of the great Chandra Gupta, we may check the doubts and difficulties surrounding many generations both before and after any established date that we may chance to elicit from the present and more mature inquiries.

The comparative estimates by the three methods of computation immediately available stand roughly as follows:—

Seleucidan .	[1st Sept., 312 B.C.]	B.C. 2 to A.D. 87.
Vikramāditya . .	[57 B.C. ²] . .	B.C. 48 to A.D. 41.
Saka . .	[14th March, 78 A.D. ³]	A.D. 88 to A.D. 177.

Before taking leave of the general subject of Indian methods of defining dates, I wish to point out how much the conventional practice of the suppression of the *hundreds* must have impaired the ordinary continuity of record and

in the 153rd Olympiad, etc."—xii. 4. "Seleucus cognominatus *Nicator* regnum Babelis, totiusque Eraki, et Chorasanae, Indiam usque, Ab initio imperii ipsius orditur æra, quæ Alexandri audit, ea nempe qua tempora computant Syri et Hebræi."—Bar-Hebræus, Pococke, p. 63.

"The Jews still style it the *Æra of Contracts*, because they were obliged, when subject to the Syro-Macedonian princes, to express it in all their contracts and civil writings."—Gough's *Seleucidæ*, p. 3.

The Syriac text of the inscription at Singanfu is dated "in 1093d year of the Greeks" (A.D. 782).—A. Kircher, *La Chine*, p. 43; Yule, *Marco Polo*, vol. ii. p. 22; see also Mure's *History of Greece*, vol. iv. pp. 74–79.

¹ The dates begin to appear on the Syro-Macedonian coins under Seleucus IV., *Trésor de Numismatique*, sAP = 136; Mionnet, vol. v. p. 30, PAZ = 137. Cleopatra and Antiochus VIII. also date their coins in the Seleucidan era. See Mionnet, vol. v. pp. 86, 87.

The Parthian coin dates commence with A.S. ΠΣ = 280 (B.C. 31), *APTE*, *Artemisius*, and continue to A.S. 539, *Trés. de Num. Rois Grecs*, pp. 143–147; Lindsay, *Coinage of the Parthians* (Cork, 1852), pp. 175–179.

² Luni-solar year. ³ Solar or Sidereal year. Prinsep, *Useful Tables*, pp. 153–7

affected the resulting value of many of the fragmentary data that have been preserved to our time.

The existence of such a system of disregarding or blotting-out of centuries—persevered in for ages—must naturally have led to endless uncertainties among subsequent home or foreign inquirers, whose errors and misunderstandings were occasionally superadded to the normal imperfections of their leading authorities. Something of this kind may be detected in the illustrative works both of Hiuen Tshang and Albírúni, wherever the quotation refers to hundreds in the gross. Apart from the improbabilities of events adapting themselves to *even numbers in hundreds*, it is clear that, where hundreds alone are given, the date itself must be looked upon as more or less vague and conjectural, elicited, in short, out of uncertain and undefined numbers, and alike incapable of correction from minor totals; such a test must now be applied to Hiuen Tshang's oft-quoted open number of 400 as marking the interval between Buddha and Kanishka.¹

So also one of Albírúni's less-consistently worked-out dates is liable to parallel objection, such, for instance, as the *even* "400 before Vikramáditya," which constitutes his era of "Śrī Harsha," and which he is frank enough to confess *may* perchance pertain to the other Śrī Harsha of 664 after Vikramáditya (or $57 + 664 = 607 - 8$ A.D.). His clear 400 of the era of Yezdegird is, however, a veritable conjuncture, a singular and unforced combination of independent epochs,²

¹ "Dans les quatre cents ans qui suivront mon *Nirvāna*, il y aura un roi qui s'illustrera dans le monde sous le nom de Kia-ni-se-kia (Kanishka)." —Mémoires sur les Contrées occidentales (Paris, 1857), i. p. 106. "Dans la 400^e année après le Nirvāna" (p. 172). This 400 is the sum given in the Lalita Vistāra, but the Mongol authorities have 300. Foe-koue Ki, chapter xxv., and Burnouf's Intr. Hist. Bud., vol. i. p. 568, "trois cent ans," p. 579, "un peu plus de quatre cent ans après Çakya, au temps de Kanichka." Hiuen Tshang confines himself to obscure hundreds in other places. "Dans la centième année après le Nirvāna de Jou-lai, Aśoka, roi de Magadha," p. 170. "La six centième année après le Nirvāna," p. 179. Nāgārjuna is equally dated 400 years after Buddha. "Nāgārjuna is generally supposed to have flourished 400 years after the death of Buddha." —As. Res. vol. xx. pp. 400, 513. Csoma de Koros, Analysis of the Gyut. See also As. Res. vol. ix. p. 83; xv. p. 115; and Burnouf, vol. i. p. 447, and J.A.S.B. vol. vii. p. 143. M. Foucaux, in his Tibetan version of the Lalita Vistāra, speaks of Nāgārjuna as flourishing "cent ans après le mort de Çakya Mouni, p. 392, note.

² Reinaud, *loc. cit.* pp. 137, 139. Albírúni here rejoices, that "cette époque s'exprime par un nombre rond et n'est embarrassée ni de dizaines ni d'unités," which seems to show how rarely, in his large experience, such a phenomenon had been met with.

approximately marked by the date of the death of Mahmúd of Ghazní,¹ in an era that had not yet been superseded in the East by the Muhammadan Hijrah.

I conclude this paper with a reproduction of the unique coin of the Śaka King Heraüs, which, on more mature examination, has been found to throw unexpected light on the chief seat of Śaka-Scythian power,² and to supply incidentally an approximate date, which may prove of considerable value in elucidating the contemporaneous history of the border lands of India.

I have recently had occasion to investigate the probable age of this piece by a comparison of its reverse device with the leading types of the Imperial Parthian mintages, with which it has much in common, and the deduction I arrived at, from the purely Numismatic aspect of the evidence, was

¹ The era of Yezdegird commenced 16th June, 632 A.D. The date on Mahmúd's tomb is 23rd Rabi' the second, A.H. 421 (30th April, A.D. 1030).

² Albíruni was naturally perplexed with the identities of Vikramāditya and Śalivāhana, and unable to reconcile the similarity of the acts attributed alike to one and the other. He concludes the passage quoted in note 2, p. 7, in the following terms:—"D'un autre côté, Vikramāditya, reçut le titre de *Śrī* (grand) à cause de l'honneur qu'il s'était acquis. Du reste, l'intervalle qui s'est écoulé entre l'ère de Vikramāditya et la mort de Śaka, prouve que le vainqueur n'était pas le célèbre Vikramāditya, mais un autre prince du même nom."—Reinaud, p. 142.

Major Wilford, in like manner, while discussing the individualities of his "8 or 9 Vikramādityas," admitted that "the two periods of Vikramāditya and Śalivāhana are intimately connected, and the accounts we have of these two extraordinary personages are much confused, teeming with contradictions and absurdities to a surprising degree."—*As. Res.*, vol. ix. p. 117; see also vol. x. p. 93.

A passage lately brought to notice by Dr. Bühler throws new light upon this question, for, in addition to supplying chronological data of much importance in regard to the interval of 470 years which is said to have elapsed between the great *Jaina Mahāvira* (the 24th *Tirthankara*) and the first *Vikramāditya* of B.C. 57, it teaches us that there were Śaka kings holding sway in India in B.C. 61–57, which indirectly confirms the epoch of the family of Heraüs, and explains how both Vikramādityas, at intervals of 135 years, came to have *Śaka* enemies to encounter, and consequently equal claims to titular *Śakāvi* honours.

"1. Pálaka, the lord of Avanti, was anointed in that night in which the Arhat and Tirthankara Mahāvira entered Nirvāṇa. 2. 60 are (the years of King Pálaka, but 155 are (the years) of the Nandas; 108 those of the Mauryas, and 30 those of *Pśamitta* (Pushyamitra). 3. 60 (years) ruled Balamitra and Bhānumitra, 40 Nabhovahana. 13 years likewise (lasted) the rule of Gardabhilla, and 4 are (the years) of Śaka."—From the Prakrit Gāthās of Merutunga, etc.

"These verses, which are quoted in a very large number of *Jaina* commentaries and chronological works, but the origin of which is not clear, give the adjustment between the eras of Vira and Vikrama, and form the basis of the earlier *Jaina* chronology."—Dr. Bühler, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. ii. p. 363.

that, recognizing the imitative adoption of certain details of the main devices of the suzerain rulers, and supposing such adoption to have been immediate and contemporaneous, the dates B.C. 37 to A.D. 4 would "mark the age of Heraüs."¹ This epoch singularly accords with the date of Isidore of Charax,² from whose text of the 'Stathmi Parthici' we likewise gather that the recognized seat of the Śaka-Scythians, then feudatories of the Parthian Empire, was located in the valley of the Helmund,³ and was known by the optional

¹ Records of the Gupta Dynasty (Trübner, 1876), p. 37.

"It is in regard to the typical details, however, that the contrast between the pieces of Mauas and Heraüs is most apparent. Mauas has no coins with his own bust among the infinite variety of his mint devices, nor has Azas, who imitates so many of his emblems. But, in the Gondophares group, we meet again with busts and uncovered heads, the hair being simply bound by a fillet, in which arrangement of the head-dress Pakores, with his bushy curls, follows suit. But the crucial typical test is furnished by the small figure of victory crowning the horseman on the reverse, which is so special a characteristic of the Parthian die illustration.

"We have frequent examples of Angels or types of victory extending regal fillets in the Bactrian series, but these figures constitute as a rule the main device of the reverse, and are not subordinated into a corner, as in the Parthian system. The first appearance of the fillet in direct connexion with the king's head in the Imperial series, occurs on the coins of Arsaces XIV., *Orodes* (B.C. 54-37), where the crown is borne by an eagle (Lindsay, *History of the Parthians*, Cork, 1852, pl. iii. fig. 2, pp. 146-170; *Trésor de Numismatique*, pl. lxviii. fig. 17); but on the reverses of the copper coinage this duty is already confided to the winged figure of Victory (Lindsay, pl. v. fig. 2, p. 181). Arsaces XV., Phraohates IV. (37 B.C.-4 A.D.), continues the eagles for a time, but progresses into single (*Ibid.*, pl. iii. fig. 60; v. fig. 4, pp. 148, 170; *Trésor de Numismatique*, pl. lxviii. fig. 18; pl. lxix. fig. 5), and finally into double figures of Victory eager to crown him (*Ibid.*, pl. iii. figs. 61-63), as indicating his successes against Antony and the annexation of the kingdom of Media (Lindsay, p. 46; Rawlinson, *The Sixth Monarchy*, p. 182).

"Henceforth these winged adjuncts are discontinued, so that, if we are to seek for the prototype of the Heraüs coin amid Imperial Arsacidan models, we are closely limited in point of antiquity, though the possibly deferred adoption may be less susceptible of proof."

² The period of Isidore of Charax has been the subject of much controversy. The writer of the notice in Smith's Dictionary contents himself with saying, "He seems to have lived under the early Roman Emperors." C. Müller, the special authority for all Greek geographical questions, sums up his critical examination of the evidence to the point: "Probant scriptorem nostrum Augusti temporibus debere fuisse proximum."—Geog. Gree. Min. vol. i. p. lxxxv.

³ 17. 'Εντεῦθεν Ζαραγγιανή, σχοῖνοι καί. 'Ενθα πόλις Πάριν καὶ Κορκ πόλις. 18. 'Εντεῦθεν Ζακαστανή Σακῶν Σκυθῶν, ἡ καὶ Παρατακηνή, σχοῖνοι ἐγ'. 'Ενθα Βαρδὰ πόλις καὶ Μιν πόλις καὶ Παλακεντὶ πόλις καὶ Σιγγὰ πόλις· ἐνθα βασιλεία Σακῶν καὶ πλησίον Ἀλεξάνδρεια πόλις (καὶ πλησίον Ἀλεξανδρόπολις πόλις)· κῶμαι δὲ ἔξ. Isidore of Charax, "Stathmi Parthici," ed. C. Müller, Paris, pp. 253. lxxxv. and xciii., map No. x. The text goes on to enumerate the stages up to *Alexandropolis μητρόπολις Ἀραχωσίας*, and concludes: "Ἀχρι τούτου ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν Πάρθων ἐπικράτεια. I annex for the sake of comparison Ptolemy's list of the cities of Drangia, after the century and a half which is roughly estimated as the interval between the two geographers. Sigal and Sakastanē seem

names of *Sakastanè* or *Paraitakenè* with a capital city entitled *Sigal*.

The ancient *Sigal* may perhaps be identified with the modern site of *Sekooḥa*, the metropolis of a district of that name, which, in virtue of its position, its walls, and its wells, still claims pre-eminence among the cities of *Seistán*.¹

And to complete the data, I now find on the surface of the

alike to have disappeared from the local map. 1. Προφθασία. 2. Ρούδα. 3. Ίννα. 4. Ἀρικάδα. 5. Ἀστρα. 6. Εραξιδρη. 7. Νοσάνα. 8. Φαραάνα. 9. Βρύσι. 10. Ἀριδόπη. 11. Ἀράνα.—Ptolemy, lib. vi. cap. 19; Hudson, vol. iii. p. 44; Journ. R.A.S. Vol. X. p. 21, and Vol. XV. pp. 97, 160, 206; Darius' Inscription, Persian "Saka," Scythic "Sakka." The old term of *سكان* is preserved in all the intelligent Persian and Arabian writers. Majmal Al Tawárikh, Journ. Asiatique, 1839 *سكان شاه*; Hamza Isfaháni *سكان شاه* p. 50; *وسكان اسم لسيستان* p. 51. And the Armenians adhere to the *Sakasdan*.—Moses of Khorene, French edition, vol. ii. p. 143; Whiston, pp. 301, 364; St.-Martin, L'Arménie, vol. ii. p. 18. "*سيستان*. Les villes principales sont: *Zalek, Kerkouyah, Hissoum, Zaranj*, et *Bost*, où l'on voit les ruines de l'écurie de Roustam, le Héros."—B. de Meynard, La Perse, p. 303. Other references to the geography of this locality will be found in Pliny vi. 21; Ouseley's Oriental Geography, p. 205; Anderson's Western Afghanistan, J.A.S. Bengal, 1849, p. 586; Leech (*Sekwa*), J.A.S.B., 1844, p. 117; Khanikoff, 'Asie Centrale,' Paris, 1861, p. 162 (*Sékouhé*); Ferrier's Travels, p. 430; Malcolm's Persia, vol. i. p. 67; Pottinger's Beloochistan, pp. 407–9; Burnouf's Yaçna, p. xcix.

¹ "This fortress is the strongest and most important in *Seistán*, because, being at 5 parasangs from the lake, water is to be obtained only in wells which have been dug within its *enceinte*. The intermediate and surrounding country being an arid parched waste, devoid not only of water, but of everything else, the besiegers could not subsist themselves, and would, even if provisioned, inevitably die of thirst. It contains about 1200 houses. . . . I have called it the capital of *Seistán*, but it is impossible to say how long it may enjoy that title."—Caravan Journeys of J. P. Ferrier, edited by H. D. Seymour, Esq., Murray, 1857, p. 419. "On the 1st February, 1872, made a 30 mile march to *Sekuḥa*, the more modern capital of *Seistán* . . . finally we found *Sekuḥa* itself amid utter desolation."—Sir F. J. Goldsmid. From R. Geog. Soc. 1873, p. 70. See also Sir H. Rawlinson's elaborate notes on *Seistán*, p. 282, "*Si-koheh*" [three hills], in the same volume. I may add in support of this reading of the name of the capital, that it very nearly reproduces

the synonym of the obscure Greek *Σειδα*, in the counterpart Pehlvi *سیکر = دودول*

St gar or *gal*, which stands equally for "three hills." Tabarí tells us that in the old language, "*guer* a le sens de montagne" (Zotenberg, vol. i. p. 5), and Hamza Isfaháni equally recognizes the *ger* as "colles et montes" (p. 37). The interchange of the *rs* and *ls* did not disturb the Iránian mind any more than the indeterminate use of *gs* and *ks*. See Journ. R.A.S. Vol. XII. pp. 265, 268, and Vol. XIII. p. 377. We need not carry on these comparisons further, but those who wish to trace identities more completely may consult Pictet, vol. i. p. 122, and follow out the Sanskrit *giri*, Slave *gora*, etc. Since the body of this note was set up in type, Sir F. Goldsmid's official report upon "Eastern Persia" has been published, and supplies the following additional

original coin, after the final α in ΣΑΚΑ, the Greek monogram Β, which apparently represents the ancient province, or provincial capital, of *Drangia*.¹

HERAÜS, ŚAKA KING.

Silver. British Museum. *Unique*.

Obv. "Bust of a king, right, diademed and draped; border of reels and beads.

Rev. ΤΥΙΑΝΝΟΥΝΤΟΣ ΗΡΑΟΥ

ΣΑΚΑ

ΚΟΙΛΑΝΟΥ.

(Τυραννούντος Ἡράου Σάκα κοιράνου.)

A king, right, on horseback; behind, NIKE, crowning him.²

details as to the characteristics of Sikoha:—"The town, . . . which derives its name from three clay or mud hills in its midst, is built in an irregular circular form around the base of the two principal hills. The southernmost of these hills is surmounted by the *ark* or citadel, an ancient structure known as the citadel of Mir Kuchak Khán. . . . Adjoining this, and connected with it, is the second hill, called the Búrj-i-Falaksar, on which stands the present Governor's house; and about 150 yards to the west is the third hill, not so high as the other two, undefended. . . . The two principal hills thus completely command the town lying at their base, and are connected with one another by a covered way." "Sekuha is quite independent of an extra-mural water supply, as water is always obtainable by digging a few feet below the surface anywhere inside the walls, which are twenty-five feet in height, strongly built."—Major E. Smith, vol. i. p. 258.

¹ The progressive stages of this Monogram are curious. We have the normal Δ.—Mionnet, pl. i. No. 12; Lindsay, *Coins of the Parthians*, pl. xi. No. 7. Next we have the Bactrian varieties Β, Β, and Β, entered in Prinsep's *Essays*, pl. xi. c. No. 53; *Num. Chron.* vol. xix. o.s. Nos. 48, 52, and vol. viii. n.s. pl. vii. Nos. 71, 72, and 76; and likewise Mionnet's varieties, Nos. 156, 299: *Ariana Antiqua*, pl. xxii. No. 118.

² I am indebted to Mr. P. Gardner for this woodcut. I retain his description of the coin as it appeared in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1874, vol. xiv. n.s. p. 161. It will be seen that Mr. Gardner failed to detect the worn outline of the Monogram.

Colonel Pearse, R.A., retains a single example of an exceptionally common class of small *silver* coins displaying the obverse head in identical form with the outline in the wood-cut. The reverse type discloses an ill-defined, erect figure, to the left, similar in disjointed treatment to some of the reverses in the Antiochus-Kodes class,¹ accompanied by two parallel legends in obscure Greek. The leading line, *giving the title*, is altogether unintelligible; but its central letters range $\times \square \Pi \Delta \text{HN} \times$ or $\times \square \Pi \Delta \text{HK} \times$. The second line gives a nearer approach to "Moas" in a possible initial M, followed by the letters $\text{M} \square \Pi \Delta \text{HL} = \mu \omicron \iota \delta \eta \varsigma, \mu \omicron \pi \rho \eta \varsigma, \mu \omicron \iota \alpha \eta \varsigma$, etc. All these specimens, in addition to other Kodes associations, give outward signs of debased metal, or the Nickel, which was perchance, in those days, estimated as of equal value with silver.²

The interest in this remarkable coin is not confined to the approximate identifications of time and place, but extends itself to the tenor of the legend, which presents us with the unusual titular prefix of *Τυραννοῦντος*, which, as a synonym of *Βασιλεύοντος*, and here employed by an obvious subordinate, may be held to set at rest the disputed purport of the latter term, in opposition to the simple *Βασιλεύς*, which has such an important bearing upon the relative positions of the earlier Bactrian Kings. The examples of the use of the term *Βασιλεύοντος* in the preliminary Bactrian series are as follows³ :—

1. Agathocles in subordi-
nation to Diodotus	Obv. ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ.
Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ.
2. Agathocles in subordi-
nation to Euthydemus	Obv. ΕΥΘΥΔΗΜΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ.
Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ.
3. Agathocles in subordi-
nation to Antiochus	Obv. ΑΝΤΙΟΧΟΥ ΝΙΚΑΤΟΡΟΣ.
Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ.
4. Antimachus Theus in
subordination to Dio-
dotus	Obv. ΔΙΟΔΟΤΟΥ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ.
Rev. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΜΑΧΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ.

¹ Num. Chron. vol. iv. n.s. p. 209, pl. viii. fig. 7.

² J.R.A.S., Vol. IV. n.s. p. 504; Records of the Gupta Dynasty, p. 38.

³ M. de Bartholomæi, Koehne's Zeitschrift, 1843, p. 67, pl. iii. fig. 2; Reply to M. Droysen, Zeitschrift für Münz, 1846; my papers in Prinsep's Essays (1858), vol. i. p. xvi., vol. ii. pp. 178-183; in the Numismatic Chronicle, vol. ii. 1862, p. 186; and Journ. R. A. S., Vol. XX. 1863, p. 126; M. Raoul Rochette, Journal des Savants, 1844, p. 117; Droysen, Geschichte des Hellenismus, Hamburg,

The whole question as to the relative rank of the princes, whose names figure conjointly in the above legends, reduces itself concisely to this contrast, that the sub-king invariably calls himself *βασιλεύς* on his own proper coins, but on these exceptional tributary pieces, where he prefixes the image and superscription of a superior, he describes himself as *βασιλεύοντος*. These alien Satraps were effective kings within their own domains, but clearly bowed to some acknowledged head of the Bactro-Greek confederation, after the manner of their Indian neighbours, or perchance included subjects, who so especially regarded the gradational import of the supreme *Mahārājadhirāja*, in contradistinction to the lesser degrees of regal state implied in the various stages of *rāja*, *mahārāja*, *rājādhirāja*, etc. These binominal pieces are rare, and, numismatically speaking, "occasional," i.e. coined expressly to mark some public event or political incident, like our modern *medals*; coincident facts, which led me long ago to suggest¹ that they might have been struck as nominal tribute money or fealty pieces, in limited numbers, for submission with the annual *nazarānā*, or presentation at high State receptions, to the most powerful chief or general of the Græco-Bactrian oligarchy for the time being.

There is a curious feature in these binominal coins, which, as far as I am aware of, has not hitherto been noticed. It is, that the *obverse* head, representing the portrait of the superior king, seems to have been adopted directly from his own ordinary mint-dies,² which in their normal form presented

1843; Lassen, *Ind. Alt.*, 1847; Gen. Cunningham, *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. viii. n.s. 1868, p. 278, et seq., ix. 1869, p. 29; Mr. Vaux, *Numismatic Chronicle*, vol. xv. n.s. p. 15.

¹ *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. XX. p. 127; *Numismatic Chronicle*, n.s. vol. ii. p. 186.

² I have long imagined that I could trace the likeness of Antiochus Theos on the obverse of the early gold coins of Diodotus (*Prinsep's Essays*, pl. xlii. 1; *Num. Chron.* vol. ii. n.s. pl. iv. figs. 1-3). I suppose, however, that in this case the latter monarch used his suzerain's ready-prepared die for the one face of his precipitate and perhaps hesitating coinage, conjoined with a new reverse device bearing his own name, which might have afforded him a loophole of escape on his "right to coin" being challenged. Apart from the similarity of the profile, the contrast between the high Greek art and perfect execution of the obverse head, and the coarse design and superficial tooling of the imitative reverse device, greatly favours the conclusion of an adaptation, though the motive may have been merely to utilize the *obverses* of existing mint appliances of such high merit.

the profile of the monarch without any surrounding legend, his name and titles being properly reserved for their conventional position on the *reverse* surface of his current coins. In the novel application of the head of the suzerain to a place on the *obverse* of a coin bearing the device and designations of his confessed subordinate on the *reverse*, it became necessary to add to the established obverse-device a specification of the name and titles of the superior, whose identification would otherwise have remained dependent upon the fidelity and the public recognition of the likeness itself. Hence, under the new adaptation, it likewise became requisite to engrave on the old die, around the standard Mint head, the suzerain's superscription in the odd corners and spaces in the field, no provision having been made, in the first instance, for any legend at all, and no room being left for the ordinary circular or perpendicular arrangement of the words, such as would have been spaced out under ordinary circumstances. In the majority of the instances we are able to cite, the Greek letters on the *adapted obverse* vary materially in their forms and outlines from those of the associated legends on the *reverse*, which still further proves the independent manipulation applied to the obverses of the compound pieces.

In addition to these indications as bearing upon the Bactrian proper coinage, the title of *Τυραννοῦντος* is highly suggestive in its partial reappearance on the coins of the leading Sáh Kings Nahapana and Chastana, connecting the Scythic element geographically to the southward with the province of Guzerát, for a full *résumé* of which I must refer my readers to the Archæological Report of Western India,¹ for 1875.

¹ See also the short copies of my Essay on the Records of the Gupta Dynasty, London, 1876, p. 31.