

own; the necessity of applying such corrections to the old Āryabhaṭa's works being one of the reasons that he, the younger, wrote his book. Another reason, so he adds, was the scarcity of those works. Let us hear himself.

एवं परोपकृतये स्तोत्रोक्तं खेचरानयनम् ।

किञ्चित्पूर्वागमसमसममुक्तं\* विप्राः पठन्विदं नान्ये ॥

“Thus I have given for the benefit of others, the calculation of the planets on my own authority, it being a little different (?) from ancient authorities. Brahmans, no others, should study it.”

वृद्धार्यभट्टोक्तं सिद्धान्ताद्यं महाकालात् ।

पाठैर्गतमुच्छेदं विशेषितं तन्मयोक्त्या ॥

“The Siddhānta and other works of the old Āryabhaṭa are in the long course of time worn out by the study of them; they (*i. e. Siddhāntādyam*) have been modified by me on my own authority.”

The author certainly calls himself Āryabhaṭa, but it is so extremely unlikely that two astronomers, one being the professed imitator of the other, should bear the same name, that it is far more natural to think Āryabhaṭa to be only the younger astronomer's *nom de plume*. It is by no means to be inferred that by assuming the name of the celebrated astronomer he intended any fraud; since the adoption of a pseudonym in writing is in India a mark of respect and an intimation that the former bearer of the adopted name is set up as a model. That Āryabhaṭa the younger did not attempt to impose upon others is perfectly clear from the account given about himself. I fear that it would be very difficult to show that he was as clever as he was candid. The whole book is a poor performance. The contents have been known long ago, for it is the work that Bentley pronounced to be the real Āryabhaṭa-Siddhānta, the other works being only fabrications. As Bentley

\* There is something wrong in *samasama*; I cannot make a verse out of it, for *āgamāsamam uktam* will not do.