

THE NAME KUSHAN

Baron A. von Staël-Holstein has given at p. 754 above another paper in support of his contention that the long-standing use of the name Kushan, Kushān, for the race to which Kanishka and his connections belonged, should be laid aside in favour of a new appellation, Kusha or Kuśa, set up by him. As regards one basis of his theory, it does not seem necessary to devote any more space to the Chinese translation of the *Sūtrālamkāra* and the Tibetan version of the *Mahārājakanikalēkha*. The point that these two works contain a mistake in the passages which are relied on by the Baron, and the suggestions which have been made to account for the mistake, have not originated with me: and, whatever may be the explanation of that detail, these literary compositions (even if we have before us faithful representations of the original texts, without any errors introduced by copyists) have no practical value against the distinct inscriptional and numismatic evidence that the name is Kushāṇa, Kushān. I pass on to the inscriptions and coins, about which, in view of the nature of the Baron's new arguments, it is necessary to make some more remarks.

The Māt inscription

My remarks about this record (p. 369 above) do not hinge in any way on what is implied in accusing me of "assuming damage to the stone in the most important place" (p. 755): as a reference to the facsimile at p. 378 will show, the stone is actually very much damaged, both there and in many other places.

This record, of a king whose name is illegible as one of the results of that damage, gives to that king four titles:—Mahārājo, "great king"; Rājātirājo, "over-king of kings"; Dēvaputro, "son of the gods"; and Kushāṇaputro.

In order to find here the use of a name Kusha, the Baron wished at first (p. 87, note 1) to read the last title as *Kushānuputro*; setting up a hybrid compound, the first member of which would be *Kushānu* for the foreign genitive plural *Kushānu*, and the second the ordinary Indian word meaning 'son'. Finding that that cannot be done, he now seeks to get at the same base in another way, by reading (p. 755) *Kushāṇam putro*; setting up thus a purely Indian expression, in which he would recognize the separate Prākṛit genitive plural of *Kusha*, and justifying that by claiming that there is a distinct dot (meaning an *anusvāra*) above the syllable *ṇa*.¹

Much may be done with the help of the imagination in dealing with records which are as much damaged as this one is. But, in the first place, I say again that the back of the squeeze, which is still before me, shows that we cannot read *ṇam*, any more than *nu* as was originally proposed by the Baron. The marks over and around the *ṇa*, which are matched by similar marks in many other places in the record, are due, here as there, either to damage to the stone or to natural dents in it, and do not include anything that was intended to be an *anusvāra*. The syllable is *ṇa*, and nothing else.

And take the matter on simple lines of common sense. The construction with a separate genitive would be altogether out of place in such a list of titles. And the composer of the record was quite aware of that. In the preceding title, "son of the gods", he has very naturally and properly given, not *dēvāṇam putro*, but *dēva-putro*. If he had been using a base *Kusha*, he would have given the fourth title as *Kusha-putro*. But he has actually given *Kushāṇa-putro*; in which he has used distinctly

¹ The "*ipsissima verba*" of an authority (Dr. Vogel) to which the Baron refers in note 2 on p. 754 as supporting his proposal are simply:—"It is true that there is a depression which might be taken for an *anusvāra*, but this part of the stone is damaged to such an extent that it may just as well be casual."

the base *Kushāṇa*, exactly analogous to his use of the base *dēva* in *dēva-putro*.

The title is—

Kushāṇa-putro :

“son or descendant of the Kushāṇas.”

The Panjtār inscription

The Baron has certainly not been fair to this record. I suggested (p. 372) that that was a result of his not knowing the original figuring of it, which I then reproduced in the plate at p. 378. But it seems that my charitable supposition was wrong. The Baron did know that figuring; but he “ignored” it (p. 758)!

As regards his next remarks, I am not responsible for the fact that Sir A. Cunningham —(who, it must be remembered, dealt with this record in 1854, 1863, and 1875,¹ when not so very much was known about the Kharōshthī characters and the Indian dialect for which they were used)—failed to decipher the word at the end of the first line.

That word is one of three syllables.² As I have said (p. 372), the first two syllables are unmistakably *raja*,³ and the original figuring —(the later one agrees substantially, but is not so complete here)—makes it a moral certainty that the third, which is damaged, was *mī*. And so we have the quite natural and appropriate expression—

¹ The references are, for 1854, JASB, 23. 705, and plate, No. 4; for 1863, JASB, 32. 145, 150; and for 1875, ASI, 5. 61, and plate 16, No. 4.

² The Baron says “(C. does not even mention the third letter)”. This is in a way correct; at any rate for Cunningham’s remarks in 1875, when he only speculated as to the values of the first two syllables, where he was then trying to find a king’s name. But in the figuring given therewith, as also in the earlier one, he distinctly showed three syllables. It is impossible to say why he did not try to decipher the third one.

³ They were actually read by Cunningham as *rāja*, without any hesitation, when he dealt with this record first, in 1854, in his treatment of it which the Baron has “ignored”.

maharayasa Gushanasa rajami :

“in the reign of the great king the Gushāṇa.”

There is one more remark to be made about this record. As I have already said (p. 372), the original stone is not forthcoming now, and we are dependent on the two figurings of it given by Sir A. Cunningham. Those figurings are hand-drawn, like so many others of that time. It did not need the remark made by the Baron, and the two samples given by him from the Mānikīāla inscription (p. 759 and note 1), to impress upon us that hand-drawn figurings are not as reliable as mechanical facsimiles. This is well known to all epigraphists. But when, as in this case, nothing else is forthcoming, we must do our best with the hand-drawn figurings. And in favour of these two there is this to be said: they are so good that every syllable (except the last one), of at any rate the first line, can be read without the slightest doubt; and they were made at a time when there was no preconceived view as to the possible bearing of the record, and so nothing to lead to the figurings being in any way even unconsciously influenced.

The Mānikīāla inscription

The reading given by me from this record (p. 373), viz.—

Gushāṇa-vaśa-saṁvardhaka :

“an increaser of the Gushāṇa race,”

is not a reading invented by me, though that might well be thought from the Baron's words on p. 757. Except that, for reasons given, I substitute *ṇa* for *na*, I have simply followed the reading laid down by M. Senart and Professor Lüders.

The Baron originally sought (p. 84) to read the first term of this expression as *Gushanu*, = *Gushānu*; thus finding here, again, the foreign genitive plural of a base *Gusha*, = *Kusha*. Now, as judged by his reference to what he would like us to accept as the reading in the Māt inscription, he seems to seek (p. 758) to find the same

base *Gusha* by substituting here, also, the Prākṛit genitive plural *Gushanam*, = *Gushānam*.

But, in addition to the fact that the actual syllable is no more *nam* or *ṇam* than it is *nu* or *ṇu*, either term, *Gushānu* or *Gushānam*, is equally inappropriate. In Prākṛit, as much as in Sanskrit, such an expression as *vaṁśa-saṁvardhaka* requires before it, not a separate genitive, but a base in composition with it. And what the composer of the record has given us is the base *Gushaṇa*, which means (according to the Kharōshthī spelling) *Gushāṇa*, = *Kushāṇa*.¹

The coins of Kadphisēs I

The Baron complains (p. 755) that I have not noticed at all his argument based on the coins of Kozoulo-Kadphisēs, otherwise known as Kadphisēs I, and that Mr. Allan has dismissed it very briefly. When I found that Mr. Allan, too, intended to comment on the Baron's views, I was glad enough to save space by leaving this detail to him. He has said much more about it (pp. 406–8) than the short remark which the Baron has quoted: and in my opinion he has said all that was necessary. However, I will add a brief remark by way of a summary.

In the Kharōshthī legends on some of these coins the Baron has proposed to read according to his original case *Kushanu*, for *Kushānu* (p. 85), and according to his later case *Kushanam*, for *Kushānam* (p. 757), as, respectively, the foreign and the Prākṛit genitive plural of his desiderated base *Kusha*. The same principles of reading,

¹ Mr. Pargiter has proposed (pp. 646, 650, above) to read *ṇa*, and to find here *Gushaṇa*, as the foreign nominative singular of the base *Gushaṇa*, = *Gushāṇa*, *Kushāṇa*, used, in foreign fashion, instead of the base, as the first member of the compound. As he has said (p. 651, note 1), his reading would strengthen the case which I support: at any rate it would not help the Baron's view. But I regret to have to say that, for reasons already given (p. 373, and note 2), I cannot agree with him: I retain the belief that the syllable is *ṇa*.

applied to the legends on the coins of another ruler, Pakorēs,¹ would give us the truly remarkable titles—

maharaju and *rujutiraju*,

or *maharamjam* and *ramjamtiramjam*,

instead of the ordinary—

maharaja and *rajatiraja*,

which are yielded by those legends when read on sensible lines. This point, I think, may be left at that, without any further comment.

The Shaonano shao coin-legend

Certain coins of Kanishka bear a legend which runs thus :—

Shaonano shao Kanēshki Koshano :

“Kings of kings, Kanishka, the Kushān.”²

This arrangement and interpretation of the legend are not new ones, put forward by me and endorsed only by Mr. Allan, as might well be thought from the Baron's remarks (p. 759 f.). They are the standing treatment of it, always accepted until the Baron came forward to dispute it.

In his desire to find here, again, the use of a base *Kusha*, the Baron wishes to persuade us (pp. 83, 759) that the legend begins with *Koshano* ; and that this word is a genitive plural (instead of a nominative singular), dependent on *shaonano shao*.

Now, the Baron admits (p. 759) that I have established the fact that substantial parts of the general design nearly always separate the words *Koshano* and *shaonano* on the coins in question. And he admits also that this fact would indeed favour the accepted arrangement of the legend,

¹ Whitehead, *Coins in the Panjab Museum*, vol. 1, plate 16, No. 76 ; and see p. 156, note 2. Compare Gardner, *Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India*, plate 23, fig. 8.

² The legend is in Greek characters, cursive ; and the *omicron* in it represents an *u*, as it so often does in the Greek transliteration of Indian names, etc.

supported by me, and militate against the new one proposed by him, "if [he says] it could be proved that the parts of the general design constituted on the coins of the period anything like marks of punctuation." But he goes on to ask:—"But can such a rule be proved?" A little real study of coins would, I think, have given the Baron the answer to this question, and have resolved some other doubts which he has.

It can hardly be denied, I imagine, that every coin-legend, like any other sentence which is not either nonsense or a riddle, must begin with some particular word, and cannot be read haphazard from any point in it; also, that it would not be altogether a senseless proceeding for the designer of a coin to ensure that there shall be no doubt as to what is intended to be the first word of his legend. And a glance through the plates in Gardner's Catalogue—or through those in Whitehead's Catalogue—will show that the designers of the coins represented therein did in many cases mark distinctly the beginning of their legends. They did so in more ways than one. But we are concerned here only with the means adopted by the designers of the coins of the Kanishka series, including those of Huvishka and Vāsudēva. I have figured seven obverses of this series in the plate at p. 378 above. These are not exceptional instances: they are typical ones, representing the whole series of the coins bearing the *shaonano shao* legend. They show that the designers of these coins kept steadily in view the desirability of marking the beginning of the legend, and that they did it by putting a space, filled with a substantial part of the general design, between the last word and the first. They show also that, while the designers plainly thought it good, whether from an artistic or from a common-sense point of view, to present the first word of the legend without any division of it, the rest of the legend was subordinated to the treatment of the general

design, so that any other word of it—even the king's name— might be divided at any place that should be found convenient.¹

That gives the answer to the Baron's question: the coins themselves prove the rule that he wants. It also answers another question raised by him in bringing into this matter another legend which has nothing to do with it, but which happens to illustrate further my remarks: he asks (p. 759):—"Do not the king's legs, which generally separate *Koshano* from *shaonano*, stand between the *iota* and the *lambda* (in *basileōn*) on some coins of Kanishka (cf. Whitehead, pl. xx, No. 4)?"

Certainly they do: and why should they not? The coin to which the Baron refers is not unique, and has nothing extraordinary about it: it is one of the series for which see also Whitehead, plate 17, No. 53; Gardner, plate 26, figs. 1, 2, 3; and Cunningham, *Coins of the Kushāns*, plate 16, figs. 1, 3, 5, 11. These are the coins of Kanishka, with the Hēlios, Hēphaistos, Salēnē, and Nanaia reverses, which have on the obverse a Greek legend in Greek uncial characters. The legend is—

Basileus basileōn Kanēshkou.

In each case it begins at the top, on the right (like the legend on the coins B, 1 and 2 in the plate at p. 378 above), behind the head of the spear in the king's left hand, and ends at the top, on the left (like that same legend), in front of his helmet; the beginning of it being thus clearly marked here, again, by a substantial part of the general design intervening between the first and last words. On all these coins the word *basileōn*, at the bottom, is divided by the king's legs between the *iota* and

¹ The same practice, of marking the beginning of a legend by placing a substantial part of the general design between the last word and the first, and of subordinating other parts of the legend to the design, can be traced also on coins of other lands and other times: it is found even on our own coinage of a quite recent date.

lambda; just as on the coin B, 2 the name *Kanēshki*, at the bottom, is divided between the *alpha* and *nu* by the legs and the altar. And it was so divided because it was only the middle word in the legend, and it was found convenient to subordinate the treatment of it to the treatment of the general design.

The Kushān coin-legend in which we are interested is marked distinctly as beginning with *shaonano* and ending with *Koshano*: not even the pronouncement by "a well-known authority on Indian numismatics", which the Baron has cited so hopefully on p. 760, can shake this position. For the rest, no doubt much may be done in the speculative line with the little-known syntax (see p. 760, note) of a language about which not much more is known than about its syntax. But in view of all the other evidence *Koshano*, = *Kushānu*, the last word of the legend, cannot be the genitive plural of a base *Kusha* dependent on the opening term *shaonano shao*, from which, in the construction of the sentence, it is separated by the proper name of Kanishka, or of Huvishka or Vāsudēva as the case may be: it can only be the nominative singular of a base *Kushān*, in apposition with the proper name.

Miscellaneous remarks

In note 2 on p. 754, the Baron has complained that no notice has been taken of his suggestion that evidence in favour of the name being *Kusha*, *Kuśa*, instead of *Kushān*, is to be found in the term *Kuśadvīpa*, which is the name, meaning "the *kuśa*-grass island", of one of the fabulous zones, each separated from the next one by an ocean, which the Hindū ideas of geography placed round outside *Jambudvīpa*, "the rose-apple-tree island" (India), and the *Lavaṇasamudra* or "ocean of salt" which surrounded it. This seemed, and still seems, too trivial to call for any discussion.

As to a remark made by the Baron on p. 760, I have not the slightest wish, nor, I understand, has Mr. Allan (see p. 403), to deny that the expression *Kūśān śāh*, taken as Persian and treated on "purely philological grounds", can be translated by "king of the Kūś or Kūśas". But, as Mr. Allan has indicated, the Baron's mistake has been in starting with that, at the wrong end, instead of examining first the contemporaneous evidence of the inscriptions and coins, which lead distinctly to the result that *Kūśān śāh* means "the Kūśān king".

As regards a remark made by the Baron in note 1 on p. 762, I am not responsible for the translation of the Tibetan work dealing with Li-yul, Khotan. I believe that that translation is right. But it does not matter a jot for our present purposes whether that work does or does not speak really of "Kanishka AND the king of Guzan". The important point is that it presents the transliterated form *Gu-zan*, which, like the Chinese *Kuei-shuang*, can only indicate a name *Gushan*, = Gushān.

As regards the Baron's closing sentences, I think that any reader of his papers and mine will agree that it is his novel view, not the long-standing one that I support, which is so dependent on assumptions. But the question passes now beyond the sphere of assumption and argument.

We have now a new item of evidence in the inscription of the year 136 recently discovered by Dr. Marshall at Taxila: and this in fact clinches the matter. In line 3 (p. 976 above) we have the clause—

maharajasa rajatirajasa dēvaputrāsa Khushāṇasa
aroga-dachhinae :

"for the bestowal of good health upon the great king, the over-king of kings, the son of the gods, the Khushāṇa."

No amount of ingenuity can find here in *Khushanasa* an equivalent of *Kūśān śāh*, or take the word as anything but the genitive singular of a base *Khushāṇa*, = *Khushāṇa*.

The upshot of the matter is simply that the name of Kanishka's race was *Kushāṇa*, Kushān, with the occasional variants *Gushāṇa*, Gushān, and *Khushāṇa*, Khushān.

J. F. FLEET.

MALAVA-GANA-STHITI

Dr. J. F. Fleet, commenting (*supra*, pp. 745-7) upon my note concerning the above expression, adheres to his "original interpretation of it twenty-five years ago", and maintains that "the word *gaṇa* means simply 'a tribe', not 'tribal constitution, i.e. embodiment as a tribe'". He does not, however, refer to the authorities mentioned in the note or support the statement concerning the meaning by any confirmations.

In order to put the difference of view in a pointed manner, it might be convenient to affirm that *gaṇa* never and in no place has the meaning "tribe". But, unfortunately, the word "tribe" is itself ambiguous, and we might be led into misunderstandings not germane to the point at issue. So much, however, may safely be said, that the meaning "tribe" is not, to my knowledge, given by any of the dictionaries, Sanskrit or European, although the word is treated with sufficient explicitness by most of them.

The ordinary senses ascribed to the word by Indian lexicographers are: (1) a collection or group (usually *samūha*) of animate or inanimate things; (2) the following of Śiva; (3) a subdivision of *gulma*, itself a division, or squad, in an army.

In Buddhist writings *gaṇa* denotes a group, class, or quorum, something intermediate between the Sangha and the individual monk; see, for example, the indexes to Professor Oldenberg's edition of the *Vinaya-pitaka*.

Among the Jains also the word was a technical term, meaning according to the Abhidhāna-rājendra *paras-parasāpekṣāṇām anekakulānām sādḥūnām samudāya*