

Kanyākubja and Kāśi dynasties. The incompatibility of these origins manifests itself as erroneous. Again, when the Agni Purāṇa relates these two dynasties, Kanyākubja and Kāśi, the account seems to be vitiated by error. The Matsya and Linga Purāṇas assign six kings to the Ikshvāku dynasty, but the Vāyu Purāṇa mentions thirty-one kings. The Kūrma Purāṇa contains more matter for chronicling the king Vasumanas, as well as the Haihaya monarchs, Jayadvaja and Durjaya. The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa furnishes in detail the early history of the Vaiśāla dynasty.

We have been at some pains to show that different Purāṇas contain different accounts of different dynasties. But a student of history must collate together the various details all scattered, and sift historical truth therefrom. One word more. Referring to the coronation of the Nanda two intervals are given. The interval between the death of Parikshit (the year of the Mahābhārata war) and the coronation of Nanda is said to be 1015 according to one version and 1050 according to another. The interval between the coronation of Nanda and of the Āndhra dynasty is said to be 836. According to the Kali *abda* era, the year 5038 corresponds to A.D. 1937. Subtracting the stellar cycle of twenty-seven centuries, we get 2338. If we again proceed to subtract 1937 from 2338, we get 401 B.C. which can be taken as the date of the accession of Nanda, though V. A. Smith would remark that Nanda was a powerful king even in 415 B.C. But whatever may be the date assigned to Nanda, the Purāṇas offer a workable hypothesis for a system of ancient Indian chronology.

Now comes my pleasant task; my thanks are due to the Syndicate of the University of Madras for having undertaken to publish these volumes of the *Purāṇa Index* under the auspices of the Madras University. We hope and trust that these volumes with their encyclopaedic information will prove to be a source-book for students of ancient Indian history and culture, and stimulate