

position in the itinerary of each pilgrim, and each itinerary fitted into the other. Hiuen Tsiang now supports Fa-hien, and Fa-hien supports Hiuen Tsiang."

On consideration, this theory is not so improbable as it may appear at first glance. As Mr. Mukherji points out (p. 15), Kapilavastu had decayed before the date of these pilgrimages. Of it Fa-hien, *c.* 400 A.D., says, "there is neither king nor people: it is like a great desert. There is simply a congregation of priests and about ten families of lay people"; and Hiuen Tsiang, about 230 years later, describes the district as having "some ten desert cities, wholly desolate and ruined." It is by no means improbable that, amidst this desolation, traditions may have been lost or confused. It would be interesting to ascertain whether similar confusions in the identification of places connected with the life of Christ are to be found in the Holy Land.

Mr. Mukherji has brought together a mass of information dealing with the ancient monuments of this most interesting district, the home of Buddhism, which will prove of great importance to future workers in this field. The whole scheme of his operations and his instructions as to methods of procedure were drawn up at the request of the Government of India by Mr. Vincent A. Smith. It is a matter of the deepest regret that Mr. Smith's retirement deprives India of one who, by his great knowledge of the monuments, his faculty of weighing evidence, and his sober judgment, was eminently qualified to serve the cause of Indian archæology.

E. J. RAPSON.

INDIENS KULTUR IN DER BLÜTHEZEIT DES BUDDHISMUS.  
KÖNIG ASOKA: VON EDMUND HARDY. (Mainz: Kirch-  
heim, 1902.)

This beautifully illustrated and extraordinarily cheap volume—it costs only four shillings—is one of a series on "The World's History in Character-pictures." The publisher of the series has been fortunate to obtain the

services of so able a writer and so careful a scholar as Professor Hardy for this particular volume. It is true that the popular nature of the whole series has precluded the author from the discussion of those doubtful points in the biography of the great Buddhist sovereign which would have given the best scope for his special knowledge. But the hand of the scholar is traceable throughout.

We have first an account of Alexander's invasion of India. It is incidentally noticed that copper coins struck then and there by Alexander, in just the square form of the Indian currency of the time, are still extant. A figure of one of these coins now in the Old Museum in Berlin is given in illustration. The author is of opinion that it was the invasion of Alexander that gave rise in India to the idea of a Cakravartī, of a sovereign of the world. In my little manual (p. 220) I have said, speaking of Candragupta, not of Alexander: "Is it surprising that this unity of power in one man made a deep impression upon them? Is it surprising that, like the Romans worshipping Augustus or like Greeks adding the glow of the sun-myth to the glory of Alexander, the Indians should have formed an ideal of their Cakravartī, and transferred to this new ideal many of the dimly sacred and half understood traits of the Vedic heroes? Is it surprising that the Buddhists should have recognized in *their* hero the Cakravartī of righteousness, and that the story of the Buddha should have become tinged with the colouring of these Cakravartī myths?"

This does not say in so many words that the idea was not older than Candragupta. But that was probably in my mind; and I take the present opportunity of saying that, for the reasons given in this book, it was almost certainly Alexander, and not Candragupta, whose power and career first gave strength to this old conception of the king of the golden age, so powerful ever afterwards in the minds of the peoples of India.

There then follows an account of Asoka's life as crown prince: and incidentally we have the very interesting question discussed whether the two bas-reliefs on the eastern

Toraṇa at Sānchi do not represent the state processions at the time of the taking of the Bo Tree from Budh Gayā to Ceylon. Dr. Grünwedel was the first to suggest this. Dr. Burgess (pp. 70–72 of the English edition) has adopted his view. Professor Hardy (pp. 10, 11) evidently thinks it is probably right, and makes the further suggestion that the two figures above the peacock (mayūra, mora) may be meant for Asoka and his wife. It is well known that Asoka's clan-name, Maurya, is derived from the peacock. The question is a difficult one to discuss without plates; and Professor Hardy's are much larger, clearer, and better than any we have yet had.

The description of Asoka's activity after he ascended the throne is based on the inscriptions, but illustrations of a most suggestive kind are throughout adduced both from the literature and from the monuments. And attention is directed (p. 24) to the point, sometimes overlooked, that royal edicts are not always entirely to be trusted, even when their meaning is not open to doubt. We are glad to see that the author understands the *sambodhi* exactly in the sense in which it is taken in the "Dialogues of the Buddha," l. 190–192. And the observations at pp. 29–31 are both new and true. It has been sometimes supposed that it was Asoka who gave importance to Buddhism. On the contrary, says Professor Hardy, Asoka, always intent on practical political results, probably chose Buddhism, not so much on account of its peculiar doctrines, as because it was already the creed of the majority, and therefore politically more important than other creeds. This is an exact analogy (he might have added) to the relation of Constantine to Christianity.

The book is full of suggestive points of this kind, and we trust that the author will find opportunity to publish more in full his views on several subjects, especially, for instance, on the chronology of the edicts and on the interpretation of the Bhabra Edict, on both of which he differs from M. Senart.

RH. D.