

with these two, form the great body of the Pouranas, are only romances or versified legends, written at various periods, by various authors, and not less wild in their fictions than the great works mentioned. It has been thought that in some of these writings, deeds, or the names of men somewhat resembling those mentioned by the Greeks and Latins, may be traced; and it is principally from the similarity of names that M. Wilfort has endeavoured to derive from these Pouranas a sort of concordance with our ancient western chronology,—a concordance which unfolds, at every line, the hypothetical nature of its foundation; and which, besides, can only be admitted by entirely rejecting the dates given by the Pouranas themselves. (1)

The lists of kings which the pundits, or Indian doctors, have pretended to compile from these Pouranas, are only plain catalogues without details, or decked with absurd ones, little short of the Chaldeans or Egyptians; or those which were framed for the nations of the north, by Trithemus and Saxo the grammarian. (2) These lists are far from coinciding; none of them supposes either a history, registers, or records; their very foundation has probably no other source than the fictitious work of the poets, from whose compositions they may have derived their

(1) See the great work of M. Wilfort on the Chronology of the Kings of Magadha and the Indian Emperors, and on the epochs of Vicramaditja (or Bikermadjit) and Salivahanna. Mem. de Calcutta, tome ix. p. 82, 8vo. edit.

(2) Sir William Jones on Hindoo Chronology, Mem. de Calcutta, vol. ii. p. 111; 8vo. edit. French translation, p. 164. See also M. Wilfort on the same subject, *ibid.* vol. v. p. 241; and the lists which he gives in his work mentioned above, vol. ix. p. 116.