

Vikramáditya era, which in itself (*sic.*) would be sufficient to raise an objection against it. A second, and not less mighty one, has to be added. If namely we adopt his premises and reason upon them, and test them by historical facts anterior and posterior, we shall find contradictions to established facts."

Here I shall only stop to observe, that the expression "perfectly certain chronology after the Vikramáditya era" is no argument, but again what is called begging the question. It is beyond dispute, indeed, that there is an Indian era, commonly called *Samvat*, dating from 57 B. C., but that the era was founded by a Vikramáditya, and that moreover the founder was contemporary with its beginning, is an assertion which rests upon an extremely frail base, as will appear in the sequel. What now are the contradictions to established historical facts, in which Kalhana-Pañḍita involves himself?

"If the patron of Mátrgupta had lived in the second half of the first century *before* Christ, Pratápáditya would have commenced to reign *two hundred and eighty* years before him, *i. e.* somewhat before 40 B. C.; at this time, however, Kashmere was under the sway of Açoka."*

It is difficult to see what this reasoning can have to do with Kalhana-Pañḍita, or how far it invalidates his statements, for he does not assert at all, that the patron of Mátrgupta lived in the second half of the first century *before* Christ, but *after* Christ, (or more strictly speaking at the beginning of the second century of our era). As consequently the attack might be levelled against some imaginary author, who holds the view that Vikramáditya, the patron of Mátrgupta, lived in the second half of the first century *before* Christ, but does not touch Kalhana-Pañḍita, we might dismiss here all further discussion. But let us go to the end of the passage, that it may appear how little conviction the other arguments carry with them.

If Vikramáditya (the imaginary one) had lived in the second

* See Lassen, l. c.