

idea of its real date ; the impression the reading of it makes upon me is, that it may have been written a hundred years ago, it can not be much more modern, for Wilford knew the work.

The Jyotirvidábharṇa then is the only work, as yet brought to public knowledge, which contains the information that Vikramāditya S'akāri lived before our era and was the founder of the *samvat*. If there exist other works giving the same information, they ought to be brought forward, the sooner the better.

The information we derive from the other sources, cited above, may be stated briefly to be this : as early as the time of Kalhaṇa-Paṇḍita and Albírúní, (the eleventh century) some held the opinion that there had been a king Vikramāditya before the Christian era, the historian of Kashmere identifying him with Pratápāditya, the Arab on the other hand calling him a king of Málava ; both assert that Vikramāditya, the conqueror of the S'akas lived 78 A. D. So had Utpala done nearly a century before, 966 A. D. Three centuries before, about 640 A. D., Brahmagupta, one of the greatest of Hindu astronomers, places the defeat of the S'akas 78 A. D., and Hiouen-Thsang places Vikramāditya, a mighty conqueror whose sway extended even over foreign countries, in the first half of the second century of our era. It must be admitted that the authorities of all these men is not sufficient to render the epoch of Vikramāditya's reign and his chief achievements, historically certain, for not one of them is a contemporary witness. At the same time it will be granted that they may have seen, and part of them very likely had seen, original documents, of whatever description these may have been. To declare their testimony to be of less value than that of a liar, like the Pseudo-Kálidása, is an undertaking nobody is likely to attempt. I will not deny that there may have been some king before our era, called Vikramāditya, but the authenticity of the story is many degrees lower than the authenticity of the stories about