

Volume XII, Part I

April 1933

Serial No. 34

JOURNAL
OF
INDIAN HISTORY
(Published three times a year)

EDITOR

RAO BAHADUR S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR,

M.A., HON. PH.D., F.R. HIST. S., etc.

*Honorary Correspondent, Archaeological Survey of India
Fellow of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*

ASSOCIATE EDITOR

C. S. SRINIVASACHARYAR, M.A.,

Professor, Annamalai University.



PRINTED BY

G. S. PRESS: LINO PRINTERS

MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS.

52
VOLUME 2
1122.12.1



CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES ON INDO-SCYTHIAN CHRONOLOGY—By Professor Sten Konow ..	1
HISTORY OF THE REIGN OF SHAH JAHAN—By Mr. Abdul Aziz ..	49
A PORTUGUESE INSCRIPTION OF THE GOA GOVERNOR DOM JOAO DE CASTRO—By Rev. H. Heras, S.J. ..	79
MAHARAJA AJIT SINGH OF MARWAR—By Pandit Bisheshvar-nath Reu Sahitacharya ..	85
THE HISTORICAL MATERIAL IN THE PRIVATE DIARY OF ANANDA RANGA PILLAI (1736—1761)—By C. S. Srinivasachari ..	90
EDITORIAL ..	114
REVIEWS—'Royal Empire Society Imperial Studies'; 'History of Orissa from the earliest times to the British Period'; 'The Making of the State'; 'Indian Problems' ..	134
SELECT CONTENTS FROM ORIENTAL JOURNALS ..	147
OUR EXCHANGES ..	155

Journal of
Indian History
1933

April - 12 - 34.



JL.
Vol. 1, No. 2
1933-1934
93481.



Notice to Contributors

CONTRIBUTORS are requested to be so good as to address papers and correspondence to the Editor, *Journal of Indian History*, 'Śrīpadam', 143, Brodies Road, Mylapore, Madras.

Contributors of articles to this journal will greatly oblige the editor if they will leave the upper half of the first sheet of manuscript blank, for the convenience of the editor, in entering instructions to the press regarding titling, style of printing, submission of proof, etc. Such instructions, when sent separately, are liable to result in confusion and delay.

Contributors will also greatly lighten the task of the editor, as well as lessen the cost of composition and correction, by observing the following suggestions:—

1. In preparing copy, please leave a margin of at least three inches on one side. The revision of a crowded manuscript is excessively troublesome and laborious. When the last sheet of the article has been finished, the last footnote or other interpolation added, and the last subtraction made, please number the folios consecutively with the actual numbers from one to the end.
2. Write plainly, especially proper names and foreign words. If foreign characters are to be employed, let them resemble as closely as possible the type in our fonts. If roman or italic characters with diacritical points are used, see that the points are distinct and rightly placed. Words to be printed in italics should be once underscored. Words to be printed in CLARENDON TYPE may be once underscored with blue pencil. Typewritten copy always needs to be carefully revised, with especial attention to mechanical faults and to the punctuation.
3. Indicate paragraphs clearly by a wide indentation at the beginning; or, if the break is an after-thought, by the usual sign (P). Begin all larger divisions of an article on a fresh sheet of paper. It is hardly necessary to say that the proper construction of paragraphs is far more than a matter of external appearance.
4. Punctuate the copy precisely as you wish it to appear in print. Double marks of quotation (" ") should be used for included quotations, definitions and the like, and single marks of quotation (' ') for the actual quotations.

5. In citing the titles of books, give the title in full where it first occurs. In subsequent citations the work may be referred to by the significant words of the title; but abbreviations which may not be at once understood are to be avoided, and, above all, entire uniformity should be observed throughout the article. Where some conventional system of citation is in general use, as in the case of the Vedas and the Brahmanic literature, the established custom of scholars should be followed. Titles of books will be printed in italics; titles or articles in periodicals, in quotation marks, with the name of the periodical in italics. But the well-established method of abbreviating the titles of the journals of the five principal oriental societies (*JA.*, *JAOS.*, *JASB.*, *JRAS.*, *ZDMG.*) should be adhered to.

6. It is desirable, for reasons of economy as well as good typography, that footnotes be kept within moderate limits. References to footnotes should be made by brief series of natural numbers (say from 1 to 10), not by stars, daggers, etc. As to the method of inserting footnotes in the copy, good usage differs. A way convenient for author, editor and printer is to insert the note, with a wider left-hand margin than that used for the text, beginning the note on the line next after the line of text to which it refers, the text itself being resumed on the line next after the ending of the note. But if the note is an after-thought, or if it is long, it is well to interpolate it on a fresh sheet as a rider.

7. Contributors are requested to kindly remember that additions and alteration in type after an article is printed in pages, are, in many cases, technically difficult and proportionately costly, the bill for corrections sometimes amounting to as much as the first cost of composition, and that such alterations entail a most trying kind of labour, not only on editors and compositors, but on the authors themselves as well, and they are accordingly advised that a careful preparation of their manuscript in the manner above indicated will save both the editor and themselves much unnecessary trouble.

Remittances, correspondence relative to subscriptions, and notices of change of address should be addressed to:—

THE MANAGER,
Journal of Indian History,
'Śrīpadam',
143, Brodies Road, Mylapore,
MADRAS, S.

Journal of Indian History

Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronology

By

PROFESSOR STEN KONOW, OSLO.

THE editor of the *Journal of Indian History* has asked me for a statement of my views about the chronology of the Scythian period of Indian history, and since some important new finds have come to light after I published the Indian Kharoshthi inscriptions in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, I thankfully avail myself of the opportunity.

In the *Corpus* I tried to arrange the dated Kharoshthi records in two groups, dated in an old Saka era and in that of Kanishka, respectively. At the hand of certain astronomical calculations made by the Dutch scholar Dr. van Wijk, I tentatively assumed that their epochs were such that the year 1 corresponded to 84-83 B.C. and A.D. 128-129, respectively.

I still believe that the determination of the Kanishka era cannot be far from the mark. On the other hand, the astronomical calculation of the older era has proved to have been based on a wrong interpretation of a word occurring in a Kharoshthi inscription.

The date of the Taxila silver scroll, found and first edited by Sir John Marshall,¹ is *sa 136 ayasa ashaḍasa masasa divase 15*, which I took to mean 'on the 15th day of the first Āshāḍha in the year 136', assuming *ayasa* to correspond to Sanskrit *ādyaśya*, as originally proposed by M. Boyer.² In other words, there would have been, in that particular year, an intercalated Āshāḍha. As such an intercalation does not take place every year, I asked Dr. van Wijk, who has made a thorough study of Indian astronomy, to examine the matter, and his calculations were the basis of my tentative chronology.

1. *JRAS*, 1914, pp. 973 ff.
2. *JA* XI, v, 1915, pp. 281 ff.

Kushāṇa conquest, on the other hand, we find the two records mentioned above, where the word 'of Azes' is added. It seems necessary to explain the addition in the same way as in the case of the *saka* of the silver vase: it characterizes the era as having been used under the deposed dynasty, and the word *ayasa*, *ajasa* has been chosen because the great majority of the coins issued by the Pahlava kings had that legend. It does not refer to the era as instituted or used by an individual king, but as current under the Azes-dynasty. And the era itself is no doubt, as most scholars hold, identical with the so-called Vikrama era.

We must then assume the existence of two eras within the older series of dated Kharoshthī inscriptions, one which we may call the Vikrama era, and which was apparently introduced during the Pahlava period, and another, older one, which was, in Pahlava times and possibly also earlier, characterized as connected with the Sakas. To the latter we may tentatively assign the Maira well, Shahdaur, Mānsehrā, Fatehjang, Taxila copper-plate and Muchai inscriptions, and probably also those from Loriyān Tangai, Jamāl-garhi, Hashtnagar and Skārah Dheri, to the former the remaining records of the old series.

The epoch of the older era can only be approximately calculated. If the silver vase was made about A.D. 45, its year 1 was about 146 B.C., but such a date must be accepted with the greatest reserve. We cannot say for certain when Sirkap was sacked or how old the vase was at that time.

In order to try to find other comparatively certain data during the Indo-Scythian period, we must turn to other sources, and try to interpret them.

Indian literature does not give much information. Names of the foreign tribes which entered on the Indian stage during this period, such as Saka, Pahlava, Tukhāra, Muruṇḍa, occur in the epics and the Purāṇas, partly with figures giving the supposed length and number of rulers of the various dynasties, but the attempts made at utilizing these sources have not been quite satisfactory and have not always carried conviction.

Among the tribes or dynasties mentioned above, the Sakas were certainly the first ones to play a prominent rôle in Indian history. And we can also consider it to be established that the desig-

nation Saka is an Indianization of an Iranian Saka, the Sakas being old Iranian tribes, about whom some information can be gathered from various sources: Persian, Classical and Chinese.

The word does not occur in Vedic texts, if we abstract from the Atharvaparīśiṣṭas. It is not found in Pāṇini's grammar, though a word *saka* is included, with variants in two gaṇas *gargādi* (IV. i, 105), *prajñādi* (V. iv. 38), and without in one, *śaṇḍikādi* (IV. iii. 92), where it is evidently inserted in order to explain the name Sākya. In the vārttika on VI. i. 94 *śakandhu*, of unknown meaning, is analysed as *śaka andhu*. We have not the slightest reason for seeing an old reference to the Sakas in any of these passages.

The oldest certain mention of the people is found in the Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini II. iv. 10: *śūdrāṇām aniravasitānām*, (a dvandva compound of words denoting) Śūdras that are not excluded (is put in the neuter singular). In the commentary the question is raised what the exact meaning of *niravasita* is. The first answer is that it means 'excluded from, i.e. not dwelling in Āryāvarta'. Against this it is objected that in that case we should not be able to say *Śakayavanam*, Sakas and Yavanas. From this passage we can draw the inference that the Sakas, at the time of Patañjali, i.e. about the middle of the second century B.C., were known to exist outside of Āryāvarta and as associated with Yavanas in some way.

The old non-Indian references to the Sakas in Persian and Classical sources have been discussed in an important paper by Professor Thomas,⁷ to which I shall have to refer over and over again. More important for chronological purposes are, however, the references to Saka wanderings found in Chinese annals, in connection with the so-called Yüeh-chi.

To judge from the translations and notes published by leading Sinologists, the purport of the Chinese accounts seems to be to the following effect⁸:

In 176 B.C., Mao-tun, King of the Hiung-nu, sent a message to the Chinese emperor, and stated that he had defeated the Yüeh-chi. The latter had formerly been living between Tun Huang and

7. JRAS, 1906, pp. 181 ff.

8. Cf. Corpus, pp. xix ff.

K'i-lien. After their defeat, they went westwards and drove another people, whom the Chinese call Sai-wang, i.e. the Saka-kings, out of their country, but were subsequently themselves driven out by the Wu-sun. We further hear that the Yüe-chi in the west made themselves masters of the Ta-hia, while the Sai-wang went southwards and made themselves masters of Ki-pin. About 126 B.C. the Chinese envoy Chang-k'ien found the Yüe-chi to the north of the Oxus, while the Ta-hia had their capital to the south of the river. Later on, sometime before A.D. 24, the Yüe-chi had transferred themselves to the Ta-hia country, where there were five principalities, including Kuei-shuang, which name has usually been identified with Kushāṇa, a name which we know from Indian sources. A later text states that the Yüe-chi *divided* the Ta-hia country into five principalities, as if this division did not exist before they came. It further contains the information that, at a later date, the chief of Kuei-shuang conquered the other chiefs and many other countries. After this the Yüe-chi became very powerful. They were everywhere spoken of as the Kuei-shuang kings, but the Chinese stuck to their old designation Great Yüe-chi.

Like other scholars I have formerly drawn the inference from these statements that the Kuei-shuang, i.e. the Kushāṇas, were Yüe-chi. And I have compared the Chinese accounts with what we learn from Classical authors such as Trogus. He speaks of Scythian peoples, the Asiani and Saraucae, who took possession of Bactria and Sogdiana, i.e. according to Marquart,⁹ the Saraucae occupied Bactria and the Asiani Sogdiana. A further remark mentions the Asiani as kings of the Tocharians, and the annihilation of the Saraucae.

It seems to be generally admitted that the Saraucae, for which other texts have Sakaraucae, Sakarauloi, etc., correspond to the Sai-wang, the Asiani or Asioi, as they are also called, to the Yüe-chi, and the Tocharians to the Ta-hia. There cannot well be any question about identifying the name Ta-hia, which according to Professor Karlgren was pronounced *d'ât-g'a* in the second century B.C., with Tochara, or Yüe-chi, old *gwat-ti* or *gat-ti*, with Asioi. But it is possible that the Chinese found that Tochara sounded like Ta-hia, which they knew as the name of another ancient people, and therefore applied the appellation to the Tocharians, and that the Asioi, Asiani were the ruling class of the Yüe-chi.

9. *Ērānsahr*, p. 205.

These identifications, however, cause some difficulty with regard to the supposed identity of the Yüe-chi and the Kushāṇas.

The discoveries in Central Asia have brought to light a formerly unknown language, which is called *Ārsi* in some text fragments, but *toxri*, i.e., evidently Tocharian, in Uigur translations.¹⁰ It seems probable that *Ārsi* is the same word which Classical authors give in the forms *Asioi*, *Asiani*, of whom we are told that they ruled over the Tocharians. The *Ārsi-Toxri* language can therefore either be the home tongue of the *Ārsi* or that of the Tocharians, i.e. either of the Yüe-chi or of the Ta-hia.

Now Professor Lévi¹¹ has shown that a dialect of the same language was used as the language of administration and literature in Kucha, an oasis in the north of Chinese Turkestan, and apparently also in some other oases, so that we have every reason for assuming that it originally belonged to that country. With regard to Ta-hia, on the other hand, the oldest Chinese accounts are to the effect that it was situated to the south of the Oxus. It is only at a much later date that Hsüan-tsang mentions an 'Old Tu-ho-lo' at Endere, to the south of the Takla Makan.

It therefore seems probable that *Ārsi-Toxri* was the language of the *Asioi-Yüe-chi* who conquered the Tocharians—Ta-hia in the second century B.C.

This language is an Indo-European form of speech, but it is not Aryan. With regard to the Kushāṇas, on the other hand, there are certain indications which seem to prove that they were Sakas, and the Saka language is certainly a Middle-Iranian dialect.

The oldest Kushāṇa known to us bears the name or designation *Kuyula*, *Kujula*, which is also borne by Saka rulers in India. His name further seems to be mentioned in an Indian inscription, where he is characterized as *erjhuna*, i.e. *erzuṇa*, and this word seems to be an older form of Saka *alysānaa*, *e'ysānaa*, which translates Sanskrit *kumāra*, prince.

The designation *Sai-wang*, in old pronunciation *sēk-wang*, means Saka-lord, and *wang* is evidently a Chinese trans-

10. Cf. Sieg, *SBAW*, 1918, pp. 560 ff; F. W. K. Müller, *ibidem*, pp. 566 ff.

11. *JA*, XI, ii, 1913, pp. 311 ff.

12. Cf. *SBAW*,

Now Sir John Marshall has again found an important Kharoshthi inscription near Taxila, at Kalawān, a site about three miles south-east of Sirkap,³ which definitely proves that the explanation of the word *ayasa* in the silver scroll as 'of the first' is wrong. The new record is dated *samvatsaraye 134 ajas śravaṇasa masasa divase treviśe*, i.e. in the same way as the silver scroll, only substituting *ajasa* for *ayasa*.

At first sight *ajasa* might seem to be a more likely rendering of Sanskrit *ādyasya* than *ayasa*, the latter necessitating the assumption that Prakrit *ājja* = *ādyā* had become *āja* and further *āya*, or that an old *ādika* had become *āia*, *āya*. But it is very unlikely that both forms, *āja*, i.e. *ājja*, and *āya*, should be used side by side at the same time and in the same locality. Moreover, we should have to assume that there was an intercalated Śrāvaṇa in the year 134, and an intercalated Āshāḍha in the year 136. Dr. van Wijk has been good enough to let me know that such a state of things is impossible, unless we were to make the extremely unlikely assumption that 134 was a current, and 136 an elapsed year.

It seems necessary to assume that the *j* of *ajasa* and the *y* of *ayasa* are two different attempts at rendering a sound which is not regularly represented in the Kharoshthi alphabet, and if we compare the doublets *kujula* and *kuyula* it can hardly be doubted that the sound in question was a voiced *s*, a *z*.

If *ayasa*, *ajasa* is the genitive of *aza*, it seems to me to be almost unavoidable to accept Sir John Marshall's explanation that it means 'of Azes'. It is quite true, as maintained by the late Dr. Fleet,⁴ that the use of a king's name in an inscription without any epithet is unparalleled, and that it is a universal rule that if a ruler is mentioned in connection with the date of a record, he is clearly designated as the actual ruler. The occurrence of the genitive 'of Azes' in our inscriptions must therefore be explained in a different way. Dr. Fleet has perhaps shown the way in the foot-note where he excepts the 'fictitious' Vikramāditya and Śāli-vāhana from the rule that epithets are necessary in connection with royal names occurring in inscriptions.

The ancient city of Sirkap, the capital of the Greek, the Saka, and the Pahlava rulers of Taxila, was sacked by the Kushāṇas

3. Cf. My preliminary account JRAS, 1932, pp. 949 ff.
4. JRAS, 1914, p. 997.

sometime between A. D. 65 and 79. The excavations have shown that treasure of various kinds was buried by the inhabitants on this occasion, *inter alia*, a silver vase with a Kharoshthi inscription,⁵ apparently dated *ka* 191. Professor Thomas has, however,⁶ proposed to read some faint traces, which are visible in the photographs before the initial *ka*, as *sa*, so that the actual reading would be *saka*. Mr. Hargreaves has kindly let me know that his deputy Mr. Dikshit could not see any trace of this *sa* in the original. On a plaster cast, which Mr. Hargreaves was good enough to send me, such traces are however visible, and I feel convinced that Professor Thomas' reading must be accepted, i.e. the date runs *saka* 191. If it had been filled up as in the Kalawān inscription we should have had *Sakasa samvatsaraye* 191 or *samvatsaraye* 191 *Sakasa*, in the year 191 of Saka.

We here evidently have two different eras, characterized as those of Saka and Azes, respectively, and the two additions *Saka* and *Ayasa* must evidently be explained in the same way, intended to characterize the reckoning as distinguished from some other reckoning.

Of these three records, the silver vase inscription is the oldest one. The vase was buried when Sirkap was sacked, and as it is much worn, it may have been used for say twenty years before that date. The silver scroll and the Kalawān inscription, on the other hand, belong to the post-Pahlava period.

If the silver vase inscription was engraved between A.D. 40 and 50, it belongs to the time when the Pahlava Gondopharnes was ruling in Taxila. And since it was then felt advisable to characterize the era as that of Saka, while no such addition is found e.g. in the Taxila copper plate of the time of the Saka Moga, we are led to draw the inference that, in the meantime, another era had come into use, and that can hardly have been any other reckoning than that of the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription of the time of Gondopharnes. How long after the Sakas had been replaced by the Pahlavas the new era came into use we know not. The earliest examples seem to be the Mount Banj and the Takht-i-Bāhī inscriptions of the years 102 and 103, respectively.

As long as the Pahlavas remained in power, we have no example of the new era being characterized by any addition. After the

5. Corpus Nr. XXX.

6. Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 1931, p. 4.

lation of the Saka word *murūḍa*, master, lord. *Sai-wang* accordingly means the same thing as *Saka-murūḍa*, which occurs in the Allahābād *prāśasti* of Samudragupta.

The word *murūḍa* alone is often used¹³ almost as an ethnic name. But we find it, in the form *muroḍa*, used as a title of a later Kushāna, the famous Kanishka, in the Zeda inscription. The latter ruler and his successors further use the Saka language in their coin-legends, e.g. *shaonano shao Kaneshki Koshano*, i.e., if we reduce the legend to the Brāhmī alphabet used in Saka literature, only neglecting the orthographic doubling of voiceless *sh*: *shau-nānu shau Kanāshki Kushānu*, of king-of-kings Kanishka, of the Kushas.¹⁴

Now if the Kushānas were Sakas, i.e. spoke an Iranian language, and the Yüe-chi are identical with Ārsi, we should not be able to identify the Yüe-chi and the Kushānas. We must therefore either assume that the Ārsi-Toxri language was that of the Tocharians, who must in that case have been immigrants from Chinese Turkestan, or else the Chinese were wrong in identifying the Kushānas with the Yüe-chi.

The latter solution has gradually come to present itself to me as the most likely one. And it seemed to me that the available translations of the chief Chinese sources were not so clear in all points as one could wish. I have therefore consulted my friend Professor Karlgren, who has shown me the great favour to let me have new translations of the Chinese accounts, with some extremely useful remarks.

The oldest passage is found in ch. 123 of the *Shi-ki* of Si-ma Ts'ien (ca. 90 B.C.): 'Ta-Yüe-chi (great Yüe-chi) is about 2-3000 li to the west of Ta-wan (Ferghāna). It is situated in the north of the river Wei (Oxus) When Mao-tun (died 174 B.C.) became chief [of the Hiung-nu], he beat the Yüe-chi. It went so far that the shan-yü Lao-shang of the Hiung-nu killed the king of the Yüe-chi and made a drinking vessel from his skull. Originally the Yüe-chi lived between Tun-Huang and K'i-lien. When they were

13. Cf. Lévi Mélanges Charles Harlez, Leyde 1896, pp. 176 ff.

14. Everybody who has any knowledge of the Saka language will know that *Kushānu* cannot be anything else than the genitive plural of an *a*-base *Kusha*.

defeated by the Hiung-nu, they moved far away, passed Ta-wan, and in the west attacked the Ta-hia and subjugated them (made them subjects). Then they made their royal residence¹⁵ north of the Wei river. The remaining small groups of them, such as could not go [westward], kept to the [regions of the] K'iang (i.e. Tibetan tribes) of the Nan-shan. They are called the Siao (small) Yüe-chi.'

'Ta-hia is to the south-west of Ta-wan, more than 2000 li, south of the Wei river. They are sedentary, have walled cities and houses and the same customs as the Ta-wan. They have no great kings or chiefs, but the various cities and towns put up small chiefs. Their weapons are weak, and they fear war. They are skilful in trade. When the Yüe-chi migrated westwards, they attacked and defeated them and subjugated all the Ta-hia. The Ta-hia people is numerous, some 1,000,000 and more. Their capital is called Lan-shi city.'

The next source in the sequence of time is the *Ts'ien Han-shu*, the Annals of the Earlier Han dynasty, covering the period 206 B.C.-A.D. 24, and written by Pan-ku (died A.D. 92). Here we read in ch. 96:

'The Ki-pin kingdom, its king rules in the city of Sün-sien. It is distant from Ch'ang-an 12,200 li. It is not subordinate to the [Chinese] Protector General In the north-east, to the country governed by the Protector General there are 6,840 li. In the east, to the kingdom Wu-ch'a (uo-d'a) there are 2,250 li. In the north-east, to the kingdom Nan-tou there is a journey of nine days. In the north-west, it touches Ta Yüe-chi, and in the south-west, it touches Wu-i-shan-li (Arachosia). Anciently, when the Hiung-nu beat the Ta Yüe-chi, the Ta Yüe-chi went west and 'chiefed' (became rulers of) the Ta-hia, and the Sai-wang (*sēk-wang*) went south and 'chiefed' Ki-pin. The Sai (*sēk*) tribes were scattered and constituted several kingdoms in various directions. From Shu-le (Kāshgar) to the north-west, all those who belong to the Hiu-sün (*Xidu-ziuen*) and Yüan-tu (*iwän-d'uok*) are ancient Sai tribes.'

Professor Karlgren here adds an important explanatory note: 'Two interpretations of this passage are possible. The first is that

15. 'wang-t'ing, thus not a real *ch'eng*, walled city.'

This event must have²⁰ been an important milestone in the history of the Sakas. It is even conceivable that later on they used to reckon from their final setting up as rulers of Bactria and the Tochara country, when they wanted to date their records, in other words that the era we have learnt to know as *Saka* dates from this event. Such an explanation is perhaps preferable to the other ones: according to Banerjea²¹ the old *Saka* era may have been founded by Venones c. 100 B.C.; according to Sir John Marshall,²¹ who now, however, thinks a considerably earlier epoch preferable, by Moga c. 95 B.C.; and according to Professor Rapson²² it may mark the establishment of a new kingdom in Seistān after its incorporation into the Parthian empire by Mithradates I c. 150 B.C., while Mr. Jayaswal²³ thinks that c. 123 B.C. is the most likely epoch.

As the situation had developed in the period covered by the Ts'ien Han-shu i.e. sometime before A.D. 24, however, Saka rule in that region had come to an end, and now the Ta Yüe-chi were the masters of the whole country, the bulk of the Sakas having moved on to Ki-pin.

A still later stage of development is represented by the Hou Han-shu, the Annals of the Later Han Dynasty, which cover the period A.D. 25-220. The author Fan Ye states that he has gone through the account of the Western Countries in the older Annals, i.e. the Ts'ien Han-shu, and selected what in the period Kien-wu (A.D. 25-55) and later was different from what had already been said formerly, and that all the facts have been related by Pan Yung at the end of the reign of the emperor Ngan (A.D. 107-125).

It can hardly be stated more definitely that such new events as are narrated in the Hou Han-shu cannot be dated earlier than A.D. 25, and usually not later than A.D. 125. And we learn that the account is based on the reports of Pan Yung, who had himself taken an active part in the events in Chinese Turkestan.²⁴ On the other hand, it is evident that we cannot trust the Hou Han-shu

20. Ind. Ant. XXXVII, 1908, p. 67.

21. JRAS, 1914, p. 986.

22. l.c. p. 570.

23. JBORS, XVI, p. 240.

24. Mr. Jayaswal does hardly do justice to Pan Yung when he, l.c., p. 243, speaks of him as 'an author who wrote before 120 A.D., sitting in China'.

when it changes the wording of the Ts'ien Han-shu with reference to older events.

Now we read in the Hou Han-shu, ch. 118: 'The Ta Yüe-chi kingdom inhabits the city of Lan-shi Originally, when [the kingdom of] Yüe-chi was annihilated by the Hiung-nu, they migrated to the Ta-hia and divided their kingdom into the five district *hi-hous*, Hiu-mi, Shuang-mi, Kuei-shuang, Hi-tun, Tu-mi. More than a hundred years afterwards the *hi-hou* of Kuei-shuang, K'iu-tsiu-k'io, attacked and annihilated the other four *hi-hous* and made himself king. The kingdom was called "the Kuei-shuang kings."

Professor Karlgren adds the following notes: 'The Hou Han-shu, much later than the Ts'ien Han-shu, has altered the account. When the Ts'ien Han-shu says simply "there were five *hi-hous*," the Hou Han-shu says, "the Yüe-chi divided the land into five *hi-hous*." This innovation is not to be trusted. The earliest accounts indicate that the Ta Yüe-chi found a country divided into five parts, the "small chiefs" of which were of Sai (*Sēk*) origin, as stated above. One of these families rose to become powerful: the Kuei-shuang, i.e. the Kushāṇas. The texts seem thus rather to favour the idea that the Kushāṇas were of Saka origin.'

The last clause, *kuo hao Kuei-shuang-wang*, "the country was called the Kuei-shuang-kings," seems curious, and a commentator proposes that the last word *wang* "king" should be eliminated. On the contrary, I find the expression extremely interesting, supporting the thesis that in *Sai-wang* (the *Sēk* kings) as the name of a nation *wang* is not a transcription, but really means "kings".

It will be seen that Professor Karlgren's last remark supports my explanation that *Sai-wang* is a translation of a Saka term, such as e.g. *Saka-murūṇḍa*. In a similar way *Kuei-shuang-wang* might be rendered in Indian as *Kushāṇa-rāja* or *Kushāṇa-mahārāja*, and it is therefore a priori likely that the *Maharaja Gushana*, *maharaja rajatiraja devaputra Khushana* mentioned in Indian inscriptions is the *hi-hou* K'iu-tsiu-k'io of the Hou Han-shu. We shall have to return to this question later on.

After the passage translated by Professor Karlgren, the Hou

TABLE SHOW

head towards the beggar. The latter is under a tree, and totally against the letter of the tradition, he is represented well dressed, perhaps for fear of offending pious and scrupulous eyes. The whole carving is now painted in green, black and white. St. Martin is represented on the top of this inscription for on his feast day Dom Joao de Castro obtained the decisive victory over the Musulmans round Diu. In point of fact the whole inscription refers to this war with the Sultan of Gujerat.

The inscription proper covers a space 24 ft. 4 in. square. The inscription is written in block letters carved into the stone. The letters were in the beginning gilded,³ but at present they are painted in black. They are all capitals and of the same size excepting four: the first letter of the inscription and the initials of *Joao, India* and *Cambaya*. The "u"'s are substituted by "v"'s, as customary in the 16th century. The words are written in succession without any separation excepting in the first and the last lines. The three words of the first line are slightly separated apparently to fill up the whole space of the line. In the last line the figures of the year 1547 are separated from the previous words and from the abbreviation that follows by two dots, one on each side. Similarly at the end of the inscription before commemorating the date there is another dot. The preposition *de* also is separated from the previous word *era* by a small gap not used between other words of the epigraph. It must be noticed also that the words are not properly separated at the end of the lines. Of the seven lines that the inscription contains five times the last words of the lines are not divided in such a way that the division should fall between syllable and syllable, but it falls between the letters of the same syllable, a circumstance that makes difficult the first reading in spite of the clearness of the epigraph.

The inscription reads as follows:—

Porestaporta
 entrovdomJoao
 decaastrodefenso
 rdaIndiaqvand
 otrivnfovdCa
 mbayaetodoest
 emvrolhefoider
 vbado. era. de. 1547 a

3. Correa, *Lendas da India*, IV, p. 637. (Lisbon, 1864).

