

year 3068 of the Kali-yuga, or 33 B. C. This is enough ; a man, living 33 B. C., calls himself the contemporary of Varáha-mihira, who lived more than 500 years afterwards. As if to assist us in the discovery of his forgery, the Pseudo-Káli-dása does not only say, Varáha-mihira, but he adds also the epithet *khyáta* "the celebrated," so that how many other Varáha-mihira's there may have been, he at all events means the author of the Brhat-Sanhita. I fully agree with F. E. Hall, when he says : "There is every reason for believing the Jyotirvidábharana to be not only pseudonymous, but of recent composition." He does not state his reasons ; amongst the many reasons I have for concurring in his opinion, are : 1° the absurdity of the language ;\* 2° he calls the S'aka-prince king of Rúma, for which the Sanskrit equivalent, at least in form, would be Romaka ; I subjoin the stanzas where the word occurs :

यो रूमदेशाधिपतिं शकेश्वरं  
जित्वा गृहीत्वोज्जयिनीं महाहवे ।  
आनीय संभ्राम्य मुमोच तं त्वहे  
श्रीविक्रमार्कः समसह्यविक्रमः ॥  
तस्मिन् सदा विक्रममेदिनीशे  
विराजमाने समवंतिकायाम्  
सर्वप्रजामण्डलसौख्यसंपद्  
बभूव सर्वत्र च वेदकर्म ॥†

The story told here of the S'aka-king of Rúma reminds one strongly of what befel the Turkish emperor of Rúm when defeated and captured by Timur. But to say that the fabrication is composed after that event, would give no adequate

\* The poetaster is very partial to the word *sam*, which he uses as an adverb, foisting it in wherever he has to fill up a gap in the metre. Did he suppose, that because *sam* in composition is paraphrased with *samyak*, it could stand alone in that sense?

† The word *babhúva* to denote a present action is very amusing.