



Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies

Volume 23 (2016), Issue 2

Oešo and Śiva: Interconnected Natures and Iconographies

by Doris Meth Srinivasan

ISSN 1084-7561

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11588/ejvs.2016.2.1227>

"Oešo and Śiva: Interconnected Natures and Iconographies"

Doris Meth Srinivasan; Research Professor; State University of New York - Stony Brook

ABSTRACT

This paper brings together studies published over the last fifteen years which clarify aspects of the so-called Oešo/Śiva problem. Essentially, the problem revolves around the identification of the figure on Kuṣāṇa coins and seals which has some 'Śiva' markers but is inscribed 'Oešo'. The prevailing opinion that the figure is Śiva cannot be maintained in light of the information from the recent findings, discussed below, in the following sequence:

I. 1. A brief comparison of Kuṣāṇa *śaiva* images in Mathura and Gandhāra indicates basic regional differences, thus laying the ground that Gandhāra incorporated outside, non- Indian iconographic elements to fashion its *śaiva* forms. 2. The Northern *śaiva* images have more in common with Kuṣāṇa coins and seals than with Mathura *śaiva* icons. It is these coins and seals that carry the 'Oešo' inscription. 3. Itemization of the new, recent studies on the subject. 4. Descriptions and analyses of recently published seals, ending with the observation that iconographic ambiguity exists on the Oešo coins and seals inscribed 'Oešo'.

II. The ambiguity prompts an assessment of those iconographic features 'Oešo' seals and coins share with Mathura 'Śiva' images. The conclusion of the comparison is that an image labeled 'Oešo' is 'Oešo' and not the god 'Śiva'.

III. Investigation into the nature of Oešo follows: 1. Who is Oešo? 2. Is there a connection between Oešo's Avestan forerunner and a Vedic god? There is and it is based on the bi-polar nature of each 3. Terminology and iconography which focuses on Oešo's benevolent side. Discussion on the symbolism of the raised liṅga. 4. The need of the Zoroastrian religion, when formulating divine imagery, to borrow an iconographic language so that the imagery is understood in the regions where the coins and seals circulate. The adopted iconography incorporates, for the most part, multivalent symbolism.

IV. Post-Kuṣāṇa imagery conflates elements from both deities when representing Oešo in Northern areas of Central Asia and China, and when depicting Śiva in the Southern areas in the subcontinent.

V. Overall conclusions.

I. 1. A brief survey of Kuṣāṇa *śaiva* images in Mathura and Gandhāra

For over fifteen years I've had Śiva on my mind. What I have found so puzzling is the great discrepancy between the way Śiva is represented in Mathura and Gandhāra during the same timeframe. Mathura was the cradle for creating acceptable representations of Brahmanic, that is, early Hindu deities. Śiva is a Hindu deity. He stems out of the earlier Vedic/Brahmanic religious tradition¹. In Mathura this tradition is reflected in the threefold typologies associated with Śiva's icons. Gandhāran art does not reflect this religious tradition. Śiva has numerous features in Gandhāran art that cannot be explained by recourse to the major religious traditions originating in the subcontinent, although his features in Gandhāran art are often - and surprisingly - not at odds with symbolism found in these religions. I have often wondered why Gandhāran images of Śiva are so atypical. They are, as a group different from Mathura Śiva images. And they tend to be,

individually, quite distinct from each other. Corroborating my impression is Callieri's finding based on his study of Northwestern seals and sealings. He calls the Śiva seals "the least homogeneous" of all the seal sub-groups in the Northwest." ²

Śiva's three typologies made in the Kuṣāṇa art of Mathura reveal the theological belief that the power of Śiva unfolds progressively into the phenomenal world. The *liṅga* is his most ethereal sign and symbol of his power to effectuate all creation. From this sign (in the shape of a phallus), one or more heads can emerge and begin the manifestation process; the form representing this phase is called a *mukhaliṅga* (i.e. a sign with one or more faces). Lastly, the entire anthropomorphic figure of Śiva stands fully revealed to his worshippers. This is the *mūrti*, the *pratimā*, the *Śiva tanū*, that is, the body of Śiva, which represents but a fraction of his omnipotence. The *mūrtis* seen on temple walls and, of course, in museum displays, are thus aspects of Śiva's total power.

All three typologies - *liṅga*, *mukhaliṅga* - *mūrti* - are present in Mathura and the surrounding Gangetic region as early as the pre-Kuṣāṇa period. They are not present, as a series, during pre- Gupta periods in the Northern regions, that is prior to the 4th - 5th centuries. ³ Different underlying sources and beliefs may account for the divergence between Northern *śaiva* images and those found at Mathura. ⁴

Early sculptural *mūrtis* from Gandhāra may show some *śaiva* characteristics found on Mathura sculptures but also others unknown there. Illustrative examples are three standing Śiva-s from Gandhāra known for their ample use of iconographic symbols: the four-armed, three headed ithyphallic icons in the Berlin Asian Art Museum (Acc. No. MIK I 5888; Pl. 1) and in Rome's Museo Nazionale d'Arte Orientale, and an image formerly in the Sherrier Collection (Pl. 2).⁵ They share the number of extra arms and

heads, the trident and vase held as emblems, the god's raised phallus and his third eye. Of these only the third eye and raised phallus are found on Mathura *śaiva* images; the sun disc held by the Rome's Śiva is once associated with a Mathura Warrior Goddess. Discounting style and minor details, these Kuṣāṇa Gandhāran examples significantly differ also from each other in the shape of the ascetic locks (varying from bun decorated with a crescent, to cone, to quasi-uṣṇīṣa) and in the nature of the side heads (portraying various animals as well as an anthropomorphic shape). Unknown to icons from Kuṣāṇa Mathura are the use of ancillary animal heads, the hand-held trident, a vase (or water-pot ⁶) held by the neck and a moustache on the god's face. ⁷ Śiva's Kuṣāṇa *mūrtis* from Gandhāra, at least those known to date, show variations from each other in addition to distinction from the Mathura assemblage.

I. 2 the Northern *śaiva* images have more in common with Kuṣāṇa coins and seals than with Mathura *śaiva* figures

Śiva's Northern anthropomorphic images correlate more closely with a figure on Kuṣāṇa coins. Kuṣāṇa coins, minted by the rulers, seem to show an iconography that is somewhat more in keeping with the way Śiva is shown on Gandhāran sculptures.⁸ The male on Kuṣāṇa coins is usually referred to as Oešo/Śiva since he has some attributes that pertain to Śiva but has the name of an Iranian god, Oešo, inscribed on nearly all the coins. ⁹ The obverse of the coins usually portrays the ruler and therefore provides a guide for dating. Accordingly, *śaiva* features can be isolated right from the earliest through the later Kuṣāṇa rulers, that is, from Vīma Khadphises through Vāsudeva I and II ¹⁰. From the time of Vīma, Oešo /Śiva has two arms and one as well as three heads, and is associated with the trident (or trident -axe), the vase (often called a water pot), the thunderbolt (*vajra*), a

halo, an animal skin and the bull (not necessarily all on the same coin, of course). Hardly any of the latter features are evident on a standing Mathura Śiva. Exceptions are a bull occurring on a unique Kuṣāṇa relief (GMM 3340)¹¹. A small roundish vessel is held by an ithyphallic figure assumed to be Śiva from Rṣikesh, Uttarakhand. I dated the sculpture to the pre-Kuṣāṇa period ¹²; Kreisel gave it a Kuṣāṇa date¹³. Multiplicity of heads (three) and arms (four) in Gandhāran sculpture occur on Huviṣka's coins. But whereas the multiplicity convention stems from the Brahmanic tradition, Mathura sculptures work with a theoretical five-headed, not three-headed, figure ¹⁴. These are but general observations. Comprehensive iconographic comparisons between Kuṣāṇa representations of Indian, including Mathura, Śiva icons and Gandhāran Oešo/ Śiva images are provided below. At this point, it suffices to note that the disparity between Gandhāran and Mathura śaiva iconography and the former's closer connection to Kuṣāṇa numismatics strongly suggests that a source other than the Vedic/Brahmanic one accounts for the numerous Northern features associated with Oešo/Śiva. After all, the Kuṣāṇas were Central Asians and foreign to the traditions and religious beliefs of Brahmanic India.

I. 3 Itemization of New Studies

The identity of Oešo / Śiva on the coins has been vigorously debated from the nineteenth century onwards. The general consensus, until rather recently, has been that the god on the coins is Śiva, or an aspect of Śiva. That assumption received a significant challenge by K. Tanabe who rightfully asserted in his paper of 1991/ 1992 that thus far the Iranian material had not been sufficiently probed. He did this, and thereby opened up a new frontier: use of Iranian religion and art to comment on the Oešo/Śiva problem in art ¹⁵. Several subsequent finds and studies have, in effect,

strengthened the case for an Iranian connection. The Rabatak Inscription, attributed to a high official of Kaniška I, and analyzed by N. Sims-Williams in several publications between 1995 - 2004 ¹⁶, yields an important finding for the current study, namely that all deities, except one, mentioned (and presumably worshipped by the Kuṣāṇa dynasty) are Iranian gods. In 1997, Joe Cribb tabulated the known Oešo/ Śiva images on Kuṣāṇa and post - Kuṣāṇa coins according to chronology and iconography¹⁷. His tables, plus reproductions of numismatic and statuary images, and commentary distinguishing between normal and rare features provide a useful interpretive guide. Also in 1997, an additional visual corpus became available; Pierfrancesco Callieri published his revised PhD dissertation on ancient seals of the Northwest. ¹⁸ A conference presentation by Fabrizio Sinisi, in 2010, demonstrated that Roman coins were ineffective as a model for Oešo on Kuṣāṇa coinage. Rather, foreign features on the coins were probably introduced from Kuṣāṇa Period seals which received Western glyptic influences. ¹⁹ More seals from Greater Gandhāra became available for study in 2011. ²⁰ Many of these seals are inscribed, some with the name 'Oešo'. Most important are the researches at Dunhuang (published in 2009; 2013) which have brought to light in Cave 285 a remarkable visual retention of Oešo's impact upon Śiva's northern imagery. Lastly at the end of 2014, a new paper by Helmut Humbach on the Iranian Wind God was published²¹. In light of all this newly available information, the Oešo/Śiva problem is here taken up anew with the aim of advancing a solution.

I.4 Description and analyses of recently published seals

To begin, I shall analyze six seals referring to Oešo/Śiva catalogued in the 2011 publication. The seventh, also in this publication, may allude to Oešo. These seals have not received prior art historical analyses. Reference to

them is given by their number in the Catalogue (see fn. 20) and by the collector's Inventory Number. Since the figure on the seals can sometimes be allied to Kuṣāṇa coin types which can be approximately dated and occasionally sequentially ordered, my method is to discuss the seals and their comparative numismatic material first in order to categorize them. I shall then proceed with an analysis which terminates with a possible rationale for the presence of *śaiva* markers on the Iranian deity, Oešo.

The male on the clay token (07.01. 08; Inv. No. Gkc 416;Pl. 3) seems to be three-headed, but because of the worn condition of the token it is not clear whether the side heads are human or animal. Perhaps the figure is nude as may also occur on some Vīma Kadphises series; ²² possibly the male is without the raised *liṅga* but the token is not in sufficiently good condition to be sure. There is no halo or inscription. The figure stands in front of a humped bull. He holds a trident in his raised right hand; the left rests on the bull. The prongs of the trident are curved in a manner seen on the obverse of a bronze tetradrachm of Vīma Kadphises as well as on the obverse of a gold stater of Vāsudeva I.²³ This form is seen later in Mathura Kuṣāṇa sculpture. ²⁴ The combination of three-headedness, a bull and the trident has recently been found on Vīma Kadphises' coppers in the British Museum and the Masson Collection as well as on a few of his gold coins also in the collection of the British Museum ²⁵. However, the side heads (one animal, one human) can compare with only one four-armed Gandhāran figure, a sculpture of the Kuṣāṇa Period.²⁶ On our token the deity stands erect and frontal, without bending his body. Iconographic features on Vāsudeva I, Vāsudeva II and Kaniṣka III coins have some added attributes or slight variations. ²⁷ Thus there is no seal or coin example having the constellation of characteristics that can be confirmed on the clay token: three heads, two arms - one resting on the bull, the other holding a trident with curved prongs - an erect, frontal posture for body and face, possibly

nude and possibly without the *ūrdhvaliṅga*. A South Asian hoard found in 2006 may contain the earliest Vīma coins. They include examples of Oešo/Śiva as tricephalic, nude ²⁸, two-armed (right holds trident; left is various), without *liṅga* ²⁹, frontally positioned and series IV also shows the bull. But a study of some of the early series (I - III) shows that these coins published by Bopearachchi stand outside Vīma Kadphises' routine production and have problematic features ³⁰. Therefore more work needs to be done to remove the doubt of authenticity from these newly found coins. Our clay token (Pl. 3) is difficult to date; it could be placed anywhere after the first decade of the second century A.D. (Vīma ruled c. 100/105 - 127 A.D.) through the third century A.D.³¹ However if indeed the figure is not ithyphallic - a critical determinant - then the token is more likely to relate to early (i.e. Vīma) than later coinage. The 2011 Catalogue calls the figure 'Weš', that is how Bactrian Oešo was pronounced.

The next figure, on the garnet ring - bezel seal (07.01.09; Inv. No. GKg xx 19; Pl. 4) is four-armed and clothed in a *dhoti*. He holds, starting from upper right and going anticlockwise: the trident, a club, a vase, an animal skin over the arm, and the thunderbolt (*vajra*). The appearance of the sacred thread (*yajñopavīta*) is uncertain. Many features recall Greek imagery. The club, (possibly lion's) skin and the nude muscular torso (though awkward legs) are adaptations of Heracles' imagery ³², already evident in Central Asia by the second century B.C. (Pl. 5). Greeks and the philhellenic population living in northern Afghanistan fled from their homeland in mid-1st century BC. Crossing the Hindu Kush, they continued to live and rule in areas south for another 150 years causing their influence to remain in Gandhāra. The site of Barikot, an Indo -Greeks urban center in Swat (Gandhāra) provides archaeological evidence of the direct Hellenistic tradition in its art. Barikot was excavated by Pierfrancesco Callieri; he has synthesized much of his work in "Barikot: An Indo-Greek Urban Center in

Gandhāra” in *my On the Cusp of an Era. Art in the Pre-Kuṣāṇa World*. Brill, 2007, pp. 133-164, especially page 161. Callieri, following the late, great Gandhāran art historian Maurizio Taddei, argues for the presence of workshops and craftsmen working in the Hellenistic traditions in Gandhāra and transmitting a Hellenistic style into Gandhāra. In addition, the Indo-Parthians who conquered the Gandhāran region prior to the Kuṣāṇas also retained Hellenistic influences there while instilling Iranian ones as well. The garnet ring - bezel seal dates to the Kuṣāṇa Period. It exhibits traits similar to a Kaniṣka I seal (cited as S 1 in Callieri’s *Seal and Sealings*) which is also similar to U.7.1 (in the same book, and possibly a bit later according to comparisons noted by Callieri on page 189). The deity is named Wes in the 2011 Catalogue. With no indication of an inscription, a *liṅga*, bull or ascetic’s hair, one could wonder why this Hellenized figure, in spite of its multiplicity, would be called ‘Weš’ and would be part of the current discussion. The next two bronze seals address this issue.

Two bronze double-hoop-handled seals (07.01.11; Inv. No. GKm xx 86 and 07.01.12; GKm 805 in Pl. 6) relate closely to Kuṣāṇa coin types. Falk maintains that the god on the reverse copies the reverse of a Kaniṣka I gold coin.³³ Joe Cribb shows, via an example, that the “two seals are based on a gold stater of Huviṣka, with reverse die as in Göbl 1984, type 308.10 and 11”³⁴; Cribb’s Huviṣka example is illustrated in Pl.7. Both seals show a four-armed figure holding three of the same attributes as the figure on the garnet ring - bezel seal, above but Inv. No. GKm xx86 is inscribed with the Bactrian legend ‘Oešo’³⁵. That permits bringing the above garnet ring into the orbit of Oešo/Śiva. The figure’s slight *dehanchement* pose reminds of Heracles’ posture. Oešo/Śiva holds the trident and antelope in his upper and lower left hands and the thunderbolt and tilted vase in his upper and lower right hands. The tilted vase is of a Persian type according to Boyce³⁶ and not a Brahman’s kamaṇḍalu. She proposes that the tilted vase is a libation

vase since water drops sometimes flow from it.³⁷ Its association with water, she states, implies that the eastern Iranians continued to see their god Weš (or Bactrian, 'Oešo'), as bringer of water through rain. Her suggestion goes a long way towards explaining the presence of the trident and the thunderbolt on both the seals and coins. Remembering the continuation of Hellenic influences in Gandhāra, we connect the trident with Poseidon, the Olympian whose domain is water. The trident is the main attribute of the 'God of the Sea'. His brother is Zeus, God of all the Olympians, who rules the sky and the upper regions. Zeus is armed with the thunderbolt which he can shake to produce storms with lightning, thunder and presumably rains. If therefore Oešo is a bringer of rain, these attributes suit him well. Quite wonderfully, they are also cognizances known in Greater India. An indigenous association exists for the trident, or *triśūla*. A *śūla*, a sort of spear or sharp lance was used in the Vedic *śūlagava* ritual to Śiva's forerunner, namely Rudra. The *śūla* was probably used to impale the ox or bull as an offering to Rudra. The interface between *śūla* and *triśūla* may have resulted in the sort of staff seen on a clay Gandhāran sealing surrounded by auspicious symbols (15.03.07; Inv.No. GKc 401 Pl. 8). The thunderbolt, or *vajra* is Vedic Indra's designated attribute. However, Rudra is the only Vedic deity who can also wield Indra's *vajra*.³⁸ As for the vase, it could remind of the ascetic's *kamaṇḍalu* which, however, is more of a vessel which can be oblong; in some cases it has a handle or a spout ³⁹. Its symbolic association with asceticism works well with Śiva (as perhaps seen on the Ṛṣikesh statue, mentioned above).

Though only half of the fifth, a quartz seal, remains its features are those appearing with Oešo/Śiva (07.01.10; Inv. No. GKg 010; Pl. 9). The male, dressed in a *dhoti*, stands frontally on a base line and faces to his right. His sacred thread is prominent. Two of his four arms remain. He holds the thunderbolt/*vajra* in his upper left and has an animal skin draped over his lower left arm. That hand may hold a vase.⁴⁰

The finest Oešo/Śiva seal in this Collection with respect to modeling and imagery (07.01.07; Inv.No.GKg 001 PL. 10) is an agate seal with an inscription in the Bactrian 'monumental script' which Nicholas Sims-Williams identified and found to be typical of Kuṣāṇa coins and inscriptions. A personal name seems to be inscribed on this seal ⁴¹. The four-armed male with the ascetic's topknot is seated on the back of a humped bull, resting on folded legs. The *yajñopavīta* crosses his bare chest. These attributes, together with the raised *liṅga* seen through his *dhoti*, plus the bull bespeak of Śiva ⁴². However, the attributes blend well with both Śiva and Oešo. A trident (*triśūla*) is in the upper right; a wheel (*cakra?*) is in his lower right; the thunderbolt/*vajra* is in his upper left and an oblong shaped vase (*kamaṇḍalu?*) is below. The wheel can be found on two exceptional Kuṣāṇa gold coins minted during the reign of Huviṣka (2nd half of the second century A.D.). One, showing a three-headed, four-armed ithyphallic god [indicated by the halo], is inscribed with the name 'Oešo' (J1); the other is with a single-headed, four-armed ithyphallic figure (I1).⁴³ Seal Inv. No. GKg 001 and its comparisons are important because they indicate that Kuṣāṇa artisans, aware of śaiva iconography, seem to apply it to Oešo (indicated by the inscribed coin J 1), or, are content to allow for an ambivalency. To repeat: the Huviṣka coin (J1) indicates that the wheel, four-arms, three differentiated heads and a raised phallus can be attributes of a deity labeled Oešo; seal Inv. No. GK g 001 likewise depicts a four armed, ithyphallic male with many attributes that can work for both Oešo and Śiva, as will be enlarged upon below. The same tendency towards ambiguity is demonstrated by a six-armed figure both on a Kuṣāṇa coin and on a post-Kuṣāṇa carving from Akhun Dheri dating to c. 3rd- 4th century AD. ⁴⁴ The three headed, six-armed male with the raised *liṅga* on the carving certainly holds a preponderance of śaiva - or better multivalent - attributes: *vajra*, staff of the presumed trident; vase. Standing in front of the bull who licks

his feet as on Vāsudeva I coins, he is seen with the *yajñopavīta* and ascetic locks, plus the third eye. Yet a good two hundred years earlier, a number of these traits were already featured on a copper of Huviṣka found on a British Museum coin (No. 1990 - 8 -20-2) bearing the Bactrian inscription 'Oešo'.⁴⁵

II. Assessment of Oešo's and Śiva's shared iconography in pre - though - Kuṣāṇa times.

Why is there ambivalency? "Why is Oešo attributed *śaiva* traits?" Or, conversely "Why is a deity with *śaiva* traits not called 'Śiva' when the name 'Śiva' (or the epithet 'śiva') is attested in Gandhāra from the 1st c. A.D. through Kuṣāṇa times (for example, at Taxila, at Chilas II, and with the Bimaran reliquary)?⁴⁶ This is especially odd since both Oešo and Śiva are not minor deities whose identities are interchangeable. Could it be that the populace in antiquity understood the meaning of the symbolic language, or is the ambiguity registered by modern scholars more correct? The latter position can be illustrated in the writings of Frantz Grenet. He considers the Iranian name identifies the Hindu god Śiva as early as the Vīma coins and throughout the coinage of the Kuṣāṇas. Whereas the iconographic type stems first from the imagery of Heracles, a change occurs from Kaniṣka's issues onwards with the god exhibiting three heads, four arms, *the vajra*, a fawn (a possible allusion to a mythic antelope), the water flask (possibly connected with the *rājāsuya*).⁴⁷ In brief, this view considers the god depicted on the coins of virtually all the Kuṣāṇa rulers as the Indian Śiva who is named Oešo.⁴⁸ A nuanced variant, offered by Cribb, contends that the Śiva-like images on Kuṣāṇa coins are related to both Śiva and Heracles but represent the Zoroastrian god Oešo, a later development from the Avestan wind god.⁴⁹ Tanabe goes further. Whereas the god called 'Oešo' on the coins may have some features associated with Śiva that does not mean,

according to Tanabe, that this god is Śiva, only that the former shared some iconographic features with the latter. ⁵⁰

II. 1. Comparison of *śaiva* attributes from Indian sites with Oešo's markers on the above described seals.

Just how many features do these two deities share? To get an idea of the actual extent of *śaiva* iconography on Kuṣāṇa Oešo/Śiva coinage and seals, it is necessary to determine which of the attributes relate to Śiva's Hindu attributes in the pre-Kuṣāṇa and Kuṣāṇa art of the Indian subcontinent. Śiva's earliest Hindu imagery is found at sites located along a *tirtha* network going from Andhra Pradesh to the upper reaches of the Gaṅgā and Yamunā river systems. Located on Hindu pilgrimage routes, some ancient sites, exposed to the circulation of ideas and customs, were able to translate these stimuli into an incipient *śaiva* iconography wherefrom it blossomed into a foundational corpus. ⁵¹ Four studies cover these sites. To the three already cited in fns. 4 and 5, namely by G. Kreisel, N.P. Joshi and my paper also in the Meister volume, we may add the 2013 volume on the Mathura School which contains a few new *śaiva* fragments. ⁵² What follows is a list of Oešo/Śiva attributes on the six seals described above and their occurrence in the contemporaneous *śaiva* art at Indian sites. Although this comparison is limited to the attributes on a few seals, the findings probably would have wider application because the attributes on these seals are prevalent on many Kuṣāṇa coins and seals:

1. Trident - Not evident anywhere except on Ujjain tribal coins (problematic whether depicting Śiva, see Kreisel, pp. 22- 23) and late Kuṣāṇa - pre Gupta 3rd century AD. Saṅkīsa (U.P.) seals showing Śiva with trident, as noted by N.P. Joshi.

2. Thunderbolt - Not evident anywhere.
3. Vase or Water Pot - small pot, not tilted thus no indication of fluid; evident in the Guḍimallan Śiva Liṅga; the Bhita Pañcamukha Liṅga, the Mūsānagar Śiva Relief, the Ṛṣikeśa Śiva statue, the Philadelphia standing Śiva. The pot is considered a *kamaṇḍalu*.
4. Pelt - worn or held on body, not evident.
5. Hand-held Horned Animal - Guḍimallan Śiva Liṅga.
6. Club - only occurrence on Ujjain coins where Joshi sees Śiva with *daṇḍa* and trident. Probably Balarāma, not Śiva.
7. Multiple heads -no true Indian three-headed examples are evident, nor examples of animal and human ancillary heads. Four faces on a Liṅga, or, three faces superimposed by a fourth are both noted, but four faces are not a Gandhāran feature until the 3rd century. The unique example is a fragment in the Linden Museum. Four-headed adorsed standing Śiva with side heads is invented in Mathura.
8. Multiple arms: whereas four arms are common on Kuṣāṇa coins there is but one unique Indian Kuṣāṇa Śiva example, a statue. It comes from Mathura portraying a four-armed Śiva standing in front of his Liṅga (Pl. 11)⁵³
9. Ūrdhvaretas: (erect phallus) - rather common attribute, beginning with Śunga Ṛṣikeśa Śiva statue; standing pillar at Mūsānagar; and continuing on some Kuṣāṇa pieces, especially Ardhanārī examples noted by Kreisel. There is no Ardhanārī, to the best of my knowledge, in Gandhāran art dating to the Kuṣāṇa period.
10. Yajñopavīta - begins on Indian Śiva icons in pre- Kuṣāṇa period and becomes usual in the Kuṣāṇa period. See Kreisel, under *upavīta*.
11. Bull - begins to be represented as Śiva's *vāhana* in Mathura art during Kuṣāṇa times. But it is depicted on a unique example (as stated above - GMM 3340); the connection of the bull to Śaivism on B. C. tribal coins is problematic (Keisel, pp. 93 - 94).

II.2 Conclusion: Śiva's distinctive attribute which is associated with Oešo is the raised liṅga.

This comparison highlights some important findings:

- 1) only two features (the *ūrdhvaretas* and the bull,) on the Northern seals (and coins) are used in Kuṣāṇa *śaiva* iconography in the South, that is, the Indian subcontinent's conceptualization of *śaiva* art and iconography; the humped bull, however, being known also in ancient Iran could have a multivalent function⁵⁴, as do the majority of characteristics; see next;
- 2) The majority of attributes function on two levels; being multivalent they can be absorbed by both Iranian and Indian religious beliefs which can therefore depict them. The trident connotes the realm of water (associated with Oešo, though initially with Poseidon, whose bust and symbol are already found on the coinage of the Greek kings of Bactria and Indo-Scythian [Saka] coinage).⁵⁵ The trident can also evoke the *śūla* (associated with Rudra although it cannot be cited as an attribute of Śiva until the late Gupta Period).⁵⁶ The thunderbolt connoting water/ rain evocative of Zeus and held by Oešo, can also remind of the Indian *vajra*; the Zoroastrian water vessel can also suggest the Indian *kamaṇḍalu*; the Zoroastrian *kusti* equates with the Vedic sacred thread or *yajñopavīta*. The bull, though allied later with Śiva in the South, has a long, prior exposure to the west of Gandhāra (see fn. 54 above), and later on Northern coinage. Both Indo-Greeks and Indo-Scythians used the bull on their coinage where possibly it could designate their presence in South Asia⁵⁷;
- 3) The horn- held animal could reflect influence from Roman coinage according to Göbl (1984. Pl. 176; Group 19;)
- 4) Perhaps the biggest surprise is the weak correlation between the number of multiple heads and arms in Gandhāran and Indian *śaiva* forms. These two

attributes are nearly always cited by scholars as *śaivite* features in the Kuṣāṇa imagery of Oešo, but this seems not to be the case. Perhaps because these multiplicity features are a hallmark of post- Kuṣāṇa *śaiva* imagery, scholars have assumed them to be present earlier, thus superimposing them upon Oešo and then identifying him as Śiva.

III. The Nature of Oešo

In view of these results we may now assume that the deity inscribed 'Oešo' on Kaniška I coinage is Oešo and not Śiva in disguise, and also that Oešo begins to be represented on Vīma's coins since the deity on his coins is sufficiently similar to the subsequent inscribed ones.

This conclusion therefore concurs with the observation of those scholars who do not consider, based on Wīma's numismatic legend, the king to be a devotee of Śiva (see fn. 56). Reformulating therefore the main question, we now ask: "What is there in Oešo's nature that makes it appropriate to depict him with the *ūrdhvaretas*, and attributes that conform to both Zoroastrian and *śaiva* concepts.

III.1 Review of Humbach's theory of 1975

The place to begin is with Humbach's theory in print since 1975⁵⁸. Humbach's research concluded that Weš is derived from Avestan *Vaiiuš*, that is, Vayush, the Wind God in the Zoroastrian religion of Iran. Thus Bactrian Oešo on Kuṣāṇa coins and seals, pronounced Weš, (and equivalent to Middle Persian 'Way') is called 'wyšprkr' in Sogdian, (i.e. Weš-parkar; lit. Vāyu whose activity is above)⁵⁹. This explanation has been widely accepted. The Sogdian version of the *Vessantara Jātaka* (917) assigns three faces to Weš-parkar and he is depicted as such in an c.8th century Sogdian mural inscribed with his name. It would seem that Oešo's three faces on Kuṣāṇa coins, even on Vīma's coppers, are reflected in a Sogdian context.⁶⁰

Humbach made other important observations. He noted that Vāyu's three faces could visibly express the complex nature of the Wind God. The ancient Iranians formulated both a physical and a meta-physical Wind God. They venerated Vata, who personifies "the wind that blows", thus the physical wind, according to Mary Boyce ⁶¹. This deity seems to correspond to OADO on Kuṣāṇa coins ⁶². As the physical wind, he is shown, both on coins and in one known Gandhāran sculpture, with upraised hair and an inflated mantle which he holds above his head.⁶³ Quite noteworthy is that later images in Indian art retain a memory of the Wind God on Kuṣāṇa coinage and sculpture. ⁶⁴ The other Wind God, Vāyu, is more of a cosmological principle than a phenomenal power. Vāyu is the life-breath which animates living things, but abandons them at death and thereby causes death. As a result, from ancient Indo-Iranian times onward Vāyu has two aspects: "harmful" and in Yašt 15.5 beneficial.⁶⁵ Middle Iranian texts attributed Vāyu a good and bad - plus a neutral aspect ⁶⁶. Perhaps the three aspects are symbolized by the three heads.

III.2 The Vedic complement to this theory: Vedic Vāyu,

It is well known that there is also a Vedic Wind God called Vāyu. While the commonality between the Vedic and Avestan divinities is recognized, a most important shared attribute has never received sufficient attention in discussing the Oešo/Śiva problem. Vedic Vāyu may also have a good and a bad side. Vedic Vāyu's bi-polar nature may be deduced since the term *śiva* is applied to him in the Rig Veda (RV 8.26.23). The RV applies the term adjectivally. Vedic Vāyu is not identified with the deity Śiva whose divinity develops later. Vāyu has a *śiva* or auspicious nature, inviting the strong possibility that Vedic Vāyu also has an inauspicious nature. Not only is Vedic Vāyu likely to share an ambiguous nature with Avestan Vāyu but also with Rudra, the Vedic forerunner of the god Śiva. Rudra's formidable side in the

Rig Veda is *ūgra* etc. and his gracious, auspicious side is also called *śiva* as well as *mīdhvas* synonymous with *śiva*.⁶⁷ Vedic Vāyu and Rudra have additional traits in common. Vāyu, like Rudra can father the Maruts, who are storm gods (RV 1.134.4), and like Rudra (RV 2.33.2), Vedic Vāyu has healing powers, perhaps expressive of the purifying character of the wind. It should not go unnoticed that Rudra's connection to the Maruts ultimately results in Śiva's absorbing traits relating to wind, storm, rain - and ambivalency. Indeed, capacity for bi-polar action is a trait shared by high gods in the oldest stratum of the Vedic religion; this trait may reach back into Indo- Iranian times. Indeed the probability of an Indo-Iranian belief in wind having both good and bad traits which crystallized into a wind deity having a bi-polar nature has been already suggested by Jan Gonda.⁶⁸ Thus, Oešo and Śiva - to answer the reformulated question - inherit to some extent, a bi-polar nature, including an atmospheric quality of both beneficial and violent air.

III.3 An example which focuses on Oešo's benevolent side.

A Gandhāran sealing in the ur Rahman Collection may indicate the term designating the benevolent side of Oešo. The clay sealing shows a male standing frontally in a slight dehanchement posture (07.01.03; Inv. No. GKc 589; Pl.12).⁶⁹ The folds of his dhoti are seen around the legs. He holds a spear or lance in his right hand and supports what looks like an inflated bag or pouch on his left arm.⁷⁰ The seal's inscription 'muzhduwān ', in the older Bactrian 'monumental script' provides the Kuṣāṇa dating. Muzhduwān meaning 'the gracious One', is a term virtually synonymous with *śiva*⁷¹. Muzhduwān, derived from a form cognate with Vedic *mīdhvām*⁷² (on *mīdhvāmś* -, see above), may be a proper noun, or epithet of the deity Oešo (MPers. 'Way') - as discussed by Sims-Williams⁷³, and as considered a

possibility by Falk in connection with sealing no. GKc 589.⁷⁴ 'Muzhduwān', the Zoroastrian good, or gracious One is mentioned on the Rabatak Inscription describing one of the chief deities in the Kuṣāṇa pantheon. Presumably he was worshipped by the official of the Rabatak inscription, and by Kuṣāṇa rulers⁷⁵. The semantic similarity between the terms '*muzhduwān*' and '*śiva*' - and the former being a derivative of a synonym of the latter - require that we take a closer look at the image on the sealing in Pl. 12 in order to understand more about the deity termed as the good or gracious One.

The operative word here is 'good'. Whereas, in the aggregate, the trident, thunderbolt and water vessel that Oešo holds on seals and coins remind that he brings rain, these attributes refer to the result of his good aspect but they do not *per se* capture the meaning 'good' or 'gracious'. The concept 'good' or 'gracious' is however sufficiently important to appear via the term *muzhduwān* in the Rabatak inscription, and on the seal discussed above. It must be registered that *muzhduwān* also appears on a rare Kaniṣka I coin type having minimal resemblance to either seal GKc 589 (Pl. 12), or to Oešo's iconography on other coins or seals inscribed 'Oešo', or, to *śaiva* attributes in the Kuṣāṇa art of Mathura⁷⁶. Since this *muzhduwān* figure does not show typical *śaiva* markers, these rare coins do not enter the current discussion whose fundamental aim is to understand why 'Oešo' inscribed images are represented with *śaiva* markers, and multivalent (i.e. Hindu and Zoroastrian) attributes.

The identity of the figure on sealing Inv. No. GKc 589 (Pl. 12) is largely contingent upon the hand-held attributes. The spear or lance recalls both the trident handle and the *śūla*, thus an emblem probably within the domains of Oešo (via Poseidon) and Rudra/Śiva.⁷⁷ The formless object resting on his left arm is more likely to be an inflated pouch than a bird (see fn. 70). A bird

has somewhat greater definition on Gandhāran seals and is not quite as bloated as the object resting on the figure's left arm. ⁷⁸ It would be easy to think of an air bag resting on the arm of the *muzhduwān* Wind God. But Tanabe in a paper on imagery of Wind Gods states that "Classical, Roman and Kushan wind gods have no wind-bag" ⁷⁹ He finds no iconographic influence from the Greek myth of Aiolos and his bag of winds upon Central Asian art and beyond (via Kuṣāṇa imagery). This finding makes the 'air bag' proposal weak unless one could detect this attribute in the imagery of a pre-or- post Kuṣāṇa Wind God from the Northwest. To date, a wind bag cannot be found. Another possibility has greater promise. The inflated shape on the arm of Muzhduwān on seal Inv. No. GKc 589 is very much like the shape found in a scene on an embossed silver dish perhaps from the Dehra Ismail Khan district of the Punjab; the dish is dated to the third or fourth century A.D. (Pl. 14). ⁸⁰ The scene is described as a drinking scene and the shapeless item is identified as a wineskin. But a skin need not only contain wine; today in the Northwest, skins inflated with water can be used to navigate or cross a river. Presumably skins could contain water in antiquity as well. If then Muzhduwān on sealing Inv. No. GKc 589 were holding a pouch or skin filled with water, the notion of 'good or 'gracious' could easily refer to Oešo's function as bringer of water. It would make perfect sense in a Northwestern context that the Zoroastrian libation vessel held by Oešo on some coins and seals is converted, in this instance, to its Gandhāran equivalent, namely a skin containing water, which 'the gracious One' could hold as bringer of (rain) water. I understand *muzhduwān* in this instance to refer to the good aspect of the Wind God Oešo (or Weš), and propose that Kuṣāṇa sealing Inv. No. GKc 589 shows the good aspect of the Wind God holding (possibly) the handle of a trident or a *śūla*, and a water bag.

If it is accepted that the iconography and inscription on sealing GKc 589 highlights, by way of a term and attribute, the good aspect of Oešo, then it means that the good aspect was sufficiently significant to adherents to warrant representation. One needs to ask how the concept 'good', defining Oešo, could be represented on seals and coins solely in a visual manner - without recourse to a term (an adjective or noun). None of the other seals and sealings discussed above carry a term signifying 'good'. The only term on most of the Kuṣāṇa coins and seals described above is 'Oešo', the name of the deity. It is also worth remembering that no previous Iranian iconography for Oešo existed. As will be explained below, Oešo's depiction on Kuṣāṇa pieces is an invention composed of visual symbols which could be understood in the areas where the pieces circulated. I have concluded that Oešo's liṅga is a visual metaphor, working as a 'text'; that is, it says something without using words. Oešo's 'liṅga' conveys a meaning other than the actual depicted penis. I have concluded that Oešo's raised liṅga predicates 'goodness'. Here are the steps leading to my conclusion:

1. The raised phallus (and the bull, to a lesser extent) are the main Kuṣāṇa iconographic markers on Oešo coming from the domain of Śiva. On the Vedic significance of 'liṅga' please see Appendix I, No. 4; it does not apply to seal GKc 589.
2. What is there in the nature of Oešo that makes it appropriate for him to have a raised phallus. First, it is noteworthy that the majority of Oešo's iconography has meaning in both the Indian and Iranian contexts.
3. Next, on the Iranian (or Avestan) side, the Wind God, Vayush, has a good/bad & a neutral side in Middle Iranian texts.
- 4a. A particular term is used specifically to describe the good or gracious side of Vayush. That term, 'muzhduwān' is cognate with a Vedic term applied to Rudra - forerunner of Śiva, and importantly, that term is semantically similar to the adjective 'śiva'.

4b. Next, one has to ask if the 'good' side of the Wind God is to be visually represented what symbol could be adopted for this purpose on Kuṣāṇa seals and coins.

5. To continue, if '*muzhduwān*' has a similar meaning to '*śiva*', and if the god representing the '*śiva*' quality is Śiva whose most discreet symbol is his raised phallus, then- I propose - the raised phallus can likewise be the symbol used for Oešo in his '*muzhduwān*' nature.

6. The raised phallus on Oešo is a visual metaphor used to refer to the '*muzhduwān*' nature of the Zoroastrian Wind God, whose iconography was being formulated during the period under discussion.

7. As to the multiple arms, I indicate below, that this feature is unlikely to come from the *śaivite* sector.

I am not saying that Oešo with the erect phallus was identified as Śiva. I agree with Humbach who has declared in his EJVS 2014 paper that Oešo with Śiva's attribute is not meant to be Śiva; he states "it makes sure that the characteristics of Śiva were to a large extent characteristics of the Iranian Vaiiu in non-orthodox traditions of the Iranian religion" ⁸¹. The common denominator accounting for their shared characteristics, I propose, is twofold: a similar ambiguous nature - referred to by similar terms, and, a similar connection to atmospheric wind. In consequent these similarities could assist in peeling off iconographic symbols from the *śaiva* god (which, in the main, mirror meaning in the Zoroastrian religion), and attach them to the other god whose anthropomorphic representations were being newly formulated. The totality of Oešo's iconography, including the *śaiva* signs, are a visual compendium emphasizing - with clarity- the goodness and graciousness of an Iranian/ Zoroastrian god having no previous visual record.

III.4 Inventing Oešo's Iconography

Zoroastrianism, as is well - known, was initially aniconic. Eventually the deities of this religion were depicted by adopting iconographies from the art of other cultures whose symbolism could interface with Zoroastrian beliefs. In our analysis of the seven seals and sealings in the ur Rahman Collection, the arts of the Greek, Roman, Hellenistic and Greater Indian spheres are found to have had a defining influence on the Northwestern imagery of Oešo on Kuṣāṇa coins, seals and carvings. Whereas the authoritative work on the chronological and interlinked progression of these sources has yet to be written, a synthesis is building. In the paper Fabrizio Sinisi delivered at the 2010 European Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Vienna, he isolated - drawing and building upon the prior works of Göbl and Callieri - the three major sources for imagery on Kuṣāṇa coins and seals and the routes by which the sources entered Greater India . As the paper is still unpublished, details and examples will await its publication, but the sources can be summarized as coming from Rome, from Iran (via the Śakas, Parthians and the Indo-Parthians), and from the subcontinent itself. I would add that the subcontinent offered symbolism and iconography from Brahmanism and also from Hellenism since artisans trained in the Classical tradition were still active in Pre-Kuṣāṇa urban centers located in Gandhāra, as for example, at Barikot, Swat ⁸². Artistic interplay from these national and international areas of influence had an important affect upon Gandhāran art especially in devising depictions where no prior artistic conventions existed. Another example can be cited in an analysis I did on the iconographic sources impacting a Gandhāran Buddhist relief. I found that influences from Rome and Parthia (especially Palmyrene art) converged to invent the image of grieving Māyā at her son's Parinirvāṇa, at a time when Indian art had no funerary precedents for representing a mourning Queen.⁸³ In the volume 'On the Cusp of an Era' (see fn. 82) more examples

come to the fore. Multiple arms of Oešo should have come from Brahmanic art of India though the source is unlikely to have been *śaiva* art. If only one Kuṣāṇa example - from c. 2nd century A.D. Mathura - of a four-armed Śiva sculpture is known to date (Pl. 11), it probably did not stimulate the appearance of four-armed Oešo beginning with Kaniška I coins and seals. Viṣṇu and other *vaiṣṇava* deities were more commonly depicted with four arms. Future research may wish to investigate a possible *Vaiṣṇava* source. Already the above noted Huviška gold coin, inscribed 'Oešo' has the god holding a wheel which ought to have a connection to Vaiṣṇavism. Another four-armed god, on a Bactrian inscribed seal of the 4th - 5th century, is being worshipped by an Iranian nobleman whose clothing and tiara suggest his Central Asian origin (a Sasanian or Sogdian, perhaps)⁸⁴. This seal, an agate gem from The British Museum (Acc. No. 1892. 11- 3.98) indicates the need for further exploration into the *vaiṣṇava* influence. The seal also anticipates the possible role that later Iranians played in continuing earlier iconographic and religious traditions eastward, across Asia (see below) ⁸⁵.

IV. Post-Kuṣāṇa Conflation of elements pertaining to both deities

The conceptual linkage I am postulating between Oešo and Śiva - foundation for Oešo's adoption of *śaiva* attributes - was already noticed by Humbach. He described in his 1975 paper, textual passages in which a series of gods are named ⁸⁶. Specifically, two Sogdian texts of Buddhist content cite a list of equivalences. In a passage added to the Vessantara Jātaka the god Wešparker is "paralleled to Mahādeva the current name of Śiva." ⁸⁷ In another Sogdian Buddhist text (P 8. 41 - 42), their equivalency is corroborated. Soon after Humbach published his groundbreaking philological analyses, visual evidence confirmed his findings. Fragments of Sogdian wall paintings from Panjikent have been recognized as portraying Wešparker with *śaiva* characteristics. Now comes exciting new testimony from Dunhuang. It

also takes cognizance of a linkage between the Wind God and Śiva. ⁸⁸ Whereas Panjikent continues the innovation started in the Kuṣāṇa Period, showing Oešo with some features that relate to Śiva, here in a mid-6th century cave at Dunhuang, Śiva and the Wind God are united into one image.

“Cave 285 of the Mogao Grottoes was completed around 539 CE”, writes Zhang Yuanlin who has published an analysis of murals on the western wall that depict what appear to be Hindu images in a Buddhist cave. ⁸⁹ He refers to them as three guardian deities, namely Maheśvara, Āditya and Candara, the Sun and Moon deities; these are the subject of his analysis. However, there are other ‘Hindu-like’ representations in this cave that do not receive as full an analysis. Zhang notices Nārāyaṇa and his family - which includes Indra - as well as members of Maheśvara’s family. These other Hindu-like representations need further research.

It is important to dwell on the author’s entire description of Śiva’s portrayal - here at the eastern most terminal of the Silk Road - which reflects knowledge of purāṇic Śiva (Pl. 15 a & b). [Oešo’s *śaiva* iconography on the Kuṣāṇa coins, seals and sculptures is of course pre- purāṇic]. It is best to quote Mr. Zhang who is (among other appointments) Research Fellow at the Dunhuang Academy and whose description therefore is based on on-site inspection.

The image of six-armed Maheśvara is crowned and is “the only example at Dunhuang from the period of the Northern Dynasties (420 - 589 CE). He wears a hide skirt and sits on a blue bull in lalitāsana (half-lotus position). We can see his three faces: the central one looks dignified like a guardian, the right one looks elegant like a Bodhisattva, while the left one looks very ferocious like a yakṣa. His two upper arms hold the sun and the moon respectively. The right arm in the middle seems to hold a bell and the left

one seems to hold a short arrow. The lower two hands are in front of the chest, with something like a bow in the right one, while an indistinct object is in the left. Below are images of his two sons, Kumāra who looks like a child and Vināyaka, the Hindu god Ganeśa who has an elephant head and a human body. And correspondingly, on the lowest register are. ..two of the four Guardian Kings".⁹⁰

The description - mentioning the bull, a hide dhoti, differentiation of the three heads with Aghora to the left side and a peaceful face to the right, plus (as stated elsewhere) three eyes, erect penis ⁹¹, and the appearance of the two sons - verifies that it must be Śiva who is depicted. It is thus of considerable interest that the image in the crown is unique and not part of Śiva's usual iconography. Indeed Zhang states, after having duly registered images of Śiva across Central Asia, "no similar example has been found outside India except in Cave 285". ⁹² In 1997 Sasaki Ritsuko identified the figure in Śiva's crown as a wind god. She determined that the depiction is that of a non-Han male holding in his two arms both sides of an inflated bag (or scarf).⁹³ The non- Chinese features of the male in the crown can still be made out (Pls. 16 & 17). There is precedent in Central Asia for the wind god with both devices, bag and scarf. His inflated overhead scarf can be seen at Kizil Cave 38, at Dunhuang Cave 249 and, as mentioned above, on Kuṣāṇa coins and in one known Gandhāran sculpture where OADO is pictured this way⁹⁴. An inflated bag full of water as proposed for the Kuṣāṇa Muzhduwān seal (Pl 12; Inv. No. GKc 589), has additional precedents. According to Tanabe's investigations, a wind-bag or pouch would have much greater validity at a site such as Dunhuang. He states that Chinese wind gods of the sixth century almost always carried a wind - bag in their arms. Tanabe goes on to make a most thought-provoking supposition: the wind-bags depicted in Chinese and Dunhuang art might have been derived from the winebags of

Central Asian wine- sellers visiting China where they would have originated in the late 5th - early 6th century. ⁹⁵

What is to be deduced from a 6th century wall painting at Dunhuang representing Śiva crowned with the Wind God ? To date this is a unique combination which cannot be extrapolated from the purāṇic mythology of Śiva. And yet the sons of Śiva seated below him do demonstrate an awareness of developments in purāṇic lore. One thinks immediately of the progressive linkages between Oešo and Śiva - which I have espoused - achieving here visual fruition. And yet, the image in the crown does not resemble Oešo, nor Muzhduwān on Kuṣāṇa coins and seals, nor the Sogdian Wešparker, though it does roughly recall the Kuṣāṇa Wind God OADO. The fusion of Wind God and Śiva is remarkable. Somehow the gods' ancient commonalities based on bi-polarism and atmospheric wind have surfaced here. The iconic blend results from the interplay of numerous modules relating to Hinduism and Zoroastrianism without directly imitating any one. This characteristic - to combine characteristics from several cultures and to assemble them in new ways by artists familiar with Hindu and Zoroastrian traditions- pertains, according to Zhang, to the Sun and Moon Deities as well. He notices that artists blended these foreign traditions with Chinese Buddhist symbols (a merging already apparent in the Wind God's pouch, discussed above).

Whoever created or patronized these images in Cave 285 should have had some exposure to Hinduism, to Zoroastrianism and to Indian and Chinese Buddhism of the early sixth century. Zhang postulates, with excellent reasoning, that the most likely candidates are the Sogdians who "participated in the construction of other caves at Mogao." ⁹⁶ The suggestion invites further investigation, which in the light of the present demonstration, holds considerable promise. Lokesh Chandra likewise sees the presence of Central Asian, thus non- Chinese, artists working in this

cave.⁹⁷ Additional research may find evidence that Sogdians not only worshipped Wešparker but also kept alive an equivalency between him and Śiva which could result in the Dunhuang fused image. Incentive to investigate further comes from the words of the c. 6th century Chinese text, the Liang-ching-hsin-chi. It mentions the “Hu” people, that is, the Sogdians and their beliefs. Mode, quoting Eichhorn, renders the passage as follows: “The Iranian (Hu) god of the sky of the Western Countries is the one called Mo-hsi-shou-lo (Maheśvara) in Buddhist Sutras.”⁹⁸ Should we understand here that the Zoroastrian God on High, (i.e. Vāyu), is the one called Śiva in (some?) Buddhist Sūtras? I believe so.

Thus far we have concentrated on evidence demonstrating how Śiva left his mark- or his sign (liṅga) - on the Wind God and we have followed this engagement from the Kuṣāṇas to the Sogdians’ Central Asian lands and ultimately to the border of China where Sogdian presence can be documented in the vicinity of Dunhuang as early as the 4th century.⁹⁹ The reverse, Oešo’s iconography going southward from Gandhāra during the Kuṣāṇa era and influencing Śiva’s depiction, seems also to be happening. Indicative of *śaiva* iconographic readiness to absorb Oešo’s markers is attested on a relief housed in the Peshawar Museum (Pl. 18; No. 850). Oešo’s attributes are held by an ithyphallic male who we know is meant to be Śiva. The figure’s identity is secure because he appears together with other Brahmanic (e.g. Skanda/Kārttikeya, Brahmā or a Brahman) and Buddhist (e.g. a Buddha) deities who are emanating from a Bodhisattva.¹⁰⁰ The trident and vase, attributes of Oešo, (but absent in contemporary Mathura *śaiva* imagery), are held by the male figure. In this context it is unlikely that the figure is Oešo. Why would the Zoroastrian Wind God be in the company of Hindu and Buddhist deities, and project from a Bodhisattva? This Peshawar relief forecasts the possibility that absorptions of Oešo’s multivalent attributes could affect India’s *śaiva* iconography. The several

anomalous Gandhāran statues described at the outset of this paper may owe their unusualness to being early Northwestern Śiva icons heavily influenced by Oešo's iconography. Perhaps the uniqueness and distinctiveness of the standing Śiva-s from Gandhāra (Pl.1 in the Berlin Asian Art Museum, Rome's Museo Nazionale d'Arte Orientale, and Pl. 2 formerly in the Sherrier Collection) are to be explained as being in the forefront of absorbing aspects of Oešo's iconography. But, unlike the small Śiva emanating from a Bodhisattva in the Peshawar Museum relief (Pl. 18), there is no context for these Gandhāran statues so we cannot be absolutely sure that they represent Śiva and not Oešo.

It seems a fallacy to think that Kuṣāṇa Oešo/Śiva imagery was confined strictly to Gandhāra; it travelled southward as well. An example is provided by an impression from the same seal as the one excavated at Sari Dheri (Charsadda, near Peshawar, Pakistan), depicting Oešo/Śiva on a Kuṣāṇa token which was also found at Sanghol (in Punjab, India).¹⁰¹ Whereas the lack of corroboration between North and South śaiva imagery in the Kuṣāṇa period has been stated at the outset, post-Kuṣāṇa imagery now needs to be considered. Were post-Kuṣāṇa Śiva icons from Mathura, and other sites above the Vindhya affected by Gandhāran influence?

In order to explain a few iconographic developments in post- Kuṣāṇa śaiva art, the trend towards incorporating Oešo's markers into Śiva imagery is postulated. There are indicators that Oešo's main attributes affected Śiva's imagery in the Gangetic area (see below) and beyond. To prepare for what follows, the trident and vase regularly seen with Oešo on Kaniṣka I coins and seals, and possibly already on Vīma Kadphises' issues (e.g. 07.01. 08; Inv. No. Gkc 416; Pl. 3) will become a rather common feature in Śiva's Gupta Hindu iconography.

Gandhāran influences further south do not reverse the pivotal role of the Mathura School in establishing the foundation of Indian iconography. Almost

axiomatic is that the Mathura School gave definition to classical Hindu iconography. Whereas this School certainly invented many forms that developed into the later classical norms, in some cases, the post-Kuṣāṇa developments showed modifications stemming from Gandhāra. The case of Śiva's anthropomorphic imagery exhibits such modification ¹⁰² Figures of this god begin to adopt attributes regularly seen on the few Kuṣāṇa Gandhāran Śiva images, and on Kuṣāṇa Oešo coins and seals. Foremost are the trident and the vase, important attributes in Oešo's arsenal.¹⁰³ A late 4th century relief of Śiva and Pārvatī from Kausambi shows the ithyphallic god holding the water vessel in one of his two hands. He has the ascetic locks and third eye and wears, according to Härtel, a dhoti or else a lion skin, a possibility not cited by Williams. ¹⁰⁴ (Of course, the lion skin could hark back to Heracles' attribute, but the skin and the lion already appear in pre-Kuṣāṇa *śaivite* art, as noted above). From the same site comes another standing four-armed Śiva, with jaṭāmukuṭa, the third eye and ūrdhvaretas; he holds the water pot in one hand and the trident in another ¹⁰⁵. The bull in back of Oešo is found on Kuṣāṇa coins and the seals; he occurs with Śiva in a pre-Gupta statue from Mathura (Mathura Museum No. 3340 ¹⁰⁶) and in the previously mentioned Akhun Dheri relief, of c. 3rd- 4th century AD.¹⁰⁷) Around the 5th century, the bull is often added in statuary: Mathura has a Śiva standing with Pārvatī before Vṛṣa ¹⁰⁸; at Samalaji, ithyphallic Śiva, with jaṭāmukuṭa, four arms, three eyes, stands before Vṛṣa holding the trident and wearing a lion skin ¹⁰⁹. These same elements (plus others) are seen in a 5th century Rajasthani sculpture; here an animal skin is wrapped around the god's thighs. ¹¹⁰ The skin is still seen in a giant 6th century Śiva stele from Mandasor Fort where the god holds the trident. ¹¹¹ The intermittent appearance of the lion skin worn by Śiva is another feature occasionally seen on Kuṣāṇa coins ¹¹². Whereas the lion is not worn by him

in works related to the Mathura School, the lion does appear by the side of Śiva or at the base of a Śiva liṅga. ¹¹³ Lastly, in a relief reputedly from the Idar region of Gujarat where the Śakas of the Northwest settled, Śiva holds the trident.

V. Conclusions

The trend I am outlining needs further, fuller consideration for post - Gupta times. The above survey of trends in Śiva's iconic development and its relationship to the Oešo/Śiva puzzle on Kuṣāṇa coins and seals does permit several provisional conclusions:

1) According to my analysis, the so-called Oešo/Śiva figure on the reverse of Kuṣāṇa coinage is to be identified as Oešo. The god's attributes have, for the most part, multivalent significance. The iconographic elements that bespeak of Śiva, particularly the ūrdhvaretas (perhaps less so the bull), are likely to call attention to the gracious, aspect of the Wind God (who possesses, like Śiva, the opposite aspect as well).

2) When in the past some of Oešo's attributes on Kuṣāṇa coins and seals have been interpreted as śaiva markers (especially multiple arms and heads, the trident and the vase), scholars have in fact superimposed later (i.e. post-Kuṣāṇa) Śiva attributes upon the depictions of Oešo 's Gandhāran images and called him 'Śiva'!

3) The initial formulation of Śiva's purāṇic image in the subcontinent, dating to the Gupta ages, includes salient features from Gandhāran imagery. The process accounting for the development of Śiva's Hindu iconography during the Gupta Age is strikingly similar to the process accounting for Śri-Lakṣmī's Gupta imagery. Her representations and those of Śiva showcase some attributes that stem from the Northwest. Some of these remain while others

cease as these gods' depictions become more complex and more stable during and after the post-Gupta Period. In the final formation of Hindu art, Gandhāra seems to have played a role. Its extent needs to receive greater recognition and further analysis.

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 220th Meeting of the American Oriental Society in St. Louis, March 15, 2010. I wish to thank Nicholas Sims-Williams for reading the paper with a view to alerting me to any incorrect citations to Iranian sources. Should any remain, it is my own doing. I am pleased to acknowledge Joe Cribb's helpful observations for both the conference presentation and this paper, and Fabrizio Sinisi's comments on this paper and generously sharing with me his unpublished Vienna presentation. Katsumi Tanabe gave valuable insights. I thank Michael Witzel and Oskar von Hinüber for their comments on the problematic legend found on Wima Kadphises' gold coins. I appreciate the permission given by Aman ur Rahman to present, in St. Louis, the photos of seals, sealings and tokens from his Collection. Those photos are now used in this paper. When in early 2008 Mr. ur Rahman invited me to work on his Collection, he gave me a set of photos he made of his seal collection. He did this because he asked me to study the iconography of his seals. In the meantime, the seals that I was asked to study (and are used here) have been published in 2011 by Mr. ur Rahman and Harry Falk (see fn. 20). His invitation kindled my interest in studying early seals from the Gandhāran region. This interest has resulted in the publication of three articles of which this is the third. The other two are in *South Asian Studies* (Vol. 26. 1; 2010; 77 -95) and *Annali* (Vol. 71; 2011; 115 - 136).

APPENDIX I :

Demonstration for the Pre-Puranic theological belief that five-headedness represents the Śiva Reality and thus underlies all śaiva cephalic multiplicity renderings

Some scholars may have difficulty in accepting the theoretical primacy of Śiva's fiveheadedness, whether or not shown explicitly in the art (for example, Hans Bakker in *Artibus Asiae* , Vol. 58, No.3/4; 1999, 339–342). However the basis for the theological belief in a fivefold Śiva Reality underlying all *śaiva* iconic forms can be traced from the Vedic texts onwards. As the last sentence makes clear, fivefoldedness is a theological statement and the form, a Pañcamukha Liṅga is its visual expression. A Pañcamukha Liṅga is thus not a form taken by Śiva to demonstrate his powers to his worshippers. It is, rather, an intermediate form taken by the Śiva Reality as the divinity moves from the transcendental realm to the realm of man for his benefit and adoration. [For this reason, the Tilottamā episode in the Mahābhārata (I. 203. 21 - 26) is not part of the analysis of Fivefold Śiva].

The demonstration:

1. The doyen of the Dutch Indological School, Jan Gonda, starts his discussion on the five 'faces' of Śiva by noting that the names first occur in the tenth book of the Taittirīya Araṇyaka, named the Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad which he conjectures could date to the 3rd century B.C. (Gonda, p. 42 and fns. 103 & 104). The names given in the Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad are: Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva, Aghora, Tatpuruṣa and Īśana.

2. I discuss at length the Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad in Chapter 10 of my book *Many Heads* (see especially pp. 119 - 123). A series of mantras which can be called the Rudra Litany (unfolding of the Supreme Deity) indicate how Rudra-Śiva evolved from formlessness to apprehensible form. The intermediate stage is the subtle body of god, which is five-faced. Right after the five individual names are given as cited above, the next verse (286) states "He. ..is indeed Sadāśiva".

3. B.N. Sharma provides the only iconographic study on Sadāśiva. Herein he works with the proposition that Sadāśiva is fiveheaded Śiva, represented as a full figure or a Pañcamukhaliṅga. A perusal of the images Sharma includes in his monograph shows that in addition to Pañcamukha Liṅgas, he includes Caturmukha Liṅgas, three-headed busts, three-headed full figures, four-headed full figures and five-headed full figures. He accepts the theory that three headed and four headed forms when rendered in a relief are to be understood as Sadāśiva. Sharma cites the 15th century iconographic text, the Rūpamaṇḍana (IV 92 - 94; see his fn. 7) which states that the fifth face (of Īśana) is beyond the ken of even the Yogīs and is therefore not generally shown. It can simply be represented by the dome of the Caturmukhaliṅga (Sharma pp. 2 -3).

4. My paper "Ritual as Icon" confirms the significance of the Pañcamukha Liṅga as indicated in the Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad and insinuates how this intermediate stage is to be understood. The five levels of the Agnicayana brick altar are constructed by means of a ritual named the Agnicayana ritual. In each of the five layers, group of bricks called the mukha (head) bricks are placed. There are five mukha bricks in each layer and they are laid down in a specific pattern. The mukha bricks initiate a series of bricks laid down immediately after to continue building the altar. Importantly, five aṅga or limb bricks come right after the mukha bricks and they are placed in close proximity to the mukha bricks. A unit is formed. That unit (mukha and aṅga)

appears to be the beginning of 'a body' in the process of 'becoming' or 'forthcoming'. The anthropomorphic entity evoked in the rite is Rudra, Śiva's Vedic forerunner. Indeed, at the completion of the building of the altar a chant to Rudra is offered.

If we combine the meaning of mukha (+ aṅga) as derived from the Agnicayana ritual, with the Vedic significance of liṅga (the first, undifferentiated, ethereal sign of the Godhead), then the meaning of mukhaliṅga, specifically 'pañcamukhaliṅga, becomes apparent: A mukhaliṅga seems to symbolize the theological belief in the forthcoming manifestation of the transcendental Śiva Reality. Specifically, a pañcamukhaliṅga is an icon representing the first part of the body of Śiva projecting out of his own cosmic essence (the Liṅga). These definitions ally themselves with the theological beliefs in the śaiva Āgamas. I discuss specific āgamaic texts in great details in two papers ("Śaiva Temple Forms: Loci of God's Unfolding Body" in *Investigating Indian Art*, Berlin 1987; and "From Transcendancy to Materiality: Para Śiva, Sadāśiva and Maheśa in Indian Art", *Artibus Asiae*, Vol. L, 1/2, 1990). Both papers, available in scholarly publications, pre-date my monograph *Many Heads* etc. and are summarized in my monograph. In addition, both papers have been reprinted in my anthology, *Listening to Icons, Vol. I, Indian Iconographic and Iconological Studies*, New Delhi, 2016.

In sum, the ancients understood divine manifestation by analogy. Rudra-Śiva moves towards manifestation as a baby moves towards birth: the head projects first.

5. It remains to cite images associated with the Pañcamukha concept . The excellent paper by Maxwell, "The Five Aspects of Śiva in Theory, Iconography and Architecture" is a good place to start. He summarizes the

remarks in the Taittirīya Aranyaka and in the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa (3. 48. 1 - 8) on the fivefold nature of Śiva. Then he cites the following icons: Five-faced Śiva in the Trilokanātha Temple, Mandi; Five-bodied Śiva in the Pañcavaktra Temple, Maṇḍi; Pañcāyatana Śiva-Liṅga (in the National Museum, New Delhi); Pañcāyatana – Caturmukha -Liṅga from Kalyānpur. The program on the face of two Śiva Temples ends his demonstration. To these I can add earlier examples: The Bhita Pañcamukha Liṅga; The following examples from Gerd Kreisel (*Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mathura Kunst*, Stuttgart, 1986): Full Figure: Abb. 67 a- c (GMM E 12) where V.S. Agrawala finds the possible trace of a fifth head on top and depressed (A *Catalogue of the Brahmanical Images in Mathura Art*, Lucknow, 1951; p. 25); differentiated heads on a Caturmukha Liṅga, where the central liṅga dome represents the fifth head are in Abb. 57,58, 59, 60, 61, 62. For Full figured differentiated four-headed Śiva around a central Liṅga, see Abb 66. Numerous miniature paintings from the former hill stations of North India depict Śiva with five heads (See Sharma; Pls. XX - XXV).

I shall end by quoting the doyen of Indian art history, Stella Kramrisch, and thus bracket my demonstration by placing it between the thoughts of two great scholars in the field of Indology and art history. In her famous analysis of the three-headed so- called Śiva “bust” (see “the Great Cave Temple of Śiva in Elephants: Levels of Meaning and Their Form” in *Discourses on Śiva*, ed. Michael W. Meister Philadelphia, 1984), Kramrisch writes:

This colossal sculpture confronts the devotee who enters from the north. It is meant to be seen only from the front. Its back is inaccessible, and darkness merges with the plane of the ground. While the fourth head of this Pañcamukha liṅga is not represented, it is postulated by the three visible

heads. The fifth head, suggesting Śiva's transcendency, also is absent here as on most of the Pañcamukha liṅgas carved in the round. (p. 4)

PLATE CAPTIONS

Plate 1. Śiva. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (Museum for Asiatic Art, Berlin) Photograph courtesy Staatliche Museen zu Berlin-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin.

Plate 2 Śiva. Gandhāra. Probably Kuṣāṇa Period. Formerly from the Julian Sherrier Collection. Photocopy courtesy Julian Sherrier.

Plate 3. Clay token. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01. 08; Inv. No. GKc 416). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 4. Garnet ring-bezel seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.09; Inv. No. GKg xx 19). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 5. Bronze statuette of Heracles. Afghanistan. c. 2nd century B.C. (Private Chicago Collection.) Photo after Catalogue De l'Indus a l'Oxus. Archéologie de l'Asie Centrale, 2003; Fig. 89.

Plate 6. Bronze double-hoop-handled seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.12; Inv. No. GKm 805). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 7A and 7B. Huviṣka gold stater. Obverse and reverse. Photo courtesy Joe Cribb.

Plate 8. Clay sealing with auspicious symbols. Gandhāran (ur Rahman Collection 15.03.07; Inv.No. GKc 401). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 9. Quartz seal pendant. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.10; Inv. No. GKg 010). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 10. Agate seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.07; Inv.No.GKg 001). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 11. . Maheśa in front of Liṅga. Mathura. Kuṣāṇa Period. Photograph after A.K. Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, (New York 1927; reprint 1965. Fig. 68).

Plate 12. Clay sealing. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.03; Inv. No. GKc 589). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 13. White crystal seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection GK g 048). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman.

Plate 14. Silver Dish. Found in the Dehra Ismail Khan district, Punjab. Third - Fourth century A.D. Photo after O.M. Dalton, *The Treasure of the Oxus*; Third Edition, London 1964; Pl.XXXIII.

Plate 15A. Dunhuang. Interior of the Mogao Cave 285 - West Wall.

Plate 15B. Dunhuang. Interior of the Mogao Cave 285 - Section of Maheśvara and his Family

Plate 16. Dunhuang. Interior of the Mogao Cave 285. Figure in the Crown on the head of Maheśvara

Plate 17. Sketch by Inez Konczak of figure in the Crown on the head of Maheśvara

Plate 18: Six figures emanating from a Bodhisattva. Śiva is in the middle of left side. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. Peshawar Museum 850. Photograph courtesy Christian Luczanits.

¹ Doris M. Srinivasan, "Vedic Rudra-Śiva", *JAOS* 103.3 (1983); 543 - 556

2. Pierfrancesco Callieri, *Seals and Sealings from the North-West of the Indian Subcontinent and Afghanistan (4th Century BC - 11th century AD)*. Naples 1997; page 270.

³ To clarify, I am not saying that these forms are unknown in the Northwest. They are known. For example, see Ibrahim Shah, "Some *Mukhaliṅgas* in the Pakistani Collections ", *Pakistan Heritage* Vol. I (2009). 87 - 91. General observations are by S.R. Dar, "The Earliest Known Hindu Sculpture from Lahore now in the Lahore Museum" *Lahore Museum Bulletin*, Vol. III. 1990, 29 - 42. Plates I - VI. Also note a Liṅga inscription with an etched liṅga dating according to the author between 4th and 6th Century AD, in M. Nasim Khan, *Treasures from Kashmir Smast* (the earliest Śaiva Monastic Establishment), Peshawar, 2006; page 99. My point is that all three forms are not found at the same site at the same time prior to the 4th century, as for example is the case at Mathura. See Gerd Kreisel, *Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mathura - Kunst*, Stuttgart; his plates 6,7,8 (for liṅga icons); 13,14,15 (for Mukhaliṅga icons); 66,67 (for mūrtis emanating from the liṅga). As all these three forms are not found at any one Gandhāran site at the same time, it is difficult to assume that the Kuṣāṇa Gandhāran śaiva icons express the same theological beliefs as the Mathura ones.

⁴ The best surveys for early śaiva sculptures (excluding coins) probably are G. Kreisel, *Śiva Bildwerke*, Gritli von Mitterwallner " Evolution of the Liṅga", my own, "Significance and Scope of Pre- Kuṣāṇa Śaivite Iconography" and N.P. Joshi, Early Forms of Śiva ", all three are in Michael W. Meister (ed.), *Discourses on Śiva*, Philadelphia; 1984 pp. 12 - 31; 32 - 46; 47 - 61, respectively plus Plates; Laura Giuliano, "Studies in early Śaiva iconography: (1) the origin of the *triśūla* and some related problems". *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 10; Kamakura 2004, 51 - 96; Madhuvanti Ghose, *The Origins and Development of Anthropomorphic Indian Iconography* [PhD Thesis submitted to SOAS], 2002;. See also Doris Meth Srinivasan, "Hindu Deities in Gandhāran Art" in *Gandhāra. The Buddhist Heritage of Pakistan. Legends, Monasteries and Paradise*. Mainz, 2008; pp. 130 - 134 and catalogue illustrations. On the overall distinctiveness between Gandhāran and Mathura śaiva sculpture, see Doris Meth Srinivasan, *Many Heads, Arms and Eyes. Origin, Meaning and Form of Multiplicity in Indian Art*, Leiden 1997; pp. 267 - 271.

⁵ Illustrated in Ghose, *Anthropomorphic. .. Iconography* 2. 34/5; 2.36, 2. 37; also see Giuliano, " *triśūla* " Fig. 1.

⁶ Note that Śiva holds a short neck vessel in his right hand on a pillar panel in the Muktādevī Temple, Mūsānagar. See illustration in Srinivasan, " Pre-Kuṣāṇa Śaivite Iconography"; Pl 30. Perhaps it represents a *kamaṇḍalu*, which is usually different from a Persian vessel (see below).

⁷ Already the post-Kuṣāṇa standing Śiva in the Peshawar Museum (No. PM -3017 [0682 and M676] has other distinctions, namely six arms and a hand-held vajra or thunderbolt. See Catalogue No. 110 in *Gandhāra*.

⁸ The several iconographic overviews are by Joe Cribb, "Shiva images on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian Coins ", *Studies in Silk Road Coins and Culture*, eds. Katsumi Tanabe, Joe Cribb, Helen Wang; Kamakura 1997 pp. 11 - 66; Robert Bracey, "The Coinage of Vīma Kadphises", *Gandhāran Studies* 3, 2009; Peshawar 25 -74; John Perkins, " Three - Headed Śiva on the Reverse of Vīma Kadphises's Copper Coinage ", *South Asian Studies* Vol. 23, 2007; 31 - 37. Robert Göbl, *System und Chronologie der Münzprägung des Kuṣānreiches*, Wien 1984, offers the superb foundation for the above overviews.

⁹ Cribb ("Shiva Images", p. 13; # 2), lists a few exceptions minted by Vīma Kadphises.

¹⁰ A coin ascribed to Vīma Takto, thus before Vīma Kadphises, has according to Falk the image of Oešo on the reverse. See Aman ur Rahman and Harry Falk, *Seals Sealings and Tokens from Gandhāra*, Ludwig Reichert Verlag (Band 21 der Reihe Monographien zur Indischen Archaologie, Kunst und Philologie); Wiesbaden 2011; page 220; Fig. 53.

¹¹ See Kreisel, *Śiva - Bildwerke*, p. 217; Abb. 73. The fragment shows a small round water pot on the left hip.

¹² Srinivasan, "Pre- Kuṣāṇa Śaivite Iconography", page 35; Plate 23.

¹³ Kreisel, *Śiva - Bildwerke*, pages 215 - 216; Abb. 70.

¹⁴ Theological belief in the five-headedness of all śaiva cephalic renderings is an important concept in śaiva religion and art. In the present context, it is necessary to understand that this concept, not represented in Gandhāran stone, seals and coin imagery, marks the Northern representations distinctively different from Mathura images. It is therefore deemed useful to demonstrate the primacy of Śiva's fivefold nature, again as in my book *Many Heads, Arms and Eyes*, in order to support this paper's position. This paper posits the fundamental difference between Gandhāran and Mathura śaiva imagery.

Appendix I, at the end of this paper provides the demonstration. Bibliographic references to the fundamental publications used in the Appendix I are: Jan Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism, A Comparison*, London, 1970; B.N. Sharma, *Iconography of Sadāśiva*, New Delhi, 1976; Doris Meth Srinivasan, "Ritual as Icon" in *World Art. Acts of the XXVIth International Congress of the History of Art*, 1989; also Chapter 14 in my book *Many Heads etc.*; Thomas S. Maxwell, " The Five Aspects of Śiva in Theory, iconography and Architecture", *Art International* Vol. 25; 1982; 41 - 57. Two more papers of mine giving textual details in the Śaiva Āgamas relating to

Śiva's fivefold nature, also in print prior to the publication of my book, are mentioned within Appendix I.

15 Katsumi Tanabi, "OHpO: Another Kushan Wind God", *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 2, 1991/92 pp. 51 - 71. Please see this paper for a survey on the main previous scholarship relating to the identification problem. Thus, no need to repeat here. However scholars' vacillation between calling the figure Oešo or Śiva continued; being, for example still evident in 2007, see Perkins, "Three - Headed Śiva" fn. 26.

16 Nicholas Sims-Williams and Joe Cribb "A new Bactrian Inscription of Kanishka the Great", *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 4, 1995 /96; pages 75 - 142. Nicholas Sims-Williams, "The Bactrian Inscription of Rabatak: A New Reading", *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, N.S. Volume 18; 2004; 53 - 68. Nicholas Sims-Williams, "A Bactrian god", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (1997) 344 - 338 . Nicholas Sims-Williams " A New Bactrian Inscription from the Time of Kanishka" in *Kushan Histories. Literary Sources and Selected Papers from a Symposium at Berlin, December 5 to 7, 2013*; ed. Harry Falk; Bremen, 2015; pp. 255 - 264.

17 Joe Cribb, "Shiva images on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian coins" , *Silk Road Art and Archaeology*. Special Volume; 1997, pp. 11 - 66.

18 Pierfrancesco Callieri, *Seals and Sealings from the North-West of the Indian Subcontinent and Afghanistan (4th Century BC - 11th century AD)*. Naples 1997

19 Fabrizio Sinisi, "Iconographic Transmission between Roma and the Kushan Empire: Seal and Coin Imagery" European Association of South Asian Archaeology and Art [EASAA], Vienna, 2010.

20 Aman ur Rahman & Harry Falk, *Seals Sealings and Tokens from Gandhāra*, Wiesbaden 2011.

21 Helmut Humbach, "Wind - an Old Iranian deity", *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies*, Vol. 21; Issue 2 (Dec. 2014); p. 5 - 7.

22 Cf. Robert Göbl, *Münzprägung des Kušānreiches*, Wien 1984. See under Oesho; description, No. 2 on p. 43

23 See Laura Giuliano, " Studies in early Śaiva iconography: (I) the origin of the *triśūla* and some related problems ", *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 10, 2004, p. 89, Figs. 25 and 26. See also Fig. 22, a Huviška gold stater showing a three-headed Oešo /Śiva.

24 Compare the shape with the trident held by Mahiṣāsūramardinī to Late Kuṣāṇa stone reliefs from Mathura in Herbert Härtel, "Early Durgā Mahiṣāsūramardinī

Images: A Fresh Appraisal", *Eastern Approaches. Essays on Asian Art and Archaeology*, ed. T.S. Maxwell; Delhi, 1992, Figs. 33 and 35.

25 John Perkins, "Three-headed Śiva". The frontal face usually has a moustache.

26 See Perkins, "Three-Headed Śiva ", 35.

27 See Joe Cribb, "Shiva Images on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian coins", Tables on pages 48 and 49.

28 See O. Bopearachchi, "Les Premiers Souverains Kouchans: Chronologie et Iconographie Monétaire" , *Journal des Savants*, Paris; 2008; 3 - 56; see his series I - III; and again in his series VII.

29 Bopearachchi, "Les premiers Souverains Kouchans" , p.13, fn.24; noted that the deity is ithyphallic beginning only with the sixth series.

30 On this, see Robert Bracey, "The Coinage of Wīma Kadphises"; see 52 - 53. He discusses in detail the unusual elements including, for example, the weights, the absence of bull and *linga* with Oešo, Greek on the reverse, problematic dimensions - and more.

31 Note that Falk (in *Seals, Sealings* p. 96) compares GKc 416 to coins from Vīma and Vāsudeva I. But these are inexact comparisons. The Vīma coin has the face in profile and the Vāsudeva I coins show advanced styles and additional attributes.

32 Cf. J.N. Banerjea, *The Development of Hindu Iconography*; 2nd revised edition; New Delhi, 1956, pp. 119 - 120; re. club on Sirkap seal.

33 See ur Rahman & Falk, *Seals, Sealings*, p. 28.

34 Personal communication dated April 5, 2013

35 Often on Kaniška's and Huviška's issues, a nimbus is around Oešo's head, but not on these seals.

36 Mary Boyce, "Greater Vayu and Greater Varuna", *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 7; 1993: 38. She notes that water drops falling from the vase have symbolic significance with Zoroastrianism's Vayu. This interpretation fits well with the information gathered and presented herein, whereas Pal's theory does not (Pratapaditya Pal, "Śiva as dispenser of royal glory on Kushan coins", *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* II, 1988, 31 - 35.

37 See designs in Cribb, "Shiva Images on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian coins ", p. 51; G2 (on Kaniška 1 example) and G 4, G 6 (on Huviška examples).

38 Rahul Peter Das, "Indra und Śiva/Rudra", *Geregeltes Ungestum*, eds. Rahul Peter Das und Gerhard Meiser, Bremen 2002; p. 141 and fn. 15.

39 For illustrations of several shapes, see T.A. Gopinatha Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. I Part 1; Varanasi, 1971; Plate IV Nos. 3 - 6 and pages 11-12.

40 The Kaniška 'Oesho' coin series # 5 (812/3) in Göbl (1984: Pl. 169) and a Kushan seal (U.7.2) in Callieri's monograph on Northwestern seals exhibit some features, though none corresponds well.

41 The name may identify the owner of the seal. See ur Rahman & Falk, *Seals, Sealings*; p. 96

42 The Indian Museum, Calcutta possesses a Late Kuṣāṇa seal showing a four-armed Śiva seated on the reclining bull. See E.V. Zeymal, " Visha-Shiva in the Kushan Pantheon " in *Gandhāran Art in Context*, eds. Raymond Allchin; Bridget Allchin; Neil Kreitman; Elizabeth Errington; New Delhi; 1997; pp, 245 - 266. See Fig. 6.

43 Cribb, "Shiva Images on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian coins" , pages 52 (I1; the wheel is in the upper left; vase lower left; trident and antelope are in upper and lower right), 53 (J1; the god has a halo; wheel is in upper right; antelope lower right; trident and thunderbolt are in upper and lower left)

44 See Herbert Härtel, "A Śiva Relief from Gandhāra", *South Asian Archaeology, 1985* eds. K. Frifele and P. Sørensen, London 1989, 392 - 396.

45 See discussion and photos in *Gandhāra. The Buddhist heritage of Pakistan. Legends, Monasteries, and Paradise*. Exhibition Catalogue; Bonn. 2008; Catalogue Nos. 93 and 110 and page 131.

46 See Tanabe "OHpO: Another Kushan Wind God", p. 57. Terms used: Śivadasa, Śivasena, Śivarakṣita

47 Frantz Grenet, "The Iranian Gods in Hindu Garb: The Zoroastrian Pantheon of the Bactrians and Sogdians, Second - Eighth Centuries ", *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*; Vol. 20 (2006), pp. 88 - 89.

48 Sims-Williams, "A Bactrian god", 338.

49 Cribb, "Shiva Images on Kushan and Kushano-Sasanian coins", 41.

50 Tanabe, "OHpO: Another Kushan Wind God", p. 64

51 Please see my chapter "Religious Networks and Incipient Śaiva Forms" in *Many Heads, Arms and Eyes*.

52 Gupta, *Mathura*, 2013. See Chapter 6 on Śiva.

53 See also discussion on Pl. 19.19 in my *Many Heads, Arms and Eyes*.

54 Trudy Kawami writes in an email dated 3/12/2009: "The humped bull (Zebu, *Bos indicus*) may have originated in India but had moved as far west as the Levant but [sic] the second mill BCE (a distinctive vertebra has been excavated), Central Asia & Iran in the Iron Age, and is known on Achaemenid seals engraved probably in Anatolia (modern Turkey). All of these examples date well before the Kushans so the zebu is no marker of "recently out of India." On Heracles with his attributes, she remarks in the same email :

"The image that is called Herakles in the Greek tradition was wide-spread in Iran in the Parthian period, occurring from rock reliefs in SW Iran to small bronzes to terra cotta metopes at Nisa, the Arsacid capital in what is now Turkmenistan. Like the humped bull, the naked (or nearly) strongman with a club & animal skin was all over western & central Asia. You don't need any Indian influence to develop the image of OESHO. "

55 See David W. MacDowall, "Coinage from Iran to Gandhāra" , in *On the Cusp of an Era. Art in the pre-Kuṣāṇa World*, ed. Doris Meth Srinivasan. Leiden.Boston; 2007, note his Fig. 9.66; Giuliano, "Studies in early Śaiva iconography: (1) the origin of the *triśūla*, 53 - 54.

56 Gerd Kreisel, *Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mathurā-Kunst*, Stuttgart, 1986, pages 104 - 105. This is a major fact overlooked by most scholars engaged in interpreting the image of Oešo /Śiva on coins and seals. The last, in a long line of investigators attributing the trident to Śiva on Kuṣāṇa coinage is Frantz Grenet, "Iranian Gods in Hindu Garb: The Zoroastrian Pantheon of the Bactrians and Sogdians, Second - Eighth Centuries", *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, Vol. 20, 2006; 87-99. This unverified attribute for the Kuṣāṇa image of Śiva continues in Grenet's latest paper "Zoroastrianism among the Kushans" in *Kushan Histories*, ed. Harry Falk, Bremen 2015; see p. 207. Here Grenet also assumes that the titles on the reverse of some of Wīma's gold coins reflect Wīma's devotion to Śiva. The legend 'sarvaloga- iśvara mahiśvara' is interpreted by him as (devotee of) the Lord of the World, the Great Lord, epithets characteristic of Śiva. Grenet cites and follows G. Fussman ("L' Inscrition de Rabatak et l'Origine de l' ère śaka", *Journal Asiatique*, Tome 286, 1998: 593, fn. 55). Fussman conjectures that 'sarvaloga iśvara' should be read with an initial *vṛddhi* and thus signifies 'devotee of Śiva, Lord of the World'. Grenet does state that Ciro Lo Muzio ("OHpO: A Sovereign God", *SRAA* 4, 1995/96, 163), thinks that *mahiśvara* is a royal title that Wīma has conferred on himself and it does not stand for *maheśvara*. This position has now gained considerable support. Harry Falk is of this view in "Names and Titles from Kuṣāṇa Times to the Hūnas - The

Indian Material" in *Coins, Art and Chronology II. The First Millenium C.E. in the Indo-- Iranian Borderlands*, eds. Michael Alram, Deborah Klimburg - Salter, Minora Inaba, Matthias Pfisterer, 2010 ; p. 76. The latest, most lengthy and explicit refutation of Wīma's devotion to Śiva comes from Joe Cribb in his paper "The Soter Megas coins of the first and second Kushan kings Kujula Kadphises and Wīma Takto" *Gandhara Studies*, Vol. 8, 2015; 79 - 122. Cribb not only shows, on pp. 88 - 89, that the legend on Wīma's coins (namely *sarvaloga-iśvara* and *mahiśvara*) are titles that apply to the king, he also leaves no doubt that Osmund Boppearachchi's interpretation of the same legend as indicative of Wīma's adoration of Śiva (in his "Les Premiers souverains Kouchans: Chronologie et Iconographie Monétaire", *Journal des Savants*, Jan. - Juin 2008, 3 - 56, see p. 44) cannot be sustained. The title *ishvara* in the form *ispara* also appears on an Apracharaja coinage and in an Apracharaja inscription (R.C. Senior A Catalogue of Indo-Scythian coins, vol 2, p. 137) according to Cribb. In view of my Section II.1, the position expressed by Lo Muzio, Falk and Cribb makes sense.

⁵⁷ See David W, MacDowall, "Coinage from Iran to Gandhāra, with special reference to divinities as coin types", *On the Cusp of an Era. Art in the Pre- Kuṣāṇa World*; D.M. Srinivasan ed. Brill, Leiden; 2007 pp. 233 - 265

⁵⁸ Helmut Humbach, "Vayu, Śiva und der Spiritus Vivens im Ostiranischen Synkretismus", *Acta Iranica 4. Monumentum H.S. Nyberg*; Leiden (1975); 397 - 408.

⁵⁹ The region [i.e. Sogdiana] always had commercial contacts with the Kuṣāṇa and Kuṣāṇa-Sassanian realms although it was not included in either. From the 5th century onwards it had strong cultural and artistic influence from previous Kuṣāṇa spheres. Frantz Grenet, "The second of three encounters between Zoroastrianism and Hinduism; Plastic influences in Bactria and Sogdiana (2nd - 8th c. A.D.)"; *Bombay; Asiatic Society of Bombay*; (1994); 43

⁶⁰ See Perkins, "Three - Headed Śiva ", 34; For a reference to the Sogdian version of the Vessantara Jātaka, please see R. Gauthiot", *Une version sogdienne du Vessantara Jātaka* ", *JA*, 10, Vol. 19 (1912), p. 163 - 193, 429 - 510. Regarding Wešparkar, Humbach refers the reader to VJ 910 - 935 on page 402. Another reference to the Sogdian Vessantara Jataka is:"On the Sogdian Vessantara Jātaka" by Ilya Gershevitch, *JRAS*, April 1942; 97 - 101. *Studies in "Sogdian"*, in Rüdiger Schmidt, ed., *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden, 1989

⁶¹ Mary Boyce, *History of Zoroastrianism I* p. 79.

⁶² See British Museum Coin IOC 299 in *Gandhāra. The Buddhist heritage of Pakistan. Legends, Monasteries, and Paradise*. Exhibition Catalogue; Bonn. 2008; page 146 Cat, No 81.

63 See Katsumi Tanabe, "The Kushan Representation of ANEMOS/OADO and its Relevance to the Central Asian and Far Eastern Wind Gods", *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* I, 1990, Kamakura; 51 - 80.

64 "A study of north Indian images of Vāyu would thus show that the deity may be assigned either two or four arms. If two-armed, he is depicted either holding the ends of a scarf fluttering behind or over his head or the banners in his hands. In the case of four-armed images, his attributes have been found to be a rosary, a banner (*dhvaja*) a flag (*patākā*) and a water vessel". Bhagawant Sahai, *Iconography of Minor Hindu and Buddhist Deities*, New Delhi, 1975; page 58.

65 Boyce, *Zoroastrianism*, 79. Vata is portrayed on Kaniška I bronzes and labeled OADO, in Bactrian.

66 Humbach "Vayu, ..." p. 405

67 Srinivasan, "Vedic Rudra-Śiva"; 543 - 556.

68 Ibid. Jan Gonda, *The Dual Deities in the Religion of the Veda*, in *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 81* (Amsterdam, London, 1974) p. 222.

69 Listed in ur Rahman & Falk, *Seals, Sealings*, p. 95.

70 Falk in ur Rahman & Falk, *Seals, Sealings*, p. 95. opines "a bird (?)". The formless shape challenges this identification.

71 Nicholas Sims-Williams, "A Bactrian God", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, University of London; Vol. 60, No. 2 (1997); 338.

72 Ibid.

73 Sims-Williams, "A Bactrian God", 338

74 Falk, *Seals, Sealings*, states it is not clear whether the term Muzhduwān " is used as a personal name or whether it names the deity (Weš) portrayed on the seal".

75 See N. Sims-Williams and J. Cribb, "A New Bactrian Inscription"; 75 - 142. N. Sims-Williams, "A Bactrian God", 338.

76 The equestrian male on the reverse of these rare Kaniška I coins is bearded, wears a diadem and hat or cap according to Rosenfield, who also sees a staff with a single ring on top (rather than the trident noted by Sims-Williams, " A Bactrian God", 338), as well as a "small Parthian bun in the back of the neck, scarf over

arm", and heavy boot pointing downward. (John M. Rosenfield, *The Dynastic Arts of the Kushans*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967,, pp. 82 - 83; Coin Figs. 132, 133). The male sits on a double-headed horse: "Possibly it could be related to the dual nature of the god Vayu" (Nicholas Sims-Williams, "A Bactrian God", 338). Grenet (in "Zoroastrianism among the Kushans"), makes an interesting identification for the figure on these rare gold Kaniška coins. He considers the male a royal figure, "a sort of mirror image of the Kushan king" (p. 211). Working with this hypothesis (whether or not the figure represents Kaniška I), suggests that the term is an epithet which can be employed with various "good, gracious" figures. Thus the term could be a descriptive title for Oešo (i.e. good Oešo) and for a sovereign (i.e. good king).

77 For example, the same Aman ur Rahman Private Collection contains a white crystal seal that seems to be a composite Poseiden-Śiva showing a male holding a trident and a wreath (AuR GK g 048; Pl.13).The trident which is somewhat indistinct on this seal is clearly marked on another seal (AuR GK g 033), which seems to be carved by the same hand. A fold across the chest (of GK g 048) may indicate the sacred thread. Prominent is Śiva's *liṅga* shown in a way it is never shown in Gangetic Hindu art, that is, very large and raised outward, not upward, a depiction seemingly at variance with the cosmic symbolism attributed to Śiva's upward raised *liṅga* at this time. Cribb (in personal communication dated June 7, 2010) observes that similar laterally raised *liṅgas*(as on GK g 048, Pl.13) occur on Kaniška I small copper coins. He cites Nos. 813 and 814 in Göbl's *Münzprägung des Kušānreiches*, although Göbl does not mention a raised *liṅga* for series 813.

78 See examples in Callieri, *Seals and Sealings*, Pl. 19: 7. 2; Pl. 31: M 5; Pl. 58: Cat, U 7.4 - U 7.6; U 7.8 A. But Pl. 38: S 4 renders Skanda's bird more dumpy.

79 Katsumi Tanabe, "The Kushan Representation of ANEMOS/OADO and the Relevance to the Central Asian and Far Eastern Wind Gods", *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 1, 1990 p. 64.

80 From O.M. Dalton, *The Treasure of the Oxus*, with other examples of early oriental Metal-Work. London; 1964; # 204 pages 58 -59 and Plate XXXIII.

81 The complete sentence is (on p. 6 of " Wind, an Old Iranian Deity", *Electronic Journal of Vedic Studies*, Vol. 21, 2014; Issue 2: "Accompanying a pictorial representation of four-armed Śiva and written in Graeco-Bactrian script that name is found on the reverses of very numerous coins of the Indo-Scythian Kuṣāṇa dynasty. That does, of course, not mean that Oešo/Vaiiuš is Śiva, but it makes sure that the characteristics of Śiva were to a large extent characteristics of the Iranian Vaiiu in non-orthodox traditions of the Iranian religion".

82 Pierfrancesco Callieri, "Barikot, An Indo-Greek Urban Center in Gandhāra " in *On the Cusp of an Era. Art in the pre-Kuṣāṇa World*, ed. Doris Meth Srinivasan; Leiden, Boston; 2007; p. 133ff. See especially page 161.

83 Doris Meth Srinivasan, "From Roman Clipeata Imago to a Gandhāra Image Medallion and the Embellishment of the Parinirvana Legend" in *Architetti, Capomastri, Artigiani. L'Organizzazione dei Cantieri e Della Produzione Artistica nell'Asia Ellenistica*, Ed. Pierfrancesco Callieri; Roma, Is. I.A.O., 2006; pp. 247 - 269.

84 Illustrated in Callieri, *Seals and Sealings*, Pl. 57; Cat. U 7.3 and write - up page 190 -191.

85 Weš / Oešo continues to be depicted on Sasanian and Kidarite coinage; see Göbl, *Münzprägung des Kušānreiches*, coin types :702 - 758. Also *The Crossroads of Asia. Transformation in Image and Symbols*; Exhibition Catalogue; Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; 1992; pp. 86 - 87 for Coins Nos. 92 & 93.

86 Humbach, Kashan, Śiva und der Spiritus Vivens " 402 - 403.

87 See also Humbach, "Wind", page 6.

88 What is new in the account is an enhanced description, not the discovery of the paintings, *per se*. As recently as 1991/92, Henrik H. Sørensen (" Typology and iconography in the Esoteric Buddhist Art of Dunhuang", *SRAA* 2; 1991/92; page 287), did not record the figure in Śiva's crown, much less offer an interpretation for this figure in Cave 285. These are contained in Zhang Yuanlin's paper.

89 Zhang Yuanlin, "Dialogue Among the Civilizations: the Origin of the Three Guardian Dieties ` [sic] Images in Cave 285, Mogao Grottoes", *The Silk Road* 6/2 (2009); 33 - 48. I wish to thank Inez Konczak for bringing this study to my attention.

90 Ibid; 35.

91 Zhang Yuanlin, "Maheśvara Images found in Dunhuang and Khotan and Relevant Problems ", *Dunhuang Research*, No. 6; 2013; China Academic Journal Electronic Publishing House. p. 2. I extend my thanks to Zhang He who translated the article for me.

92 Zhang "Dialogue Among the Civilizations"; 37. The present author cannot think of a similar image inside India.

93 Ibid; 37. For Sasaki's bibliographic reference please see Zhang "Dialogue Among the Civilizations"; 47.

94 See Tanabe, "OADO and the Relevance to the Central Asian and Far Eastern Wind Gods.", Figs. 3,4,5.

95 Tanabe, "OADO and the Relevance to the Central Asian and Far Eastern Wind Gods ", 64 - 67.

96 Zhang, "Dialogue Among the Civilizations", 44.

97 Lokesh Chandra and Nirmala Sharma, *Buddhist Paintings of Tun-Huang in the National Museum, New Delhi*, 2012; New Delhi; p. 27.

98 Markus Mode, "Sogdian Gods in Exile - Some iconographic evidence from Khotan in the light of recent excavated material from Sogdiana ", *Silk Road Art and Archaeology* 2, 1991/92; Kamakura, 179 - 214; see page 186. For recent publications on Sogdian documents coming from China and found in Khotan, please see Bi Bo and Nicholas Sims-Williams, " Sogdian Documents from Khotan I: Four Economic Documents, *JAOS* 130.4, 2010; 497 - 508 and " Sogdian Documents from Khotan II: Letters and Miscellaneous Fragments ", *JAOS* 135.2; 2015; 261 - 282.

99 Zhang in "Dialogue Among the Civilizations ", 41- 42 mentions the "Ancient Sogdian Letters " which Aurel Stein found in the ruins of the watchtower west of Dunhuang.

100 See M. Taddei, "Non-Buddhist Deities in Gandhāran Art - Some. New Evidence", in *Investigating Indian Art*, eds. M. Yaldiz and W. Lobo, Berlin; 1987; pages 349 - 362. Plate 18 must be as 'read 'as a group of deities emanating from the central meditative Bodhisattva. The general emanating schema seen in Plate 18 occurs in numerous other Buddhist sculptures. E.g, see examples in the Taddei paper and consult Juhjung Rhi, "Complex Steles: Great Miracle, Paradise, or Theophany" in Gandhāra. The Buddhist Heritage of Pakistan. Legends, Monasteries, and Paradise. Exhibition Catalogue, Mainz, 2009, pp. 254 - 259 and references given.

101 Callieri, *Seals and Sealings*, p. 142 and Cat. S 1.

102 A similar trend occurs in the post-Kuṣāṇa depiction of Śrī-Lakṣmī. E.g. see my paper "Lakṣmī on the Lion ", in *Temple Architecture and Imagery of South and Southeast Asia. Prāsādanidhi. Papers Presented to Professor M.A. Dhaky* , eds. P.P. Dhar and G.J.R. Mevissen. New Delhi, Aryan Books International ; 2016 ; pp. 246 - 261.

103 See Cribb. "Śiva images", Figures Nos. 10; 11;12; 13. Plus see his Tables II through Vb.

104 Joanna G. Williams, *The Art of Gupta India*, 1982, Princeton; Fig. 31. J.C. Harle, *Gupta Sculpture*; Oxford, 1974. Fig.. 53; pages 44- 45.

105 Harle, *Gupta Sculpture*; Fig. 54. I must register that I have never been completely convinced that this is a genuine carving.

106 See Kreisel, *Śiva -Bildwerke*, Abb. 73, being a Kuṣāṇa fragment showing the lower part of an ithyphallic male holding a vase and standing in front of a bull.

107 See fn. 45.

108 Williams, *Gupta India*; Fig. 77 and page 73

109 Sara L. Schastok, *The Śāmalājī Sculptures and 6th century Art in Western India*, Leiden, 1985; Fig. 11.

110 Pratapaditya Pal, *The Ideal Image. The Gupta Sculptural Tradition and its Influence*. Exhibition Catalogue, New York; 1978; Fig 21.

111 See Harle, *Gupta Sculpture*, Fig. 100 and page 50. Harle is correct in finding a Gandhāran "echo" in this stele; this feature is not mentioned in Williams, see fn 105.

112 See Cribb, "Śiva images", especially page 46.

113 See Kreisel, *Śiva-Bildwerke*, Figs. A15; 72;10d. See also page 95. I, for one, consider the lion worn as a skin reminiscent of Heracleian iconography popular in the North, whereas the lion animal is probably symbolic of power and majesty, in both regions and thus not necessarily under the influence from the Northwest when appearing in the Gangetic region.



Plate 1 - Śiva. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (Museum for Asiatic Art, Berlin) Photograph courtesy Staatliche Museen zu Berlin-Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin



Plate 2 - Śiva. Gandhāra. Probably Kuṣāṇa Period. Formerly from the Julian Sherrier Collection. Photocopy courtesy Julian Sherrier



Plate 3 - Clay token. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01. 08; Inv. No. GKc 416). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 4 - Garnet ring-bezel seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.09; Inv. No. GKg xx 19). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 5 - Bronze statuette of Heracles. Afghanistan. c. 2nd century B.C. (Private Chicago Collection.) Photo after Catalogue De l'Indus a l'Oxus. Archéologie de l'Asie Centrale, 2003; Fig. 89



Plate 6 - Bronze double-hoop-handled seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.12; Inv. No. GKm 805). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 7A - Huviška gold stater (Obverse). Photo courtesy Joe Cribb



Plate 7B - Huviška gold stater (Reverse). Photo courtesy Joe Cribb Plate



Plate 8 - Clay sealing with auspicious symbols. Gandhāran (ur Rahman Collection 15.03.07; Inv.No. GKc 401). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 9 - Quartz seal pendant. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.10; Inv. No. GKg 010). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 10 - Agate seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.07; Inv.No.GKg 001). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 11 - Maheśa in front of Liṅga. Mathura. Kuṣāṇa Period. Photograph after A.K. Coomaraswamy, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, (New York 1927; reprint 1965. Fig. 68)



Plate 12 - Clay sealing. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period (ur Rahman Collection 07.01.03; Inv. No. GKc 589). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 13- White crystal seal. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. (ur Rahman Collection GK g 048). Photo courtesy Aman ur Rahman



Plate 14- Silver Dish. Found in the Dehra Ismail Khan district, Punjab. Third - Fourth century A.D. Photo after O.M. Dalton, *The Treasure of the Oxus*; Third Edition, London 1964; Pl.XXXIII



Plate 15A - Dunhuang. Interior of the Mogao Cave 285 - West Wall



Plate 15B - Dunhuang. Interior of the Mogao Cave 285 - Section of Maheśvara and his Family



Plate 16. Dunhuang. Interior of the Mogao Cave 285. Figure in the Crown on the head of Maheśvara



Plate 17. Sketch by Inez Konczak of figure in the Crown on the head of Maheśvara



Plate 18- Six figures emanating from a Bodhisattva. Śiva is in the middle of left side. Gandhāra. Kuṣāṇa Period. Peshawar Museum 850. Photograph courtesy Christian Luczanits.