

material culture, and so forth, all make very interesting and instructive reading. I can cordially recommend the book.

C. O. BLAGDEN.

---

ARCHÆOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA. ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1906-7; pp. 267; 74 plates, and numerous text-illustrations. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India; 1909.

The publication of this volume so soon after the preceding one has done much towards bringing the issue of the series up to date.

The first part of the volume, pp. 1-33, with 11 plates, deals as usual with conservation, in which line some specially important work was done at Jaunpūr, Agra, Lahore, and Shāhdara, in addition to good progress having been made at other places in India and in Burma.

The bulk of the volume is devoted to exploration and research: pp. 34-205, with plates 12-74. Operations were continued at Kasiā by Dr. Vogel (pp. 44-67), and at Sārnāth by Mr. Marshall and Dr. Konow (pp. 68-101). Some valuable discoveries were made at Sahribahlol by Dr. Spooner (pp. 102-18), including, notably, a fine group of Kubēra and Hāriti with attendant figures (plate 32, *c*), and a beautifully executed seated Buddha (plate 34, *a*). The latter article is followed by a second note by the late Dr. Bloch on his excavations at the funeral mounds at Lauriya (pp. 119-26). And Mr. Taw Sein Ko has given us, from the excavations at the Pet-leik-paya pagoda near Pagan in Burma, another series of the curious terra-cotta plaques illustrating the Jātaka stories (pp. 127-36).

We have next the first instalment of an article by Dr. Vogel on the Mathurā school of sculpture (pp. 137-60). What he may have to say on this topic will naturally be best understood and weighed when we have the

complete article before us. Meanwhile it appears from Mr. Marshall's résumé on p. 43 that the results so far are, that the Mathurā school was largely dependent on that of Gandhāra, though it did not owe its origin to that school; that its existence is carried back to at least the second century B.C.; that it had come under the influence of the fully developed Gandhāra art in the time of the early Kushan kings; and that, consequently, "the art of Gandhāra itself must be pushed back to a considerably earlier period; sufficiently far, that is, to account for the relatively great decadence of the Mathurā as compared with the Gandhāra work."

A contribution on Muhammadan architecture in Kashmīr by Mr. W. H. Nicholls comes next (pp. 161-70). Then follows one by Mr. Cousens on the temple of Brahma at Khēḍ-Brahma (pp. 171-8). And then a contribution by Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar on the Lakuliśa form of Śiva (pp. 179-92), in which he has very usefully given us a brief abstract of the Kārvāṇ Māhātmya, and the text, with translation, of an extract from a Jain work entitled Tarkarahasyadipikā, which presents a summary of the Śaiva doctrine of the Naiyāyikas: regarding Lakuliśa, something has already been said in this Journal, 1907. 419-26.

The remainder of this part of the volume (pp. 193-205) is occupied with some notes by Pandit Daya Ram Sahni on the results of a short tour of inspection made by him in the Gōrakhpūr and Sāran Districts under instructions given by Mr. Marshall on a request made by the writer of this notice. The request was largely based on "information received" which does not seem to have been of a very reliable nature, since various reported indications of stūpas and other remains were not found to exist. The results, however, are not wholly unremunerative, though they have not at all come up to what was expected. And they do not upset the writer's belief that Kusināra, where

Buddha died, is to be looked for somewhere near Pachrukhi, a railway station about 32 miles north-west-by-north from Chhaprā.

The epigraphic portion of the volume contains a general progress report for the year written by the Epigraphist, Dr. Konow (pp. 206–16), and a comprehensive monograph on the Pallavas by the present Epigraphist, Mr. V. Venkayya (pp. 217–43), which is a very useful addition to previous treatments of the history of that great ruling family of Southern India.

On p. 210 Dr. Konow has brought to notice, apparently from the Hazārā District, an interesting date recorded in the Laukika or Lōkakāla reckoning which is well known in connexion with Kashmīr, the Kāngra District, and some of the neighbouring Hill States. The characteristic feature of this reckoning is the omission of the hundreds (both centuries and millenniums); so that, e.g., “the year 38” may mean also any such year as 138, 238, 338, and so on, up to 4938 (we have not yet come to the year 5038). In this new inscription, the year is stated in figures as simply Saṁvat 38, in the usual fashion, but also fully in words as Laukya- or Lōkya-saṁvat 538. The other given details are Kārttika śukla 13, Saturday. And they place the record on Saturday, October 17, A.D. 1461.

The interest attaching to this date lies in its stating the century, and in the point that according to the usual reckoning the date should fall one year later, in A.D. 1462. We find the explanation of the matter in Albērūnī's account of the Lōkakāla: see his *India*, translation by Sachau, 2. 8. He has told us that his gauge-year Śaka-saṁvat 953 expired, = A.D. 1031–2, was the year 6 (expired) according to the Kashmīr custom, but was counted by the people of Bardari and Mārīgala (Taxila) as the year 110 of an era of their own, and by the

people of Nirahara, "behind Mārigala", and of Lanbaga (Lamghān) as the year 108. From that we see that the reckoning had been introduced into countries outside Kashmir at some time between A.D. 925 and 1025; and the people of the territories named by Albērūnī, not recognizing its purely centennial nature, had continued the numbers of that century into a new century instead of beginning again with a fresh year 1. The people of Nirahara and Lanbaga had dislocated the reckoning to the extent of four months, by using it with a year which began with the Mārgaśīrsha śukla 1 preceding the Chaitra śukla 1 with which the year of the same number began in Kashmir. Subsequently, their reckoning must have been further dislocated, by eight months more, by an adoption of the Chaitra śukla 1 preceding Mārgaśīrsha śukla 1 as the initial day of the year. And so it came about that Kārttika of the year 538, in which numbering we recognize a continuation of the era set up by the people of Nirahara and Lanbaga, fell in A.D. 1461 instead of 1462.

J. F. FLEET.