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When engaged in the study of the coins of Maues, Azes, Gondophares, and the other kings whom I designate collectively as Indo-Parthian, for the purpose of the Catalogue of non-Muslim Indian Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, which I have undertaken at the request of the Trustees, many difficulties were encountered. The works of numismatists and other scholars failed to give adequate solutions of these difficulties, and I was thus forced to undertake an independent investigation of the subject. The necessary discussion, although confined to the narrowest possible limits, occupies more space than could be accorded in the Introduction to a catalogue of coins, and is therefore offered for the consideration of scholars in the pages of this Journal. The opinions now expressed differ considerably from those printed in the Early History of India and other publications in which I have referred to the Indo-Parthian dynasties. The discrepancies are the outcome of fuller knowledge acquired by special study, and anything that I have written previously on the subject should be considered as superseded by this essay. The abandonment of the hypothesis that Maues and other chiefs were Sakas carries with it many consequences, and involves a complete change in the aspect of the historical problems discussed. The key to these problems now seems to me to be obtainable from the history of Parthia; and if our knowledge of that history were more complete then it is, or is likely to be, we should be in a position to understand the relations of the Indo-Parthian rulers to the world of their day. But, even as matters stand, the consideration of Indo-Parthian problems from a Parthian point of view promises to elucidate much that has remained obscure.

My use of the term 'Indo-Parthian' requires some explanation and defence. The coins of the kings whom I group together under this name are described by Cunningham as the 'coins of the Sakas', and defined as being all those 'which bear names either of Parthian
origin, or of kindred forms, beginning with Moas [sic] and Vonones and ending with Pakores. There appear to be at least three distinct families of these princes, the two earlier ones of Moas and Vonones being contemporary, while that of Gondophares was some time later. All the coins of this class have on their reverse literal translations in the Indian Pali language and in Arian [= Kharoṣṭhī] characters of the Greek legends of the obverse”1).

Professor Gardner, in the British Museum Catalogue of the coins of the Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India, published in 1886, distinguished Maues, Azes, and Azilises as Scythic, and Gondophares etc. as Parthian kings.

Professor Rapson, in his work Indian Coins, published in 1898, similarly treated Maues or Moa, Vonones, Azes, and Azilises under the head of ‘Scythic Invaders of India’, while he confined the term ‘Indo-Parthian coins’ to the issues of the dynasty of Gondophares. Professor Rapson followed Cunningham in regarding Maues as being a Saka by race, and expressed the opinion that “the earliest of the Saka dynasties in India is that of Maues or Moa” 2) (op. cit. sec. 29).

Having called attention to the Parthian affinities of the coinages of both Maues and Vonones, Professor Rapson proceeds to observe that “it is certain that the dynasties of Maues and Vonones were intimately connected, and it is difficult to separate them so far as to call the former Saka and the latter Parthian. The difficulty is, perhaps, to be explained by supposing the existence among the Sakas of this period of a strong Parthian element due to previous events” (op. cit. sec. 30).

Von Sallet (Die Nachfolger Alexanders des Grossen, 1879) abstained from any formal classification and was content to describe all the coins in question as issued by princes with non-Greek names.

Considering that all these coins have intimate relations one with the other, and that they all show a more or less distinct Parthian complexion, the descriptive designation ‘Indo-Parthian’ appears to be best. The whole series is to some extent both Indian and Parthian, and the name chosen simply expresses this certain fact. The investigation, as it progresses, will show that the connexion between India and Parthia was closer then is usually admitted. The question concerning the propriety of Cunningham’s term ‘the coins of the Sakas’ requires to be considered in some

2) This king’s name is actually known only in the genitive case, as Greek ΜΑΩΟΤΟΥ, Kharoṣṭhī Moasa. The nominative of the latter form was undoubtedly Moa; but that of the Greek form might be Maus, Mausas, or Maues. The analogy of other names, e.g. ΠΑΚΟΡΗΣ, indicates that the form Maues is to be preferred. Similarly, Azes is preferable to Azes. There is no authority for Thomas’ and Cunningham’s ‘Moas’.
detail. Von Gutschmid suggested that Maues should be regarded as a Saka because his kingdom might be identified with that founded by the migrating Sakas when they were driven south, as recorded by the Chinese historians\(^1\). Cunningham admitted that "there is no direct historical evidence that the Sakas ever occupied the Panjab, but the three great kings, Moas, Azas, and Azilises, whose coins are found chiefly in the Panjab, and very rarely to the west of the Indus, are universally accepted as Saka Scythians". This cannot be considered a very satisfactory argument. He assumes further that Vonones and his family were Sakas, but gives no clear evidence in favour of the assumption\(^2\). He was largely influenced in his choice of the term 'coins of the Sakas' by the belief that certain satraps, whose coinage is related to that of the kings in question, were demonstrated by epigraphic evidence to have been Sakas. His argument is expressed as follows: — "I have kept the coins of the Saka satraps apart from those of the kings, as I felt uncertain where to place them. That they belong to the period of Saka rule is clearly shown by their types, which are chiefly copied from the coins of Azas.

But a most decisive proof of their Saka nationality is found in the Arian Pali [Kharoṣṭhī] inscriptions of a pillar capital which was found at Mathura about twenty years ago by my lamented friend, Pandit Bhagwân Lāl. The principal inscription records the erection of a Stūpa for the relics of Buddha by the Queen Nanda-sriyā in the time of the great Satrap Rajul (Rajubul of the coins) and of the Yuva Raja Kharadost, who also bore the title of Satrap. Mention is made of Prince Tulama, the son of Kharadost, and also of the Satrap Sudds, the son of Rajul. A separate inscription on the same capital records the name of the great Satrap Kusalaa, who is almost certainly the Satrap named Liaka-Kusulaka in the Taxila copper-plate .... On the same capital with these Satrap names there is a short record which proves that all of them must have been Sakas. The words are sarva Sakastāna pujae, 'for the merit of all the people of Sakastān', that is of the country occupied by the Sakas. The name of the city of Taxila is also found on the capital. At this time, therefore, the Indian territory of the Sakas must have extended from the Indus to Mathura, and from Kashmir to Sindh\(^2\).

Since Cunningham wrote the above observations the inscriptions on the 'Mathurā lion-capital' have been studied by several scholars, who have thrown more light on its brief, enigmatical inscriptions, but here I need refer only to Dr. Fleet's recent researches. The words loosely quoted by Cunningham are really 'sarvasa sakasta-

---

1) *Geschichte Iran*, p. 107.
3) *The Coins of the Sakas*, p. 22.
\textit{nasa puyae}, which were formerly translated as ‘in honour of the whole Sakastana’. But Dr. Fleet shows good reason for holding that the compound word \textit{saka-stana} of the Mathurā inscription P. is the exact equivalent, in the dialect of the records, of the \textit{saka-sthāna} of the Pāli Jātakas, or Sanskrit \textit{svaka-sthāna}. “There is no reference”, he observes, “to Śakas, either here, or in any other of the records on the lion-capital, or in any of the connected records. And the inscription P. is simply a record which some person or persons, to be probably found named in one of the adjacent records, caused to be engraved ‘for the worship of the whole of (his, her, or their) own home’; that is, in honour of his her or their whole household”\textsuperscript{1}). If this interpretation of the word \textit{saka} be correct, as it seems to be, the main support of the proposition that the satraps of Mathurā were Śakas, falls to the ground.

Dr. Fleet goes further and maintains that the belief in the existence of Śaka immigrants in Northern India is a mere delusion. “There are no real grounds”, he writes, “for thinking that the Śakas ever figured as invaders of any part of Northern India, above Kāthiāwād and the western and southern parts of the territory now known as Mālwa (see J. R. A. S., 1904, 706 ff., and page 155 above). Indeed we may now say definitely that they never did so; and, to what I have said there concerning the occurrence of the word Śaka in one of the early Jain inscriptions at Mathurā, I may add that it is now certain that the word there used means simply Buddhists, mentioned as Śakas by a form, which in the language or spelling of that period was the customary form, of the tribal name of their founder Śakamuni-Buddha”\textsuperscript{2}).

Whether or not it be true that the Śakas never figured as invaders of any part of Northern India, it seems to be established that the name of their horde is not certainly mentioned in inscriptions, as it was supposed to have been. No definite reason for regarding the satraps of Mathurā as Śakas by race now remains, nor is there any adequate justification for describing the coins of Azes, Vonones, and the rest as ‘the coins of the Śakas’. That designation must be abandoned, and, as I have already said, the purely descriptive term Indo-Parthian is the most convenient for use as correctly including the whole class.

With the exceptions that Gondophares is mentioned in a single inscription and in a well-known early Christian legend, coins are our sole source of direct knowledge of the Indo-Parthian dynasties.

\textsuperscript{1}) J. R. A. S., 1904, pp. 703—9. In a subsequent note (J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 155) Dr. Fleet, accepting a suggestion of Professor Hultzsch, took \textit{sarva} to be a proper name and translated, ‘(A gift) of Sarva, in honour of his home’. This version seems to be the best.

\textsuperscript{2}) J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 230. I doubt the correctness of Dr. Fleet’s interpretation of the Mathurā record, and still prefer Bühler’s.
The coins of Maues described in the British Museum printed catalogue comprise seventeen distinct kinds, not to mention minor varieties; and the number of distinct kinds now known may amount to a score or more. The general aspect of the fine series in the British Museum, as enriched by the addition of the Cunningham collections, not included in the catalogue, is plainly suggestive of an early date, and all numismatists are agreed that Maues must be regarded as the earliest of the Indo-Parthian kings. Some of his pieces are literal copies of coins of Demetrios and Apollodotos, but Von Gutschmid goes too far when he deduces from this fact the inference that Maues was a younger contemporary (einz jüngerer Zeitgenosse des Demetrius und Apollodotus) of both those princes. So far as Apollodotos is concerned the remark may be accepted as correct, because his rule on the north-western frontier of India may be assigned with approximate accuracy to the period 156—140 B.C. But Demetrios was much earlier in date and must be placed somewhere about 200 B.C. Mr. Rapson (Indian Coins, see 29) holds that the date of Maues is "probably not later than c. 120 B.C.,” and this determination appears to be very close to the truth.

Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar has ventured to reject the unanimous opinion of numismatic experts that the Indo-Parthian series of coins begins with those of Maues, and to maintain that "Maues is the last prince of the Saka dynasty”. He bases this opinion chiefly on the identification of Maues with the king Moga mentioned in a well-known inscription dated in the year 78 of an unspecified era, which Mr. Bhandarkar is convinced must be the so-called Saka era. But there is no evidence that the Saka era was in use in Northern India at so early a period, and whatever may be the correct interpretation of the date in the Taxila inscription, the theory that it was expressed in the terms of the Saka era is the most improbable. Further, there is no proof or real reason to suppose that Maues was a Saka, and speculations, such as those of Mr. Bhandarkar, concerning the supposed decline of the Saka dynasty are premature until the existence of such a dynasty has been ascertained. No person at all versed in the interpretation of numismatic facts can fail to perceive that the aspect of the Maues series of coins is earlier than that of Azes, Azilises etc.; and, notwithstanding Mr. Bhandarkar’s dissent, I have no hesitation in agreeing with Wilson, Von Sallet, Gardner, and Cunningham that the coinage of Maues stands at the head of the Indo-Parthian series. The coins of Vonones are approximately contemporary, but probably a few years later in date.

1) Geschichte Iran, p. 106.
Justification for giving the name Indo-Parthian to the coinage of Mæues was supplied long ago by the observation of Von Sallet, who, when describing a coin of that king with horseman obverse and bow-case reverse (his Pl. V, 2), remarked that "this fine coin is remarkable on account of the completely Arsakidan types, which occur especially on the reverses of the copper money of Arsakes VI [Mithradates I], and were exactly copied by the hitherto imperfectly known Arsakes Θεός of Bactria (unique specimen in Berlin, Pl. V, 2). Without indulging in further conjectures, we must maintain that both these pieces indicate an Arsakidan rather than an Indo-Scythian origin for Mæues".  

This observation is perfectly just, and is confirmed by study of the legends on the coins of Mæues. The pieces with types directly imitated from the coinages of Demetrios and Apollodotos bear the brief legend ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΣ ΜΑΤΩΤ, and may be presumed to belong to an early period of his reign. But most of his coins give the fuller royal style, ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΤ ΜΑΤΩΤ, which is unquestionably a copy of the Parthian regal formula. Unfortunately, the attribution of the coins in the Parthian series is open to so much doubt that it is impossible to affirm with absolute certainty when the formula in question first came into use. The Parthian kings, no doubt, copied it from the title ksayathiya ksayathiyam, 'kings of kings', arrogated by the Achaemenian monarchs of Persia, but it is difficult to decide whether the earliest copyist was Mithradates I (Arsakes VI), or his nephew Mithradates II, commonly called the Great. The limits of the reign of the former are approximately 171-186 B.C., and those of the reign of the latter 123-88 B.C. Most authorities ascribe the assumption of the Persian title to the elder king, but Mr. Wroth, who attributes to Mithradates II certain coins usually assigned to his uncle, is inclined to think that the formula ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΤ was first used by Mithradates II. He admits, however, that Mithradates I "may well have taken the title", while adding that "the proof that he did so rests solely on the attribution of these coins to his reign". The coins referred to by Mr. Wroth (p. 30 of Catalogue) exhibit the king’s bust to the left on the obverse, and the characteristically Parthian type of the seated bowman on the reverse. The earlier coins ascribed by Mr. Wroth to Mithradates II showing the king’s head without helmet, bear the simple title ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΣ like the early coins of Mæues, who evidently followed closely the Parthian precedent.

1) Nachfolger Alexander's, p. 140.
2) Catalogue of the Coins of Parthia, by Warwick Wroth (Greek Coins in the British Museum), 1903, Introd. p. XXV, note. Mr. Wroth dates the close of the reign of Mithradates I in 138 B.C., Rawlinson puts it two years later.
The coins of Maues are found ordinarily in the Panjab only, and chiefly in the western portion of the province, of which Taxila was the ancient capital. If we could determine definitely whether Maues borrowed his royal title from Mithradates I or from his nephew, we should be in a better position for fixing with approximate accuracy the date of the accession of Maues to the throne of the Western Panjab. But the question does not seem to admit of determination, and the chronology which I adopt is as consistent with the supposition that the title in question was first assumed by the elder Mithradates as it is with the supposition that it was adopted by his nephew. Both those kings were great conquerors and added materially to the Parthian empire, and either would have been justified in celebrating his achievements by the assumption of a pretentious title. Mithradates I is known to have wrested two provinces from Eukratides, king of Bactria, although, unluckily, their position cannot be ascertained. The younger Mithradates, commonly called the Great, is recorded to have added many provinces to his ancestral dominions, but details of his operations are almost wholly wanting, and historians of his reign are driven to fill their pages with conjectures rather than ascertained facts. I am, however, inclined to agree with Mr. Wroth in believing that the title BAZIAESIN BAZIAESIN MEIÅΛΛΩΤ was first assumed by Mithradates II.

Von Gutschmid (Geschichte Irans, p. 79) makes the observation that "the ordinary opinion that the emergence (auftauchen) of Parthian names among the Indo-Scythian rulers of the Kābul valley [sic]" has a connexion with the conquest of Mithradates II is negatived by the fact that, so late as the middle of the first century B.C., Kandahar (U-ghe-shan-li), lying much farther to the west, was recognized by the Chinese as an independent kingdom. This observation has no force. Even if it be granted that the purport of the Chinese statement is correctly given, which in the absence of precise reference, cannot be tested; and if it be further granted that the Chinese U-ghe-shan-li really means Kandahār, still the premise will not bear the weight of Von Gutschmid's inference. The phrase 'recognized as an independent kingdom' is of very vague import, and might very well be applied by distant foreigners like the Chinese to a realm governed by a king of its own, even though he might acknowledge a greater power as his suzerain. The various satrapies of the Parthian empire, as Müller points out, were all recognized as kingdoms. "Id enim agitabant Arsacidae" he observes, "ut reges regnum appellarentur, ut e multis constat monumentis. Hunc titulum quo meliori jure mereri viderentur, id satrapiarum omnium rectoribus concedebant ut reges appellarentur.

1) 'Kophenthale'; but the Indo-Parthian rulers never held the Kābul valley.
Inde factum ut apud illos tantundem valeret regni nomen atque provinciae\(^1\) Such kingdoms might well appear to Chinese writers to be 'independent'. As a matter of fact, as will be shown presently, Arachosia with its capital Kandahār, formed a portion of the Parthian empire in the first century B.C. Whether or not the Kandahār region could be properly described as 'independent' in B.C. 50, the question does not affect the connexion between the 'emergence' of Indo-Parthian princes in the second century B.C. and the extension of the Parthian empire at the same period.

The extreme imperfection of the records of Parthian history forbids the specification of exact dates for the conquests effected by either Mithradates I or Mithradates II, but the advance of the former in the direction of India may be ascribed safely to the closing years of his reign, which ended in or about 136 B.C. I confess I see no good reason for doubting the explicit statement of Orosius that, subsequent to the defeat of the general of Demetrios, king of Syria, and the occupation of Babylon, Mithradates I annexed to his empire the territory of all the nations between the Indus and the Hydaspes, or Jihlam river. Orosius, although himself a late writer, who made his compilation about 400 A.D., necessarily drew his materials from earlier authors, and it is not at all likely that he should have invented his assertion concerning the Indian conquests of Mithradates. Von Gutschmid supposed that the statement was derived, through Livy and Diodorus, from Posidonius, who died about 50 B.C. at an advanced age. Whatever the source of the statement, it must have been made on some authority, and it seems to me intrinsically probable\(^2\).

On the assumptions that the statement made by Orosius is well-founded and that Mithradates the Great died in or about 136 B.C., his annexation of the Western Pañjāb may be dated in 138 B.C. After his death, the Parthian state was grievously troubled by the hordes of nomad invaders, Sakas and others, who

---


2) The text is "Mithridates, tunc siquidem, rex Parthorum sextus ab Arsace, victo Demetrior praefecto Babylonam urbern finesque ejus universos victor invasit. Omnes praeterea gentes quae inter Hydaspem fluviam et Indum jacent, subegit (Bk. V, ch. IV, sec. 16; ed. Zangemeister, Vienna, 1883). The comment of Von Gutschmid (Geschichte Iran, p. 50) is:— 'Mit der Angabe Justin's schien eine andere zu streiten, die deshalb trotz ihrer treulichen Bezeugung allgemein verworfen worden ist, die nämlich, daß Mithridates seine Herrschaft bis Indien ausgedehnt und auf friedlichem Wege das ehemalige Reich des Porus oder, wie es an der Parallelstelle heißt, alle Völker zwischen Indus und Hydaspes sich unterworfen habe'. I do not know the 'parallel passage' to which Von Gutschmid alludes, without giving a reference. The vague statement of Justin (Bk. XLI, ch. 6) that Mithradates "extended the Parthian empire by reducing many tribes under his yoke from Mount Caucasus to the river Euphrates" is hardly sufficient to refute Orosius, even if the Indian Caucasus or Hindū Kush be understood, and it is not clear that the proposition must necessarily be so understood."
kept pouring in from the steppes, seeking for new pastures and camping grounds to replace those from which they had been driven out by rival hordes pressing on their rear. Phraates II, the immediate successor of Mithradates was killed in battle with the nomads about 127 B.C.; and some four years later, Artabanus I, who followed him on the Parthian throne, met the same fate in the same way. These events obviously offered a favourable opportunity to an ambitious governor of a remote province; and if we suppose that Maues, the oldest of the Indo-Parthian rulers, had been the Parthian governor of the Western Panjāb for a few years, and then, on the occurrence of favouring events, renounced his allegiance and asserted his independence, the supposition accords well with the known facts. His declaration of independence may be dated approximately in 125 or 120 B.C., and his earliest ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΣ ΜΑΣΩΤ coins may be assigned to the first two or three years of his reign. If he began to issue the ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΑΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΩΤ ΜΑΣΩΤ coins in or about 122 B.C., he might have borrowed the title from either Mithradates I or his nephew. But the date 120 for his accession seems to be preferable.

Whatever may have been the method by which Maues attained the rank of king of Taxila, I believe that his accession was a consequence of the annexation of the Western Panjāb by Mithradates I, and that the 'emergence' of Parthian names among the rulers of the Indus valley can be explained best by connecting it with the advance of the central Parthian power into India. It is not necessary to suppose that Maues ever became absolutely independent. The mere stamping of brave titles on coins often means very little, and it is quite possible that the 'king of kings' at Taxila may have recognized in some way the superiority of a greater 'king of kings' at Ctesiphon. But, perhaps, it is more likely that the province to the east of the Indus remained an integral portion of the Parthian empire for a few years only, and that Maues, from the date of his accession, about 120 B.C., was independent both in theory and practice.

This latter view is confirmed by the fact that the Indian province is not included in the list of eighteen 'kingdoms' (regna) or provinces into which the Parthian empire was divided at the beginning of the Christian era. The governments more or less closely concerned with India which were at that time parts of the empire were (1) Arīa, with its capital 'Alexandria among the Arīans', the modern Hirāt (Herat); (2) the country of the Anauoi, being a segment of Arīa, with its chief town Phra, the modern Farrah; (3) Zarg|#224anian, or Drangiana (Zarg|#224anian), lying farther south, E. long. 60°, N. lat. 31°—32°, to the east of the Hamun or Zareh Lake; (4) Sakastana (Sakastan), to the southeast of the last, also called Parastacena (Parastacena), including Sigal, the Šaka
capital, a province to the north of the Helmund river; and lastly (5) Arachosia, which the Parthians called White India with its capital, Alexandropolis, the modern Kandahār. So far extended, says Isidor of Charax, the realm of the Parthians.

The value of this statement, which is certainly earlier than the date of the publication of the Natural History of Pliny, published in 77 A. D., depends partly on the date assigned to Isidor of Charax. The arguments adduced by C. Müller are sufficient to satisfy me that Isidor was the geographer from Charax, specially appointed by Augustus to the staff of his legate, Gaius Caeser, in 1 A. D. ¹ Assuming the correctness of this inference, we learn that Arachosia, the Kandahār province, was actually a part of the Parthian empire at the beginning of the Christian era, and it is probable that it had been under Parthian rule from the time of Mithradates the Great ¹.

Even if Müller's argument concerning the identity of Isidor be rejected, the significance of the statements recorded by Pliny will not be affected very seriously, because the Characene author, whom be quotes, be his name Isidorus or Dionysius, is expressly described as being ‘quite recent’.

The proved fact that Arachosia formed an integral portion of the Parthian empire at or about the beginning of the Christian era, and probably had been under Parthian rule for at least a century previously, has an important bearing upon the Indo-Parthian problem; because the coins of the family of Vonones, as well as those of Orthagnes, etc. the successors of Gondophares, come to a large extent from the neighbourhood of Kandahār, the representative of the ancient capital of Arachosia.

I have already dealt with the early Indo-Parthian coins of Maues, king of the Western Pañjāb, and given reasons for believing

¹) The list of provinces is given in a condensed form by Pliny (Bk. VI, ch. 25; cited by Von Gutschmid as sec. 44, 112); and Müller shows sound reasons for believing that in Pliny's Book VI, ch. 27 (Basle ed.; cited by Müller as 51, sec. 138) the words 'Dionysium terrarum orbis situs recentissimum auctorem' should be read as 'Isidorum etc.' The mistake may have been due to a slip of the pen made by Pliny himself (Geogr. Graeci Min., Proleg. p. LXXXI). The work of Isidorus, from which the statements in the text are taken, is preserved in an abstract entitled Σταθμοὶ Παρθικοὶ, a route-book for the Parthian dominions from the Euphrates to Kandahār, which has been edited by Müller (op. cit. Vol. I, p. 253). Müller's atlas shows the position of the various provinces as understood by him. The Greek text concerning Arachosia is: — Ἑκτέθησαν Ἀραχοσία, σχοινίοι λέγεται [= 36]. Ταύτισι δὲ οἱ Παρθικοὶ ἐνδιήκνυσι καλοῦσιν: εὗθα Εὐρωπῶν τά πόλις καὶ Φαραγνία πόλις καὶ Χοραγοῖο πόλις καὶ Χαράκτας πόλις: εἶτα Ἀραχοσίας, μητρότατος Ἀραχοσίας, εἶτε δὲ Ἑλληνίδας, καὶ παρεσθείν κατὰ πολλοῖς ἑφαγοντας. Τίνος τούτῳ ἠστίν ἤ τῶν Παρθικῶν ἐπικράτεια. Α' σχοενὶς = 30 stadía of 2021/2 yards each: 36 schoeni = about 124 English miles.
that his kingdom was the outcome of the Indian annexations effected by Mithradates I about 188 B.C.

I now turn to the coinage of Vonones (Onônes) and his family, which, according to Cunningham (Coins of the Sakas, p. 4), comes "chiefly from the ancient Arachosia, or Kandahar and Ghazni. Some have also been found in Sistân, the ancient Drangiana. A few have been obtained at Kabul, but, as not even a single specimen was got at Beghram by Masson during his three years collection, it seems almost certain that Vonones could not have ruled there. For a similar reason the family of Vonones could not have ruled for any time in the Panjâb, as their coins, are very rarely found there".

I proceed to consider who Vonones was, and to examine the indications which give a clue to his date.

The name Vonones is familiar in the history of Parthia as that of two kings, namely Vonones I, about 8—12 A. D., and Vonones II, about 51 A. D. On the coins, both Parthian and Indian, the name is spelt Onênês, Ovonôs, but it was probably pronounced Vonônes, as the Latin historians write Vonones, which is now generally accepted as the correct spelling. It is clear, therefore, that the Vonones of Indian numismatics bore a purely Parthian name, and that in the absence of decisive evidence to the contrary, he should be regarded as being himself a Parthian. There is no sound reason for calling him Saka, or anything else than a Parthian. He is, however, a rather shadowy person, for he is not mentioned in any historical document, nor are any coins issued by him merely in his own name known 1). Our knowledge of his existence is derived solely from a series of provincial coins struck apparently by his relatives, who placed their own names and titles on the reverse, and those of Vonones on the obverse. The name and titles of Vonones are given in the Greek language and script as ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΥ ΟΝΩΝΟΥ, according to the regular Parthian formula, as used by Maues in the Pañjâb, while those of his relatives are given in Indian Prâkrit and the Kharoṣṭhī script, the Arian Pali of Cunningham. There can be no doubt that Vonones was the suzerain, and that his relatives were his subordinate colleagues, who were obliged to use an Indian language and script in order to make their coin legends intelligible to their subjects on the Indian border-land; while Vonones continued the old Bactrian and Parthian practice of using the Greek language and script as being one of the successors of Alexander 2). If the dates could be adjusted to suit, the most obvious assumption would be to identify the Vonones of the coins

1) If the coins of this Vonones ever should be recognized, I should expect them to be purely Parthian in type, without any Indian characteristics, and to be found in Sistân.

in question with Vonones I of Parthia, who reigned from about 8 to 12 A. D. But this is impossible, and the Indo-Parthian Vonones must be regarded as a Parthian chieftain, otherwise unknown to history who assumed, like Manes, the titles of the greater monarch occupying the throne of Ctesiphon. The probability would seem to be that our Vonones was a Parthian king of Sistān, or Saka-stēnē, more or less dependent on the central Parthian power, and that he administered Arachosia and the Indian border-land as dependencies of that kingdom through the agency of near relatives armed with viceregal powers\(^1\)). We possess the coins of three of such relatives, namely, (1) Spalahora, (2) Spalagadama, and (3) Spalirises.

Two types of the coins of Spalahora exhibit on the obverse the name and titles of Vonones in Greek, while the reverse legend is Maharajabhrata dhramikasa (or dhramiassa) Spalahorasa, [coin] of the pious Spalahora, brother of the king. A third type bearing the name of Spalahora is primarily a coin of his son Spalagadama, with the reverse Kharoṣṭhī legend, Spalahorapurutasa dhramiassa Spalagadamasa, [coin] of the pious Spalagadama, son of Spalahora. The obverse Greek legend is ΣΠΑΛΑΤΡΙΟΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΤ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΤ ΤΟΤ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ, where the genitive ΣΠΑΛΑΤΡΙΟΣ indicates a nominative ΣΠΑΛΑΠΙΣ as the Greek equivalent of Spalahora. Another and earlier type of the coins of Spalagadama gives the names of both Spalahora and Vonones, the legends being, in Kharoṣṭhī, Spalahorapurutasa dhramiassa Spalagadamasa, and in Greek, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΤ ΟΝΩΝΟΤ.

From these facts the inferences are inevitable that the king Vonones had a brother named Spalahora (Greek ΣΠΑΛΑΤΡΙΟΣ), who governed Arachosia as viceroy with the power of coining money. Spalahora ventured to coin in his own name as 'brother of the king', but never assumed the royal titles of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ or mahrājā. It also appears that Spalahora must have died during the lifetime of Vonones, and have been succeeded in the viceregal office by his son Spalagadama\(^2\).

But we also possess similar coins struck by one Spalirīsā as "brother of the king", with the Kharoṣṭhī legend Maharajabhrāhā dhramiassa Spalirīsasa, [coin] of Spalirīsā, brother of the king, and the Greek legend ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΤ ΣΠΑΛΑΠΙΣΟΤ.

---

1) We must remember that although Šakas were settled in Sistān, or Saka-stēnē probably a little before the time of Vonones, the province is described as one of the eighteen governments which made up the Parthian empire at the beginning of the Christian era. It may have come under the rule of a Parthian prince as a consequence of the conquests of Mithradates I.

2) I do not believe in the reading Spahorabhṛata dhramikasæ Spalahorasa supposed to have been found on a coin belonging to Mr. Brereton, mentioned by Thomas in Prinsep's Essays, Vol. II, p. 204, and quoted in B. M. Catal., p. 173; the normal reading would be Maharajabhrata etc. The obverse had the usual ΟΝΩΝΟΤ legend.
Again, other coins exhibit Spalirisa as king on his own account, with Kharoṣṭhī legend, Maharajasa mahatakasa Spalir-isasa, and Greek legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΤ ΣΠΑΛΙΡΙΣΟΤ'. The 'king' referred to in the first of these two types can hardly be any other than Vonones, and the legitimate inferences seem to be that the Spalirisa was a second brother of Vonones, who survived both Spalahora and Vonones and succeeded the latter on the throne, which as I have said, was probably that of the country now called Sistān.

Two types of coins (B. M. Catal., p. 102) exhibit on the reverse the Kharoṣṭhī legend, Maharajasa mahatakasa Ayasa, and on the obverse the Greek legend, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΤ ΣΠΑΛΙΡΙΣΟΤ. These coins prove that Spalirisa, after his succession to the throne, employed a relative named Aya as his viceroy in Arachosia. The nature of the relationship not being defined, the presumption is that Aya was the son of Spalirisa. As we shall see presently, the name Aya is rendered in Greek as Azes, which is the form generally cited. The series of the early Indo-Parthian coinage of Arachosia closes with these viceregal coins of Azes. A later series consists of the issues of the successors of Gondophares. The interval during which no Indo-Parthian coinage of Arachosia is known extends over about a hundred and thirty years; and this fact, not clearly recognized hitherto, calls for an attempt at explanation. But before entering on that question, I ask the reader to be good enough to carry in his mind the following brief tabular statement of the dynastic facts so far established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indo-Parthian Rulers of Arachosia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vonones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalahora (viceroy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalagadama (viceroy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalirisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aya or Azes (viceroy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The belief that Vonones struck coins bearing the name of Aya (Azes) on the reverse, originally expressed by Thomas in 1858 and re-affirmed by Cunningham in 1889, is due to the misreading of the legends on coin Nr. 256 of the cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

1) The order of the words ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ is peculiar to this king.

2) When preparing the catalogue of Indo-Parthian coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, including the cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, I was surprised at not finding the coin described as one of 'Vonones and Azas' by Thomas (J. A. S. B., 1868, p. 252) and Cunningham, Coins of the Sakas, p. 36, Pl. IV, 8). On comparing coin No. 256, which I had catalogued as one of Maues, with Cunningham's plate, I perceived that it must be the piece

9 *
The technical description of A. S. B. No. 256 (see figure 1) is as follows:—Æ; diam. 1 inch, or 26 mm.; weight, 93·5 English grains, or 6·35 grammes. Obverse,—Herakles standing facing; club and lion's skin in l. hand; r. hand on hip. Remains of indistinct Greek legend, [BAΣIA]ΕΩΣ BAΣΙΛΕΩΝ MΕΤΑ[ΛΟΥ], and below, traces of a name ending in ρ. Reverse,—Maneless lion or panther standing l.; mon. in l. field. Kharosthī legend, [rajadi]rajasa ma[hata], and below, [Mo]asa, indistinct; in poor condition.

Coins bearing the name of Azes, designed and executed in the Indo-Parthian style, and closely related in many details to the coins of the Vonones family, are extremely numerous, and occur in more than twenty distinct types. But these coins are obtained almost exclusively from the Paṇjāb, whereas the coinage issued by Azes as viceroy of Spalirīṣa belongs to Arachosia. In the Paṇjāb Azes was the successor, probably the immediate successor of Maues, and established a dynasty of considerable stability, while in Arachosia the series of early Indo-Parthian coins ceases abruptly with the viceregal coinage of Azes. The assumption has always been made tacitly that Azes, the king of the Western Paṇjāb, was identical with Azes, the Arachosian viceroy of Spalirīṣa. The correctness of the assumption is not self-evident, but the hypothesis of the identity of the regal with the viceregal Azes may be accepted provisionally. Proof will be given presently that there were two kings named Azes in the Paṇjāb, namely Azes I and II, probably related as

![figure 1.](image)

...
grandfather and grandson. If the viceroy of Spalirisa was really identical with either of them, that one must have been Azes I.

How then can the facts be given an explanation, which may pass as reasonable and adequate, even if not absolutely demonstrated? I think such an explanation may be found in the hypothesis that Arachosia was not definitely incorporated as a province in the Parthian empire until late in the reign of Mithradates II. I suppose that the establishment of a Parthian king, Vonones, perhaps independent, in Sistan, and the extension of his sway by means of viceroys over Arachosia took place about 120—115 B.C., as a collateral result of the operations of Mithradates I, rather than of those of his nephew. Vonones and his successor, Spalirisa, or Spalirises, continued to rule their realm, consisting chiefly of Sistan and Arachosia, as kings enjoying practical, if not nominal independence. But when Spalirisa died, the ambitious sovereign Mithradates the Great, then nearing the close of his reign, would seem to have suppressed the independence of Sistan, including its appanage Arachosia, or at least to have withdrawn from its rulers the privilege of coining money in their own names. Azes, who had been viceroy of Arachosia under Spalirisa, was not allowed to succeed that prince at Kandahar, but received compensation in the form of succession to Maues at Taxila in the Western Panjab. How all this happened, it is impossible to say. It is easy to imagine that the Parthian rulers of Kandahar may have been closely united with those of Taxila by ties of blood and marriage, and the remarkable similarities of the coinages of the two kingdoms support this hypothesis. But such conjectures are vain, and all that seems fairly certain is that Azes, the viceroy of Spalirises, lost Arachosia, and became King Azes I of Taxila. The chronological scheme which commends itself to me suggests that these events may have been the result of the tightening of the grasp of the central Parthian power on Arachosia by Mithradates the Great, but I am not able to give definite proof of this theory.

However this may be, and whether or not Azes I was personally connected with Maues, the Taxilan kingdom of the latter unquestionably passed into the hands of the line of Azes. The proof that then were two kings of Taxila named Azes is easy. Azes I struck a few coins, of which three specimens are recorded, bearing his own name in Greek on the obverse, and that of his successor, Azilises, or Ayilisa, in Kharoshthi, on the reverse. The legends are \( \text{BAΣIΛAΣ} \text{ ΒΑΣΙΛΗΣ} \text{ ΜΕΓΑΛΟΣ} \text{ ΑΣΟΣ} \), and \( \text{MΑHARAJASA} \text{ RAJA-RAJASA MAHAΤASA} \text{ AYILIŚAŚA} \). \(^1\)

---

1) B. M. Catal., Pl. XXXII, 9; Coins of the Sakas, Pl. VII, A 1; Catalogue of the Coins collected by C. J. Rodgers, purchased by the Government of the Panjab, Calcutta, 1895, Part III, p. 40. In Kharoshthi legends I make no attempt to mark long vowels, because the marks of quantity on the coins are distributed in very erratic fashion.
The coins struck by Azilises as independent king in his own name alone are numerous and various. One silver coin of his with his name in Greek on the obverse exhibits the name of Azes (Aya) in Kharoṣṭhī on the reverse, the legends being ḪAUSR PAKES PAUS ΛEΩΡA MAHAṬAposites and Maharajasa rajarajasa mahatasa Ayasa). These coins when considered together, prove that Azilises, before his accession to independent power, was the subordinate viceregal colleague of an Azes, and that an Azes, similarly, was subsequently the subordinate viceregal colleague of king Azilises. It is obvious that the two princes named Azes cannot be identical, and that they must be distinguished as Azes I and II. This necessary inference is fully confirmed by minute examination of the immense mass of coins bearing the name of Azes alone, which readily fall into two classes,—one well executed, with good Greek legends,—the other, semi-barbarous with debased, and often corrupt, Greek legends. The two groups are further distinguished by minor peculiarities. Opinions may differ as to the precise manner in which the line should be drawn; but the existence of the two groups is incontestable, and in most cases the discrimination is easy. Nevertheless, the existing works on Indo-Parthian numismatics fail to discriminate them; and, although Von Sallet long ago perceived that more than one Azes ought to be recognized 2) the first attempt to draw the line between the coinage of Azes I and that of Azes II is that made in my catalogue of coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, now passing through the press. Without going into minute numismatic details, I may say that the coins of the Strategos Aspavarma, with the name of Azes in corrupt Greek on the obverse, undoubtedly must be assigned to the reign of Azes II. The same remark applies to the coins, probably composed of billon, which exhibit either Pallas or a goddess with cornucopiae on the reverse, and have blundered Greek obverse legends. The case of the coins with the reverse type of Zeus holding out an image of Nikē is doubtful, and this issue may belong partly to Azes I and partly to his namesake, or, possibly, wholly to Azes I. In ancient India it was a common practice for a grandson to bear his grandfather's name, and the probability is that Azes II was the grandson of Azes I, and son of Azilises, who undoubtedly succeeded Azes I.

Azes II seems to have been succeeded directly by Gondophares, whose name appears on the coins in various forms, as Undopherres, Gudapharna, etc. The name obviously is a Persian one formed like Holophernes, Sitaphernes etc., but the form Gondophares is sanctioned by usage and may be retained 3). The coins of Gondo-

1) From Cunningham's collection, now in B. M.; photographed in Coins of the Sakas, Pl. VII, A 2.
2) "Vielleicht gab es mehrere Azes?" (Nachfolger, p. 140).
3) Dr. Fleet's form, Gondophernes, is not supported by authority (J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 229).
phares are found all over the Pañjab, from the foot of the mountains to as far south as Mūltān, as well as in Kandahār and Sīstān. In the course of three years' collection, Masson obtained only four specimens at Beghrām, but found none in the deposits of the *ṣtuṇas* near Kābul, and only four examples in those of the Jalālābād *ṣtuṇas*. From these facts Cunningham inferred that Gondophares “ruled over Kandahar and Sistan in the west, and over Sindh and the Panjab in the east”. This inference may be accepted, because the knowledge of Sir Alexander Cunningham concerning the local distribution of coins was unrivalled, and the facts seem to warrant his conclusion. The coins of Azes I, Azilises, and Azes II, being confined almost exclusively to the Pañjab, it is startling to find the coinage of Gondophares extending over the old Arachosian kingdom of Vonones and Spalirises as well as over the Taxilian realm of Maues and Azes.

The proper inference seems to be that Gondophares, king of Taxila, extended his sway over Sind and Arachosia by conquest. The troubles of the central Parthian government during the latter years of the reign of Artabanes, and the earlier years of Gotarzes, between 34 and 45 A. D., may suffice to explain the success of Gondophares.

I am disposed to place his death about 60 A. D. No Parthian successor to his throne in the Pañjab can be traced, except his nephew Abdagases, whose reign seems to have been short, and this fact probably finds its explanation in the strong pressure exercised at that time by the Yueh-chi and other nomad hordes from Central Asia. The annexation of Kābul to the growing Yueh-chi or Kushān empire may be dated approximately in 50 A. D., when the chief, whom European writers conveniently designate as Kadphises I, swept away the last remnants of Greek authority as represented by Hermaios. During the Indo-Parthian period, the Eastern Pañjab seems to have been held, as suggested by Cunningham, by Zoilos, Apollonices, and other Greek princes. But late in the first century, say about 90 A. D., all the minor states of the Pañjab, both Greek and Indo-Parthian, were absorbed into the Kushān monarchy by Kadphises II (Ooemo, etc.)¹). Probably the attacks by the nomad hordes lasted for many years, and it would seem as if, after the withdrawal of the strong arm of Gondophares, the Pañjab soon fell into disorder, until finally annexed by Kadphises II.

¹ For the chronology see my paper, ‘The Kushān or Indo-Scythian Period of Indian History’, *J. R. A. S.*, 1903, p. 29. Dr. Fleet and Dr. Otto Franke of Berlin (*Beiträge aus chinesischen Quellen zur Kenntnis der Türkvolker und Skythen Zentralasiens*, Berlin 1904, p. 72) are both willing to accept my Kadphises dates, but endeavour to show that Kanishka preceded Kadphises I. I cannot, as at present advised, accept their views on that point. If Dr. Fleet’s strong assertions were supported by equally strong arguments, they would be more convincing (*J. R. A. S.*, 1905, p. 233).
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The known successors of Gondophares, excepting Abdagases, whose coins come from the Western Pañjab, seem to have been restricted to Arachosia and the lower valley of the Indus. If a legend on a coin of Orthaghes is rightly interpreted as stating that he was a brother of Gondophares, he must be placed first in order. Pakores (ΠΑΚΟΡΗΣ) seems to come next, and a few rare coins commemorate an obscure ruler named Arsakes Dikaïos, whose position is uncertain. The coin of Arsakes Theos seems to be purely Parthian, and to have nothing to do with India. The same remark is applicable to the coins of Sanabares. The last trace of the Indo-Parthian power is found in the statement of the author of the Periploi of the Erythraean Sea, towards the close of the first century A.D., that the delta of the Indus, which he calls Scythia, was then governed by a number of Parthian chiefs, engaged in incessant internecine war. The Parthians evidently were forced southwards gradually by the ever growing Kushân power, which attained its climax under Kanishka and Huvishka in the second century, and the final extinction of the Indo-Parthian dominion may be attributed to Kanishka, whose dominions are known to have included Sind in the year 11 of the era in which his inscriptions are dated, and which may run from his accession or coronation.

But in order to complete my review of the subject, some brief reference must be made to the history of the Indian satraps, who have been alluded to, and were intimately connected with the Indo-Parthian kings. The theory that these satraps, or any of them, were Saka nomads has been exploded, as shown above, and the little that is known about them must be considered without the prejudice involved in the adoption of an erroneous hypothesis.

Cunningham remarks that "as the coins of Zeionises or Jihonisa [sic] are of superior execution, I would assign him to an early date during the reign of Azas, or about 80 B.C. I take him to have been the Satrap of Taxila, as I found one of his coins in a Stûpa at Minikyâla, along with a relic casket marked with the Arian [scil. Kharoṣṭhī] letter j on each of its three pieces (Arch. S. Reports, II, Pl. LXV). The coins give the name of his father Manigul, and as he is also called a satrap, I think it probable

1) "The seaboar of Scythia, a region which extends to northward. It is very low and flat, and contains the mouths of the Sinthos (Indus), the largest of all the rivers which fall into the Erythraean [= Arabian] sea . . . . In the interior is Minnagar, the metropolis of Scythia, which is governed, however, by Parthian princes, who are perpetually at strife among themselves, expelling each other" (Ch. 38, Mc Crindle's transl. Ind. Ant. VIII, 138. The text will be found in Müller, Geogr. Gr. Minores, I, 287; χασινιατα δε υπο Παρθων, συνεχος άλληλοις ένδωκοινατον). The exact position of the capital Minnagar and its port Barbarikon cannot be determined, owing to the extensive changes in the courses of the rivers. The evidence concerning the date of the Periploi is summarized in Early History of India, p. 207, n. 2.

2) Inscription from Suč Vihár near Bahāwalpur in Sind (Ind. Ant., X, 324).
that Manikyāla may have received its name from him. The coins of Jihonisa [sic] are found chiefly in the north-west Pañjāb. The silver pieces are rare, but the copper coins are common. The name of Manigula is decidedly like that of a later prince, Mihirgul".

The evidence fully warrants the opinion that Zeiónises and his father Managula were satraps of Taxila, but the date assigned by Cunningham is much too early. Although the dies of the coins are executed with some boldness and freedom, the Greek legend on the obverse is debased and corrupted to such an extent that it is barely possible to make out that the letters seem intended to represent MANNI'TAOT ΤΙΟΤ ΣΑΤΡΑΠΟΤ ΖΕΙΟΝΙΣΟΤ, no one of the four words being spelled correctly. Such Greek is very different from that found on the early coins of Azes I, dating from about 90—80 B. C., whereas it is similar to that used on the late coins attributed to Azes II. The so-called ‘Buddhist symbol’ of trisula form in the obverse field of the Zeiónises coinage also occurs on both the Pallas and Aspavarma types of Azes II, but never on the coins attributable to Azes I. It seems to me quite certain that the coinage of Zeiónises belongs to the period of the later, and not to that of the earlier, Azes. The mean approximate date of 10 A. D. may be assigned to it.

The satrap’s name in vernacular is not Jihonisa, as given by Cunningham, but Jihānia. The Greek form of the name of his father is too much corrupted to be certain, but may have been MANNITAEΣ. In the vernacular, on all the specimens which I have examined, the name is Managula, not Manigula, which latter reading would seem to be due to the influence of the corrupt Greek and of the desire to connect the name with Manikyāla, where a coin of Zeiónises was found by Cunningham. No coins of the satrap Managula have been found yet. My impression is that both Managula and his son Zeiónises were satraps or governors of the province of Taxila, that is to say, the Western Pañjāb, during the reign of Azes II, between about 15 B. C. and 25 A. D. Aspavarma, the son of Indravarma, is called on his coins stratēgos, a title used as a synonym for satrap. He belongs to the same period as Zeiónises. His coins, which are common, are found “all over the Pañjāb, but chiefly in the north-west”. Probably he was to a large extent contemporary with Zeiónises, although entrusted with the government of a distinct province, and having his capital at Chiniōt, Siālkōt, or some other of the many ancient cities of the Pañjāb.

The names of Aspavarma and his father indicate unmistakably

---

2) The reading of the drawing of the coin, B. M. Catal., Pl. XXXII, 11, is given by Gardner (p. 174) as Jihānia, but I have no doubt that the correct reading is Jihonisa, as on other specimens.
3) Bevan, House of Seleucus, 1902, p. 152; with reference to Polybius, XXI (13), 4.
that they were members of the native Indian community, who obtained office under the government of the Parthian foreigners. Theoretically, the word *varma* or *varman* should be used as a component of Kṣatriya names only.

The names of Zeiōnises (Jihunia) and his father Managula do not seem to occur elsewhere, so far as I know. These satraps may either have been Parthians, or have belonged to some other race of foreigners, members of which took service under the Parthian king.

Another group of Satraps of Taxila is known from epigraphic records and is intimately connected with a line of satraps of Mathurā. The earliest of the latter line probably were the associated rulers Hagāna and Hagānasā, presumably brothers, whose coins are not uncommon. Their names are distinctly Persian (Parthian). These local rulers, perhaps, were succeeded directly by the satrap Rājuvula or Rājula, whose son was the satrap Sodāsā. Bhagvān Lāl Indraji was probably right in his suggestion that the Indianized form Sodāsā represents the Persian Zodas, and that a Persian name also lies hidden in Rājuvula, and its variant forms Rājula and Raṇjubula.

In the line of connected Taxilan satraps several names are known. The rare coins of Charanostis (Kharamosta) are found only in the north-western Pañjab. He seems to be named in the inscriptions on the Mathurā 'lion-capital'. His son Artas is also given the title of Satrap. Other satraps of Taxila were Liaka and his son Patka. The relations of these princes with one another, as well as with the Hindū Rājas of Mathurā, and the Greek kings named Strato, are exceedingly obscure; and an attempt to elucidate them in detail would require a long separate treatise. The subject cannot be discussed as a supplement to an essay mainly concerned with the Indo-Parthian dynasties; and I refer to it briefly here only for the purpose of calling special attention to the markedly Persian features of these dynasties of satraps. The title satrap itself is, of course, of Persian origin, and the continued use of it in India for many centuries proves the deep impression made on the Indian mind by Persian institutions, and indicates, I think, the existence of relations between the Persian empire and the states of India closer than those which are usually admitted. For nearly five centuries, from about 248 B.C. to 226 A.D., the government of the ancient Persian empire was in Parthian hands, and, so far as foreign powers were concerned, the words Parthian and Persian were synonymous.

The connexion between India and Persia was of very old standing. going back to the conquest of the Indus valley by Darius, the son of Hystaspes, about 500 B.C.\(^1\). Alexander claimed to

---

be, and actually was for a few years, the successor of the great Persian monarchs.

His campaign maintained the association between India and Persia, and after his death traces of Persian influence may be detected in the usages of the Maurya court and in the language of Asoka’s inscriptions\(^1\)). The cession by Seleukos Nikator to Candragupta Maurya of a large part of Ariana kept the Indian monarchy in close touch with the Bactrian kingdom, and so indirectly with Persia\(^2\); and when the Parthian kings, Mithradates I and II, annexed provinces of Bactria, and extended their power up to and beyond the frontiers of India, they did not appear in the light of total strangers. They only continued the intimate relations which had existed for centuries, with more or less interruption, between India and Persia.

The so-called ‘Northern Satraps’ of Taxila and Mathurā were all, I believe, closely connected officially with the Indo-Parthian dynasties, the history of which has been investigated in this paper. Whatever might be the nationality of a particular satrap, I doubt if he would ever have been known by that Persian title but for the conquests of Mithradates I and his successors, the Parthian kings of Persia. I feel no difficulty in admitting the identity of Moga, the ‘great king’ of the Taxila copperplate, with Maues, the Parthian king of Taxila, and in recognizing Liaka and Patika the satraps, as provincial governors under Maues. Similarly, the satrap Zeiōnises and the stratēgos Aspavarma administered parts of the Pañjūb under the control of Azes II. The position of the satraps of Mathurā in relation to a superior power is obscure, but it is certain that these officers were intimately associated with the satraps of Taxila, and I feel tolerably certain that the satraps of Mathurā, like their Taxilan contemporaries, acknowledged some kind of fealty to the Indo-Parthian kings, and thus indirectly to the distant Parthian sovereign, who occupied the throne of the Achaemenidae\(^3\)).

---

2) *Early Hist. of India*, pp. 132–34.
The Nameless King, Sōtēr Megas, whose coins are unmistakeably Parthian in style, was probably a Parthian chief, subordinate to Kadphises II, and perhaps a scion of one of the old Indo-Parthian ruling families. He was certainly contemporary to some extent with Kadphises II.

I have reserved for the last discussion of the few notes of time which serve to indicate the chronology. They are unfortunately not very positive, and their interpretation depends largely on the validity of certain hypotheses. If I am right in connecting Maues with the annexation of the Western Pañjab, or kingdom of Taxila, by Mithradates I in or about 138 B.C., that approximate date gives a starting point, and no Indo-Parthian king or coin can be earlier than 138 B.C. When the dates are also considered from the other end of the series, and reasonable estimates are made for the length of each reign, I think it will appear that the accession of Maues may be dated in 125—120 B.C.

If the assumption be correct that Azes I of Taxila is identical with Azes, the viceroy of Spalirises in Arachosia, the chronology of the Arachosian and Taxilan lines must be harmonized in his time. The Arachosian line consists of two principal kings only, Vonones and Spalirises, whose coins are not very abundant, and for whom, accordingly, long reigns cannot be claimed.

On the other hand, the extent and variety of the coinage of Azes I, Azilises, Azes II, and Gondophares demand the allocation of long reigns to all these four kings. As the terminus a quo is supplied by the approximate date 138 B.C. for the annexation of the Pañjab by Mithradates I, so the terminus ad quem is supplied by the approximate date of 90 A.D. for the annexation of the same country by Kadphises II, Kushān; and the whole Indo-Parthian history must lie within the period of 228 years comprised between those limits. But the real limits are somewhat narrower, because the accession of Maues cannot well be carried back farther than 125 B.C., nor can the death of Gondophares, which practically marked the close of the Indo-Parthian power in the Pañjab, be placed later than 60 A.D. The Indo-Parthian dominion in the Western Pañjab, the kingdom of Taxila, may be assigned with some confidence to the period from 120 B.C. to 60 A.D., in round figures. It lasted a little longer in Arachosia and the lower Indus valley, and lingered in the Delta as late, perhaps, as 130 A.D. Its climax in both the Pañjab and Arachosia was attained in the days of Gondophares, whose long reign may be dated as extending from 20 to 60 A.D.

---

1) Early Hist. of India, p. 222. Masson found four specimens of the coinage of Gondophares associated with numerous coins of Kadphises I (Kujula) and a few of those of the Nameless King in stūpas at Jalalābād (Coins of the Sakas, p. 21). He collected no less than 695 coins of the Nameless King at Beogrām near Kābul (Thomas’ Prinsep, I. 351).
Gondophares was certainly anterior to Kadphises II, and later than the Azes group of kings. According to the well-known Christian legend, which can be traced back to the third century 1), he was believed to have been contemporary with the apostle Thomas; and the Taxila inscription dated in the 26th year of his reign, and the year 103 of an unspecified era, is ordinarily interpreted in terms of Vikrama era. I doubt very much if the so-called Vikrama era was then in use, and think it quite possible that the inscription may be dated in the Caesarean era of Antioch, for instance, which ran from 49 or 48 B.C., or in some other foreign era. But the ordinary interpretation fits well, and we are entitled to assume with some confidence that the reign of Gondophares began somewhere about 20 A.D. An argument from his use of the title аврοχαρες, which was formerly cited, is no longer valid, as that title was assumed by Sinatruces, who reigned in Parthia from about 77 to 70 B.C. (Wroth, p. 42), long before any possible date for Gondophares.

My view of the chronology, as deduced from all available indications, may be summarized in the following statement:—

**Parthia.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mithradates I</td>
<td>circa 171 B.C.</td>
<td>annexed kingdom of Taxila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mithradates II</td>
<td>circa 123 B.C.</td>
<td>annexed parts of Bactrian kingdom, including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>? Arachosia and Sistan (Zarangiana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100—90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artabanus III</td>
<td></td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artabanus III</td>
<td></td>
<td>times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34—45 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indo-Parthian kingdom of Taxila.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ruler</th>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maues, acc.</td>
<td>circa 120 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azes I, acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azilises, acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azes II, acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strategos Aspavarma and satrap Zeionises subordinate.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gondophares, acc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conquered Arachosia and Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdagases, son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of brother of Gondophares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60—65 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2) According to Cunningham (Coins of the Sakas, p. 64) the coins of
V. Smith, *The Indo-Parthian Dynasties*.

### Indo-Parthian kingdom of Arachosia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vonones, acc.</td>
<td>circa 115 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalahora, brother, and Spalagadama, nephew, as subordinate colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalirises, acc.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azes, subordinate colleague, lost Arachosia and became king of Taxila</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Arachosia brought under direct rule of Central Parthian government by Mithradates II</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Arachosia recovered by the Indo-Parthian Gondophares, king of Taxila</td>
<td>40 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthagnes, acc.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakores, acc.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinction of Indo-Parthian power, except in the Delta, by the Kushāns</td>
<td>90—100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Final extinction of Indo-Parthian chiefs of the Delta by Kanishka</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abdagases are found in company with the closely related coins of Gondophares, bearing the word *sasasa* in the exergue of the reverse. The statement in *B. M. Catal.*, that the coins of Abdagases "with legend Sasasa" come from the Western Panjāb is a blunder. No such coins are recorded, except that Thomas erroneously used the heading 'Sub-Abdagases Sasan' in *Prinsep's Essays*, II 216. I do not believe that the word *sasasa* is a proper name. It seems to be an epithet or title, like *jayatasa* in the same position on the nearly contemporary coins of Azes II and his strategos, Aspavarma. Mr. Rodgers boldly dubbed the mythical 'Sasan' as "a relative of Gondophares" (*Coins Collecting in N. India*, Allahabad, 1894, p. 27). The relationship of Abdagases to Gondophares is affirmed explicitly on the coins.
The Pahlavi Texts of the Sroš Yašt, being those of Yasna LV—LVI, edited with the collation of all the MSS.*

By

L. H. Mills.

Yasna LV.

Sroš Yašt i kas.

Introduction.

The Hearing of Aūharmazd is invoked.

*Niyōkšesn'1** latamā aē2 ait³ i⁴ aūharmazd av⁵ yazešn'⁶ [aēy barā aē⁷ denā⁷ yehmtēnāt] i sūt Ḿvāstār žag i⁸ aharūv' [žag⁹ (i)¹⁰ aūharmazd] man' lanā ᾶvāstār¹¹ [nēvakih¹²] čegōn aš (or 'aš')¹² frātūm [mēnesnīg¹³ bayen¹⁴ av¹⁵ denā yazešn yegavimūnāt¹⁶ am (or 'havam')¹⁷] aētōn¹⁸ afdūm i²¹ [aētōn u²⁰ mēnesnig²¹ roēsā²² barā vebedūnām-²³ aīs latamā aētōn²⁴ hanā²⁵ ait²⁶].

[The Text of the first sub-section of B (D, P⁴ 4) is here given in its entirety.

Sroš Yašt i kas¹***)

Sroš as the 'Ear of God'.

1 Niyōkšesn² latamā aē³ ait (i)⁴ aūharmazd av⁵ yazešn' [aēy yazešn' aētōn yehvūnāt i aūharmazd gōs yayešnīnāt] i sūtēmānd⁶ (i) aharūv' [žag aūharmazd] man' lanā ᾶvāstār [nēvakih] čegōn frātūm aētōn afdūm [čegōn aē³⁷ frātūm bayen yegavimūnāt havam afdūm rōēsā barā vebedūnānī⁸ latamā aētōn'.]

2 Niyōkšesn¹ hanā ait¹ i aūharmazd yazešn' i sūtēmānd i aharūv man' lanā ᾶvāstār [nēvakih].

*) Translations of Y. I, X, XI, XII, XIX, XXXV—XLII, IX, 1—48 have appeared in JRAS.; that of Y. IX, 49—103 in JAOS. Transl. of this Sroš Yašt also appeared in JRAS., July '05.

**) Cf. Y. 28, 5.

***) As this text differs considerably from those of the other MSS., it is here cited apart. It coincides to some extent with C, the Parsi-pers.