

I have assumed throughout, for argument's sake, that Utpala was wrong in making Vikramáditya the founder of the S'áka era because I had to show that, whether rightly or wrongly, he placed Vikramáditya 78 A. D., not 57 B. C. Whether he is right in doing so is a question apart which we shall discuss afterwards ; first we have to revert to Lassen's remarks concerning Brahmagupta. This astronomer, says Lassen, reckons from the S'áliváhana era ; that is true, but apt to mislead ; he reckons from the S'áka era, which Europeans persist in calling S'áliváhana era. Moreover not only does Brahmagupta reckon from the S'áka era, but all other astronomers do so. The only inference from the facts, that Brahmagupta reckons from 78 A. D. and that the same Brahmagupta places in that year the end of the S'áka kings, is that his testimony agrees with that of Utpala, barring that he does not give the name of their conqueror. The stricture upon the commentator, who erroneously brings forward Vikramáditya, is begging the question ; it ought precisely to be shown that Vikramáditya did *not* live at that time. Arguments of a different kind are required, before the authority of the Hindu astronomers is shaken.

As harmless as this attack upon them, is the attack upon Kalhana-Pañḍita, the historian of Kashmere. Let us see what charges are brought against him.

Lassen,* after premising that Kalhana-Pañḍita sees the real conqueror of the S'akas, not in Pratápáditya, who is said to have reigned 167—135 B. C., but in the king, who placed Mátrgupta from 118—123 A. D. on the throne of Kashmere, tries to controvert this statement, firstly by referring to the arguments we have disposed of, and secondly by the following remarks :

“ The first objection to his (Kalhana's) assertion is its being in conflict with the perfectly certain (*sic.*) chronology after the also calculated by the well known mathematician and astronomer Bápu-Deva S'ástrí, one of the ornaments of India.

* Indische Alterthumskunde, Vol. II. p. 399, sq.