

remarkably steady drop in average weight particularly for the square coins with the increase in the number of reverse marks (p. 30 and fig. 3). However, "from the fact that an occasional coin with blank reverse occurs in the oldest groups, it is clear that the system of reverse marks applied only to coins in active circulation, and perhaps in a limited region" (p. 31).

The obverse marks have been discussed far more by earlier writers and Prof. Kosambi reviews the numerous suggestions offered and points out several 'neglected possibilities' (p. 11) before stating his own working hypothesis as to the meaning of the symbols. He accepts the crescent-on-arches as the monogram of Chandragupta Maurya, and considers its absence from the earlier hoard a guarantee of its pre-Mauryan character. He isolates a particular variety of the *Sadaracakra* (six-armed symbol) occurring with Chandragupta monogram as the dynastic symbol of Mauryas and suggests that the form of the Cakra should be made the basis of classification by dynasties. The peacock on arches is also Mauryan, and the arches themselves are taken to indicate 'descent from'—at least the five arches. Equally plausible identifications are made of the symbols for Sisunaga, Saisunaga, and Nandin,

and those of Mahapadma are reached by elimination.

Prof. Kosambi says more than once that with the establishment of the Mauryan empire we enter on a period of cruder coinage in which 'the variances jump up suddenly', and *prima facie* the condition of the second and later Taxila hoard seems to support this. Yet, this conclusion hardly tallies with impressions of the Mauryan epoch gathered from other sources like the inscriptions of Asoka, or the polished stone pillars—not to speak of Megasthenes and the *Arthashastra*. There are other statements, *obiter dicta*, which may surprise the reader, and even shock him; but there is much, very much in these papers and in their method for which he will be grateful. The work that Prof. Kosambi has been doing is important, and one hopes that the Director-General of Archæology, the museums of the country and individual owners of coin-cabinets will give him all the aid he needs for carrying his researches further. It is a pleasure to see the evidence of his collaboration with Dr. S. Paramasivan of the Madras Museum whom he cites for the phenomenon of decupercification (p. 43) that has not so far been taken note of by numismatists.

K. A. N.

AN AID TO STUDY OF KANT

An Introduction to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. By N. A. Nikam, M.A. (The Bangalore Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd.), 1941. Pp. 195. Price Rs. 5-8.

Much of the possible criticism having been disarmed or rendered innocuous by the utterances or the *obiter dicta* of the author like "I shall not be dissatisfied if this *Introduction to the Critique of Pure Reason* be described as a partially mistaken help" (Preface), and "If this book cannot claim originality in Kantian scholarship, it can at least claim originality in reversing Kant's order of treatment" (p. 63), I would consider the task of reviewer considerably lightened, though this comment would not certainly mean any disparagement of the excellent work of Prof. Nikam who has made a serious and sustained attempt to push Kant's "Critique of Pure Reason" into the focus of academic awareness and critical consciousness. Helped by a Mysore Government

scholarship, he had the "matchless piece of philosophical good fortunes" (viii—I emphatically protest against the typographical plural!!) "in attending the lectures of G. E. Moore and C. D. Broad which kindled and stimulated" his interest in Kant. In ten chapters, Prof. Nikam has admirably analysed the contents of the "Critique". Prof. Nikam has easy and perfect control over the subject-matter and I would invite attention of readers particularly to pp. 145-152 in which he sums up the "Central Teaching of Kant's Philosophy", with convincing clarity and intimate insight.

Time was when Indian philosophers were contributing namby-pamby discussions to foreign periodicals on "Kant and Bhagavad-Gita", "Kant and Sankara" and so forth, and I am glad to note that Prof. Nikam has not indulged in blowing the soap-bubbles of pretty, but puerile parallelisms between Kant and Indian idealists like Sankara. But

in a foot-note, he has referred to Advaita in the spelling of which he was caught within the grips of the Printers' Devil. And again "Aham-padartha" is outrageously printed though Advaita has been corrected in "Errata".

Kant's "Critique" has been "made in Germany" with especial emphasis. I wish Prof. Nikam had not echoed or re-echoed the familiar critical judgments on Kant. It will not be an exaggeration to state that a real and genuine estimate of Kant has yet to be attempted by Western philosophers themselves. Whether at all Kant ever woke up from the dogmatic slumber from which he claims to have been rudely awakened by Hume, and whether at all he has effected any Copernican revolution in philosophical outlook are some of the persistent problems of Kantian *Weltanschauung*, and though as Prof. Nikam points out (p. 21) Kant himself might not have urged or adumbrated such a claim, critics have a duty to examine the claim that the most striking contribution of Kant is transference of philosophical emphasis from the objective to the subjective. Prof. Nikam does not examine the claim in any detail.

The fact is that on the plea of an analysis of the conditions and characteristics of *a priori synthetic judgments*, Kant has really constructed an elaborate and imposing *totalitarian structure in philosophy*. Surprise, bewilderment, astonishment and admiration which have marked reaction to Kant's work are all due to the psychological dread of the unknown and the ununderstood. There are many who are likewise scared away by the style of Sankara. In the Kantian scheme of *Totalitarian Metaphysics* the

objective reality was assigned some sort of existential recognition in a patronising manner and it is this totalitarian scheme that supplied the motive-force of the subsequent totalitarian metaphysics of Nietzsche who advocated the cult of the *Urbemensch*, master-morality, slave-morality and the like. In Hitler's campaigns against Democracy and against all weaker nations, one witnesses directly the practice of the totalitarian philosophy of Kant and Nietzsche. Psycho-analysis of the Freudian brand was perfected in Germany, and there is no use fighting shy of the same psycho-analytic technique being applied to an analysis of the metaphysical mind of Kant as revealed in his "Critique".

Be that as it may, Prof. Nikam seems to view the work of Prof. Paton almost with religious awe and fervour as if biblical sacrosanctity attached to it! Prof. Paton has to be rated as an enthusiastic admirer of Kant, and like all admirers he naturally seeks to make much of Kant and his work. Paton's estimate of Kant is not after all altogether a philosophically detached one.

It is noteworthy that a citation from Omar Khayyam stands at the opening of each chapter. Prof. Nikam should therefore not blame the reviewer if he closed with the observation that after a fairly careful study of the work of Prof. Nikam, the reviewer was obliged to come out of the edifice or structure of the Kantian metaphysics by the same door as in he went!! Still, I heartily commend Prof. Nikam's neat little volume on Kant as an eminently suitable text-book for university students of the philosopher of Konigsberg.

R. NAGA RAJA SARMA.

CENTENARIES

Baskerville, Simon (1574-1641)

SIR SIMON BASKERVILLE, a British physician, was born at Exeter October 27, 1574. He joined the Exeter College, Oxford, in 1591 and was elected a fellow even before he graduated. He became M.B. in 1611 and after some practice entered the College of Physicians, London, in 1614 and became a fellow thereof in 1615.

Even when Baskerville was an undergraduate his brilliance was such that when James I visited the University, he was "chosen as a prime person to dispute before him in the philosophic art, which he performed with great applause of his majesty". In later years when

he rose to eminence as a doctor, he was appointed physician to James I and later to Charles I who knighted him in 1636.

Baskerville had such wide practice and thereby amassed so much wealth that he came to be known as "Sir Simon Baskerville the rich". He was also generous. 'He never took a fee of an orthodox minister under a dean nor of any suffering cavalier in the cause of Charles I . . . but with physick to their bodies generally gave relief to their necessities'.

Baskerville died July 5, 1641.

S. R. RANGANATHAN.

University Library,
Triplicane.