

1: *saṃ 1-1-100-20-20-20-10-4-4-1* (= 279) *gapiu na(?)ma 1(?) [ma?]sa[sa] di<vase 10-4-1*

2: *rajatirajasa [trata](rasa?) dhramikasa(?) ...*

3: *vhema kuśasa pi [.]gadapiṇa . śea (...) sa*

“Year 279, month (...) Gorpaios, day (15), of the King over Kings, the great (...), of the lawful Vhema Kuśa, (...)”

**Note ed.:** The clear reading *vhema kuśa*, most likely rendering the more common *vema kuṣaṇa*, is again proof of the difficult reception of terms in the Kushans’ own language. The same irregular sibilant is also found in *kuśānavamiśyaḥ kaniṣka nāma rājā*, “A king of the Kuśana lineage called Kaniṣka”, in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, ed. N. Dutt, with corrections by K. Wille ([http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1\\_sanskrit/4\\_rellit/buddh/vinv\\_06u.htm](http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskrit/4_rellit/buddh/vinv_06u.htm)). This variant *vhema kuśa* or a similar one may have provided the basis for the Middle Chinese equivalent to modern *yangaozhen* (Mandarin) or *yimgouzan* (Cantonese) (cf. § 077).

## Events in the time of Vima Kadphises

### 091 – Year AD ±112: Date for Vima Kadphises in inscriptions: Yavana year 287

**Context:** This is the only rock inscription from the time of Vema Takhtu’s son Vima Kadphises. No reliquary inscriptions carry his name. This epigraph by the roadside mentions his name and provides a date. Khalatse lies in Ladakh, 337 km east of Srinagar, on the old road to Leh; the rock has been recently blasted when the road was modernized. The spelling of the king’s name is unique. The text is commonly reproduced from Konow 1929: 81. The date starting with 200 was first read correctly by Cribb (1997: 230, fn. 32) and met with strong scepticism. The extended beginning is obvious from a plate in G. Tucci (1958: 294, fig. 8), and went unnoticed so far. Ed.:

1: *deva[pu]/ta / maharajasa uvimo kavthisasa*

2: *sa 2 100 20 20 20 20 4 1 1 1*

“Year 287 of the *devaputra-maharaja* Vima Kadphises, Year 287.”

### 092 – Kushan kings not named on graffiti of the Indus-Hunza road to China

**Context:** A.H. Dani (1985, 1987, 1989) read Kharoṣṭhī epigraphs on the “sacred rock of Hunza”, north-east of Gilgit, and was sure that they contained the names of Vima Kadphises (allegedly: *maharaja Uvimma Kadhatphrisa*), Kaniṣka (allegedly: [*Gushana*] *devasa maharajasa* (...) *kaniṣkasa*) and Huviṣka (allegedly: *Maharajasa devaputrasa Huvi[ṣkasa]* and *Gushana maharaya Huv[iṣkasa]*). None of these readings could be verified by Neelis (2001: 164, 166 “I.B.K3”, 181 “I.D.K3”). Only in one case is a

*maharaya* found and reconfirmed, followed by *dho/rošimiya* (cf. *śimikā* as a place-name in the Rājatarāṅginī), which Neelis (2001: 167) considers to be the name of this king. For all other cases he states “Firsthand examination of the rock in 1995-6 did not confirm Dani’s readings and interpretations of these names and titles.”

### 093 – Year AD 114-120: Yuezhi king interferes successfully with dynastic problems in Kashgar

HHS 88/118.13b (2927), 《後漢書·列傳·西域傳·52》; Zürcher 1968: 369, Thierry 2005: 519, texte 31, Hill 2009: 43 with slight changes by CHING:

安帝元初中，疏勒王安國以舅臣磐有罪，徙於月氏，月氏王親愛之。後安國死，無子，母持國政，與國人共立臣磐同產弟子遺腹為疏勒王。臣磐聞之，請月氏王曰：

“安國無子，種人微弱，若立母氏，我乃遺腹叔父也，我當為王。”

月氏乃遣兵送還疏勒。國人素敬愛臣磐，又畏憚月氏，即共奪遺腹印綬，迎臣磐立為王，更以遺腹為磐橐城侯。

後莎車連畔于寘，屬疏勒，疏勒以強，故得與龜茲、于寘為敵國焉。

“During the Yuanchu period [114-120 CE] in the reign of Emperor An, Anguo, the king of Shule [Kashgar], exiled his maternal uncle Chenpan to the Yuezhi [Kushans] for some offence. The king of the Yuezhi became very fond of him.

Later, Anguo died without leaving a son. His mother directed the government of the kingdom. She agreed with the people of the country to put the ‘Posthumous Child’, who was the son of a full younger brother of Chenpan, on the throne as king of Shule [Kashgar]. Chenpan heard of this and appealed to the Yuezhi [Kushan] king, saying:

‘Anguo had no son. His relative [the ‘Posthumous Child’] is weak. If one wants to put on the throne a member of [Anguo’s] mother’s family, I am the ‘Posthumous Child’s paternal uncle; it is I who should be king.’

The Yuezhi [Kushans] then sent soldiers to escort him back to Shule [Kashgar]. The people had previously respected and been fond of Chenpan. Besides, they dreaded the Yuezhi [Kushans]. They immediately took the seal and ribbon from the ‘Posthumous Child’ and went to Chenpan, and made him king. The ‘Posthumous Child’ was given the title of Marquis of the town of Pangao [90 *li* or 37 km from Shule].

Afterwards Suoju [Yarkand] followed by resisting Yutian [Khotan], and put themselves under Shule [Kashgar]. Thus Shule [Kashgar], became powerful and a rival to Qiuci [Kucha] and Yutian [Khotan].”

**Note Hill:** See Hill 2009: 418, note 21.3+2015,I, note 21.4: “The mistaken claim that the

Yuanchu period ran from 114-116 CE was first made by Sten Konow in his work of 1929, and was repeated by a number of writers. In fact, the Yuanchu period ran from 15th Dec., 114 CE to 16th Feb., 120 CE.” [Cf. Thierry 2005: 520, fn. 197. ed.]

## Events in the time of Kaniṣka I

### 094 – Years AD ±129-±150: Dates for Kaniṣka I in inscriptions: 2-23

as *mahārāja kaniṣka*: years 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 16, <sup>?</sup>19, 20, 23 (SS #19, 13-14, Kimbell, 19, 28, Russek, 43, <sup>?</sup>Singapore, 52, 57)

as *mahārāja devaputra kaniṣka*: years 10, <sup>?</sup>20, (SS #35, <sup>?</sup>London)

as *maharaya rayatiraya devaputra kaniṣka*: year 20 (CKI 246)

as *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra kaniṣka*: undated statue from Māt (cf. § 088).

**Note ed.:** To keep the references brief, the years given here and for the succeeding kings refer to the numbered editions in the most comprehensive collection of dated Brāhmī epigraphs so far, by Satya Shrava 1993 (“SS”). Misallocations and misreadings are numerous, but not relevant to our chronological overviews. Pieces not contained in SS are indicated by terms commonly used by epigraphists. CKI 246 is the only text written in Kharoṣṭhī script. A superscript question mark refers to inscribed pieces of art with debated authenticity.

### 095 – Year AD ±127: Year 1 of a Kuṣāṇa century

Yavanaajātaka 79,15; Falk 2001: 126, 127:

*gatena sādhyardhaśatena yuktyā vyekena koṣāṇagatābdasaṃkhyā  
kālaḥ śakānāṃ pariśodhya tasmad atītam anyadyugavarsayātaṃ.*

“The elapsed years of the Kuṣāṇas in combination with 149 (change into) the time of the Śakas.

Subtracting from this (Śaka time [plus 56]) the elapsed (*yuga*, i.e. 165 years) (produces) the elapsed years of the second *yuga*.”

**Note ed.:** The text was arbitrarily altered by Pingree (1978) for his edition which resulted in a nonsensical formula. The text as given here follows the single old manuscript seen by Pingree and is supported by the readings relegated by Pingree into the critical apparatus. Only the first line is important for defining the starting point. For the intricacies of the second line, dealing with the particular system of the *yuga*, cf. Falk 2001. In contrast to the published reconstruction I now see a compound starting with *anyad*<sup>o</sup>, related to the “elapsed” (*atītam*) number of years. The meaning is not affected. The first line produces a year AD 227 for year 1 of the Kuṣāṇas. I combined this with the “dropped hundred theory”, not first but most thoroughly justified by Johanna van Lohuizen-de Leeuw in 1949, and the result is AD 127. The paper Falk 2004 shows that year numbers based on a start in AD 127 or 227 with omitted hundreds were kept in use in Mathura even after AD 327 and 427.