APPENDIX

Date of Kanishka:

The date of Kanishka's accession to power and the foundation of the era named after him, have been a subject of discussion and disputation for more than three quarters of a century. In the maze of conjectures and possibilities no firm footing exists and one gets worried on this account, especially because the period of uncertainty and guess, far from being narrowed down, is being extended. Chronology based upon epigraphy, evidence from the coins, their finds in hoards and palaeography, and the imitation of the types, excavated sites and the unearthed materials from India and abroad, Chinese evidence in late works or traditions, astronomical data etc have been marshalled by scholars in support of one theory or the other.

1. The wording of the dates of the Kushāṇa records of the time of Kanishka, Huvishka, and Vasudeva is radically opposed to the wordings of the Saka dates. On the other hand, as Kielhorn suggests, it is identical with the wording of the dates in the so-called Malwa-Vikrama era (I.A. XXVI, p. 153.

2. Quoted by Konow - CII, pp. XCVI, 77.

3. CII, p. 77, (Corpus Inscriptionum, Indicaum).

4. Ibid, p. 29.

5. Ibid., p. 81.
It would therefore, be necessary to consider and examine the entire evidence afresh without being tied down to any one view to fit in the details accordingly. 6

At the London conference on the date of Kanishka, held in 1913, the British Orientalists were sharply divided. Besides those advocating the Vikrama theory, there was a strong band of scholars supporting the Śaka era theory. Col. Waddle 7 suggested that Kanishka seemed to be associated with the great epoch-making event of Eastern Asia - the introduction of Buddhism into China. This factor also tended to place him in the first Century A.D. about the beginning of the Śaka era. Long work Dames 8 was non-committal, while F.W. Thomas 9 whose paper actually started the discussion was an advocate of the 78 A.D. Theory. Rapson also supported this view.

Among the Indian scholars supporting A.D. 78 for Kanishka were H.C. Ghosh 10 and H.C. Raychaudhari 11 .

6. JRAS, 1913, pp. 945-952.
10. The date of Kanishka, IHQ, IV, 1928, pp. 760-764.
former pointed out that a date as late as 125 A.D. or later for Kanishka's ascendancy is impossible in view of the fact that Vasihska\textsuperscript{12} is mentioned in an inscription of the year 28 of the Kanishka era at Sanchi, while Rudradaman\textsuperscript{13} is known to have ruled over that part of the country about 150 A.D. Raychaudhari\textsuperscript{14} has summed up the views of different scholars and finally agreed with the Saka era advocates. Prof. Lohuizen-de-Leeuw\textsuperscript{15}, however, suggests A.D. 79, as the starting point of the Kanishka era and draws attention to the remarkable coincidence that Van - Wijk found the year A.D. 79 to be one of the three possibilities for the epoch of the Kanishka era.\textsuperscript{16} Earlier in the same work Van Lohuizen has suggested that Kanishka ascended the throne in or after A.D. 71 and before A.D. 86.\textsuperscript{17} In a recent work B.N.

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., IHQ V, 1928, pp. 49-70.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, V, 1928, pp. 75-80.
\textsuperscript{14} PHAI, 3rd ed. (1931), p. 321 ft.
\textsuperscript{16} Van-Wijk, The Erans in the Indian Khārostī Inscriptions; AO, III, p. 78; The Seythian Period, pp. 381-82.
\textsuperscript{17} op.cit; p. 64.
Mukherjee also places Kanishka's accession in A.D. 78.\textsuperscript{18}

The number of supporters of the second century A.D. for Kanishka appears, of late, to be growing. V.A. Smith\textsuperscript{19} was the first to moot this idea. Smith while referring to nine different theories of the Kushāṇa chronology, proposing dates for the accession of Kanishka ranging from B.C. 57 to A.D. 278, a period of 335 years, felt bewildered. John Marshall,\textsuperscript{20} who conducted excavations for two decades at Taxila, while participating in the debate, ruled out on the basis of the stratigraphic evidence from the historic place, the possibility of Kanishka as the founder of the era of 58 B.C.\textsuperscript{21} and also of his family preceding that of Kadphises.

In his magnum opus Taxila, Sir John\textsuperscript{22} points out that his discoveries at Taxila have proved beyond question that Kanishka followed the two Kadphises,\textsuperscript{23} and the conclusion seemed inevitable that he could not have come to power until

\begin{enumerate}
\item[18.] The Genealogy and Chronology of the Kushāṇas, pp. 64-65.
\item[19.] Smith, V.A., The Kushāṇa or Indo-Scythian Period of Indian History, pp. 44-46.
\item[20.] The date of Kanishka, JRAS, 1914, pp. 973-980.
\item[21.] Ibid, 1915, pp. 191-196.
\item[22.] ARASI, 1902-3, pp. 174-176.
\item[23.] Taxila, I, p. 38.
\end{enumerate}
after A.D. 125\textsuperscript{24}. This conclusion, according to him, is also borne out by the decadent character of the relic casket from Kanishka's stupa at Peshawar, which on grounds of style can hardly be referred to an earlier date than the second century A.D.\textsuperscript{25}

Sten Konow was another great supporter of the second century A.D. theory for Kanishka's accession to power. Equating Po-tiao with Väsenteva he tried to fix the beginning of the Kanishka era approximating between A.D. 130 and 170. Accepting the astronomical calculations done by Van Wijk, Sten Konow at first suggested that A.D. 134 as the date of Kanishka's accession.\textsuperscript{26}

Later on he proposed that the initial year of the Kanishka era should be A.D. 128-129.\textsuperscript{27} He pointed out that Wijk\textsuperscript{28} had done so, implying that he accepted the results of the latter's astronomical calculations. In a subsequent paper, "Notes on Indo-Scythian chronology" published in

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{26}Taxila, I, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{27}I.H.Q. II, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{28}A.O. III, pp. 83 ff; V, pp. 168 ff.
\textsuperscript{28}JJH, XII, pp. 1-46.
1933, Sten Konow, a Norwegian archaeologist, suggested 145 B.C. for the beginning of the old Saka era and 128-129 A.D. for the beginning of Kanishka's reign. In 1947 the Norwegian Professor proposed A.D. 138 as the beginning of the Kanishka era. While in another article contributed in the Vogal Volume he arrived at another date for Kanishka, viz. A.D. 200. The earlier date, viz. 128-129, suggested by Sten Konow was also accepted by Jayachand Vidyalankar who firmly accepted Sten Konow's contention which, according to him, could be definitely taken as the date of Kanishka's accession.

B.N. Puri suggested in 1942 that Kanishka era seems to have started in c. A.D. 144, thus eliminating the chance of his clash with Rudradaman as both ruled over the Malwa region. Prof. Ghireshman made an analytical study of the finds of Begram, which was destroyed by the forces of

30. Van Hahnizen-de-Leeune (Seythian Period, p. 16).
32. The date of Kanishka, JBOHS, XVI, (I & II), pp. 45-63.
33. Indian Culture VIII, pp. 91 ff.
Shahpur I and subsequently restored, came to the conclusion that Vasudeva (Po-Tiao) was the last Kushana sovereign whose coin type was borrowed by the Sassanian sovereign. The Sassanian princes also assumed the title Kushana Sahanshah (the king of the kings of the Kushanas) from A.D. 230 to 248. He proposed c. 144. A.D. as the date of Kanishka's accession to power and the initial year of his era to coincide with the information from other sources-Chinese & Iranian.

Epigraphic Evidence regarding date of Kanishka:

Epigraphic evidences are also furnished by the records referring to this Kushana ruler and his successors. These inscriptions are dated in an era with a reference to the regnal year of Kanishka's rule and an important point worth noticing is that the months and dates follow a uniform pattern, the seasonal division of the year and dates having no reference to the bright or the dark half but are in

36. IRAS, 1912, pp. 997 ff.
continuation. This is very significant.\textsuperscript{38} The advocates of the Saka era theory while accepting Kanishka's claim as the founder of the era, suggest that the era was the famous era of A.D. 78. In doing so they identify the Kushāṇa ruler mentioned in the famous Taxila record of the year 136 A.D. with Kanishka himself. The find place of this inscription and the dating pattern are important for consideration. The silver scroll bearing the Khāroshthī inscription was found by Marshall in one of the chambers to the west of the Dharamrajika stupa of the Chir mound. According the Sir John, "The Chapel in question built in a small diaper type of masonry which came into vogue in Taxila about the middle of the first century A.D., and lasted for about a hundred years'. The plate shows that symbol which is known from the coins of Kujula Kara Kadphises and Wima Kadphises.\textsuperscript{39}

The record is dated in the old era, and if Kanishka was the founder of an era starting from year one of his

\textsuperscript{38} The wording of the dates of the dating Kushāṇa records of the time of Kanishka, Huvishka and Vāsudeva is radically opposed to the wordings of the Saka dates. On the other hand, as Kielhorn suggests, it is identical with the wording of the dates in the so-called Malava-Vikrama era. (IA. XXVI, p. 153). The Saka records generally use the word Varsha while these of Kanishka and his successors have words like, sa, samuatsa, samvatsara.

\textsuperscript{39} Konow-CII, pp. XCVI, 77.
accession, there seems no reason why this Taxila record, and so many others that follow - Peshawar Museum inscription of the year 168.40 Khalatse of the year 187(?),41 the Taxila silver vase of the year 191,42 the Dewai inscription of the year 200,43 should be in the old era, and in these, unlike the records connected with Kanishka and his family, the names of the individual months are also given. No records dated in the old era are found between 200 (Dewai) and 318 (Loriyan Tangai). According to Lohuizen-de-leeuw44 that was the period covered by the inscriptions of Kanishka and his successors. That might be acceptable but there seems a consensus of opinion that this old era has to be equated with the famous era of 58/57 B.C. which later on came to be known as Vikrama or Krita era.45

If we identify the Kushāna ruler of the Taxila scroll inscription with the king Kanishka and his era with the Saka one of the 78 A.D. then there is an insurmountable

40. CII, p. 77.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid. 79.
43. Ibid., p. 81.
44. Ibid. 108.
45. JBBRAS, XX, 1902, p. 386.
chronological difficulty that cannot be overcome. The record of Jihonika dated in the year 19146 133 A.D. from Taxila itself supports him as a full fledged ruler with the title Rajan and he issued coins as well in his name. The question of his exercising authority over Taxila and the adjoining region is, therefore, settled. On the other hand the Wardak inscription of Huvishka,47 dated in the year 51, extends the rule of this Kushāṇa ruler even 30 miles to the west of Kabul. If it is dated in the Saka era of 78 A.D. Huvishka empire extended as far Afghanistan in the year 129 A.D. Therefore, either Jihonika was ruling as a vassal of the Kushāṇas, or the western portion of the Kushāṇa empire must have been lost of this ruler. Unfortunately neither of these two probabilities can be accepted. There are instances of several Kushāṇa Kshtrapas and Mahakshatrapas, namely, Kharapullana, Vanashpara, (Sarnath),48 Liaka (Zeda),49 Vespasi (Manikiala),50 the Kapisa Kshatrapa51 the son of

46. op.cit,
47. CII, p. 165.
48. Ref. No. 16.
49. Ref. No. 79.
50. CII, p. 150.
51. Ref. No. 20.
the Kshtrapa G (r) - Anavhryaka - (Manikiala Bronze Casket) of the time of Kanishka and his successor probably. They never issued coins, although in two cases the name of the overlord too is not mentioned.

An instance of chronological overlapping arises from Kanishka being placed in the second century A.D. in his contemporaneity with Rudradaman. His great Girnar inscription\(^5^2\) of the year 72 = A.D. 150 makes no mention of an overlord, nor does the era employed in it is based on a date in the second century, but in the Saka era of A.D. 78. Although he assumes the titles of Rājan Mahākshatrāpa, which he attained himself (svayam = Adhigata mahākshtrapanāmnā); he was evidently not a vassal but a very powerful and independent monarch. He also claims victories over the Yahudheyas who dwelt on the southern bank of the Sutlej in the very heart of Kanishka's territory. Further in the year 28 of Kanishka's era Vasishka, the successor of Kanishka, is mentioned as emperor in an inscription of Sanchi.\(^5^3\) This would clash with the Saka's hold over Ujjain.

\(^{52}\) EI, VII, pp. 42 ff.
\(^{53}\) EI, Vol. IX, p. 244.
Numismatic Evidence:

This evidence is confined to the finds of Kushāna rulers in treasure troves along with those of others whose dates are known, or nearly known, the types of the coins issued by the rulers after a certain pattern or patterns and corresponding to a set weight to cater for commercial and trade requirements, their borrowing later on, and the use of the cursive Greek in legends on their coinage. The Ahinposh Stupa finds, though not the largest treasure trove, provided ample material for study in fixing the date of Kanishka. The coins included 6 of Wima Kadphsies, 10 of Kanishka and 1 of Huvishka, which was in a very good condition. The 3 Roman coins included one each of Domitian (A.D. 81-96), Trajan (A.D. 98-117) and Sabina (A.D. 128-37). These must have been brought there by traders and suggest that the coins must have been buried after A.D. 137, and in the time of Huvishka. The coins must have taken sometime to travel which might be between 25-50 years or even less. That would place Kanishka, father and predecessor of Huvishka, in the second century A.D., some time after 120 A.D. On the

other hand, Kennedy assumed\(^{56}\) that it was by mere accident that Huvishka was represented in the Ahin Posh Stupa. These coins, like the Roman ones, seem to have been placed in Stupas along with gems, relics and other valuable articles and a collection of curios. This argument of Kennedy is well constructed by Thomas\(^{57}\) disguising the circumstances in a haze of inconclusive matter. The association of the three Roman coins whether placed as curios or otherwise in the Ahinposh Stupa along with that of Huvishka and his predecessors make it certain that the stupa was built during or soon after the life time of Huvishka.

Having gone through the literature and the views and interpretations of the various scholars regarding the year of ascension of Kanishka I to the thrown has been considered and taken of A.D. 78 for this study.

\(^{56}\) JRAS, (1913), p. 737

\(^{57}\) Ibid., (Quoted by Kennedy).