

Romulus; the latter are at least genuine myths, the former does not deserve even that name. Whatever doubts may linger about the date of Vikramāditya, the conqueror of the S'akas and the founder of the S'aka era, it is certain that *he* cannot have been the contemporary of Varāha-mihira, nor, if tradition speaks truth, of Kālidāsa and Amara-Sinha. Who was it then?

In the S'atrunjaya Māhātmya* a king Vikramāditya is said to have ascended the throne in the year 466 of the S'aka or 544 A. D. As we have seen before, Varāha-mihira's life must have extended over that time. On the other hand Kālidāsa's patron is not called Vikramāditya, but Bhoja by Ballāla-Miçra, the author or compiler of the Bhojaprabandha. Now Bhoja is held to have ascended the throne 483 A. D. or, with a discrepancy of 84 years, 567 A. D.† Wilford states that a tradition in the Dekkan ascribes to Bhoja a reign of fifty years and some months, whereas in the Bhojaprabandha it is 55 years, 7 months and three days.

पंचाशत्तंच वर्षाणि सप्तमासान् दिनत्रयम् ।

भोजराजेन भोक्तव्यः सगौडो दक्षिणापथः ॥§

If we assume the date 483 A. D. for Bhoja's ascending the throne to be correct, he must have reigned, according to this stanza, till 538 A. D. This tallies well enough with what we know about Varāha-mihira. The question now is, whether Bhoja be really the same with Vikramāditya. Notwithstanding the discrepancy between the different records and the silence of Ballāla-Miçra about Bhoja bearing the title of Vikramāditya, such an hypothesis is far from inadmissible. It might be supposed too, that Kālidāsa and Varāha-mihira found two

* Not having the S'atrunjaya-Māhātmya at hand, I must rely upon the statements of Wilford, As. Res. IX, p. 156.

† Prinsep's Useful Tables, ed. Thomas, p. 250, and As. Res. l. c.

‡ The residence of Bhoja is said to be Dhārā,