

name of Kanishka the years 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 18. These dates are from records which are undeniably early, whatever may be the opinion as to the exact initial point or points of the figures presented in them. The number of them, about eighty-five for four centuries, —including four of the 2nd century, one of the 3rd, and three of the 4th,—compares quite favourably with the total number of one hundred and seventy-five epigraphic dates available to Professor Kielhorn for the period from A.D. 372 to 1302, which included only eight to cover the four centuries (almost) from A.D. 372 to 754. And, if they are referred to the era of B.C. 58, so that they range from B.C. 55–54 to A.D. 342–43, they practically fill the period antecedent to the point of time from which he took up the history of the era.

J. F. FLEET.

ITSING AND VĀGBHĀṬA.

Towards the close of Dr. Hoernle's interesting remarks "On some obscure Anatomical Terms" in Indian Medicine, in the R.A.S. Journal for October—a forerunner of his admirable forthcoming work on the Osteology of the Ancient Indians—I have met with an incidental statement concerning Itsing which seems to require further explanation.

Among many other curious bits of information supplied by Itsing (673–695 A.D. in India) with regard to the condition of medical science in India in his time, there occurs the remarkable statement that *lately* a man epitomized the eight arts of which medical science consists, and made them into one bundle, so that all physicians in the five parts of India now practise according to this book. Dr. Hoernle thinks that the Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha of Vāgbhāṭa the elder is the textbook here meant, because that work, as indicated by its title, is an "Epitome of the Octopartite Science."

Now I am not prepared to question the possibility or even plausibility of this proposed identification. Indeed, I had suggested much the same thing myself in a paper on Itsing's observations on the subject of Indian Medicine, published in the Journal G.O.S. for 1902, where I said that "Itsing,

being a Buddhist, might *also* have meant to refer to the Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha of Vāgbhata, a Buddhist writer, whose composition, as shown by its very name, is a summary of the eight parts of medical science." By 'also,' the opinion expressed by Professor Takakusu, the learned translator of Itsing, was meant that "this epitomiser may be Suśruta, who calls himself a disciple of Dhanvantari, one of the Nine Gems in the Court of Vikramāditya" (Takakusu's transl., p. 222).

It will be necessary to decide, then, whether Vāgbhata the elder or Suśruta has the better claim to be regarded as the medical writer alluded to by Itsing. Nor must we lose sight of Vāgbhata the younger, whose Aṣṭāṅgahr̥daya is also a short compendium of the octopartite science, nor of those rather numerous medical writers whom we know from quotations only. Caraka's somewhat diffuse, though ancient, textbook is, I think, less likely than the other works to be the manual referred to by Itsing.

Fortunately, the Chinese Buddhist has taken care to give us some account of the alleged eight parts of the Indian science of medicine. They treat of: (1) all kinds of sores, (2) acupuncture for any disease above the neck, (3) diseases of the body, (4) demoniac disease, (5) Agada medicine (i.e. antidote), (6) diseases of children, (7) the means of lengthening one's life, (8) the methods of invigorating the legs and body. In another paragraph Itsing has explained each of these eight terms.

If we compare with these statements the eight sections as given by Suśruta, Vāgbhata (the elder and the younger), and Caraka, we find the following :—

SUŚRUTA, I, 1.	VĀGBHATA, I, 1.	CARAKA, I, 30.
(1) śalyam.	kāya-.	kāyacikitsā.
(2) śālākyam.	bāla-.	śālākyam.
(3) kāyacikitsā.	graha-.	śalyāpaharṭṭkam.
(4) bhūtavidyā.	ūrdhvāṅga-.	viśagaravairodhika-.
(5) kaumārabhr̥tyam.	śalya-.	bhūtavidyā prasamanam.
(6) agadatantram.	damṣṭrā-.	kaumārabhr̥tyakam.
(7) rasāyanatantram.	jarā-.	rasāyanam.
(8) vājīkaraṇatantram.	vṛṣa-.	vājīkaraṇam.

Here the only difference between Itsing and Suśruta consists in the relative position assigned to Nos. (5) and (6), i.e. antidotes of poison and infantine diseases. Moreover, Itsing refers to antidotes as *agada*, using the ordinary Indian term, just as Suśruta does. Vāgbhāṭa, on the other hand, has a totally different arrangement of the first six titles, and only agrees with Itsing as to (7) and (8). Some of his terms are also very unusual. Caraka agrees with Itsing as to Nos. (2) and (6-8), and arranges the four remaining titles in a manner peculiar to himself, though partly agreeing with Vāgbhāṭa, besides giving a strange, longish name to the title of antidotes (4). To this it must be added that the brief explanatory paragraph in Itsing may not unfitly be compared with the more ample paraphrases which Suśruta has added to his statement of the eight titles (p. 3 foll. in Dr. Hoernle's transl. of Suśruta).

It may be argued that Suśruta, being an ancient writer and quoted in the Bower MS. edited by Dr. Hoernle, is not likely to have lived shortly before Itsing, i.e. in the sixth or seventh century. However, Itsing's 'lately' may be accounted for in this way, perhaps, that Itsing had probably read the introduction to Suśruta—just as Alberuni (Sachau's transl., i, 159) shows himself acquainted with the introduction to Caraka—and looked upon his work as a recent compilation, because it purports to be an extract in eight parts (*aṣṭadhā pranītavān*) from an earlier work in 100,000 verses. This explanation, which would entirely divest Itsing's 'lately' of chronological significance, would indeed apply to other textbooks, or to some lost recension of Suśruta, as well as to the now extant work of Suśruta, supposing the latter to have been unknown to Itsing, since it was a generally prevailing practice with writers of medical textbooks to give out their compositions as an abridgment of some early work written by a divinely inspired sage.

However that may be, the claim of the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* to be regarded as the anonymous textbook referred to by Itsing does not seem to be sufficiently established to be used as a basis for fixing the date of the former work, or of the

Amarakośa, if that famous dictionary was actually preceded by the medical work of Vāgbhaṭa the elder.

J. JOLLY.

November 28th, 1906.

TWO VERSES FROM INDIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

In the Bagumrā plates of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Indrarāja III (No. 86 of my *Southern List*) this king is eulogized in the verse—

Kṛita-Gōvarddhanōddhāraṁ hēlōnmūlita-Mēruṇā |
Upēndram=Indrarājēna jitvā yēna na vismitam ||

“Indrarāja did not boast, even though by uprooting with ease Mēru he had surpassed Upēndra (i.e. the god Kṛishṇa-Vishṇu), who (merely) lifted up (the mountain) Gōvardhana.”

The question here is, who that Mēru was that was uprooted by Indrarāja. An answer, in my opinion, is suggested by a passage in the Cambay plates of Gōvindarāja IV (ibid., No. 91), according to which Indrarāja completely uprooted his enemy's city Mahōdaya (*Mahōdayārinagara*), i.e. the well-known town of Kanauj.

According to the Purāṇas,¹ Mahōdayā is one of the towns on the fabulous mountain Mēru. The writer of the *praśasti* therefore, purposely confounding the terrestrial Mahōdaya with that mythical town, tells the reader that the king uprooted (the mountain) Mēru, and he leaves it to him to guess that, in accordance with the maxim *tātsthyāt tāchchhabdyam*, Mēru stands here for Mahōdayā, and that this is not the celestial town so named, but the terrestrial Mahōdaya.

In a Mount Ābū inscription, re-edited by Professor Lüders in *Ep. Ind.*, vol. viii, p. 208 ff., the Paramāra Dhāravarsha of Chandrāvati is eulogized in two verses, vv. 36 and 37.

¹ Cf. e.g. *Vāyu-purāṇa*, xxxiv, 90.