

by tradition or in works, now unknown. The work is moreover, for an Indian production, so remarkably free of extravagance, that on internal grounds few charges can be brought against it. I am far from asserting that no objections may be raised against it; I must myself point out that it appears strange that the author never mentions Varáha-mihira or Amara-Sinha; but on the other hand Sanskrit literature is so poor in historical works, that one ought not to despise any bit of information which is not manifestly wrong.

The Bhojaprabandha is silent about the well known so-called *nine gems*, of whom Kálidása was one; we have to look elsewhere for the authority from which our knowledge of the *nine gems* is derived.

The tradition, if this be the word, about the *nine gems* has recently been assailed by F. E. Hall.* He points out that the stanza :

धन्वन्तरिः क्षपणको ऽमरसिंहशङ्ख-
वेतालभट्टघटकपर्पराकालिदासाः ।
ख्यातो वराहमिहिरो नटपतेः सभायां
रत्नानि वै वररुचिर्नव विक्रमस्य ॥

makes part of the Jyotirvidábharaṇa; he argues that such a book has no authority, and adds that, barring this single passage, nobody has seen the “authorities” spoken of, but never seen by Prof. Wilson. This statement of Hall’s, if it were true in every respect and did not need some qualification, would render the so-called tradition next to worthless. But Hall has overlooked an important fact, to be mentioned afterwards, so that his assertion is only partially true. True it is that the stanza in which the names of the nine gems individually occur has, as yet, only been found in the Pseudo-Kálidása. Happily this forger had too little skill to conceal that the stanza, as it stands in the Jyotirvidábharaṇa, is singularly out of

* Preface to his edition of Wilson’s translation of the Vishṇupurāṇa, p. viii. note.