

G. Jan Meulenbeld

A History of

Indian Medical Literature

VOLUME I A TEXT

found in A.s.Ci. 16.⁶⁰⁵

Hoernle's convictions about Caraka's consistency and systematic mind have, however, no sound basis and rest on a preconceived idea.

His notion that Dṛḍhabala arrived at his number of ninety-six eye diseases by adding the two extra disorders of Mādhava to the ninety-four of the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* has already been referred to.

P.V. Sharma disagrees with Hoernle in regarding the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* as a work of a later date than Dṛḍhabala. He argues that the succinct treatment of pañcakarman in the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha*, compared with the elaborate treatment by Dṛḍhabala, testifies to the latter's anteriority. He also points to the quotation from Kapilabala (A.s.Sū. 20.17), identified by P.V. Sharma as Dṛḍhabala's father, which is, however, a debatable issue.⁶⁰⁶

The Gulabkunverba team was of the opinion that both the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* and the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā* show their indebtedness to Dṛḍhabala's version of the *Carakasamhitā*, thus attesting the latter's anteriority.⁶⁰⁷

The *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā* is almost unanimously considered to have drawn extensively from Dṛḍhabala's version of the *Carakasamhitā*, which establishes that Dṛḍhabala lived before the age of composition of the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdaya* (about A.D. 600). The chronological position of the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* with regard to the *Aṣṭāṅgahrdayasamhitā* will be discussed in the section devoted to these works.

The terminus post quem cannot be determined with any precision. This date depends on the period in which the *Suśrutasamhitā* was revised and its Uttaratantra added, and on the question whether or not Dṛḍhabala was acquainted with the revised and expanded text.

Hoernle's view that the *Nāvanīṭaka* of the Bower MS borrowed from the *Carakasamhitā* before its revision and completion by Dṛḍhabala is not based on conclusive evidence,⁶⁰⁸ and would, anyhow, not be of much avail on account of the uncertain chronological position of that text.

A number of details found in Dṛḍhabala's version of the *Carakasamhitā* point to him as an author belonging to the Gupta period. Next to the details already referred to, additional evidence of the same type was collected by P.V. Sharma, in particular from the *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*.⁶⁰⁹

The data taken together suggests that Dṛḍhabala belongs to the period of about A.D. 300–500.⁶¹⁰

Patañjali

Patañjali⁶¹¹ and a work called *Pātañjala*⁶¹² are quoted in some medical works. Patañjali is quoted in Āsubodha Vidyābhūṣaṇa's commentary on the *Paribhāṣā-pradīpa*,⁶¹³ Gopālādāsa's *Cikitsāsmṛta*, Govindasena's *Paribhāṣāpradīpa*,⁶¹⁴ Raghunāndana's *Mugdhabodha*, Śivadāsasena's commentary on the *Cakradatta*,⁶¹⁵ Ṭoḍara's *Ayurvedasaṅkhyā*,⁶¹⁶ and Trivikrama's *Lauhapradīpa*. The *Pātañjala* is quoted by Śivadāsasena,⁶¹⁷ the *Pātañjalatantra* by Kāśīrāma⁶¹⁸ and Trivikrama. Nīcala refers to a *Pātañjalalohaśāstra*.⁶¹⁹ The reference by Nīcala and Śivadāsasena's citations show

that Patañjali was known as a medical authority to the authors of a *Yogaratanākara*⁶²⁰ and *Yogaratanasamuccaya*.⁶²¹ Āśubodha and Nityabodha Senagupta reproduce, in their commentary on the *Rasaratnasamuccaya*, some quotations from Patañjali and the *Fāṭāñjala* found in Śivadāsa's commentary on the *Cakradatta*.⁶²²

Satyanārāyaṇaśāstrin's *Padārthavijñāna* also quotes Patañjali and the *pāṭñjalāḥ*; some of these quotations are, however, from the *Carakasamhitā*.⁶²³ A quotation from the *Pāṭāñjaladarśana* in Yogendranātha's *Āyurvijñānaratnākara* is from the *Yog-sūtra*.⁶²⁴

Covindadāsa's *Bhaiṣajyaratnāvalī* contains a recipe attributed to Patañjali.⁶²⁵

The references and quotations in the works of Āśubodha, Govindasena, Kāśīrāma, Niścāla, Śivadāśasena and Trivikrama indicate that Patañjali's work dealt with metallurgy (lohasāstra) and its application to medicine. B. Seal claims that Patañjali gave elaborate directions for many metallurgic and chemical processes, especially the preparation of metallic salts, alloys and amalgams, and the extraction, purification and assaying of metals; he adds that it was probably Patañjali who discovered the use of the mixtures called *viḍa*. B. Seal regards Patañjali's *Lohasāstra* as a later work than that of Nigārjuna on the same subject, an opinion based on the observation that the former's directions concerning particular processes are more complicated than those of the latter.⁶²⁶

Other medical writings ascribed to Patañjali are a *Vātsakandha* and *Siddhāntasārāvalī*; the latter work incorporates a *Paṭtaskandha*.⁶²⁷

The Indian tradition regards Patañjali as the author of a lost tantra on *rasāyana*.⁶²⁸ Al-Bīrūnī was acquainted with Patañjali's association with *rasāyana*.⁶²⁹

Fatañjali is the name of at least two famous authors; the one wrote the *Mahābhāṣya*, the other the *Yogasūtra*.

An interesting development made the two fuse into one Patañjali, who, in addition to his expertise in grammar and yoga, was also credited with a thorough knowledge of medicine and allied subjects.

The medical works already referred to are often attributed to this composite Patañjali, as well as a commentary on the *Carakasamhitā*, Vārttikas on that work, or a revised version of it. As a further complication, he is even considered to be identical with Caraka.

The threefold Patañjali is mentioned as a *pratisaṃskartar* of the *Carakasamhitā* in the introductory verses of Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*.⁶³⁰ His Vārttikas on the *Vaidīkaśāstra* are referred to in Rāmahadradīkṣita's *Patañjalīcarita*,⁶³¹ written at the end of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century.⁶³² The tradition that Patañjali wrote Vārttikas on the *Carakasamhitā* is endorsed by G. Haldar, who asserts that Vijayarakṣita, in his part of the *Madhukośa*, quotes one of these Vārttikas,⁶³³ which, after having existed independently, were incorporated in the text of the *Carakasamhitā* in the first century A.D.⁶³⁴ The same author is convinced that one of Patañjali's Vārttikas is cited in Nāgésabhata's (*Vyākaraṇasiddhānta*) *mañjūṣā*.⁶³⁵ The claim that Patañjali made additions to the text of the *Carakasamhitā* was also advanced by Sūramcandra.⁶³⁶ Gaṇanātha Sena⁶³⁷ regarded him, in agreement with Cakrapāṇidatta, as a *pratisaṃskartar* of the *Carakasamhitā*.

Āśādhavarman, who wrote a commentary on the *Carakasamhitā*, is reported to have objected to views expressed in Patañjali's Vārttikas, which is thought to explain that Āśādhavarman's work is known as *Parihāravārttika*.⁶³⁸

The claim that a Patañjali wrote a Vārttika or Vārttikas on the *Carakasamhitā* is found in many publications. P.V. Sharma places this Patañjali, regarded as completely different from the one who wrote the *Mahābhāṣya*, but identical with the Patañjali of the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, in the eighth century.⁶³⁹ These views are repeated by B. Rama Rao.⁶⁴⁰ Some other scholars who accept the former existence of a now lost commentary on the *Carakasamhitā* by Patañjali are G. Mukhopadhyaya,⁶⁴¹ K.R. Srikantamurthy,⁶⁴² and G.P. Srivastava.⁶⁴³ Others⁶⁴⁴ are doubtful or reject the hypothesis.

The relatively late tradition that one and the same Patañjali was an expert on yoga, grammar and medicine, dealing in his works with the purification of mind, speech and body, is found in Bhoja's *Nyāyavārttika* (or *Yogasūtravṛtti*)⁶⁴⁵ and *Rājamārtanda*.⁶⁴⁶ Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*,⁶⁴⁷ Śivarāma's *Kāncanadarpaṇa* on Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā*,⁶⁴⁸ Rāmahadradīkṣita's *Patañjalīcarita*,⁶⁴⁹ and Vijñānabhikṣu's *Yogavārttika*.⁶⁵⁰ Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadiya* contains a verse that obviously also refers to Patañjali as a threefold authority, though without mentioning his name.⁶⁵¹ Śaṅkarācārya's *Pāṭāñjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivarṇa* is acquainted with Patañjali as a medical expert.⁶⁵²

Bhoja depicted himself as a second Patañjali because his works also covered the fields of grammar, yoga and medicine.⁶⁵³

The identification of Patañjali and Caraka is implicitly found in a verse of Svāmikumāra's *Carakapāñjikā*.⁶⁵⁴ It is obviously accepted by Narahari in his *Vāgbhaṭa-maṇḍana*, which contains references to Caraka as Bhogīśvara,⁶⁵⁵ Phanidhara,⁶⁵⁶ Phanīśvara,⁶⁵⁷ and Sahaśraphaṇin.⁶⁵⁸ This identification is connected with the tradition that both were incarnations of Śeṣa.⁶⁵⁹ J. Filliozat suggested that this tradition forms part of the trend to make the transmissions of the sciences of grammar and medicine parallel to each other.⁶⁶⁰ P.V. Sharma put forward that the reason for bringing both authorities together may have been their similar role in the purification of body, speech and mind.⁶⁶¹

The way in which the traditions concerning Patañjali were elaborated in the course of time is reminiscent of the evolution of Nāgārjuna into a multifaceted legendary personality. It may therefore not be merely accidental that the former became associated with the *Carakasamhitā* and the latter with the *Suśrutasamhitā*. The stories about both show some remarkable parallels; the Nāgas, for example, play an important role in their biographies.⁶⁶²

Numerous scholars expressed their opinion on the problem how many authors called Patañjali should be distinguished.⁶⁶³ Some of those defending the view that one and the same Patañjali wrote the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Yogasūtra* and one or more works on medicine (metallurgy included) are Gaṇanātha Sena,⁶⁶⁴ G. Mukhopadhyaya,⁶⁶⁵ and G.P. Srivastava.⁶⁶⁶ The identity of the authors of *Mahābhāṣya* and *Yogasūtra* was acknowledged by S. Dasgupta,⁶⁶⁷ R. Garbe,⁶⁶⁸ Liebig,⁶⁶⁹ S.K. Ramachandra Rao,⁶⁷⁰ and others. The investigations of H. Jacobi^{670a} and J.H. Woods made clear

that these two works belong to two different periods,⁶⁷¹ a conclusion accepted in the majority of later publications on the subject.⁶⁷²

Three different Patañjalis are recognized by Atrideva,⁶⁷³ P.V. Sharma⁶⁷⁴ and K.R. Srikantamurthy.⁶⁷⁵

Undecided on the issue are P. Deussen,⁶⁷⁶ J. Filiozat,⁶⁷⁷ Haridattaśarman,⁶⁷⁸ Hemarājaśarman,⁶⁷⁹ M. Müller,⁶⁸⁰ S. Radhakrishnan,⁶⁸¹ and Sūramcandra.⁶⁸²

The clear-cut differences between the *Carakasamhitā* on the one hand, the *Mahābhāṣya* and *Yogasūtra* on the other, were worked out and discussed by P.V. Sharma.⁶⁸³

Chapter 14

Authorities mentioned in the Carakasamhitā

- Abhijit Sū.1.10.
- Agastya Sū.1.9; Ci.1⁴.3; Ci.18.62.
- Agniveśa Sū.1.31 and 39; Ci.12.3, etc.
- Aṅgiras Sū.1.8; Ci.1³.4; Ci.1⁴.3.
- Asita Sū.1.8; Ci.1⁴.3; Si.11.4.
- Āśmarathya, Āśmarathya, or Āśvarathya Sū.1.10.
- Āśvalāyana Sū.1.9.
- Ātreya Sū.1.8 and 33, etc.
- Ātreya Punarvasu Sū.26.9, etc.
- Atri Ci.1⁴.3.
- Atriya Sū.3.30; Sū.7.66; Sū.21.62; Ci.12.4; Ci.20.3; Ci.30.7; Si.11.3.
- Atriputra Si.1.61.
- Atrisūnu Sū.30.52.
- Atrisuta Ci.22.3; Si.11.10.
- Aryātmaja Ci.12.3.
- Bādarāyaṇa Sū.1.11.
- Badiśa Sū.1.11; Sū.26.5 and 8; Śā.6.21; Si.11.7.
- Badiśa Dhāmārgava Sū.12.7; Sū.26.8.
- Bhadrakāpya Sū.25.18; Sū.26.3, 8 and 83; Śā.6.21; Śā.8.32.
- Bhadrāśaunaka (see also Śaunaka) Śā.6.21; Si.11.9.
- Bharadvāja (compare Kumārasīras Bharadvāja) Sū.1.3; Sū.25.20; Śā.3.4, 15, 22; Ci.1³.4.
- Bhārgava Sū.1.10.
- Bhela Sū.1.31.
- Bhikṣu Ātreya Sū.1.9; Sū.25.24.
- Bhṛgu Sū.1.8; Ci.1³.4; Ci.1⁴.3; Si.11.4.
- Cyavana Sū.1.10; Ci.1¹.72; Ci.1².20; Ci.1⁴.44.
- Devala Sū.1.10.
- Dhanvantari Śā.6.21.
- Dhaumya Sū.1.12.
- Gālava Sū.1.10.
- Gārgya Sū.1.10.
- Gautama Sū.1.8; Ci.1⁴.3; Si.11.4 and 6.
- Hārīta Sū.1.31.
- Hiranyākṣa Sū.1.12; Sū.25.14.

G. Jan Meulenbeld

A History of Indian Medical Literature

VOLUME I B ANNOTATION

(R.K. Sharma and Bhagwan Dash, 1976: Preface XXXIX to Vol. I of their ed. and transl. of the *Carakasamhitā*); first or the beginning of the second century (sampādakīya, 14, in ed. hh of the *Carakasamhitā*).

- 611 NCC XI, 89–90.
612 NCC XII, 23: *Pātāñjalatantra*.
613 Ad Govindasena's *Paribhāṣāpradīpa* 3.67–69.
614 *Paribhāṣāpradīpa* 3.63; comments ad 3.24.
615 Ad *Cakradatta*, rasāyana 52–53, 55–56, 61, 63–64, 67–72, 83–84, 107.
616 *Todara IX*: 1.118.
617 Ad *Cakradatta*, rasāyana 45–47 (twice), 55–56, 76, 81, 122.
618 Ad *Sārngadharaśamhitā* II.11.48cd–53ab.
619 Ad *Cakradatta*, arśas 180.
620 Śivadāsasena ad *Cakradatta*, rasāyana 67–72 and 89–90; Nīścala ad *Cakradatta*, arśas 180.
621 Śivadāsasena ad *Cakradatta*, rasāyana 52–53.
622 Ad *Rasaratnasamuccaya* 5.136–140 (compare Śivadāsa ad *Cakradatta*, rasāyana 81) and 28.59–83 (compare Śivadāsa ad *Cakradatta*, rasāyana 122).
623 See the description of Satyanārāyaṇaśāstrin's work.
624 *Āyurvijñānaratnākara* I.3.116 = *Yogasūtra*, vibhūtipāda 39.
625 *Bhaiṣajyaratnāvalī*, grahaṇī 178–184 (bṛhanmethimodaka).
626 B. Seal (1985): 63–64.
627 HIM III, 781 (two MSS are recorded). P.V. Sharma (AVI 207) refers to the *Siddhāntasār-valī* only. G. Hāldār (*Vṛddhatrayī* 29) regards these works as parts of one treatise, called *Vātsakandhapaittastakandhopetisiddhāntasārvalī* (one MS is mentioned).
628 *Guḷabkunverba* I, 146. Jaggi IV, 21. H. Parāḍkar 18. This tradition may be connected with that concerning Patañjali's *Lohasāstra*, quoted in Śivadāsa's commentary on the rasāyana chapter of the *Cakradatta*.
629 E. Sachau (1964): I, 80 and 189. Al-Bīrūnī refers to *Yogasūtra*, kaivalyapāda 1, and its commentaries. See on the *Kitāb Pātanjali* quoted by al-Bīrūnī: S. Dasgupta (1975): I, 233–236 (Dasgupta points to the differences between this work and the *Yogasūtra*; he regards as its author the Patañjali who also wrote the *Lohasāstra* and a commentary on the *Carakasamhitā*; S. Pines and T. Gelblum assume that Dasgupta was not acquainted with the MS of al-Bīrūnī's Arabic version of the *Yogasūtra*, discovered by Massignon in 1922); S. Pines and T. Gelblum (1966); J. Reineaud (1974): XIII–XV; H. Ritter (1956); A. Roṣu (1982); E. Sachau (1964): II, 263–264 (E. Sachau was led astray by the quotations and concluded that the work was totally different from the *Yogasūtra*). See on al-Bīrūnī's knowledge of his Indian sources: J. Gonda (1975a).
630 *Cakrapāṇidatta* calls him Ahipati.
631 P.V. Sharma (1970a): 25. *Vṛddhatrayī* 21. J.H. Woods (1966): Intr. XIV. Edited by Paṇḍit Śivadatta and K.P. Parab, *Kāvyamālā* No. 51, Nirmaya-sāgara Press, Bombay 1895 [IO.28.F. 5 and 6]. See on Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita, who, on account of his exceptionally high proficiency in grammar, was called the new Patañjali (pratyagrapatañjali): T.S. Kuppuswami Sastrī (1904). Venkateśvara, one of Rāmabhadra's pupils, wrote a commentary on the *Patañjalīcarita* (see T.S. Kuppuswami Sastrī, 1904: 176–177).
632 CC I, 517. T.S. Kuppuswami Sastrī (1904).
633 *Vṛddhatrayī* 21 and 30–31. This assertion creates confusion because the quotation (= Ca. Ci.26.125ab) is attributed to Kārtika in most of the editions of the *Madhukosa*. The edition used by G. Hāldār had obviously *Vārtika* instead of *Kārtika*.

- 634 Vṛddhatrayī 31.
 635 Vṛddhatrayī 17, 21, 30–31. Compare the quotation with Ca.Sū.11.18–19 and Ca.Vi.4.4. See also ABI 474; Hemarājaśarman 45; HIM III, 611 and 778. Nāgeśa refers to the definition of āpta as found in Patañjali on Caraka (Gulabkunverba I, 93). Nāgeśabhaṭṭa's citation is sometimes interpreted as pointing to Patañjali as the author of the *Carakasamhitā* (Hariprapanna, *Rasayogasāgara* I, Intr. 71).
 636 Sūramcandra (1978): 286.
 637 Gaṇanātha Sena (1924): 1, 7–10.
 638 AVI 207. Vṛddhatrayī 21 and 30.
 639 AVI 207.
 640 B. Rama Rao (1992): 300.
 641 HIM III, 611, 615, 778.
 642 K.R. Srikantamurthy (1968): 42.
 643 G.P. Srivastava (1954): 80–83.
 644 See, for example, O.P. Jaggi IV, 11–13, 16.
 645 Gaṇanātha Sena (1924): I, 7. HIM III, 779. G.P. Srivastava (1954): 81. The quotation also occurs in *Vijñānabhikṣu's Yogavārtika*.
 646 Gaṇanātha Sena (1924): I, 7. P.V. Sharma (1970a): 25. Vṛddhatrayī 22. J.H. Woods (1966): Intr. XIII–XIV. Bhoja's *Rājamārtanḍa* is the earliest text recording this tradition (J.H. Woods, 1966: Intr. XIII). Two works called *Rājamārtanḍa* are ascribed to Bhoja: the commentary on the *Yogasūtra* and a medical treatise.
 647 Introductory verse 4.
 648 CC I, 652: Sivarāma belongs to the beginning of the eighteenth century. HIM III, 779. G.P. Srivastava (1954): 81. J.H. Woods (1966): Intr. XIV. The quotation is identical with that found in Bhoja's *Nyāyavārtika*.
 649 Gaṇanātha Sena (1924): I, 9. Gulabkunverba I, 88. Haridattasāstrin, upodghāta to ed. ee of the *Carakasamhitā*. P.V. Sharma (1970a): 25. Vṛddhatrayī 21. J.H. Woods (1966): Intr. XIV. Yādavaśarman's upodghāta (8) to ed. z of the *Carakasamhitā*.
 650 ABI 474. Gaṇanātha Sena (1924): I, 7. Gulabkunverba I, 88. Haridattasāstrin, upodghāta to ed. ee of the *Carakasamhitā*. P.V. Sharma (1970a): 25. Vṛddhatrayī 20. Yādavaśarman's upodghāta (8) to ed. z of the *Carakasamhitā*. The quotation is the same as that in Bhoja's *Nyāyavārtika*.
 651 O.P. Sharma (1970a): 25. Vṛddhatrayī 22. Quoted by A. Roṣu (1978: 22). This verse (*Vākyapadīya*, *Brahmakāṇḍa* 146) says that the impurities of body, speech and mind are removed by the teachings of medicine, grammar and yoga. Neither Bhartṛhari, nor the commentator Harivṛṣabha mention Patañjali in this context (see M. Biardeau, 1964: 186–187).
 652 NCC VII, 29. See A. Wezler (1984).
 653 O.P. Jaggi V, 10. HIM III, 779. J.H. Woods (1966): Intr. XIII–XIV. Bhoja wrote a *Śabdaprakāśikā* on grammar, a commentary on the *Yogasūtra*, and a *Rājamrgāṅka* on medicine.
 654 AVI 99 and 206. P. Cordier (1903b): 330. Gulabkunverba I, 94. P.V. Sharma (1970a): 24. Vṛddhatrayī 17–18.
 655 *Vāgbhaṭamanḍana* 46, 51, 58 (twice), 84.
 656 *Vāgbhaṭamanḍana* 58.
 657 *Vāgbhaṭamanḍana* 57 and 78.
 658 *Vāgbhaṭamanḍana* 58.

- 659 NCC XI, 89–90. Patañjali is an incarnation of Śeṣa in the *Patañjalīcarita* (see Vettam Mani 583; Winternitz III, 390) and in the living tradition (see J.Ph. Vogel, 1972: 266–267); his *Mahābhāṣya* is known as the *Phaṇibhāṣya* (HIM III, 779–780). The Tibetan tradition agrees: he is called nāgarāja Vasukīputra Śeṣa (L. Chimpa and A. Chattopadhyaya, 1970: 112). Caraka is an avatāra of Śeṣa in the *Bhāvaprakāśa* (1.1.57–62). Compare Gulabkunverba I, 94–95. See on Śeṣa in general: Dowson; K. Karttunen (1989): 190–191; M.A. Mehendale (1993); D.D. Shulman (1980): 120; Vettam Mani; J. Ph. Vogel (1972); D.G. White (1996): 215–216.
 660 J. Filliozat (1975): 20. In support of this view, J. Filliozat points to a late tradition, which calls Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vārtikas* on Pāṇini's grammar, Punarvasu, a name also given to the Ātreya of the *Carakasamhitā*.
 661 P.V. Sharma (1992d): 181. The same author (Intr. to his edition and translation of the *Carakasamhitā*, IX and XII) suggested that the identification of Patañjali and Caraka may have been facilitated by their similar activities; Patañjali's *Bhāṣya* on Pāṇini resembles Caraka's enlargement by means of annotations (*bhāṣya*) of Agniśa's work in sūtra style; he added that the *Mahābhāṣya*, *Yogasūtra* and *Carakasamhitā* belong to the same period, which contributed to the confusion regarding their authors. Many Indian scholars do not accept the identity of Patañjali and Caraka (see, for example, ed. hh of the *Carakasamhitā*, 10–11; Y.K. Tripathi, 1987: 25–27).
 662 See J. Filliozat (1975): 18–20. Patañjali is represented as a snake (see H. Krishna Sastri, 1916: 82, 84, 85).
 663 See, for example, the elaborate discussion in R. Śāstrī (1977): 505–510 and 519–520.
 664 Gaṇanātha Sena (1924): I, 7–10.
 665 HIM III, 611–612, 615, 778–785.
 666 G.P. Srivastava (1954): 80–83. R.K. Sharma and Bhagwan Dash (Preface XXXVIII to their edition and translation of the *Carakasamhitā*) hold that it is likely that both Caraka and Patañjali were authors of treatises on yoga, grammar and medicine.
 667 S. Dasgupta (1975): I, 230–238.
 668 See Winternitz III, 460.
 669 See L. Renou (1940); Winternitz III, 460.
 670 S.K. Ramachandra Rao (1985): 45.
 670a H. Jacobi (1911d).
 671 J.H. Woods (1966): Intr. XV–XVI. The arguments adduced by Woods were criticized and rejected by S. Dasgupta (1975: I, 230–238); see Winternitz III, 651.
 672 See, for example: J.N. Farquhar (1967): 131–132; A.B. Keith (1949): 69–70 and (1973): 490; G.J. Larson and R.S. Bhattacharya (1987): 22. See, in particular, L. Renou (1940), who criticized B. Liebig's view, and convincingly argued that the vocabulary of the *Yogasūtra*, being radically distinct from that of the *Mahābhāṣya*, points to a considerably later date of the former work. See also M. Eliade (1960): 363; M. Winternitz III, 460.
 673 ABI 474–475.
 674 P.V. Sharma (1970a): 23–43; (1992d): 181–182.
 675 K.R. Srikantamurthy (1968): 40–42.
 676 See Winternitz III, 460.
 677 J. Filliozat in L. Renou et J. Filliozat (1953): 45–46.
 678 Upodghāta (pages tha–da) to ed. ee of the *Carakasamhitā*.
 679 Upodghāta (44–48) to the *Kāśyapasaṃhitā*. Hemarājaśarman concludes that Caraka and

Patañjali are not identical at all, but remains undecided on the identity of the authors of *Yogasūtra* and *Mahābhāṣya*. Haridattaśarman expressed a similar view.

680 M. Müller (n.d.): 313–314.

681 S. Radhakrishnan (1951): II, 341.

682 Sūramcandra (1978): 285–286.

683 AV1 96–99, P.V. Sharma (1970a): 23–43; (1992d): 181–182. See also: Gulabkunverba I, 91–92; Y.K. Tripāṭhi (1987): 26–27.

Chapter 14

Authorities mentioned in the Carakasamhitā

- 1 MW. PW. *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 4.14.14. H.H. Wilson (1972): 348.
- 2 See on this nakṣatra: J. Filliozat (1937): 77; A.A. Macdonell and A.B. Keith (1967): vide s.v. nakṣatra; J.E. Mitchiner (1982): 136, 154, 157, 271.
- 3 NCC I, 19–28.
- 4 Especially in certain Vedic texts, for example *Atharvaveda* 4.9.3 (see A.A. Macdonell and A.B. Keith, 1967; J.E. Mitchiner, 1982: 14).
- 5 See R. Barkhuis (1995): I, 80–81; A. Bergaigne (1878): I, 51, 57, (1883): II, 393–396; W. Caland (1926): 54, 81, 144, 169, 184, 188, 192; S.A. Dange (1986): 4–8; A. Daniélou (1964): 322–323; Dowson; J.A. Dubois (1947): 248, 274–275, 426; G.S. Ghurye (1972); J. Gonda (1935): 342–353, (1975), (1977); A. Holtzmann (1880); Hopkins; H. Jacobi (1925); A.B. Keith (1976): 151; W.R. Kloetzli (1985): 140–141; H. Krishna Sastri (1916): 90, 254; A.A. Macdonell and A.B. Keith (1967); M.A. Mehendale (1996): 285–286; V.V. Mirashi (1968); J.E. Mitchiner (1982); G. Mukhopadhyaya, HIM II, 246–247; H. Oldenberg (1885): 60–68, (1888): 221–222; F.E. Pargiter (1922); Poerbatjaraka (1926): I–14; V. Raghavan (1961); V.G. Rahurkar (1964): 202–209; K.R. Rajagopalan (1958); Tārācand Śarmā (1981/82): 69–70 (Agasta); Thanewar Sarmah (1991): 57, 140, 141, 314; K.A. Nilakanta Sastri (1936); L. von Schroeder (1908): 91–172; D. Shulman (1980); E. Sieg (1969): 105–129; S. Sörensen (1963); M. and J. Stutley (1977); Sūramcandra I, 72–77; P. Thieme (1963); Vettam Mani 4–10; B. Ziegenbalg (1867): 220, 231–232. See on Agastya in the *Rāmāyaṇa*: J. Gonda (1935): 344–345; K.A. Nilakanta Sastri (1936): 478–485. J. Gonda calls *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Uttarakāṇḍa* I–36, although characterized as *Rāvaṇeīs* by H. Jacobi (1893), an Agastyaparvan.
- 6 *Atharvaveda* 2.32.3 (a charm against worms in cattle), 4.37.1 (Agastya employed the plant *ajāśṛṅgi* to destroy evil beings) and 5.23.10 (a charm against worms in children).
- 7 See, in particular, Vanaparvan 96–98 (*Agastyopākhyāna*), 103–105, 107–109 (ed. Poona).
- 8 *Mahābhārata*, *Ādiparvan* 192.9; *Śāntiparvan* 208.29–30 (ed. Poona).
- 9 *Mahābhārata*, *Ādiparvan* 139.9 (ed. Poona).
- 10 *Mahābhārata*, *Ādiparvan*, *Sambhavaparvan* 118.12–15 (ed. Poona); see also Anuśāsanaparvan 115.59 and 116.16–17 (ed. Poona). Compare *Manusmṛti* 5.22. See A. Holtzmann (1880): 594–595; J.J. Meyer (1952): 234; F. Wilhelm (1991): 11.
- 11 *Matsyapurāṇa* II.84. J.E. Mitchiner (1982): 95. See on Agastya in the *Matsyapurāṇa*: K.A. Nilakanta Sastri (1936): 487–489.
- 12 *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa*, *Brahmakhaṇḍa* 16.9–22. Gaṇanātha Sena (1924): I, 14–15. Satya-prakāś 92–94. *Vṛddhatrayī* 6–7.
- 13 Strictly, Āgastya means a descendant of Agastya.
- 14 Hemarājaśarman 12. *Vṛddhatrayī* 8–10. The Hemādri who wrote the *Lakṣaṇaprakāśa* was the son of Īśvarasūri; he is said to belong to the fifteenth century (L. Gopal, 1988: 116).
- 15 Jaggi IV, 21. H. Parāṅkar 18. S.K. Mishra (1992: 313) credits Agastya with a treatise on *kāyacikitsā*.
- 16 Ad Ca.Sū.1.62–63ab.