

putra'⁹⁴ meaning 'god-son' is slightly different. It was not used for worldly kings but specifically for a class of distinguished divinities, which in Indian Buddhist texts was specifically used for four regional 'great kings', i.e., regents of four quarters, East, West, North and South who were 'sons of heaven'. In the later Kuṣāṇa times, the term seems to have denoted the sense of Royal insignia.⁹⁵ In a Buddhist text of this period the question is raised 'why kings are called *devaputra*' and the answer is that before being born as a man, he was abiding among the gods (*devas*) and that, because the thirty-three gods (each) contributed to his substance, therefore, he is 'god-son'.⁹⁶

That *Daivaputra* denotes the Kuṣāṇas is obvious, since, no other Indian king is known to have been styled 'devaputra'. Though Indian kings were usually addressed as 'Deva', we do not find any evidence of an Indian king referring to himself as *deva*. The Kuṣāṇas did not adopt *devaputra* as an official title in early times. It is totally absent from their coins, its reading on one coin of Kujula Kara Kaphsa being an error which has been noticed by Thomas after re-examining the coin in consultation with Allan.⁹⁷ Kaniška has not used the title even in Peshawar Casket Inscriptions which were officially engraved. It is only in documents inscribed by Indians that the title '*devaputra*' is used for the Kuṣāṇa kings.⁹⁸ The title is used for the first time for Kaniška (known as Candana Kaniška).⁹⁹ *Mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra* Kuṣāṇa of the Taxila Silver Scroll Inscription is generally taken to refer to Kaniška.¹⁰⁰ As rightly observed by Thomas "the *devaputrasa* of the scroll inscription is the first known instance of the application to the Kuṣāṇas of the designation *devaputra*, which regularly, though not invariably, recurs with Kaniška and his successors."¹⁰¹

Thus we do not find the title *Devaputra* being used by the Kuṣāṇa rulers themselves but was applied to them by the Indians. Why of all ruling dynasties only the Kuṣāṇas were designated as 'Devaputras' is really inexplicable. Thomas suggests two possibilities. It may be due to the fact that the Indians saw some similarity between the figures of the grand Yakṣa and those of the burly Kuṣāṇa kings and the superior title of 'Devaputra' may have appeared to be a suitable appel-