

NAME AND DESIGNATIONS OF THE RULER MENTIONED
IN THE ĀRA INSCRIPTION

BY STEN KONOW

ETNOGRAFISK MUSEUM, KRISTIANIA

(Communicated by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.)

IN MY EDITION of the Āra inscription¹ I followed Professor Lüders in reading the titles and designations of the Kuṣāṇa ruler mentioned in ll. 1 and 2 as follows: *Maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputrasa kaīsarasa Vajheṣkaputrasa Kaniṣkasa*.

I still think that this reading is the correct one, but as it has been doubted by some excellent scholars, I should like to make some remarks, which will also have to touch on some questions of a more general character.

The three first designations constitute, as is well known, the imperial title used by the Kuṣāṇa ruler of the Taxila silver scroll, whom I identify with Kujūla Kadphises. Among the kings of the Kaniṣka group it is used by Kaniṣka in the Sue Vihār inscription and also in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 7,² where the title *śāhi* is added, and by Vāsiṣka, in his Brāhmī inscriptions, likewise with the addition *śāhi*. Huviṣka is styled *mahārāja rājātirāja*, without the addition *devaputra*, in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 40³ and in the Wardak Vase inscription of the year 51, while *devaputra* is added in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 60.⁴ Finally Vāsu-deva is styled *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra* in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 74,⁵ and, with the addition *śāhi*, in the record of the year 84,⁶ and, without *devaputra*, in the epigraph of the year 87.⁷ In other inscriptions the imperial title *rājātirāja* is missing, so far as I can control the materials here in Śāntiniketan.

We cannot, of course, draw any certain conclusion from this state of things, the less so because the epigraphs are all private records and not issued from a government office. We would, however, be inclined to think that the imperial title was adopted by Kaniṣka and

¹ *Ep. Ind.* 14, 130 ff. ² Lüders No. 21. ³ Lüders No. 149 ^b.

⁴ Lüders No. 56. ⁵ Lüders No. 60. ⁶ Lüders No. 69 ^a.

⁷ Lüders No. 72.

continued by Vāsiṣka and the ruler of the Āra inscription. In the winter before the latter was executed, it had, however, been assumed in Mathurā by Huviṣka as well, and he was later on able to assert his position as *rājātirāja* not only in Mathurā, in the year 60, but also in the West, in Wardak, in the year 51. The last of the great Kuṣāṇas, Vāsudeva, finally, seems to have been recognized as paramount ruler, at least between the years 74 and 87.

I shall have to return to this question later on.

It will be seen that some of these rulers use the title *ṣāhi* in addition to *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra*. It has usually been recognized that this *ṣāhi* is the same title as that used by the Sakas of Sagakūla, as mentioned in the Kālakācāryakathānaka. And there seems to be a general agreement as to the fact that the Kuṣāṇas considered themselves and acted as the heirs and successors of the Sakas in India. Vima Kadphises' conquest of 'India' seems, in Chinese as in Indian sources,⁸ to have been considered as a reconquest, and there is nothing extraordinary in the fact that Kaniṣka and his successors use the Saka title.

It is, on the other hand, evident that Kaniṣka's accession brought about a strengthening of the national feeling of the Kuṣāṇas themselves, since he and his successors employ the indigenous form *ṣau* instead of *ṣāhi* in their coin-legends.⁹ That did not, however, prevent them from using the Saka form in the old empire of the Sakas, which does not seem to have comprised the ancient stronghold of the Kuṣāṇas in Badakshan.

In the Āra inscription *ṣāhi* is replaced by *kaisara*. The first akṣara of this title is, it is true, damaged, but there does not seem to me to be any doubt about the reading.

Kaisara cannot, as has always been recognized since Professor Lüders read the word in the inscription,¹⁰ be anything else than the imperial Roman title *Caesar*, and it presupposes that the inscription was executed at a time when the Roman empire was known in India as a powerful state.

⁸ cf. *SBAW.* 1916, 811 ff.; *Ep. Ind.* 14, 293 ff.; *Acta Orientalia.* 3, 68 f.

⁹ The Greek legend has *ṣao* and not *ṣau*, but then Greek *o* is also used to denote *u* in such forms as Κοζουλο, *Kuzūla*.

¹⁰ *SBAW.* 1912, 824 ff.; *Ind. Ant.* 1913, 132 ff.

The late Dr. Fleet maintained¹¹ that the use of the title shows that the inscription cannot be later than the emperor Hadrian. He says : “ The name Caesar, as an appellation of the head of the Roman State, started with Julius Caesar, to whom it belonged by birth. It was assumed, on adoption, by his grand-nephew and successor Octavianus, better known as Augustus from the title which was given to him by the Roman senate and people in B.C. 27. It was transmitted by Augustus, together with his own title, to his successors. And undoubtedly it was a very leading designation, along with Augustus and Imperator, of all the Roman emperors down to a certain time, and was probably the particular appellation by which they were most generally known and spoken of in popular usage in the western parts of the empire, though we may doubt whether the same was the case in the eastern parts.”

“ But there is an important change in the time of Hadrian (A.D. 117-38). He dropped the name Caesar as a title of the emperor and gave to it the application, which it continued to bear after his time, namely, he transferred it to the second person in the state, the intended successor to the throne. And though he did not make a Caesar till A.D. 136, when he adopted and appointed L. Aelius Verus, his coins show that he abandoned the use of the title by himself in A.D. 125.”

“ Thus from A.D. 125 the name Caesar was no longer a title of the emperors, but had only a subordinate value.”

Dr. Fleet's remarks would, if they could be maintained, be fatal to any attempt at fixing the beginning of the Kaniska era after A.D. 125, as I have tried to do.¹² To judge from letters which I have received from Indian friends, they seem to have made a strong impression, and my remarks about the matter¹³ do not appear to have carried conviction. I said, on the authority of my friend Professor E. Ziebarth, that all Roman emperors, with the exception of Vitellius (15-69 A.D.), use the title Caesar, and that Hadrian's innovation did not consist in abolishing its use as a title of the emperor, but in restricting it to the emperor himself and his successor and co-regent.

¹¹ *JRAS.* 1913, 103 ff.

¹² *Acta Orientalia*, 3, 72 ff.

¹³ *Ep. Ind.* 14, 141 ff.

As the matter is of some importance from the point of view of Indian chronology, I think we must not rest contented at quoting what European scholars have written and said about it. We must turn to the inscriptions themselves. I have, therefore, taken before me the well-known edition of selected Latin inscriptions by Hermann Dessau¹⁴ and there found the following state of things.

The title *Imperator Caesar* is used throughout by the Roman emperors also after Hadrian. For HADRIAN (A.D. 117-138) cf. Nos. 309 (A.D. 118), 310 (A.D. 119), 9055, 9189 (A.D. 120), . . . 316, 317, 5956, 6073 (A.D. 136), 319, 328, 5963 (A.D. 137), 8909 (A.D. 138); for ANTONINUS PIUS (A.D. 138-161) Nos. 332, 333 (A.D. 138), 322, 334, 335, 336 (A.D. 139), . . . 2006 (A.D. 158); for MARCUS AURELIUS (A.D. 161-180) Nos. 5933 (A.D. 161), 2452, 6225 (A.D. 162), . . . 2616 (A.D. 170), 373, 374 (A.D. 176); for COMMODUS (A.D. 180-192) Nos. 5338 (A.D. 181), 6808 (A.D. 182), . . . 399 (A.D. 187), and so forth. The state of things is exactly the same with the later emperors, SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS (A.D. 193-211), CARACALLA (A.D. 211-217), ELAGABALUS (A.D. 218-222), etc. It is not, however, necessary to quote further instances, because the period I have selected covers the latest possible date for the Āra inscription.

It is of even greater importance to examine the Greek inscriptions, especially those hailing from Asia, because Dr. Fleet doubted the use of the title *kaisar* in the East. The state of things can be conveniently ascertained from R. Cagnat's *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes auctoritate et impensis academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum*, Tome III, Paris 1906.

We find that HADRIAN is styled *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 1068 and 1130, both from Syria, and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ*; ANTONINUS PIUS *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 17, 35 (from Bithynia), 1060 (from Syria) and probably in No. 1214 (from Arabia), and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ*, *κύριος καῖσαρ*, etc.; MARCUS AURELIUS *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 349 (from Pamphylia), 1245, 1299 (from Arabia), and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ*, *σεβαστῶς*, *ἀγούστος*, etc.; COMMODUS *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 1133 (from Syria), 1225, 1251, 1276, 1262

¹⁴ *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, vol. 1-3, Berolini 1892-1916.

(from Arabia), and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ*, *αὐτοκράτωρ*, *κύριος αὐτοκράτωρ*, and so forth.

It will be seen that the title *Kaisar*, alone or with some addition, is used throughout, in Asia as well as in the West, and, moreover, that it is always retained in its original form, while the other imperial titles are commonly translated into Greek in the Greek inscriptions, imperator as *αὐτοκράτωρ*, Augustus as *σεβαστός*, etc. We can therefore say that it had become the real title, which could not be changed or rendered into another language. And this inference is strengthened by the history of the title, not only in Europe, but also in Arabic and Persian.

It is accordingly impossible to follow Dr. Fleet in drawing the conclusion that the introduction of the title into India would not be possible after Hadrian's "reform." We can only say that it cannot be earlier than Augustus, and it is impossible to fix any lower limit.

We would, however, be inclined to think that the most probable time for adopting the Roman title would be some period when the fame of the Roman colours was at its height in the countries bordering on the Kuṣāṇa empire. And such was the case in the latter half of the second century A.D., when the Roman armies were repeatedly victorious against the Parthians. After that date the Roman power began to dwindle in those parts of Asia, and, on the other hand, the headquarters of the rulers of India soon ceased to be situated in the North-West. There is, therefore, nothing extraordinary in the fact that the use of the title *kaīsara* was not imitated by later rulers. Its occurrence in the *Āra* inscription, on the other hand, is in complete accordance with the theory that 134 A.D. is the initial point of the Kanīṣka era, which I have tried to make probable.¹⁵

The next word in the inscription should, I think, be read *Vajheṣkaputrasa*, though the second and third akṣaras present some difficulties.

The second one is in my opinion certain. The *e* mātrā is distinct, and the prolongation of the left-hand bar is also intelligible

¹⁵ *Acta Orientalia*, 3, 52 ff.

if we compare the pointed shape of the letter in l. 13 of the Māṅkiāla inscription, where we must read *Kartiyasa majha*.

Instead of *ṣka*, we would be inclined to read *ṣpa*, because the *ṣka* of *Kaniṣkasa* is different. In my edition of the Āra inscription I have given my reasons for reading *ṣka* and drawn attention to the fact that the compound *ṣpa* does not occur in any Kharoṣṭhī inscription.

It will perhaps be of use to examine how a *pa* is treated in similar compounds in the North-Western dialect.

Our best source for studying the features of that form of speech is the Kharoṣṭhī manuscript of the Dhammapada, and the results of an analysis of that text are generally supported by the inscriptions.

We find that *p* is, broadly speaking, treated as in other Prakrits: it remains unchanged as an initial but is changed to *v* between vowels. An intervocalic *v* is, further, often interchangeable with *m*. Thus we find *namo* (Skr. *nāvam*); *emameva* (*evameva*); *vadamado*, i.e. *vadamando* (*vratavantas*); *uthaṇamado*, i.e. *utthāṇamado* (*utthānavatas*); *sabhamu*, i.e. *sambhamu* (*sambhavas*); *bhamapaṇi* (*bhāvanāya*); *sa-meva* (*sā vaiva*), and, on the other hand, *jīṇav-iva* (*jīṇām iva*); *puṣav-iva*, (*puṣpam iva*). The writing *m* for *v* also occurs where the *v* is derived from an old *p*; thus *pramuṇi* (*prāpṇuyāt*), *viṇamaṇi* (*viṇāpanīm*); *aprahai muṇi* (*aprahāya punar*). It seems necessary to infer that the pronunciation was in reality a nasalized *v*.

Now it is of interest to see that *p* and *m* are also treated in a parallel way after sibilants. *sm* becomes *sv*, for which M. Senart writes *sm*. There cannot, however, be any doubt about the proper reading, for the same compound also occurs in *svaga*, i.e. *svagga*, (Skt. *svarga*), and I do not think that anybody would seriously maintain that one and the same sign should be transliterated now in one and now in another way according to the exigencies of the etymology. We thus find *svadi* (*smṛtis*); *asvi loki parasa yi* (*asmin loka parasmimś ca*), etc.

The form *parasa* seems to stand for *parassi*; cf. the Patika plate where we apparently have *imasi saṃgharame* (l. 5), and the Taxila gold-plate, where I read *hasasi* for *hasisa* and

hasase.¹⁶ In addition to forms such as *sadaṇa* (*smṛtānām*); *tasa* (*tasmāt*); *yasa* (*yasmāt*), it shows that the *v* was very weakly sounded, as is also the case when *sv* represents an old *sv*; compare *svaga* (*svarga*), but *saīarhu* (*svalābham*); *rasa* (*hrasva*); *saigada*, i.e. *saiṅgada* (*svayamkṛta*).

In *samhaṣadi*, i.e. *saṁmhaṣadi*, from *saṁmṛṣati*, *mḥ* is, as shown by Professor Leumann in the Album Kern,¹⁷ derived from an old *sm*. In the same way the locative termination *-smin* occurs as *mi* in many Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, and that the *m* was here aspirated must be inferred from the curious hook below in *viharami*, etc., in the Wardak inscription.

We here evidently have before us two different stages of development, or different dialects. It is possible that the compound *sm* had become *mḥ* but might also be retained as a Sanskritism, and this latter form then became *sv* and later *ss*, *sv* being retained in writing even after the actual pronunciation had been changed to *ss*. But the forms may also belong to different dialects.

Now it is of interest to note that we have the same double treatment in the case of old *sp*. We find *sv* in: *svihao* (*sprḥayan*), and we find *ph* in *phaṣai* (*sprṣati*); *phuṣamu* (*sprṣāma*).

With regard to old *ṣp* we have only one instance in the manuscript, viz. *puṣaviva payesidi*, i.e. *puṣṣav iva ppayesidi*. We can infer from this passage that *ṣp* became *ṣṣ*, and the form *Poṣapurā* in l. 4 of the Āra inscription shows that such was actually the case in the North-Western dialect, for *Poṣapurī* is evidently derived from a name representing Sanskrit *Puṣpapura*, which became *Poṣapura* and was later on misunderstood as *Puruṣapura*, the modern Peshawar. It should be remembered that *Puruṣapura* is not a very likely name, while everybody who has seen the

¹⁶ It should be remembered that the two plates published of this inscription are derived from the same source, a seal-wax impression, which is stated to be not quite reliable; cf. *JASB*. 1862, 180 footnote. I think that it should be read *Sirae bhagavato dhatu pre(prati)ṭhava[ya*]tiye matu hasisa (hasasi) pidu hasase(si) loo tasa siyati [or siya ti] yo ha dehajati*, "of Śīra who establishes a relic of Bhagavat in the haṁsa of her mother, in the haṁsa of her father, in order that it may find room when a corporeal birth takes place".

¹⁷ This work is not here accessible to me, and I can only quote from memory.

beautiful flower-gardens in Peshawar will agree that it can very well be called *Puṣpapura*.

The change of *ṣp* to *ṣṣ* probably passed through the intermediate stage *ṣv*. We may infer this from the treatment of *sp* as also from the common writing *śp* for old *śv*. We find *śp* in forms such as *viśpa* for *viśva*; *viśpaśa* for *viśvāsam*; *viśpaśi* for *viśvaset*; and we find it in *Piśpasria* on the Mathurā Lion Capital and in *Veśpaśi*, *Veśpaśia* in the Māṅikiāla inscription. I do not venture to give an explanation of the former name, but *Veśpaśi* seems to me to be the same word which occurs as *Viśvaśika* or *Viśvasika* in some Mathurā inscriptions.¹⁸ I shall not here discuss the question whether *Veśpaśi* is a name or a title, in which case the Satrap's proper name would be *Khujacia*.¹⁹

If *Veśpaśi* is written for *Veśvaśi*, we would be inclined to infer that *śp* had the pronunciation *śv*, which would then in the natural course of development become *śś*. That such was actually the case seems to follow from the fact that *śv* becomes *śś* in *avalāśa va bhadrāśu* (*abalāśvān iva bhadrāśvah*), A³ 15.²⁰ Also in the ancient Iranian language of Khotan *śv* becomes *śś*; thus *aśśi* 'horse'.

I think that we are justified in inferring from this state of things that a form such as *Vajheṣpa* would be against the phonetical laws prevailing in the North-Western dialect. Now the name of Kaniska's father should not be explained in accordance with the tendencies of an Indian form of speech. It no doubt belongs to the language of the Kuṣāṇas, which seems to have been identical with the Iranian language of Chinese Turkistan. Now it is a remarkable fact that the compound *ṣp* does not occur in that tongue

¹⁸ Cf. R. D. Bandyopādhyāya, *J&PASB*. 5, 242 f.

¹⁹ We read in the Māṅikiāla inscription ll. 7 ff.: *saha taṇa Veśpaśieṇa Khujacieṇa Buriteṇa ca viharakaravhaeṇa saṁveṇa ca parivareṇa*, which can very well mean: "together with a triad, the Viśvāsika Khujacia, the Vihāra-karāpaka Burita and the whole parivāra". As in the Patika plate the Navakarmika has subsequently entered his own name as well.

²⁰ The *va* after *avalāśa* shows that the form cannot be acc. sing., in which case we would have *ba*. A comparison of the Pali passage shows that the common original must have had a form which might be understood as acc. plur. and also as acc. sing., in other words, it was written in a form of speech where the acc. plur. of *a*-bases ended in *aṁ*.

either, while *ṣk* is of frequent occurrence; cf. *oṣku* 'always'; *parrūṣka* 'the kleśas', etc.

In consideration of such facts I feel convinced that *Vajheṣka* is the proper reading in the Āra inscription, the more so because it is easy to recognize in *Vajheṣka* a name which we know from Kuṣāṇa inscriptions, viz. *Vāsiṣka*. Dr. Fleet, it is true, maintained²¹ that the two forms *Vajheṣka* and *Vāsiṣka* are not so similar that we are justified in considering both as different attempts at rendering one and the same foreign name. He says: "The name which is given unmistakably as *Vāsiṣka* in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 24 would be quite naturally presented as *Vasiṣka* in any Kharoṣṭhī record, and there is no good reason for suggesting that the *s* stands in the Brāhmī inscription for anything else."

But, as a matter of fact, there is. Dr. Fleet has himself²² admitted that *Vāsiṣka* is identical with the Kuṣāṇa ruler whose name is given in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, I. 168 as *Juṣka*, and the *j* of this form shows that the *s* of *Vāsiṣka* represents a voiced *s*, just as is the case in the well-known *Kujūla*, where the Greek rendering *κοζουλο* shows how the word was pronounced. Also here we find that some difficulty was experienced in rendering the foreign sound in Indian letters, for in the Patika plate and the Mathurā Lion Capital inscription we find *Kusuluka* and *Kusulaa* written with an ordinary *s*, just as in the Brāhmī *Vāsiṣka*.

On the whole the rendering of the voiced *s* is rather inconsistent in ancient records. That *jh* was used for that purpose is, however, absolutely certain. I have already mentioned the form *majha* in the Māṇikiāla inscription, which presents the same softening of an intervocalic *s* as is often met with in the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Turkistan, where we find *dajha* for *dāsa*, *dhivajha* for *divasa*, etc. And we can see that it was not rarely thus employed in Kharoṣṭhī at a time which is not far removed from the date of the Āra record. Thus we find *Jhoila* on the coins of Zoilos; *marjhaka* and *erjhaṇa* in the Gudufara inscription of the year 103, where the corresponding forms *malysaki* and *alysānai* in the Iranian language of Eastern Turkistan show that the actual sound was a voiced *s*.

²¹ *JRAS.* 1914, 99 ff.

²² *JRAS.* 1903, 329.

Also *y* was, as is well known, used for the same purpose. I need only remind the reader of its occurrence in the name *Aya*=Azes. In Central Asia *ys* was used instead, and this same *ys* is, as shown by Professor Lüders²³ used in inscriptions and coins of some of the Western Kṣatrapās. In face of this state of things it is of no use to examine whether *ys* or *ghs* would, theoretically, be the more likely way of marking the voiced *s*, as done by Mr. N. B. Divatia.²⁴ The clear testimony of the Turkistan texts shows which expedient was actually chosen, whether it is considered to be in agreement with phonetical laws or not.

In the present connection I shall not enter into a further discussion of the various ways of marking a voiced *s* in Indian script or of the chronological conclusions which can perhaps be drawn from the writing *ys* in Kṣatrapa records. It is certain that *jh* was used to denote the sound in question, and in my opinion there cannot be any doubt that *Vajheṣka* is the correct reading in the Āra inscription, and that it represents a *Vāzeṣka*. It is certainly an Iranian name, derived from *vāza*, which means about the same thing as Skt. *ojas* and gives an excellent etymology of the name.

The next word in the inscription is *Kaniṣkasa*, here written with a dental *n*, while some other Kharoṣṭhī records have the cerebral. The dental is found in the Sue Vihār plate, and in the Shāh-jī-ki Dherī inscription, while the Zeda and Māṇikiāla records have *Kaṇiṣka*, *Kaṇeṣka* respectively. We cannot, at present, decide which form is the original one. The usual Brāhmī and Sanskrit form, however, speaks in favour of the dental *n*, which may represent an old *n* but also an old *nd*, which compound became *nn* or *n* in the North-Western dialect and apparently also in the ancient Iranian tongue of Eastern Turkistan.²⁵

There remains one important question in connection with these names and titles: "Who was the ruler mentioned in the inscription? Was it the famous *Kaṇiṣka*, or was it one of his descendants?" Professor Lüders was of opinion that the great *Kaṇiṣka*, whose latest certain date is Sam. 23, was succeeded by

²³ *SBAW*, 1912, 406 ff.

²⁴ Above, vol. 26, pp. 159 ff.

²⁵ The name can accordingly be derived from the base occurring in *candra* or from some word corresponding to *Skanda* or *skandha*.

Vāsiṣka (dates between 24 and 28), after whose death the empire was divided, Kaniṣka, the son of Vāsiṣka, ruling in the North, while Huviṣka held sway in India proper. Later on Huviṣka also became master of the North. Dr. Fleet, on the other hand, maintained that Vajheṣka, or, as he read, Vajheṣpa, was different from Vāsiṣka, and that Kaniṣka of the Āra record should be placed after Vāsudeva, when there was, he thought, a revival of the line of Kaniṣka, represented by the Āra and Māṇikiāla records, which would accordingly have to be dated in an unknown era and not in that of Kaniṣka.

I do not think that Dr. Fleet's view can be maintained. The alphabet of the Āra and Zeda inscriptions are so similar that they cannot be separated by a long interval. And, besides, everybody will agree with me in hesitating to assume the existence of a new and thoroughly unknown Indian era.

Nor am I able to accept the view that the ruler of the Āra record is the great Kaniṣka. That would mean assigning an exceptionally great length to his reign, and we have no reason for doing so. And, besides, the facts drawn attention to above with regard to the use of the imperial title *rājātirāja* speak strongly against this theory. We would have to assume that the title was borne simultaneously by Kaniṣka and Vāsiṣka.

I am not, myself, able to offer more than a suggestion. I would, however, draw attention to the order in which the Kuṣāṇa rulers are mentioned in the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, I. 168 ff., viz. Huṣka, Juṣka and Kaniṣka. It seems to me that here we may have an indication that Huṣka, i.e. Huviṣka, extended the dominion of Kaniṣka to Kashmir, probably as Kaniṣka's general and viceroy. Later on he acted as viceroy in India proper, while Kashmir came under the rule of Kaniṣka's successor as emperor, Juṣka, i.e. Vāsiṣka. He was then succeeded as emperor by his son Kaniṣka II, who is perhaps the ruler mentioned by Kalhaṇa, as maintained by Mr. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri.²⁶ It is of interest to note, in this connection, that Kaniṣka does not play a prominent rôle in Kalhaṇa's account, where more importance seems to be attached to Juska, who is said to have founded two towns.

²⁶ *Political History of Ancient India* (Calcutta, 1923), p. 255.

In such circumstances I do not think that the empire was divided after the demise of Kaniška I. Vāsiška's titles show that he was recognized as emperor at least in Mathurā, but probably over the whole country, and as such he seems to have been succeeded by his son Kaniška II, who resided in the North-West or perhaps outside of India, while Huviška ruled as Mahārāja in India proper. Kaniška II may have died about the date of the Āra inscription. Already before that event, however, in the year 40, Huviška had made himself independent, and he soon became the acknowledged ruler of the whole empire, so that the Wardak inscription from Khawat had to be dated in his reign.

This is not more than an attempt at arranging the chronology of the Kaniška dynasty, but I can see nothing which militates against it.

January, 1925.