

priority of Āśvalāyana, which might be supported by the fact that on the whole the Śāṅkhāyana Sūtra is more systematic and better arranged than the Āśvalāyana Sūtra, perhaps also by the fact<sup>1</sup> that the Śāṅkhāyana school belonged to the western part of India, and by the occurrence of the form *draṣṭā*, i, 3, 6, as a third person passive. But in any case there is little reason to assume any wide separation of the two schools in point of time.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

#### VYĀGHRAMUŚA.

The name Vyāghramuśa, read by Mr. V. A. Smith on one of his White Hun coins (see p. 95 of the January number of the Journal), is no doubt "Śrī Vyāghramukha of the Śrī Chāpa dynasty," under whom wrote the astronomer Brahmagupta.

A. M. T. JACKSON.

#### ITSING AND VĀGBHATA.

I am afraid Professor Jolly's interesting presentment of the case of Itsing's relation to Vāgbhata (*ante*, p. 172) tends—quite unintentionally, of course—to confuse the issue. Let me try to put it clearly; not for the sake of controversy with my friend, whose views on anything touching Indian medicine are of the greatest value, but because of the importance of establishing, if possible, any point in Indian chronology.

Itsing tells us that "lately a man epitomized the eight sections of medical science, and made them into one bundle"; and he adds that "all physicians in the five parts of India practise according to this book." Here three points come out clearly: (1) The book was a recent production at the time of Itsing's sojourn in India; (2) it was an epitome of the eight sections; (3) it was a standard book for medical practitioners.

Which of the ancient medical textbooks answers to these three conditions? Professor Jolly names for consideration

<sup>1</sup> Bühler, *S. B. E.*, ii, xxxi.