

NOTE ON THE NAME KUSA

Āsvaghoṣa's *Sūtrālamkāra* and more than forty other Buddhist works have been translated into Chinese by Kumārajīva, a celebrated Śramaṇa of Indian extraction who flourished in Eastern Turkestan about A.D. 400. He studied in Cabul at a time when Yüeh-shih¹ rulers still governed parts of Central Asia, and must have possessed some first-hand knowledge of the race which Dr. J. F. Fleet (above, pp. 369–81) and Mr. J. Allan (above, pp. 403–11) agree in calling Kushān, instead of using the name Kuṣa, found in the Chinese version of the *Sūtrālamkāra* as well as in the Tibetan translation of the *Mahārājakanī[ś]-kalekhā*.² It might possibly be thought that the authors of the translation last named, owing to their imperfect knowledge of history, misunderstood the original Sanskrit

¹ The characters 月 氏 are rendered by Yüeh-shih, which represents their modern Peking pronunciation. The usual transcription (Yüeh-chih) has not been adopted for reasons stated in my paper "KOPANO und Yüeh-shih" (Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1914, pp. 643–50). In the article mentioned I call attention to the fact that in the Ma-ming-p'u-sa-chuan (Life of Āsvaghoṣa) Kanīṣka is spoken of as a ruler of the Little Yüeh-shih, and try to prove that the characters 月 氏, which in one of the old dialects were probably pronounced *Kur-ṣi* or *Gur-ṣi*, represent the nominative singular corresponding to the genitive plural KOPΣANO (KOPANO) = *Kursānu* (*Kuṣānu*). The regular nominative singular of the theme *Kuṣa* would, in the second "unknown" language of Eastern Turkestan (cf. above, p. 84), be *Kuṣi*.

² The work last named has *Kuśa* (not *Kuṣa*). It seems to be admitted (above, p. 380) that the difference between *ś* and *ṣ* is in this case immaterial (cf. above, p. 87). I note that my suggestion regarding the name Kuśadvīpa has not been criticized. The fact that this name is in the *Matsyapurāṇa* placed immediately after the Śākadvīpa has been mentioned above (p. 88), and I still believe that the expression might be rendered by "the dvīpa of the Kuṣas". Those who accept this interpretation will agree that the name Kuṣa occurs at least three times in Indian literature (preserved in the original or translated into foreign languages), while no trace of the supposed name Kuṣāṇa (or Kushān) can be found there. Cf. what Professor Konow says in the Journal of the German Oriental Society (1914, p. 96) about Kuśadvīpa, which he also connects with the "ethnic name Koṣa or Kuṣa".

text, and made the mistake alleged above (pp. 380, 411); but it seems incredible that a famous scholar like Kumārajīva,¹ who had travelled in the Yüeh-shih dominions as early as the fourth century and translated a life of Kaniṣka's court poet, should have been ignorant of the correct name of the great monarch's race.

The Māt Inscription

The newly discovered inscription of Māt, if considered as it is (without assuming damage to the stone in the most important place, cf. above, p. 371, n.), agrees perfectly with the *Sūtrālamkāra* and the *Mahārājakani[s]kalekhā*, according to which Kaniṣka belonged to the Kuṣa race.

There is a distinct dot above the *mātrkā na* (in line 2), and several well-known authorities² on Indian epigraphy who have examined squeezes of the inscription agree that the dot might be regarded as an anusvāra. If we pursue this course we arrive at the reading *Kuṣāṇam putr[o]*, and stand face to face with a Prākṛt title which can only be considered as meaning "scion of the Kuṣas".

Kadphises I's Coins

Hardly any notice has been taken of the coins published in my article (above, p. 85). Dr. J. F. Fleet does not even mention them, and Mr. J. Allan (p. 410) dismisses these most important pieces of evidence with the words: "The hook in the *n* is a well-known feature of Kharoṣṭhī epigraphy, quite without significance." I do not see any hooks in the places concerning us, but well-defined strokes

¹ We find some biographical data concerning Kumārajīva and a list of his existing translations in Bunyiu Nanjio's *Catalogue of the Chinese Translation of the Buddhist Tripitaka*, Appendix ii, No. 59. Among the translations there are lives of Aśvaghoṣa, Nāgārjuna, and Deva.

² The *ipsissima verba* of one of them are quoted in my article "KOPANO und Yüeh-shih", referred to above (p. 754). Dr. J. F. Fleet reads (above, p. 370): "*Kuṣāṇa-putr[o]*: son or descendant of the Kushānas", and adds (p. 371): "we cannot find an *anusvāra* and read *Kuṣāṇam*, and still less *Kuṣāṇām*," and "The marks above the *na* are only due to damage to the stone".

to the left forming right angles with the *mātrkā na* and attached to the bottom of it in all the three legends reproduced. The *mātrkā na* combined with a stroke to the left placed at its bottom can, however, mean either *nu*¹ or *naṃ*, and it is not easy to decide how it is to be read on the coins.

The sign described was at the time of Aśoka undoubtedly used to represent *nu*.² The same stroke to the left being observed at the bottom of the *akṣara* which on the coins of Kadphises I represents *ju*, and the "Greek" legends of the same monarch showing the word ΚΟΡΑΝΟ (ΚΟΡΣΑΝΟ) = *Kuṣānu* (cf. above, p. 84, and Mr. Smith's Catalogue, p. 65), I suggested the reading *Kuṣānu yavugasa*. After my article "Was there a Kuṣāna Race?" (above, pp. 79–88) had appeared I found that the sign described above (the *mātrkā na* with a stroke to the left attached to its bottom) did stand for *naṃ* in some Kharoṣṭhī documents later than Aśoka.³ In view of this

¹ I considered (above, p. 87) *Kuṣānu* as a Scythian (i.e. Old Khotanī, or language ii) genitive plural, preserved in the half-Prākṛtized legend. It would, no doubt, simplify matters if it could be proved that a Prākṛt genitive plural (*Kuṣānaṃ*) was intended.

² e.g. in the word *paśumanuśanaṃ*. Cf. Senart, *Inscriptions de Piyadassi*, p. 64, pl. i. Mr. Pargiter says (above, p. 650): "u in *nu* was denoted [in the Aśoka inscriptions] by that [leftward] stroke applied, however, to the very extremity of n."

³ We find the same sign in the word *Naṃdasena*, which occurs in one of the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Niya deciphered by Professor Rapson. Cf. p. 10 of his *Specimens of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*. The same sign will, I think, be recognized between *Me* and *drasa* on some of Menander's coins, and I have no doubt that it was intended for *naṃ* (*nan*). Cf. Mr. Smith's Catalogue of Coins, pl. v, No. 3; Professor Gardner's Catalogue, pl. xi, No. 11; and Mr. Whitehead's Catalogue, pl. vi, No. 471. The stroke to the left attached to the *mātrkā na* is wanting on all coins known to me where there are certain *na*'s, as on those of Philoxenos (*Philasinasa*). Cf. Gardner, pl. xiii, No. 7; Smith, pl. vi, No. 4; and Whitehead, pl. vii, No. 577. Many of those interested in Indian history will, I am sure, believe that on the coins of Menander (*Menambra*) and Kadphises I (*Kuṣānaṃ yavugasa*) the stroke to the left attached to the *mātrkā na* means something, until they see a sufficient number of coins proving the contrary. I have not been able in the catalogues mentioned to discover any well-defined strokes

fact, I now think that the words *Kuṣānaṃ yavugasa* were intended by the die-sinkers in question. We might hesitate between *Kuṣānu* (genitive plural of *Kuṣa* in the language ii) and *Kuṣānaṃ* (Prākṛt genitive plural of *Kuṣa*); but we cannot admit that the clear-cut leftward stroke, repeated on at least three dies, stands for nothing. Those who accept what has just been said will agree that the legends mentioned constitute still stronger evidence in favour of my view (*Kuṣa*, not *Kuṣana* or *Kushān*) than the *Māt* inscription does, because the latter can be put aside by assuming one accident (damage to the stone), while three are required if the existence of legends reading “of the *yavuga* of the *Kuṣas*” (*Kuṣānaṃ* [or *Kuṣānu*] *yavugasa*), etc., is to be denied.

The Māṇikyāla Inscription

I do not think that the sign  which immediately

follows *Guṣā* in the *Māṇikyāla* inscription can possibly be intended for the same group of sounds as the signs



which correspond to the fourteen certain *na*'s of that record. (cf. above, p. 84). But even those who accept Dr. J. F. Fleet's reading, *Guṣānava[m]śasaṃvardhaka*,¹

to the left attached to *na*'s in the *Kharoṣṭhī* legends of any ruler except Menander and Kadphises I. The strokes to the left are on the coins published above (p. 85) more pronounced than on those of Menander.

¹ The exact reading adopted by Dr. J. F. Fleet (p. 373) is *Gushāṇa-vaśa-saṃvardhaka*. On p. 374, however, it is said: “and so we have the name here as *Gushāṇa = Gushāṇa*,” and on p. 371 we find the statement: “the *Kharoṣṭhī* alphabet does not always, if indeed ever, distinguish clearly between the cerebral *ṇ* and the dental *n*.”

will have to admit that this expression might be regarded as meaning "scion (or increaser of the race) of the Guṣas". I think that the nearly identical title *Kuṣāṇaṃ putr[o]* of Māt, the first part of which can be nothing but a genitive plural, makes this interpretation inevitable, and that there is certainly nothing in the Māṇikyāla inscription¹ disproving the correctness of Kumārajiva's translation (*Kuṣa*, cf. above, p. 754).

The Panjtar Inscription

All we know of this record, the original of which has been lost, is contained in two² different treatments of it by Sir A. Cunningham (JASB., 1854, p. 705, and Arch. Surv. India, vol. v, Calcutta, 1875, pp. 61–2). I do not think I deserve the reproach of hardly having done justice to the inscription (cf. above, p. 372). The fact is that I ignored the figuring of 1854 and accepted the statement of the learned General printed in 1875: "It is very unfortunate that the name of the king is broken off at the end of the first line, the initial letter *R*, or perhaps *N*, being the only one un mutilated. The second letter, which is very doubtful, may be either *re*, or *ha*, or *ne*."

Dr. J. F. Fleet reads *ra-* (Cunningham's *R*, or perhaps *N*) *ja* (C. : very doubtful—*re*, or *ha*, or *ne*), while considering it as a "moral certainty" that the third letter, "which is damaged" (C. does not even mention the third letter), was *mi*—and all this on the sole authority of a plate known to Sir A. Cunningham. The eminently

¹ I have not had sufficient time properly to consider the new treatment of this important record which we find above (pp. 641–60), but I note that the reading *Guṣaṇo* is suggested there by Mr. Pargiter, who refuses (p. 651) to admit an Old Khotanī (language ii) genitive in the Māṇikyāla inscription "because all the terminations here are Prakrit", and explains the *o* (in *Guṣaṇo-ra*°) by assuming that the "compound" is formed "after the Iranian[!] fashion of using the nominative form instead of the base-form in the first member of a compound word" (p. 650).

² See also JASB., 1863, pp. 145, 150.

the ϣ and the Λ (in ΒΑCΙΑΛΕΩΝ) on some coins of Kanīṣka (cf. Whitehead, pl. xx, No. 4)? Many similar legends could be quoted from the catalogues mentioned, and I think that no facts have been adduced which preclude our recognizing the well-authenticated title *Kūṣān śāhān śāh*, the existence of which is admitted above (p. 379), on the coins of Kanīṣka and his successors.¹

Mr. Vincent A. Smith authorizes me to say "that he knows of no reasons which could prevent our reading ΚΟΡΑΝΟ ΠΑΟΝΑΝΟ ΠΑΟ ΚΑΝΗΡΚΙ on certain coins of Kanīṣka, and that he does not consider as convincing the arguments advanced by Dr. J. F. Fleet and Mr. J. Allan in favour of a different arrangement of the legend (ΠΑΟΝΑΝΟ ΠΑΟ ΚΑΝΗΡΚΙ ΚΟΡΑΝΟ)". This statement of a well-known authority on Indian numismatics will, no doubt, be of special interest to those who have observed the uncompromising attitude adopted by Mr. J. Allan on p. 403 ("It must be obvious to anyone who has ever seen one of the coins in question that the legend cannot be taken in the order in which," etc.).

General Remarks

It seems to be admitted that, if nothing else were known of the name of the race, the most natural way of translating the title *Kūṣān śāh* on purely philological grounds would be "King of the Kūś or Kūśas". This being so, it must be proved by independent evidence that in this case a different interpretation has to be resorted to. I cannot see a sufficient proof in the fact that the word *Kūṣān* and

¹ Even those who read ΠΑΟΝΑΝΟ ΠΑΟ . . . ΚΟΡΑΝΟ need not abandon the view that *Kuṣa* is the correct name of Kanīṣka's race. Professor Konow (op. cit., p. 93) adopts the arrangement last mentioned and still considers ΚΟΡΑΝΟ as a genitive plural of *Koṣa* or *Kuṣa*. ΚΟΡΑΝΟ placed after the name of the king might perhaps mean "of the *Kuṣas*" ("who belongs to the *Kuṣa* race"). We know very little of Old Khotanī (language ii) syntax, and cannot say whether such a use of the genitive occurs in that language. In *Prākṛt*, however, similar cases seem to be proved. Cf. Professor Konow's article, "Goths in Ancient India," *JRAS.*, 1912, pp. 379-85.

its Chinese equivalent *Kuei-shuang*¹ have been used as the names of a tribe or territory. That does not seem to be more astonishing than the circumstance that the word *Preussen* (originally nothing but a plural of *Preusse*) is used as the name of a well-known kingdom at the present day.

The word *Cuseni* or *Cusani*, mentioned by Mr. J. Allan (on p. 405), is admittedly nothing but a conjecture by Tomascheck (*Sitzungsb.* of the Vienna Academy, 1877 [not 1887], vol. lxxxvii, pp. 155–6). Professor Marquart, who reads *Cussis* where the text has *Ruffis*,² is responsible for a similar conjecture which favours my view. The *Qušani* or *Qasani* of the *Spicilegium Syriacum* are easily outbalanced by the *Kūš* of the Syriac legend of Alexander.³ It is true that the Armenian *K'ušank'* has probably (but not necessarily, as I am informed by a most competent Armenian scholar) to be regarded as a plural of *K'ušan* (not *K'uš* or *K'uša*). I do not think, however, that this fact can outweigh the authority of *Kumārajiva*—one of the most famous scholars of Buddhist antiquity—borne out, as it is, by the *Māṭ* inscription and by certain coin-legends of *Kadphises I*.

May I conclude this note by drawing attention to the manner in which Dr. J. F. Fleet deals with the documentary evidence supporting the view put forward in my article "Was there a *Kušana Race?*" (above, pp. 79–88). One die-sinker's mistake repeated in several dies,⁴ two accidents,⁵

¹ The expression *Kuei-shuang* never, as far as I know, occurs in places where it cannot be explained as the Chinese rendering of an Iranian plural form or of a singular form of the type *Preussen*. It would be a different matter if e.g. *Kadphises I* were called a *Kuei-shuang* instead of being spoken of as a *Kuei-shuang-hsi-hou* or *Kuei-shuang-wang* (cf. above, p. 80).

² *Ērānšāhr*, p. 36, n. 2.

³ Cf. Marquart, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁴ It is implied above (p. 407) that the expression *XOPANCY* of the *Kadaphes*-coins is a mistake for *XOPANOY*.

⁵ The *amusvāra* which necessitates the reading *Kušanam putr[o]*, "scion of the *Kuša's*," is dismissed as due to damage to the stone

and two translator's errors¹ are assumed in order to disprove the correctness of the name Kuṣa.

A case in assailing which, assumptions of this kind have to be so freely resorted to, must be a very strong one, and I am as convinced as ever that Kuṣa (not Kuṣana or Kushān) was the correct name of Kaniṣka's race.

A. VON STAËL-HOLSTEIN.

Sir Charles Lyall, Vice-President of the Society, has been elected an Honorary Member of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft; and nearly simultaneously the University of Strassburg conferred upon him the honorary degree of Ph. D. On June 2 he was present at the Oxford Convocation to receive the Honorary D. Litt. These distinctions are in recognition of Sir Charles' eminence in Arabic studies—more especially in connexion with the old poetry—as shown in his edition of the *Mu'allaqāt* (with commentary, Calcutta, 1891), the *Dīwāns* of 'Abid and 'Āmir ibn at-Ṭufail (Leyden, etc., 1913), and the *Mufaḍḍa-liyyāt* (in progress), and in the translations associated with these or published independently.

(cf. above, pp. 371, 755), and the mark in the Māṇikyāla inscription which Mr. Pargiter describes (p. 649) as "clearly cut, precise, and deliberate", is disregarded as "nothing but a slight exaggeration of the slope to the left with which the Kharōshthī *ṛ* often ends" (p. 374).

¹ Both translators, who are evidently quite independent of each other, give the name as Kuṣa (cf. pp. 380, 754), and Dr. J. F. Fleet believes that they are wrong, having mistaken *Kuṣanavaṃṣe* for *Kuṣānām vaṃṣe*. Another error must be assumed if the passage of the Li-yul-lo-rgyus-pa quoted above (p. 381), "the king Kanika AND the king of Guzan and king Vijayakīrti, lord of Lī, and others . . .", is to have any force. If the text is considered as correct, Kanika cannot be the king of Guzan, and it becomes impossible to connect Guzan with Kūṣān. But, even if we do assume an error in the text and consider Guzan as a form of Kūṣān, we need not attach more importance to Guzan than to the Chinese *Kuei-shuang* (cf. above, p. 761). I do not, owing to want of time, discuss at present the new interpretation of a certain Kidāra coin legend suggested above (p. 410) and some other matters less intimately connected with the main question (Kuṣa or Kushān) involved, but I hope I may be allowed to do so at a future date.