

## Short Notices

THE first edition of *The Early History of India from 600 B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest*, by Mr. Vincent A. Smith, was reviewed by us in 1906 (*ante*, xxi. 136 f.), and the second was noticed in 1908 (xxiii. 607). We are glad to call attention to the appearance of a third edition (Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1914) with further revision and enlargement. A.

The first emperor of India known to history, as distinguished from myth or legend, was Asoka's grandfather, Chandragupta Maurya, called Sandrakoptos or Sandracottus by the Greek and Roman authors. Shortly after the departure of Alexander the Great, that is to say in or about 322 B.C., he attained supreme power by the aid of a wily Brahman named Kautilya. Many quotations in Sanskrit literature testified to the former existence of a treatise attributed to Kautilya and entitled *Arthasāstra*, the Science of Polity. But the book itself was lost for centuries. A few years ago the librarian of the Maharāja of Mysore discovered a copy, and other manuscripts were subsequently unearthed. Mr. Shamasastri, the librarian, then made and published a rough translation which attracted much attention among students of ancient Indian history. Careful criticism demonstrated satisfactorily that the treatise really is old, and that it may be assigned confidently to the age of Alexander the Great. In the first volume of his *Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity (based on the 'Arthasāstra' of Kautilya)* (London : Longmans, 1914), Mr. Narendra Nath Law gives some account of Kautilya's remarkable treatise. The book appeals rather to learned Hindus and professors of Sanskrit than to the general reader—indeed, it would not be fully intelligible to a reader unable to read the Sanskrit character. Nor does Mr. Law do full justice to the interest of the treatise, which, as Dr. F. W. Thomas has observed, sheds 'more light upon the realities of ancient India, especially as concerns administration, law, trade, war, and peace, than any text which we possess'. Mr. Law dwells too much on minor details and so misses the real value of the book. He fails to notice that the treatise, although it may possibly have been written after the establishment of the Maurya empire, deals with the state of things that existed before that event occurred. It depicts the political conditions of India in the time of Alexander the Great, when the whole country was filled with a multitude of petty states engaged in an unceasing struggle for existence. The author instructs his royal pupil how to fight for his own hand with absolute disregard of all moral rules or considerations. He is not interested in the ethical prescriptions of the *Dharmasāstras*, like the so-called 'Laws of Manu', written by idealists. He is brutally practical, and

openly advocates the practice of every form of villainy for reasons of state. His procedure in criminal cases is based on the extensive use of judicial torture, on the principle that 'those whose guilt is believed to be true shall be subject to torture', of which there were eighteen kinds, including seven varieties of whipping. On the whole, Kautilya confirms the accuracy of the information about the state of India recorded by Megasthenes and Arrian.

V. A. S.

Although partly concerned with questions of textual criticism and grammatical interpretation, Mr. T. Rice Holmes's edition of *Caesar, de Bello Gallico* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), calls for some notice in this Review, if only because it marks the fitting completion of the task which the author set himself many years ago; and those who possess Mr. Holmes's earlier works and have traced in them the history of Caesarian study during the last quarter of a century will be glad to find a place for it upon their shelves. A reviewer may be excused if he turns first of all to the pages upon which we read Mr. Holmes's very last words on Itius Portus. They run as follows: 'The upshot of the matter is this. The balance of probability is greatly in favour of Boulogne; but unless the question is settled by excavating for traces of the Roman camps, an element of doubt, however slight, will remain.' This is no place to reopen the controversy; and in fact whatever needs to be said on the subject is very candidly and clearly stated by Mr. Holmes himself in the pages which precede the paragraph just quoted. But we should not be surprised if some readers were tempted to draw a different conclusion, viz. that the balance of probability is *somewhat* in favour of Wissant. A word may be said on one other controversial topic. Mr. Holmes is still convinced that the problem of Caesar's bridge over the Rhine has been solved by Mr. Stanley Hall. It would be pleasant to share his certainty; but we cannot believe that so important an element in the trestles as the pair of tie-beams introduced in Mr. Hall's reconstruction would have been passed over without *explicit* mention by Caesar, for to translate *revinctis* 'having a diagonal tie' is very forced. That the *fibulae* were of the nature of 'dogs', on the other hand, is an eminently likely suggestion; but if so, they may well have been employed in the way that Mr. Kitson Clark has conjectured.

H. S. J.

That France possesses a wonderful natural system of waterways is known to every geographer. The historian has been less anxious to inquire how that system has affected the history and development of France. Even M. Louis Bonnard, in his *Navigaton intérieure de la Gaule à l'époque romaine* (Paris: Picard, 1913), has not carried the quest very far. In his opening chapters he sketches clearly and usefully the 'hydrography' of Gaul and the uses to which the Romans put its rivers. When he passes, in ch. iv, to discuss individual rivers, he seems to prove too much. The Romans, he argues, had regular river traffic on nearly thirty streams, including even the wayward Durance, but they did very little to aid that traffic by engineering works; hardly any harbours or wharves or store-houses have left traces behind them. While it is plain, in a general way,