

ritual in Siam seems to be of late date, as the author cannot find any mention of it earlier than 1640 A.D. It was very probably borrowed from similar customs in India. Though the historical portions of the book, in which the Indian origin is taken for granted, is very weak, the volume is valuable as a detailed and evidently reliable description of a curious ceremony as now practised in Siam.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE DEKKAN DOWN TO THE MAHOMEDAN CONQUEST. By RAMKRISHNA GOPAL BHANDARKAR. 2nd ed. Bombay Gov. Cent. Press, 1895.

In minor details Dr. Bhandarkar has added to his new edition of the *History of the Dekkan*; but the book is, in the main, little more than a reprint of his earlier work. Since the publication of the latter in 1884, research has, in fact, thrown little new light on the history of the dynasties with which it is concerned, and such fresh evidence as has since appeared seems to have strengthened rather than weakened Dr. Bhandarkar's belief in the conclusions formed by him at an earlier period on various historical and chronological questions.

With regard to the Andhras, he has seen no reason to change his earlier views, which, it may be added, differ materially from those of other scholars. A considerable number of historical and chronological data as to the later princes of the dynasty has lately accumulated; but the rashness of basing conclusions on these, while scholars are so divided in their interpretation of them, is exemplified in the present work. There is scarcely a point in connection with the Andhras upon which Dr. Bhandarkar does not differ from his colleagues, not only as to the interpretation of the data, but with regard to the conclusions to be drawn from them.

For some time past the date of Gotamiputra I. has been considered to be fixed within very narrow limits by the synchronism connecting him with Nahapāna. Two of the

Nāsik inscriptions have been attributed to Gotamīputra, dated in the fourteenth and twenty-fourth years respectively. Scholars have taken these dates to refer to his own reign, and as the inscription of the fourteenth year is dated from the victorious camp at Govardhana, and records a grant of lands previously held by Nahapāna, and as Nahapāna's latest known date is Ś. 46, *i.e.* A.D. 124, the inference has been drawn that Gotamīputra's initial date must fall somewhere about A.D. 113. Dr. Bhandarkar, however, takes an entirely different view of these inscriptions. The year 14 he evidently reads as the year 18, and he refers both it and that of the year 24 to the reign of Puṣumāyi, arguing that Gotamīputra and Puṣumāyi ruled contemporaneously, the first at Dhanakataka, the second at Nāsik. He finds a support for this hypothesis in the inscription at Nāsik, dated in the nineteenth year of Puṣumāyi, in which Gotamī, the donor of the cave, is called the mother and grandmother of a great king, and Gotamīputra's exploits are enumerated in a way which suggests his being still alive at the time.

With regard to Chaturapana, Māḍharīputra, and Yajñaśrī, Dr. Bhandarkar likewise holds different views to those of other scholars. Paṇḍit Bhagwānlāl supposed Chaturapana, from his bearing the name of Vāsishṭīputra, to be a brother and successor of Puṣumāyi, and he thought to have proved from one of his coins that he was the father of Yajñaśrī Gotamīputra II. Dr. Bhandarkar's reading of the coin in question, however, exactly reverses the Paṇḍit's conclusion, and makes Yajñaśrī the father of Chaturapana.

Māḍharīputra's exact relation to the other Andhras has never been satisfactorily determined, but Dr. Bhagwānlāl claimed to have established his position between Puṣumāyi and Gotamīputra II. on the evidence of the Kolhāpur coins. The grounds on which he based his argument were, first, the workmanship of the coins; and second, the fact that Māḍharīputra re-struck coins of Puṣumāyi, and that coins of his own were in turn re-struck by Gotamīputra. The re-striking by Gotamīputra of Māḍharīputra's coin is denied

by Dr. Bhandarkar, who considers the re-striker to be Māḍharīputra, and the coin in question originally one of Gotamīputra's. At the same time he brings forward a piece of evidence in support of his view of which Paṇḍit Bhagwānlāl was unable to make use. The coins of Vāsishṭīputra (Puḷumāyi) and Gotamīputra bear the legend *Vīlīvāyakura*, those of Māḍharīputra that of *Sevalakura*, which Dr. Bhagwānlāl was unable to interpret. Some time ago Dr. Bhandarkar broached the theory that these were the names of the viceroys appointed by the Andhras to rule that part of the country, the coins in question being issued in their names, and this supposition was made almost a certainty by the identification of Vīlīvāyakura with the Baleokuros, governor of Hippokura, mentioned by Ptolemy as contemporary with Puḷumāyi. This theory the Professor still holds, and it incidentally confirms his view as to Māḍharīputra's position in the list of the Andhra kings; for, as Vāsishṭīputra and Gotamīputra have the same viceroy, the inference is that they succeeded each other; while Māḍharīputra, having a different one, may have preceded or succeeded them, but could not have come between them.

On various other points connected with the Andhras Dr. Bhandarkar maintains his old views. He is inclined to give its full weight, for chronological purposes, to Ptolemy's mention of Chasṭana and Puḷumāyi, and disposes pretty successfully of the objection raised against it by other scholars. With regard to the disputed passage about the Sātakarṇi King in Rudradāman's inscription, Professor Bhandarkar has modified his earlier translation; though it is evident that he still differs from Dr. Bühler as to the exact interpretation to be put upon the words in question, and is not, apparently, inclined to follow that scholar in the deductions he draws from it in connection with the Kanheri Cave inscription of the Queen of Vāsishṭīputra Sātakarṇi (see *Ind. Ant.*, xii. 272 ff.).

It is open to question whether the date for the rise of the Andhra dynasty yielded by manipulation of the Paurāṇic records, is so reliable as Dr. Bhandarkar seems to think.

The Nānāghaṭ inscription of Simuka, who has been identified with the Paurāṇic founder of the dynasty, belongs, according to Dr. Bühler, to the period B.C. 200–150, a date which the resemblance of the Nānāghaṭ characters to those of the Hāthigumptā inscription (Maurya era 165, *i.e.* B.C. 150) goes far to confirm; while the date derived by Dr. Bhandarkar from the Purāṇas is B.C. 73.

It is true that the agreement of the various Purāṇas as to the number of years occupied by the Maurya and Śuṅga dynasties gives a certain plausibility to conclusions based on these, but Paurāṇic chronology must always be used cautiously. On the other hand palæographic evidence, if unsupported by any other, can never be more than an approximate guide for chronological purposes, as the development of alphabets is probably not everywhere a uniform process, but liable to be modified by accidental and local influences for which it is not always easy to account. It may be well, before committing ourselves to either date, to await some fresh light on the subject.

With the Chālukyas we touch firmer chronological ground, and, as the main lines of their history are well established, but little addition of new material is to be expected in the present work.

With regard to Maṅgalīśa it is to be noted that the Professor differs from Mr. Fleet in his reading of the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription, which, according to the latter, is dated in the fifth year of Maṅgalīśa, the Siddhārtha Samvatsara full-moon tithi of Vaiśākha (Ind. Ant., xix. 7), corresponding to the 12th April, 602, thus fixing Maṅgalīśa's initial date in A.D. 597 or 598. Dr. Bhandarkar adheres to his original date of A.D. 591, being that furnished by Indravarman's Goa grant of Ś. 532, issued in the twentieth year of the reign, which reign Dr. Bhandarkar takes to be Maṅgalīśa's, while Mr. Fleet regards it as Indravarman's (see Ind. Ant., xix. 11). The Professor discusses the question in a footnote, and gives his reasons for differing from Mr. Fleet.

Considerable doubt still exists amongst scholars as to the

Chālukya rulers of Gujarāt. Dr. Bühler (Ind. Ant., xvii. 199) recognized two Gujarāt branches of the dynasty. Mr. Fleet, whose list in the third volume of the *Epigraphia Indica* is the latest, gives three branches; but the grant of Vijayarāja, from which he derives his first branch, is considered spurious by Dr. Bhandarkar, who, even if he were to admit its genuineness, would be inclined to identify the "Jayasimha" mentioned in it with the brother of Vikramāditya I. rather than to regard him as an earlier prince of the same name, as does Mr. Fleet. The date Sam. 394 he would refer to the Gupta rather than the Chedi era, as has hitherto been done.

In his account of the Rāshtrakūṭas the author has incorporated some facts which have come to light since he wrote his earlier work. The date of Ś. 705 furnished by the Harivaṃśa Purāṇa for Govinda II., and already mentioned in the appendix to the earlier edition, is worth noting. Mr. Fleet seems to have overlooked it in his latest list of the Rāshtrakūṭas (Epig. Ind., iii. 54), or, what is more likely, has referred it to Govinda III. since it exactly corresponds to A.D. 782, the first date given by him to that monarch. Dr. Bhandarkar quotes some interesting notices from Jaina works about the first Amoghavarsha, showing that he patronised the Jaina creed, if he did not actually hold it himself. The Digambara Jains attribute to him the authorship of the *Praśnottara Ratnamālikā*, and a stanza at the end of their copies of it says he composed it after he had abdicated the throne "in consequence of the growth of the ascetic spirit within him." This statement throws light on a chronological difficulty hitherto unexplained. A Kanheri inscription of Ś. 799 mentions Amoghavarsha as king, while another at Saundatti of Ś. 797 names his son Kṛishṇa as reigning. If Amoghavarsha really abdicated his throne, this discrepancy may easily be accounted for.

As regards the rest of the Rāshtrakūṭa dynasty, the conclusions already arrived at by the Professor in his first edition of the work, and verified by the evidence of the

Wardha grant (J.B.R.A.S., xviii. 239 ff.), have required no modification. Mr. Fleet, who formerly differed from him as to various points in the genealogy of the dynasty, has, to judge from his latest table of it (Epig. Ind., iii. 54), accepted, in almost every case, Dr. Bhandarkar's views.

In the case of the later Chālukyas, the Kalachuris, and the Śilahāras, there has been no material addition lately to the historical facts already known about them. The Samgamner plate of Bhīllama II. and the Kalas Budruk grant of Bhīllama III. have enabled the author to throw light on some doubtful points in the earlier chronology and genealogy of the Yādavas of Devagiri, while Jahlan's *Sūktimuktāvali* has yielded some information about the later Yādavas. Dr. Bhandarkar, like Dr. Hultzsch, seeks to establish a synchronism between the Yādava Jaitugi I. and the Kākatiya Gaṇapati of the Ekāmranātha inscription of Ś. 1172; but, as I have pointed out in the Ind. Ant., xxii. 326, these kings can only be made contemporary by the assumption that Gaṇapati reigned forty or fifty years, for which assumption there seems little justification, and still less, if any reliance is placed on the evidence afforded by contemporary literature for the Kākatiya dynasty.

Amongst other points of interest in the new work are the Professor's adherence to his old views regarding the dates of Pāṇini and Patañjali, and his rejection of the theory that Kanishka was the founder of the Śaka era. As to Patañjali's date probably few scholars now differ from him, but it is doubtful whether his relegation of Pāṇini to the seventh century B.C. will find the same support. With regard to Kanishka, the Professor seems to lay rather too much stress on the difficulties in the way of identifying him with the founder of the Śaka era. The era began, we know, in A.D. 78, and all evidence hitherto available points to Kanishka's having ruled about that period. He is known, not only from coins and inscriptions, but from contemporary notices, as a very powerful ruler with a widely extended dominion. He was, moreover, a Śaka, and, so far as we know, there was no other king of

that period likely to have started the era. Consequently, though direct proof is wanting, probability is strongly in favour of the theory that the era was inaugurated at his coronation.

Indian chronology is like a gigantic and incomplete puzzle, the pieces of which tax all one's ingenuity to put together. A great portion of it is still in almost hopeless confusion, but here and there gaps are gradually being filled up. A book like the present is a striking example of the amount of information which patient research has gleaned from the materials at its disposal, and, coming as it does from the pen of one who has rendered such brilliant services to the cause, it inspires the hope that more of the missing pieces may yet be found to complete the picture which scholars are so laboriously putting together, and that the method which has been so effective in elucidating the early history of the Dekkan may be applied with equal success to other obscure regions of Indian history.

C. M. DUFF.

THE JĀTAKA, OR STORIES OF THE BUDDHA'S FORMER BIRTHS. Vol. I. Translated by ROBERT CHALMERS, B.A. Cambridge: University Press, 1895.

This beautifully printed volume is the first instalment of the promised translation of the Jātaka, under the superintendence of the veteran Professor Cowell, who has contributed an interesting preface. Out of the 550 stories constituting the whole work, the present issue contains 150. This corresponds to the number in the first volume of Fausböll's edition. Forty of these had been already translated by Prof. Rhys Davids, fifteen years ago, who had also rendered the precious introduction, the *Nidāna-kathā*, in which the life-story of Gotama up to the attainment of Buddhahood was related. The plan of the new enterprise has not included this; and it has also dropped the Pāli commentary on the Gāthās which