

court were nine learned men, *celebrated under the epithet of the Nava-ratnāni or nine jewels*; one of whom was Amara-Deva, who was the king's counsellor, a man of great learning, and the greatest favourite of his prince." The inscription is from *Samvat* 1015 or 948 A. D. So the antiquity of the tradition is fully vindicated, and at the same time additional strength is given to the assertion that the stanza is intruded into the *Jyotirvidābharāṇa*.

It is at the same Buddha Gayā that General Cunningham has found a corroboration of the tradition that Amara-Sinha was contemporary, or at all events nearly contemporary, with Varāha-mihira. The learned archæologer shows* that the Buddhist temple at Gayā, the remains of which he has surveyed, is the same as the one seen by Hiouen-Thsang between 629—642 A. D.; he shows farther that the temple did not yet exist at the time of Fa-Hian's visit between 399 and 414 A. D. As the temple, according to the inscription before mentioned, was erected by Amara-Deva, one of the nine gems at the court of Vikramāditya, he concludes that Amara-Deva is the same with Amara-Sinha, the author of the *Amara-Kosha*, and that the same Amara-Sinha must have lived between 400 and 600 A. D.; taking the mean, we get 500 A. D., which again coincides with what we should expect in regard to Varāha-mihira.

It remains to make some remarks about the date of the *Pancatantra*. Colebrooke argues from Varāha-mihira being quoted in that work,† that he must have been anterior to or contemporary with the celebrated Shah Nushirvan, in whose reign, 531—579 A. D., the translation of the *Pancatantra* into Pehlevi was made. Bentley makes the objection that Colebrooke's argument does not hold good, unless the name of Varāha-mihira be proved to occur also in the Pehlevi translation, on

* Archæological Survey Report (Journ. As. Soc. B. Vol. XXXII), p. vii. sqq.

† *Pancatantra*, (ed. Kosegarten,) p. 50.