

A concordance of proper names (pp. 200–230), a list of symbols (pp. 231–245), and a glossary (pp. 246–319) enhance the value of this industrious, well-arranged, and well-printed book. To every future student of this branch of Assyriology Dr. Hinke's treatise will be indispensable. One can only wish the "Babylonian Expedition" well and hope that more volumes will soon follow.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

---

THE EARLY HISTORY OF INDIA, FROM 600 B.C. TO THE MUHAMMADAN CONQUEST. By VINCENT A. SMITH. Second edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908.

Mr. V. Smith is to be heartily congratulated on this new edition of his history; congratulated not only on the popularity of the work, as shown by its sale, but still more on the improvements he has introduced in the second edition. It is an ambitious and an arduous task to write the history of Ancient India when the materials are so imperfect, the *lacuna* so great, and so much is in dispute. By the history of Ancient India we virtually mean the history of Northern India; and even for this our materials are very incomplete and very capriciously distributed. The epigraphic evidence, which is much the most important, has been digested for two periods only—the age of Asoka and of the Guptas; with regard to the Śakas and the Kushāns, matters are still in dispute. The evidence of coins fails us altogether east of Allahabad, and the testimony of the Greeks and Chinese is limited to certain brief periods, while the Purāṇic legends and the chance references of native writers help us little. After the fourth century A.D. matters improve somewhat, and before the close of the mediæval era we begin to have some local histories; but, generally speaking, we have darkness illuminated by gleams of light,

and although the outlines are perceptible, the details are unknown. Thus any political history of Ancient and Mediæval India at the present time must be regarded as largely tentative; but the discoveries of the last 50 or 60 years have been so numerous that it was worth while making the attempt. Mr. Smith's preliminary studies on Alexander's campaigns, Asoka, the Indo-Scyths and Kushāns, the Gandhāra sculptures, and the coinage and geography of the Guptas have made scholars acquainted with his views, and these have not always met with acceptance. But Mr. Smith's merits as a collector and arranger of facts are undeniable; he has ransacked every recent publication bearing on his subject down to the end of 1907; his diligence is admirable, and his history maintains a uniform average of general excellence and seldom degenerates into a bald chronicle of names. He succeeds as a rule in giving the ordinary reader a succinct impression of what is surmised or known; and he has supplied the student with a storehouse of references to the recent literature. Few scholars have the good fortune to see a large edition of so serious a work exhausted in three years; fifty years have not sufficed to dispose of Lassen's monumental tomes; and although the rapid sale of Mr. Smith's book is due in part to its adoption by the Indian Universities, it argues a considerable public interested in the results of research, if not qualified to follow the preliminary discussions.

The improvements in the new edition of Mr. Smith's work are twofold. It has evidently been subjected to a very careful revision; verbal changes are fairly numerous, dates are altered here and there, and most of (although not all) the slips have been corrected. But the main feature of the present work is the addition of more than 70 pages of new matter, an addition really of one-sixth to the volume of the book. Most of the additions relating to the history of Ancient India proper, the period before 650 A.D., relate to matters of secondary importance, and

spring out of recent literature. A paragraph at the end of the long note on Aornos tells us that Dr. Stein's exploration of Mahāban completely disproves Colonel Abbott's theory. We have an interesting resumé of the recent papers in the *Indian Antiquary*, etc., on Chāṇakya's revenue system; the much vexed question of Hiuen-tsiang's Mo-la-p'o is rediscussed; and evidence is adduced to show that Skandagupta had some liking for the Buddhists. Mr. Smith has added something in support of his views on Kushān chronology, and he has arrived at the conclusion that the so-called 'Chinese' hostages of Kanishka were petty princes of Kashgharia, a conclusion which is doubtless correct. So far we are only dealing with the details of old matter. As regards the Śakas and the Indo-Parthians, his views have undergone some modification. He still appears to hold that the main body of the Śakas entered India by way of Gilgit or Chitral, an opinion which is shared by many other scholars, and for which much may be said, although it is probably erroneous; but he recognises for the first time in some adequate fashion the influence of the Parthians in Western India, a point of capital importance, as it seems to us, which supplies the key to many things.

So far as the ancient history is concerned, we regard this acknowledgment of Parthian influence to be the chief contribution of the present volume. Before passing on, however, to greater matters, we may point out that in his account of S. Thomas and Gondophares, which is partially new and based on the latest discussions of the subject, Mr. Smith still quotes the Clementine Recognitions as the chief authority for the mission of S. Thomas. S. Thomas' apostolate among the Parthians and his visit to Gondophares are highly probable; but the insertion of the name of S. Thomas in the Clementines is demonstrably a dramatic interpolation (J.R.A.S., 1907, p. 958, note). The chief feature of the present edition, the feature which

distinguishes it from its predecessor, is the treatment of mediæval India, including under that term the Chalukyas and Rāshtrakūtas of the Deccan and the Pallavas and later kingdoms of the Tamil country. The treatment accorded to this period in the original work was meagre, lifeless, and inadequate; it evidently had no interest for the author. It has been rewritten for the greater part, and enlarged to double, so that it now forms nearly one-fourth of the whole history. For the chapter on the Chalukyas and Rāshtrakūtas of the Deccan Mr. Smith, of course, had excellent materials to start with, and here comparatively little has been altered. The history of the kingdoms of the South has been largely rewritten and considerably enlarged, the most noteworthy additions being the introductory sketch of the trade and civilisation of the South in Roman times, and the account given of the Pallavas. All this is well done. But the chief feature of the new edition is the mediæval history of Northern India. Sind and Assam are brought for the first time under review; we should expect more to be made of Nepāl and its age-long connection with Tirhūt, with the help of M. S. Lévi's fascinating volumes, but that, after all, is only local history; the history of the Pālas and Senas of Magadha and Bengal is much improved, and brought into accordance with the most recent lights. But it is in dealing with Kanauj, the Rājputs, and the Gurjaras that Mr. Smith is at his best. He now admits (for the first time, we believe) that the Hūṇa invasion really shattered the foundations of the Gupta Empire and changed the face of North-Western India: the recent speculations on the origin of the Rājputs and their connection with the Gurjaras and other barbarian invaders have fired his imagination; and he rightly insists that the Rājputs form an occupational caste composed of many elements, Aryan, aboriginal, or Central Asian, which were fused together and took shape in the anarchic centuries

that followed the invasion of the Hūṇas. In all this there is, of course, nothing original, but we are glad to have him for a convert, and he tells the story well. The history of Kanauj is closely connected with that of the Rājputs, and is related more fully than has ever been done before; indeed, it was impossible to do so until very recently. Of course, there are many points on which we venture to dissent. Take the first which occurs to us. We have certain reasons for thinking that both Ptolemy's Kanagora and Kanogiza refer to Kanauj, and we know no reason to the contrary (p. 347). Again, the obvious reason for the final abandonment of both Kāmpilya (Kampil) and Kanauj was their desertion by the Ganges (p. 348). But to omit all petty matters, let us come to the main point. Mr. Smith sometimes fails, we think, to see the wood for the trees; and he has overlooked the fact that the tradition of empire attached itself to Kanauj from the days of Harsha to the close of the mediæval period. What Rome was to the barbarians, and Byzantium to the mediæval world of Europe, that was Kanauj in a lesser degree to the upspringing tribes of the Rājputs. The empire of Harsha was the last great empire which they knew of; the Doāb was the sacred land of the Hindus, and Harsha's capital, Kanauj, was the greatest and most magnificent of its cities; learning and the arts continued to flourish there in the eighth and ninth centuries, when they were almost extinct in the surrounding provinces. Thus Kanauj became the cynosure of the Rājputs, the pattern of the purest Hindu civilisation, the inheritor of a great tradition and renown. None of the great Rājput tribes had their origin in this holy land, while all aspired to imitate its ways. Alone among the inland kingdoms of Hindustān the fame of Kanauj extended beyond the frontiers of India; it reached the ears of the Chinese and the Arabs. Emigrants from Kanauj were sought for to fashion the Hinduism of Bengal and to occupy lands in Gujarāt. The King of Kaśmīr

counted it his proudest boast to have defeated the army of Kanauj; and the alien monarchs who occupied the seat of Harsha assumed imperial titles, and seem to have occasionally exercised a vague suzerainty over territories which sometimes extended as far as the Himalayas, and at other times to Gujarāt. The celebration of the *aswamedha* by Rāja Jaichand, the last of the Kings of Kanauj, was an expression of this imperial claim, a claim out of all proportion to the reality, and contested in the closing centuries of the Middle Ages by Ajmīr, Mahobā, Delhi, and other famous homes of Rājput valour and Sanskrit learning.

We have dwelt at length on this point, partly because it is intrinsically important and is usually overlooked, and partly because it refutes an error which is in danger of becoming general. Philologists divide the Aryan vernaculars of Northern India into two great groups—an inner group allied to the classical Sanskrit, and an outer group of non-classical Aryan. The inner group, which is the speech of the Doāb, radiates outwards into the Eastern Punjāb and Rājputāna, and, as Dr. Grierson says, “it has burst through the retaining wall of exterior languages, and reached the sea in Gujarāt.” East of Allahabad we have a vernacular which holds a middle place between the inner and the outer circle. This distribution corresponds exactly with the mediæval influence of Kanauj and the history of the Rājputs. But a theory has recently sprung up which we should call wild, if it were not advocated by some great authorities and adopted in the new Gazetteer of India. This theory assumes that there was a second invasion of Aryans speaking a vernacular allied to the later classical Sanskrit, who, without leaving any trace of their migration on the road, installed themselves in the heart of the country, and pushed the earlier Aryans north, south, east, and west. That such marked linguistic differences should survive after the lapse of

more than three thousand years, and the "drums and tramlings" of so many conquests, is scarcely credible, and certainly unparalleled; nor does it explain the anomalous linguistic survivals which lie outside the pretended ring fence. The Gazetteer, indeed, says that "the record of physical characters bears out the conclusions suggested by philology." If the Gazetteer means that the fair-skinned Aryans got the more mixed the farther they travelled east, no one doubts it. But this is no support to the theory. On the contrary, the ring-fence theory ought to show the survival of the fair-skinned Aryans in Bengal in contradistinction to the darker Aryans of mixed blood in the Doāb. Q.E.A., a veritable absurdity, as Euclid saith. Mr. Crooke sums up the ethnographical evidence very clearly: "While to the east and south we can recognise an Indo-Aryan race of overlords and a lower stratum of black menials, in the Punjāb, from the Rājput and Brahman at the top down to the scavenger at the bottom, the race type is uniform." The physical facts not only do not support the ring-fence theory; they are a direct refutation of it. The linguistic facts are undoubted, and the mediæval influence of Kanauj and the Doāb on the Rājputs is their obvious historical explanation. When the Rājputs took the manners and civilisation of the 'Middle Country' for their standard, they largely adopted its speech, a speech which had been moulded by centuries of literary culture. The Brajbhāshā was to them what the literary language of the South of England was to the dialects of Britain. Pity it is that Mr. Smith lost so excellent an opportunity of giving the *coup de grace* to a speculation so impossible and misleading as this 'ring fence' theory.

J. KENNEDY.