he would admit, what to me has never seemed doubtful, that the *Khuṣaṇasa* of the coins is also a genitive singular, but would still hold that the evidence which he has adduced suffices to prove that the real name was *Guṣa*, and that this is represented by the Chinese form *Yue-chi*, *Kwei-shān* being later, and due to importation from India. To what I have previously (pp. 990–1) urged to this effect I should like to add that the simplest explanation of all is that the genitive plural of the original dialect, *Guṣāna*, “of the *Guṣas*,” was mistaken in the first instance by Indians *only* for a nominative singular and accordingly declined. Thus India’s acquaintance with this race begins with a sort of Hobson-Jobsonism. This explanation deserves consideration, and it has met with the approval of several eminent scholars.

3. Sir J. H. Marshall’s observations (JRAS., 1914, p. 983, and *supra*, pp. 195–6) remind me of the fact that in Wilson’s *Ariana Antiqua* also (pp. 73–4 and 101–2) correspondences are noted by Masson between different styles of building observed in topes and the coins found in the topes. We may add the fact that tope No. 13 of Hidda, as it contained the Hidda inscription of the year 28 (*supra*, pp. 91–6), will belong to the style prevalent under the Kanīṣka dynasty.

It would accordingly be possible for Sir J. H. Marshall to compare his results at Taxila (perhaps he has done so already) with the plates contained in *Ariana Antiqua*, and so to ascertain whether there are any interesting correspondences.

F. W. THOMAS.

MALAVA-GANA-STHITI

Dr. J. F. Fleet in his last note upon this expression (*supra*, pp. 138–40) again upholds the view that the word *gaṇa* is here used in the sense of “tribe”. He

does not, however, adduce any passage from Sanskrit writing where this meaning is either authorized or appropriate. The sole evidence supplied is the occurrence of the meaning "tribe" in the list of quasi-synonymical renderings given in Monier-Williams' Dictionary: such a citation will have no weight with any scholar of Sanskrit. The exact meanings of the word are carefully set out in the St. Petersburg Lexicon and the native Indian vocabularies, and the idea of tribe is not included among them.

It is plain, however, that Dr. Fleet himself does not rely upon the precise meaning "tribe", as inherent in the word itself, but considers that the established general sense of "collection", "group", etc., may in certain contexts have that import. But the idea of "tribe" is a special one, and it is a complex political conception, which in Latin is represented by *gens*, *natio*, and *tribus*, in Greek by *φῶλον* and *φυλή*, and with similar particularity in other languages. The Sankrit employs the word *jāti*, and the fact that in the expression *Mālava-gana* a different word is used indicates that a different conception is to be conveyed. We should not in English substitute "the group of Judah" for the "tribe of Judah", as a mere linguistic variant, more especially in an official record.

Dr. Fleet might "maintain" (p. 139) that in connexion with names of peoples such as *Mālava* and *Yaudheya* the best rendering of the word is "tribe": and, if anything like proof were intended, appeal might be made to the facts of the case. But the facts of the case are what is principally in question; hence we must rely upon evidence from some other side. Now precisely the evidence required has been supplied by Mr. Jayaswal in the paper to which I have referred, evidence for the use of the word *gana* in a definite political sense, a sense appropriate to the present case, which he renders by "republic", but which may better be represented by "governing body" or "senate";

and this is accordingly the only sense which has a title to consideration here.¹

It will be observed that Dr. Fleet speaks (p. 139) of "the ordinary general sense" of the word "tribe", and seems to think any further discriminations pedantic. But the facts of history, both in India and elsewhere, lend a substantial importance to the distinctions² between (1) a tribe as a nation supposed to be united by blood, (2) a tribe as a part of a nation, whether (a) as a ruling caste, or a subordinate caste, living among an alien stock, or (b) as a subdivision of a nation presumed to be racially homogeneous. The *Mālava* and *Yaudheya* "tribes" may have been assignable to either (1) or (2). But I do not think that in either case the word *gana* would have denoted anything but the governing body of the "tribe".³

F. W. THOMAS.

¹ Let me add the following quotation from the *Sukranīti*, iv, 4, 29-30:—

राज्ञा ये विदिताः सम्यक् कुलश्रेणिगणादयः ।
साहसस्त्रियवर्जानि कुर्युः कार्याणि ते नृणाम् ॥
विचार्य श्रेणिभिः कार्यं कुलैर्यत्र विचारितम् ।
गणैश्च श्रेण्यविज्ञातं गणाज्ञातं नियुक्तकैः ॥

"What families, corporations, and *ganas* are well known to the king, these should deal with people's affairs, excepting cases of violence and theft. The corporations should consider an affair which has not been considered by the families; the *ganas* that not decided by the corporations; the officials that not determined by the *ganas*."

² For these and other distinctions see the Oxford English Dictionary.

³ Dr. Fleet is under the impression (p. 138 and note) that in a former note (1914, p. 1010) I misrepresented his connexion with this matter. But it will be seen upon inspection that both in the reference to his adherence to his "original interpretation of it twenty-five years ago" (his own phrase) and also in the statement regarding the "substance" of his "original" rendering I intended to confine attention to the meaning of the word *gana*, in regard to which the references seem to hold good. Previously (1913, p. 413) I had carefully stated the difference of Dr. Fleet's two successive views.