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.

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 Astāṅgasamīgraha of Vāghbhaṭa 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 \textit{Aśṭāṅgasaṁgraha} of Vāgbhaṭa, 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 Vāgbhaṭa 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 Vāgbhaṭa the younger, whose \textit{Aśṭāṅgahṛdaya} 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, Vāgbhaṭa (the elder and the younger), and Caraka, we find the following:—


(1) \textit{śalyam.} kāya-. kāyacikita-.
(2) \textit{śolāyam.} bāla-. sālāyam.
(3) \textit{kāyacikita-.} groha-. sālāyapahartṛkam.
(4) bhūtavidyā-. ārāheśga-. visyagranasvaradvikā-.
(5) kaumārabhṛtyā-. śalya-. bhūtavidyā | prāśamanam.
(6) ayadatentrām. dāmeśrā-. kaumārabhṛtyaka-.
(7) raśiyanatantrām. jara-. rasīyanam.
(8) vājikaraṇatentrām. vṛṣa-. vājikaraṇam.
ITSING AND VAGBHATA.

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. Vāgbhaṭa, 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 Vāgbhaṭa, 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 (*aṣṭādhā prontavān*) 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 Aṣṭāṅgaśaṅgraha 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
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Amarakaśa, 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 Bagumra plates of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indrarāja III (No. 86 of my Southern List) this king is eulogized in the verse—

Kṛta-Gūvarddhanaḍdhāraṇa hēlōnmūlita-Mēruṇā |  
Ūpēndraṇa-Indrarājena jītvā yēna na vismitam ||

"Indrarāja did not boast, even though by uprooting with ease Mēru he had surpassed Upēndra (i.e. the god Krishna-Viṣṇu), 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 Māhōdaya (Māhōdayārīnagama), i.e. the well-known town of Kanauj.

According to the Purāṇas,1 Mahōdaya is one of the towns on the fabulous mountain Mēru. The writer of the prākṣasti 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 tātsthyat tātchhhabdyam, Mēru stands here for Mahōdaya, 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 Dhārāvarṣha of Chandravatī is eulogized in two verses, vv. 36 and 37.

1 Cf. e.g. Viṣṇu-purāṇa, xxxiv, 90.