

The *Suśrutasamhitā* on the Plastic Surgery of the Ears and Nose: The Nepalese Recension

Dominik Wujastyk Jason Birch Andrey Klebanov
Madhu Parameswaran Madhusudan Rimal
Deepro Chakraborty Harshal Bhatt Devyani Shenoy
Vandana Lele

Draft of 19th July 2022
© The authors.

Contents

Introduction	3
The Aim of the Article	3
Importance of SS.1.16 in the History of Medicine	5
The Transmission of the Work	9
The Nepalese Version	9
The Versions of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa	11
Differences between the Nepalese and Subsequent Versions of	
SS.1.16	14
Changing Spelling, Sandhi and Syntax	18
Changing Technical Terms	19
Augmenting the Text	20
Transposing Words, Verses and Passages	21
Redacting Recipes and Elaborating on Treatments	21

The Printed Editions	23
The Vulgate	23
The sources of the 1915 edition	23
The sources of the 1931 edition	24
The sources of the 1938 edition	24
Evaluation	25
The 1939 edition	26
For the Bhānumatī	27
For the Suśrutasamhitā	27
Evaluation	27
The Manuscripts	29
Palaeographical features	31
Editorial Principles	32
Method	32
Stemma	33
The Edition and Apparatus	34
Printed Edition	35
Digital Edition	35
Critical Edition of Sūtrasthāna 16	38
Translation of Sūtrasthāna 16	46
Abbreviations	55
Index of Manuscripts	58
References	58
Glossary	75
Glossary of Medical Substances	78

Introduction

The Aim of the Article

The *Compendium of Suśruta* (*Suśrutasaṃhitā*) is amongst the most important treatises on medicine to survive from the ancient world. It has been studied seriously by historians since it first became available in print in the mid-nineteenth century.¹ Meulenbeld listed forty-four editions of the work since the first edition of 1835 by Gupta in Calcutta, and eight translations, starting from the Latin translation of 1844 by Hessler.² Many more translations have appeared in recent decades.

The study of this work has yielded rich historical discoveries about the earliest history of surgery, ancient pharmacology, toxicology and many other social and medical topics. Yet there remain fundamental unanswered questions about the history of the text itself and about related issues in the history of medicine in Asia.³

In January 2007, a manuscript of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, previously unknown to contemporary scholarship, was brought to international attention.⁴ MS Kathmandu KL 699 is a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript covering about two thirds of the Sanskrit text. It is dated to 878 CE, making it one of the earliest dated manuscripts known from South Asia.⁵ The manuscript has been declared by UNESCO to be part of the Memory of the World.⁶

The newly-discovered manuscript in Nepal is related to two other early palm-leaf manuscripts in the National Archives in Kathmandu, MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333 and MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1079. Klebanov (2010; 2021a) has assembled compelling evidence for believing that these Nepalese manuscripts present a version of the text that was in wider circulation in northern India, especially Bengal, in the period up to about 1200 CE. Generally speaking, the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* is more rudimentary than the versions commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta (fl. eleventh century) and Ḍalhaṇa (fl. twelfth century). The version of the

1 A selection of prominent contributions includes: Hoernle 1897; 1906a,b; 1907a,b; Strauss 1934; Singhal et al. 1972–82; P. V. Sharma 1975; Rây et al. 1980; R. Adriaensen et al. 1984; Yano 1986; HIML; P. V. Sharma 1999–2001a; Valiathan 2007.

2 HIML: IB, 311 ff.

3 HIML: IA, 203–389.

4 Dimitrov and Tamot 2007.

5 Harimoto 2011: 87–88.

6 UNESCO 2013.

Suśrutasamhitā commented on by Ḍalhaṇa has formed the basis of modern printed editions, such as those of Yadavaśarman Trivikramātmaja Ācārya and others.⁷ Some of the changes in the text between the Nepalese version and what we might call the Ḍalhaṇa version, or the vulgate version, consist of the addition and loss of numerous verses, changes to medical recipes, and reordering of chapters, especially in the *Uttaratantra* or last part of the work. Lariviere hypothesized long ago, in a different context, that Sanskrit texts tended to continue to expand through the addition of new materials,

The process of addition to these compilations must have gone on for centuries. The hearers or readers of these compilations must have known other verses ... and it would be natural for them to include these verses in the compilation. This type of addition may have continued until a commentary on the collection was composed. A commentary would have served to fix the text. and the expansion of the text would have been more difficult after that.⁸

In the case of the *Suśrutasamhitā*, the Nepalese manuscripts appear to present us with the last recoverable snapshot of this stage of the work when it was still open to absorbing new materials, most notably the *Uttaratantra*, and before the closing of the text as a result of the authority of the major commentators.

The present study offers a critical edition and annotated translation of the sixteenth chapter of the *Ślokaśthāna*, the first book of the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.⁹ This chapter is important in the history of Indian medicine because of its discussion of surgical methods for repairing torn ears and severed noses. In addition to discussing the manuscripts and published editions used in this new edition, the introduction of this study

⁷ Su 1915; Su 1938; P. V. Sharma 1999–2001b.

⁸ Lariviere 2003: xii, cited with agreement by Olivelle (2005: 51) in the context of legal literature and by Bronkhorst (2016: 62–63) in the context of epic literature. See the latter citation for further discussion of Sanskrit text formation between the empires.

⁹ This book is called the *Sūtrasthāna* in later versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. Note that the *Suśrutasamhitā* itself used the name *Ślokaśthāna* at several places, e.g., 6.42.61 (Su 1938: 721), 6.65.30 and 31 (Su 1938: 818), usually referring to identifiable passages in that part of the work. The name is also used in the *Ślokaśthāna* itself, at 1.1.40 of the Nepalese version.

addresses some of the challenges of editing the Nepalese manuscripts and the salient differences between the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* 1.16 and the text as known to Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa. The notes to the edition incorporate alternative readings mentioned by the commentators. The annotations to the translation discuss the following topics: instances where the text is uncertain; non-standard spellings and syntax; the meaning of technical and obscure terms; relevant remarks by the commentators; ambiguities in the identification of medical ingredients, in particular, plant names; and the additional compounds, verses and passages in Ḍalhaṇa's version of the text. In short, this is a pilot study for undertaking a complete edition and translation of the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.

Importance of SS.1.16 in the History of Medicine

Simple forms of surgery have a long history in South Asia. In works datable to at least 1200 BCE we learn how a reed was used as a catheter to cure urine retention.¹⁰ Cauterization too was described in the same ancient sources, to prevent wounds from bleeding. The *Atharvaveda*, in the early first millennium BCE, described the bones of the human body, showing early anatomical awareness in a religious context.¹¹ The *Brāhmaṇa* literature of the only slightly later contains more detailed descriptions of animal butchery in the context of religious sacrifice that involved the enumeration of internal organs and bones.¹² This exemplifies an early Sanskrit vocabulary for internal parts of bodies. However, this is not the same as anatomical dissection, whose methods and intentionality are quite different. As was pointed out long ago by Keith (1908), the enumeration of the bones in the *Brāhmaṇas* was derived from correspondences with the numbering of various verse forms, not from anatomical observation. With the *Suśrutasamhitā* we find ourselves in the presence of something quite different and more medically developed, in which the body was studied specifically for medical and surgical purposes.¹³ The text gives us a historical window onto a school of professionalised medicine, including surgical practice, that existed almost

10 Zysk 1985: 70–71.

11 Translation by Hoernle (1907b: §43, §100). Further bibliography: HIML: IIB, 819.

12 Malamoud 1996; Saha 2015.

13 Zysk 1986. The *Carakasamhitā* too has brief descriptions of surgical techniques, but the *Suśrutasamhitā* goes into greater detail.

two millennia ago, and which in its day was perhaps the most advanced school of surgery in the world.

The author of the *Suśrutasamhitā* described how a surgeon should be trained and how various operations should be done. There are descriptions of ophthalmic couching (the dislodging of the lens of the eye), perineal lithotomy (cutting for stone in the bladder), the removal of arrows and splinters, suturing, the examination of dead human bodies for the study of anatomy, and other procedures.¹⁴ The author of the *Suśrutasamhitā* claimed that surgery is the most ancient and most efficacious of the eight branches of medical knowledge.¹⁵ Anecdotal discussion with contemporary surgeons suggests that many details in the descriptions could only have been written by a practising surgeon: it is beyond doubt that elaborate surgical techniques were a reality in the author's circle.

Torn ear lobes Suśruta's description of the repair of torn ear lobes is unique for its time.¹⁶ Majno, a practising surgeon, noted that, "through the habit of stretching their earlobes, the Indians became masters in a branch of surgery that Europe ignored for another two thousand years".¹⁷ The different types of mutilated ear lobe which the *Suśrutasamhitā* describes are not always easy to understand from the Sanskrit: the illustrations supplied in Majno's text help visualization.¹⁸

Rhinoplasty One of the best-known surgical techniques associated with *Suśrutasamhitā* is rhinoplasty, the repair or rebuilding of a severed nose. The history of this operation was discussed by Wujastyk (2003: 67–70, 99–100), and a translation of the Sanskrit passage from the vulgate edition of the *Suśrutasamhitā* was given.¹⁹ This fascinating technique is certainly old in South Asia, having been witnessed by travellers from Marco Polo in the

14 Wilson 1823; Mukhopādhyāya 1913; Deshpande 2000; Wujastyk 2003; Valiathan 2007; Narayana and Thrigulla 2011 and many other studies.

15 *Suśrutasamhitā* 1.1.15–19 (Su 1938: 4).

16 The comprehensive study of ears in the history of Indian culture by Bollée (2010) oddly omits reference to *Suśrutasamhitā*'s surgery, although it mentions the text's description of ear diseases.

17 Majno 1975: 291.

18 Majno 1975: 290–291; reproduced with permission in Wujastyk 2003: 92–93.

19 See also HIML: IB, 327–328, note 186, for further literature and reflections.

seventeenth century onwards.²⁰ Many witnesses, including the most famous, Cruso and Findlay,²¹ described an operation that differs from *Suśrutasaṃhitā* in that it takes the grafting skin from the forehead, not the cheek. But the nineteenth-century account of Thorburn is especially interesting, since the technique follows *Suśrutasaṃhitā* exactly in taking flesh from the cheek, not the forehead.²²

As noted by Meulenbeld, none of the extant commentators – Jejjaṭa, Gayadāsa, Cakrapāṇi or Ḍalhaṇa – explained the technique in any detail beyond short lexical glosses.²³ This suggests that the commentators did not in fact know the technique at first-hand.

The skin flap It is worth highlighting here a point of critical medical importance: the continued attachment of the skin flap. One of the crucial innovations of the “Hindu Method” of nasal reconstruction, as observed and internationally reported in the eighteenth century, was that the skin flap taken from the face remained partially connected to its original location.²⁴ This ensures the blood flow essential to keeping the skin alive while it heals in its new location. The Sanskrit of the vulgate is ambiguous on this critical point and the wording of the Nepalese version is unclear. However, Ḍalhaṇa clarified the meaning of the vulgate here by stating that when reading the expression “connected,” one should understand “connected flesh”.²⁵ He thus indicated that he understood the flesh to be connected to the face.²⁶ Thus, we cannot know definitively at present whether the connection of the flap was known to the redactors of the Nepalese version, although it seems likely. It was probably known to the redactors of the vulgate, and was certainly known to Ḍalhaṇa in the twelfth century.

Earlier in the chapter, in the context of ear-piercing and repair, the vulgate has a passage that is more explicit and conclusive. After listing the

20 Manucci 1907–8: ii.301.

21 Longmate 1794: 883, 891 f.

22 Thorburn 1876: 352–3.

23 HIML:IB, 328. Ḍalhaṇa also noted cryptically that a rather different version of the text, cast in *śloka* metre, was also known to him from other sources (1.16.27–31 (Su 1938: 81a)). Ḍalhaṇa’s variant bears a resemblance to the description of the operation given in printed editions of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā* (Utt.18.59–65 (Ah 1939: 841)).

24 See Wujastyk 2003: 67–70.

25 *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 1.16.28 (Su 1938: 81)

26 See p. 53 below.

names and characteristics of different types of earlobe, the vulgate cites some summary verses from an unknown source (1.16.11–14 (Su 1938: 78)). The last of these verses says,

If no lobe exists, an expert may create an ear lobe by scarifying and then using living flesh still attached to the cheek from which it has been sliced.²⁷

Get page number for Wujastyk-2003.

The commentator Ḍalhaṇa was even more explicit in his gloss on this passage:

“Living” [flesh] means “together with blood”.²⁸

Thus, Ḍalhaṇa’s comment gives us unequivocal evidence for the concept of a living skin flap in the twelfth century, and it is almost certain that this is also what the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* intended by the word “living.” The one remaining historical problem is that these specific verses, 1.16.11–14, are not present in the Nepalese version of the text. That suggests that they were part of a different tradition of practice with a verse literature that was integrated into the *Suśrutasamhitā* at the latest by the time of Ḍalhaṇa.

If we can assume that the descriptions of ear-surgery and rhinoplasty were part of a single professional tradition of surgical method, then this the passage in the context of the earlobe strongly supports the idea that rhinoplastic surgery too was conducted with attention to keeping a living skin flap.

By the late first millennium, had the rhinoplastic technique had moved into the professional competence of barber-surgeons? On the other hand, perhaps the influence was in the other direction, and a technique known to practitioners elsewhere in South Asia in the first millennium was integrated into the text of *Suśrutasamhitā*. The rhinoplastic description consists of only five verses and they are written in the Upendravajrā metre, which is different from the rest of the chapter. The description’s appearance at the very end of the chapter, its terseness, its ornate metre, and the paucity of the commentators’ treatment could all be taken as pointing in this direction.

27 1.16.14 (Su 1938: 78): गण्डादुत्पाद्य मांसेन सानुबन्धेन जीवता | कर्णपालीमापालेस्तु कुर्यान्निलिख्य शास्त्रवित् । Cf. the translation of the whole passage by Wujastyk (2003).

28 1.16.14 (Su 1938: 78): जीवेति शोणितसहितेनेत्यर्थः ।

The Transmission of the Work

The Nepalese Version

In the present article and the other publications of our research group, we focus on the study of what we call the ‘Nepalese version’ of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. The primary rationale behind using this designation was outlined in Klebanov (2021a: 2–3), but we consider it necessary to reflect upon its meaning here given the conceptual significance that this term occupies in our research. It is possible that in the course of our research, we will refine our understanding of the phenomenon and, consequently, review and modify our current interpretation.

Put plainly, the ‘Nepalese version’ refers to a hypothetical text-critical reconstruction of the wording of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that is based primarily on the evidence of three ancient Nepalese manuscripts that we have briefly introduced above and that we will describe in more detail in a later section. We call these MSS “Nepalese” not just because they were preserved and discovered by modern scholarship in the Kathmandu valley but also because we believe that they were produced in the same area. We conclude this because all three MSS are written in a specific variety of Indic scripts which, to the best of our knowledge, was not used outside of the region.

Furthermore, we speak of a single “version” because we hold that these manuscripts attest to a peculiar line of transmission of the text, that is, in terms of stemmatic analysis, they share a common ancestor (hyparchetype) or a group of ancestors, while at the same time, bear no signs of significant contamination. This hypothesis was postulated in Klebanov (2010) and reiterated in Klebanov (2021b) as the result of a systematic analysis of two complete chapters (SS.1.3 and SS.1.15) as well as several shorter excerpts from the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* transmitted in the Nepalese manuscripts. On the one hand, these studies highlight that all three MSS preserve a highly uniform text with very few variations, virtually all of which can be explained as standard scribal errors or corrections. On the other hand, Klebanov (2010; 2021b) systematically compared the concerned textual excerpts with four printed editions, alternative readings (*pāṭhas*) reported by several commentators, parallel passages in other texts, and with a limited number of additional manuscripts of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. This analysis demonstrated that the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* preserved in the Nepalese MSS differs decidedly from all the above standards of comparison. In this

way, for example, we establish that another Nepalese manuscript of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1146,²⁹ does not belong to the peculiar line of textual transmission and need not be taken into consideration when reconstructing the reading of its hyparchetype.

However, in view of the more than two hundred handwritten copies of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* preserved in different libraries across South Asia and in the absence of their systematic inclusion into the project's current collation, the assumption about the regional character of the transmission line remains hypothetical. As a matter of fact, we believe that the Nepalese MSS preserve many archaic features of the early *Suśrutasaṃhitā* and it is possible, even likely, that some of these features will be found in other manuscripts of this work that have yet to be studied.

Our research group builds upon the above hypothesis about the existence of a distinct Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* and concentrates primarily on the study of this text in its own right and, additionally, in comparison to a single version of the compendium popularized by its late medieval commentator Ḍalhaṇa and recorded in the widely-used [Su 1938](#). The present study of SS.1.16 also considers the readings found in [Su 1939](#) and incorporates various observations made by both medieval commentators, Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa, into the notes of the edition and some annotations of the translation.

The current paper and several earlier publications furnish a large catalogue of uniform features that are characteristic of the Nepalese MSS and set them apart from the vulgate version.³⁰ These features of the Nepalese MSS include orthographic variants, peculiarities in the structure and structuring elements, as well as the actual wording of the text. As argued elsewhere in this article, many of these variants are likely to be closer to an archaic version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. This is partly because they preserve a version of the text that appears to be less edited, that is, slightly more idiosyncratic and original in expression, that in turn suggests that it precedes later editorial intervention, according to the principle of *lectio difficilior potior*. We also assign a high historical value to many Nepalese readings because they constitute an internally more consistent and coherent text that is at times further supported by external testimonia.

29 Rimal and Wujastyk [2022](#).

30 Earlier publications include, for example, Harimoto [2011](#); Wujastyk [2013](#); Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Parameswaran, et al. [2021](#); Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. [2021](#).

Additionally, we want to make it clear that we do not think that the Nepalese MSS provide a so-called original text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. Rather, the Nepalese MSS are witnesses to a hyparchetype, not the archetype, of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. The Nepalese MSS provide us with an intermediary node in the history of this work between the oldest reconstructable text and the vulgate version that was known to Ḍalhaṇa in the twelfth century and is reproduced in printed editions of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. The oldest reconstructable text will only come into focus when all surviving witnesses for the work are studied. Having said that, our belief is that the Nepalese version is certain to be closer to the oldest reconstructable text than are contemporary printed versions of the work. One of the reasons for this belief is simply that the Nepalese MSS give us physical evidence for the state of the work in the ninth century, which cannot be many centuries later than the original assembly of the work in the form we are familiar with, i.e., a work of five topical sections with a large added sixth section, the Uttaratāntra, that has a somewhat different character.

To summarize: the evidence arising from our studies to this point leads us to think that the Nepalese MSS provide access to single line of textual transmission that goes back to a hyparchetype that predates the composition of all major commentaries on the *Suśrutasamhitā* and that, due to its regional character, has suffered relatively little contamination. We term this hyparchetype the “Nepalese version.”

The Versions of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa

The commentaries of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa, titled *Bhānumatī* and *Nibandhasaṅgraha* respectively, are based on similar but not identical versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā*, both of which are significantly different to the Nepalese version.³¹ Ḍalhaṇa was aware of Cakrapāṇidatta’s work and reiterated many of his predecessor’s remarks, so the interpretation of the root text by these two commentators is, broadly speaking, consistent.³² Ḍalhaṇa

31 See [HIML](#): IA 374–379 on these authors. Meulenbeld already noted that “the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* in the [1939] edition of the *Bhānumatī* differs at many places from the text of the [vulgate edition of 1938]” and gave examples from the *sūtrasthāna* ([HIML](#): IB, 496, note 76).

32 [HIML](#): IB, 499, n. 162.

evidently also had several manuscripts of the *Suśrutasamhitā* available to him, since he frequently recorded their variant readings.³³

In addition to the fine-grained issues raised by the relationship between these commentators, there are added difficulties introduced by the way the editors of the printed versions of these commentaries handled the texts in several cases. The most obvious difficulty is that Y. T. Ācārya and N. Śarman's text of the *Sūtrasthāna* commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939) simply duplicated the text of that section from Y. T. Ācārya and N. R. Ācārya's edition of Ḍalhaṇa's commentary (Su 1938).³⁴ This duplication of the root text creates the misleading impression that both commentators had the same *Suśrutasamhitā* before them. However, there is much evidence, including in SS.1.16, that this was not the case. For example, Ḍalhaṇa commented on four verses, 1.16.11–14 (Su 1938: 78), as part of his root text, that Cakrapāṇidatta cited separately only in his commentary (Su 1939: 128–129). Cakrapāṇidatta introduced each verse with “some people say” (केचित्पठन्ति). This clearly indicates that these verses were not in the version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* upon which Cakrapāṇidatta was commenting, but a century or so later they were part of the text before Ḍalhaṇa. But Y. T. Ācārya and N. Śarman included them in the root text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* as if they were. Such cases make it harder than it would otherwise be to remain clear that these two commentators were working off different versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.

Also, Cakrapāṇidatta did not acknowledge or comment on some verses in the version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* known to Ḍalhaṇa. Although it is possible that a commentator may not have remarked on a verse because its meaning was clear, in some cases the commentarial convention of citing the first words of a new verse or passage provides firmer ground for suspecting the absence of a verse in the root text.

33 Cf. HIML: IA, 377. Meulenbeld drew attention to Ḍalhaṇa's commentary on 5.8.24cd–25ab (Su 1938: 587) as a particularly striking example of such awareness (HIML: IB, 497, n. 112). In this passage, Ḍalhaṇa noted that certain readings known to the earlier commentators Jejjāta and Gayadāsa were, “not to be found in current manuscripts” (स च वर्तमानपुस्तकेषु न दृश्यते).

34 There are a few exceptions where Cakrapāṇidatta glossed a word or compound that is different to the one glossed by Ḍalhaṇa. For example, in SS.1.16.18, Cakrapāṇidatta glossed राजसर्षप whereas Ḍalhaṇa glossed गौरसर्षप, and the editors reflected this in the root texts of the *Bhānumatī* (Su 1939: 130) and *Nibandhasaṅgraha* (Su 1938: 79) respectively.

To give an example, there is a prose passage at Su.1.16.18 of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that Cakrapāṇidatta commented on in his *Bhānumatī*.³⁵ It is followed by several verses also in the main text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that elaborate on the content of the prose passage.³⁶ Ḍalhaṇa commented on these explanatory verses, citing keywords that show they all formed part of the main text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that was before him.³⁷ However, Cakrapāṇidatta's older commentary showed no awareness of the first few verses in this group, Su.1.16.19–21ab.³⁸ Apparently, they were not part of the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* as he knew it. In spite of that, the editors printed these verses in their edition of Cakrapāṇidatta's work as if they were indeed part of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* known to to him.³⁹

A similar instance of this occurs in the edition of the *Bhānumatī* at SS.1.16.31 where the editors of the 1939 printed edition included a verse in parenthesis that was commented on by Ḍalhaṇa but not by Cakrapāṇidatta.⁴⁰ This verse was almost certainly not in the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* known to Cakrapāṇidatta.

The manuscript on which the editor's edition of the *Bhānumatī* was mainly based, MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908, does not include the root text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.⁴¹ Therefore, it requires a detailed reading of the commentary itself to infer what its author, Cakrapāṇidatta, was seeing in the manuscripts of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that he had before him in the eleventh century. But, to summarize, there is no evidence that they included the verses SS.1.16.19–21ab and 31 that are printed in [Su 1939](#) as if they were present to Cakrapāṇidatta.

In fact, there is some evidence that the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* was more similar to Cakrapāṇidatta's version than to Ḍalhaṇa's. For example, SS.1.16.5 of the Nepalese version begins with

35 [Su 1939](#): 130, i.e., अथाप्रदुष्टस्याभिवर्धनार्थम् ... निदध्यात् । It is numbered Su.1.16.19 in Ḍalhaṇa's *Nibandhasaṅgraha* ([Su 1938](#): 79).

36 Su.1.16.19–23 in [Su 1939](#), i.e., स्वेदितो ..., यवाश्च ..., तैलं ..., तेषाम् ..., वद्ध

37 1.16.19–23 ([Su 1938](#): 79–80).

38 [Su 1939](#): 130–131.

39 The editors remarked in a footnote that verses 20–21a were not in the Nepalese manuscript they consulted ([Su 1939](#): 130, n. 2).

40 The verse begins नाडीयोगं विनौष्यस्य. It is printed in the vulgate as 1.16.32 ([Su 1938](#): 81), with Ḍalhaṇa's commentary. It is printed in parentheses as 1.16.31 in the edition of the *Bhānumatī* ([Su 1939](#): 133).

41 The MS is described in [IOLR](#): vol. 1.5, 928, #2647. The section on p. [26](#) below describes the sources that the editors used for the 1939 edition.

the compound दोषसमुदयात्.⁴² Ḍalhaṇa's version, on the other hand, inserts two compounds, क्लृष्टजिह्वाप्रशस्तसूचीव्यधात् and गाढतरवर्तित्वात्, before this.⁴³ Cakrapāṇidatta begins his comment on this passage by glossing *doṣasamudayāt*, which suggests that he was not aware of the compounds that Ḍalhaṇa saw.⁴⁴

If one looks beyond SS.1.16, there are instances where the Nepalese version and the root text as read by Cakrapāṇidatta have the same reading, but Ḍalhaṇa mentions it as an alternative that is, “read by others.” For example, SS.1.1.28 of the Nepalese version has तत्रास्मिञ्छास्त्रे, which is also the reading commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta.⁴⁵ However, Ḍalhaṇa comments on अस्मिञ् छास्त्रे and states that “others read तत्रास्मिञ् छास्त्रे”.⁴⁶ Another example is the reading of षष्ठ्या विधानैः in Ḍalhaṇa's commentary on 1.1.8.1 (Su 1938: 3) that is not in his main text but that he ascribes to “some others.” This reading is likely to be derived from the expression षष्ठ्याभिधानैः in the main text of the Nepalese version, and to have been rewritten before Ḍalhaṇa's time because it was hard to understand.⁴⁷

Differences between the Nepalese and Subsequent Versions of SS.1.16

Several differences between the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* as found in its multiple printed versions and as reconstructed on the basis of the Nepalese MSS have already been pointed out in previous publications. Klebanov (2021a: 27f.) listed differences in the chapter sequence as it affects the overall organization and structuring themes and elements of the text. Wujastyk (2013), Klebanov (2021a: 28-32) and most recently Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Parameswaran, et al. (2021) and Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. (2021: 2-4) have explored variations in the frame story of the work as a whole. Klebanov (2021a: 32-36) highlighted the interchangeable use of two names of the first book of the text, namely *Ślokaśthāna* and *Sūtraśthāna*.

⁴² Su 1939: 126.

⁴³ 1.16.6 (Su 1938: 77).

⁴⁴ SS.1.16.5, Su 1939: 126–127.

⁴⁵ Su 1939: 17.

⁴⁶ 1.1.22 (Su 1938: 5).

⁴⁷ See the discussion by Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. (2021: 4–5).

Klebanov (2021a: 37-44) examined another peculiarity of the Nepalese version, namely, additional verse or prose colophons found at the end of each book but also each decade of chapters of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

As the present paper demonstrates, many distinct features pertaining to the actual content of the Nepalese version continuously come to light as we proceed with our study of the manuscripts. Among observations made in previous literature, Klebanov (2021a: 44-47) made some general remarks, along with a few arbitrary examples, and detailed two case studies (*idem*, 47-55). The first case study dealt with the list of skin lesions associated with urinary disease (प्रमेहपिट्का in the Nepalese spelling). Their signs and pathogenesis are described in *nidānasthāna* 6 and their treatment is the subject of *cikitsāsthāna* 12. The list of skin lesions exemplifies a case where the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* transmitted in the Nepalese MSS is internally more coherent than that commented on by Ḍalhaṇa. The incoherence of the latter version was already identified by an earlier commentator, Gayadāsa (fl. ca. 1000), who proposed a textual conjecture that corresponds to the reading of the Nepalese version.⁴⁸

The second case study by Klebanov (2021a) focussed on the variation in another list, that of the vital energies (*prāṇas*), mentioned in *śārīrasthāna* 4.

The present study also provides an example of interpolation. This is a rare case in which we have a fairly good idea of where the inserted text came from, namely the medical theory associated with the *Carakasaṃhitā*.

The discussion of the textual variant in the second case study, the list of vital energies, also recourses to Gayadāsa's learned remarks. Here, the scholar commented on the reading transmitted in the Nepalese MSS as the original one and reported an alternative reading and its interpretation preferred by another ancient commentator, Jejjaṭa. It is precisely this reading that is known to modern readers of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* from the vulgate version of the text. Another exemplary investigation of textual variants in the Nepalese version is found in Harimoto (2011: 101-104). This study looks at the classification of snakes in *kalpasthāna* 4 and reveals that, compared to the versions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* found in different printed sources, the Nepalese MSS preserve a text that is internally more consistent and coherent.

the referent of this is not so clear. 'this alternative reading'?

⁴⁸ MS Kathmandu KL 699 was copied a century or more before Gādāsa's time. So the Nepalese version cannot have been influenced by Gayadāsa's innovations or suggestions.

On the whole, these observations indicate that many features of the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* are likely to go back to an older state of the textual development common to other versions of the compendium. However, other textual peculiarities, such as the text-structuring colophons concluding every tenth chapter, are likely to have occurred within a local transmission of the text, and it is improbable that they are attested in the MSS from other regions. When evaluating the Nepalese readings historically, however, it is further necessary to keep in mind that there is plentiful evidence suggesting an ancient age of the readings accepted into Ḍalhaṇa's version of the text.

The following detailed comparison of 1.16 of the Nepalese version with Ḍalhaṇa's *Nibandhasaṅgraha* unfolded as the chapter was edited. The differences appear to emanate largely from attempts to standardise, simplify or clarify the language of the Nepalese version, add and redact information, and introduce changes to recipes and treatments. Examples from 1.16 have been provided to demonstrate the general observations which, it is hoped, a larger survey of the text will verify.

[...] suggesting that some of the readings accepted by Ḍ were ancient, if not original. (?)

Table 1 reveals the extent to which 1.16 of the Nepalese version was redacted to create the one known by Ḍalhaṇa. In this particular case, twenty-seven verses have been added, eight (11-14, 21-22ab, 23cd-24, 32) of which are well-integrated with the existing material in so far as they reiterate and elaborate on the content of passages in the Nepalese version. A block of nineteen verses (26.1-19) at the end of this chapter in Ācārya's edition of the *Nibandhasaṅgraha* (Su 1938: 80) was known by Ḍalhaṇa. These verses cover additional diseases of the ear lobes, as well as their treatment and complications. Although Ḍalhaṇa concedes that some read them in this chapter, he concludes that they were not composed by sages and, therefore, should not be read. Ācārya probably included these verses because they were in his manuscripts,⁴⁹ and Ḍalhaṇa's comments prompted him to place them in parentheses. Be this as it may, this large block of verses is absent in the Nepalese version.

In Table 1, one can also see that verses 17 and 18 of the Nepalese version were transposed in the redaction of Ḍalhaṇa's version, in which they

49 Ācārya (Su 1938: 80) does not state that these verses were absent in some or all of his manuscripts, which he usually does in a footnote if this is the case. A broader survey of manuscripts would be helpful for establishing whether these verses were part of the transmission of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* in India. For example, they are in MS Hyderabad Osmania 137-3(b).

Nepalese version	Dalhaṇa's version
1	1
–	2
2–9	3–10
–	11–14
10–15	15–20
–	21–22ab
16	22cd–23ab
–	23cd–24
–	25
17	26
–	26.1–19
18	–
19–23	27–31
–	32

Table 1: A Comparison of Verses in 1.16 of the Nepalese and Dalhaṇa's Versions

are 26 and 25 respectively. Although this only occurs once in 1.16, such transposing of verses and even their hemistiches is more prevalent in the redaction of other chapters of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

Apart from the addition of verses, the redacting of the version known to Ḍalhaṇa involved many small, yet sometimes significant, changes that are summarised below.

Changing Spelling, Sandhi and Syntax

In the majority of cases, efforts were made by redactors to standardise, simplify or improve the language of the Nepalese version. Such changes include the standardising of spelling,⁵⁰ sandhi,⁵¹ and verbal forms,⁵² as well as interventions to simplify and clarify syntax,⁵³ which often involved splitting compounds.⁵⁴ In some instances, these changes improved the grammar,⁵⁵ or altered the meaning.⁵⁶ However, some prefixes of verbal forms,⁵⁷ case endings,⁵⁸ and indeclinables were changed for less apparent reasons.⁵⁹ There is also a tendency to replace uncommon words with generic ones,⁶⁰

50 For example, *pattāṅga* (SS.1.16.21) → *paṭaṅga* (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81). For more information on this, see the relevant footnote to the translation.

51 For example, *°hastena ṛju* (SS.1.16.2) → *°hastena rju* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

52 For example, *unnāmayitvā* (SS.1.16.21) → *prānnamya* (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81); *avacūrṇayīta* (SS.1.16.21) → *upaharet* (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81).

53 For example, *śoṇitabahutvanivedanāyām cānyadeśaviddham iti jānīyāt | nirupadravatā taddeśaviddhalingam |* (SS.1.16.3) → *śoṇitabahutvena vedanayā cānyadeśaviddham iti jānīyāt | nirupadravatayā taddeśaviddham iti |* (1.16.4, Su 1938: 76); *āmatailapariṣekenopacaret* (SS.1.16.6) → *āmatailena pariṣecayet* (1.16.7, Su 1938: 77); *suparigrhītaṃ* (SS.1.16.10) → *suparigrhītaṃ ca kṛtvā* (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78); *anena* (SS.1.16.15) → *snehenaitena* (1.16.20, Su 1938: 79).

54 For example, *yadṛcchāviddhāyām sirāyām* (SS.1.16.4) → *yadṛcchayā viddhāsu sirāsu* (1.16.5, Su 1938: 76); *dhānyāmlakapālacūrṇam* (SS.1.16.10) → *dhānyāmlaṃ kapālacūrṇam* (1.16.20, Su 1938: 78).

55 For example, *surāmaṇḍakṣīram* (SS.1.16.10) → *surāmaṇḍaṃ kṣīram* (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78).

56 For example, *kṣīṇālpamāṃsaḥ* (SS.1.16.12) → *kṣīṇo 'lpamāṃsaḥ* (1.16.17, Su 1938: 79).

57 For example, *samvarddhitaḥ* (SS.1.16.8) → *vivarddhitaḥ* (1.16.9, Su 1938: 77); *niveśya* (SS.1.16.10) → *sanniveśya* (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78); *avabadhya* (SS.1.16.10) → *ca baddhvā* (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78).

58 For example, *māse* (SS.1.16.2) → *māsi* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

59 For example, *api* (SS.1.16.13) → *vā* (1.16.18, Su 1938: 79); *ca* (SS.1.16.16) → *tu* (1.16.23, Su 1938: 79); *tu* (SS.1.16.18) → *ca* (1.16.25, Su 1938: 80).

60 For example, *mrakṣayet* (SS.1.16.15) → *yojayet* (1.16.20, Su 1938: 79); *nahyet* (SS.1.16.21) → *baddhvā* (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81).

add indeclinables,⁶¹ omit the verb to be at the end of sentences,⁶² and introduce verses after a prose passage with the phrase *bhavati cātra*.⁶³

Changing Technical Terms

There is evidence of standardising and altering technical terminology in subsequent versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. Two examples of this in SS.1.16 are the terms for joins (*bandha*) and a slice of flesh (*vadhra*). The Nepalese version uses three terms for joining (*bandha*, *sandhāna*, *sandhi*) splits in the ear flaps and the flesh of nose. Redactors of subsequent versions appear to have tried to standardise this terminology by replacing *sandhāna* and *sandhi* with *bandha* in prose passages.⁶⁴ However, the use of the term *sandhāna* was retained in verses, perhaps because of the metrical challenges of making such a change. Also, the names of joins which incorporate *sandhāna* and *sandhi* remained the same.⁶⁵

The Nepalese version (SS.1.16.20,23) contains the rather obscure term *vadhra* for the slice of flesh that a surgeon cuts from the cheek in order to construct a new nose. Modern dictionaries define *vadhra* as a leathern strap (Apte: 1385, MW: 917) or a slice of bacon (MW: 917), the latter of which is more indicative of its meaning in the Nepalese version. This word was written out of subsequent versions,⁶⁶ and it was not mentioned as an alternative reading by either Cakrapāṇidatta or Ḍalhaṇa, which suggests that its use and meaning may not have been known to them. However, *vadhra* was used by the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā* (Utt.18.62 (Ah 1939: 841)) in the context of rhinoplasty, so it likely to be the correct reading in the Nepalese version.

61 For example, [absent] (SS.1.16.6) → *ca* (1.16.7, Su 1938: 77); [absent] (SS.1.16.10) → *tatra* (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78); [absent] (SS.1.16.12) → *api* (1.16.17, Su 1938: 79).

62 The words *bhavati* or *bhavanti* are omitted four times in Ḍalhaṇa's version (1.16.10 (twice), 1.16.17 and 1.16.18, Su 1938: 77, 79).

63 For example, [absent] (SS.1.16.11) → *bhavati cātra* (1.16.16, Su 1938: 79).

64 For example, *pañcadaśasandhānākṛtayaḥ* (SS.1.16.9) → *pañcadaśabandhākṛtayaḥ* (SS.1.16.10, Su 1938: 77); *daśakarṇasandhivikalpāḥ* (SS.1.16.9) → *karṇabandhavikalpāḥ* (SS.1.16.10, Su 1938: 77).

65 These names are *nemīsandhānaka*, *kapāṭasandhika*, and *ardhakapāṭasandhika* in SS.1.16.9.

66 *vadhram* (SS.1.16.20) → *baddham* (SS.1.16.28, Su 1938: 81) and *tadvadhraśeṣaṃ* (SS.1.16.23) → *tad ardhaśeṣaṃ* (SS.1.16.31, Su 1938: 81).

Augmenting the Text

Apart from adding whole passages and verses (as seen in Table 1), redactors of subsequent versions augmented the text by expanding existing compounds and inserting new compounds and words. Within the microcosm of 1.16, adjectives and adverbs were inserted to clarify statements,⁶⁷ and phrases added to elaborate on diseases and treatments.⁶⁸ In particular, the characteristics and number of symptoms of a disease, as well as their reasons for arising, tend to increase in subsequent versions. For example, the Nepalese version (SS.1.16.5) says that the wick in a newly pierced ear should be removed because of aggravated humours or a culpable piercing whereas the version known to Ḍalhaṇa (1.16.6, Su 1938: 77) includes two further reasons, namely, because of piercing with a painful, crooked and unrecommended needle or because of a wick that is too thick. Some of the split ear flaps in Ḍalhaṇa's version have additional characteristics,⁶⁹ and a list of four symptoms associated with incurable joins in the Nepalese version (SS.1.16.19) was increased to six in Ḍalhaṇa's version (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77). Also, models of classifying symptoms were introduced in subsequent versions. For example, the Nepalese version (SS.1.16.4) lists the symptoms of mistakenly piercing a duct in the ear whereas the version known to Ḍalhaṇa (1.16.5, Su 1938: 76–77) classifies these symptoms according to three ducts called *kālikā*, *marmarikā* and *lohitikā*, which results in some repetition of the symptoms mentioned.⁷⁰

67 For example, *chidre* (SS.1.16.2) → *chidra ādityakarāvabhāsita* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76); [absent] (SS.1.16.2) → *śanaiḥ śanaiḥ* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76); [absent] (SS.1.16.3) → *āśu* (1.16.5, Su 1938: 77).

68 For example, *dhātryaṇike* (SS.1.16.2) → *dhātryaṇike kumāradharāṇike vā* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76); [absent] (SS.1.16.2) → *bālakrīḍanakaiḥ pralobhya* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76); [absent] (SS.1.16.3) → *picuvartim praveśayet* (1.16.5, Su 1938: 77).

69 For example, *pīṭhopamapālir nirvedhimaḥ* (SS.1.16.9) → *pīṭhopamapālir ubhayataḥ kṣīṇaputrikāśrito nirvedhimaḥ* (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77); *itarālpapālīḥ saṃkṣiptaḥ* (SS.1.16.9) → *utsannapālir itarālpapālīḥ saṃkṣiptaḥ* (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77); *tanuviṣamālpapālīḥ* (SS.1.16.9) → *tanuviṣamālpapālīḥ* (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77).

70 In Ḍalhaṇa's version (1.16.5, Su 1938: 76–77), the symptoms of fever (*jvara*) and pain (*vedanā*) are repeated. This repetition does not occur in the Nepalese version. It is possible that this classification was not in the version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* known to Cakrapāṇidatta (1.16.4, Su 1939: 126) because he mentions that some read classifications of ducts at this point in the text and he cites verses from Bhoja on *kālikā*, *marmarikā* and *lohitikā*, but he does not gloss or comment on the passage known to Ḍalhaṇa.

Transposing Words, Verses and Passages

A close comparison of the Nepalese version with subsequent ones reveals changes in the order of words, sentences and verses. Examples of such transpositions occur in SS.1.16. In most cases, the changes in word order are insignificant and may be result of different preferences in syntax or even scribal eye-brain-hand miscommunication.⁷¹ However, the transposition of verses and passages is usually the result of efforts at redacting the text to add new material. A good example of this is the transposition of SS.1.16.17 and SS.1.16.18 in the Nepalese version to 1.16.26 and 1.16.25, respectively, in Ḍalhaṇa's. It seems that this transposition may have resulted from the insertion of new verses 1.16.23cd–24 and 1.16.26.1–19 in the latter.

Redacting Recipes and Elaborating on Treatments

Some of the additional text in subsequent versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā* introduces new ingredients in recipes and different procedures in treatments. In many instances, the new material merely clarifies or elaborates on the original but sometimes it changes the recipe or treatment significantly. An example of a suppletion that clarifies the text of the Nepalese version can be seen in 1.16.3 of Ḍalhaṇa's version (Su 1938: 76), which contains a statement that the physician should insert a wick of cotton after the ear has been pierced.⁷² This statement anticipates the instructions in the the Nepalese version (SS.1.16.5–6) on removing the wick because of aggravated humours and replacing the wick with a thicker one every three days. In this case, the additional statement of Ḍalhaṇa's version elucidates the role of the wick in the procedure of piercing the ear.

A similar clarification occurs in 1.16.18 of Ḍalhaṇa's version (Su 1938: 79), which reiterates the cure for an ear tainted by a humour that was described in 1.16.7 (= SS.1.16.6). The reiteration is quite apt because it follows a passage (1.16.17, Su 1938: 79 = SS.1.16.12) that outlines the various symptoms of ear disease arising from each of the

71 For example, *aṇusthūla*° (SS.1.16.9) → *sthūlāṇu*° (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77); *tatraite daśakarṇa*° (SS.1.16.9) → *tatra daśaite karṇa*° (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77); *nātigāḍhan nātiśithilaṃ sūtreṇāvabadhya* (SS.1.16.9) → *sūtreṇānavagāḍhaman atiśithilaṃ ca baddhvā* (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77); *pūrvan dakṣiṇaṃ kumārasya vāmaṃ kanyāyāḥ | pratanuṃ sūcyā bahalam ārayā* (SS.1.16.2) → *pratanukaṃ sūcyā bahalam ārayā | pūrvan dakṣiṇaṃ kumārasya vāmaṃ kanyāyāḥ* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

72 For example, [absent] (SS.1.16.2) → *picuvartiṃ praveśayet* (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

three humours. The author of the Nepalese version probably assumed that, after reading SS.1.16.12, the reader would refer back to SS.1.16.6 for the cure of an ear affected by a humour. However, in Ḍalhaṇa's version, the treatment is reiterated at 1.16.18.

In Ḍalhaṇa's version of 1.16, there are two instances in which ingredients were added to recipes of medicines in the Nepalese version. The first is the recipe of an anointment that should be applied to a pierced ear that has not healed. In Ḍalhaṇa's version (1.16.7, [Su 1938: 77](#)) the recipe was rewritten to include sesame seeds.⁷³ A more significant change occurs in another recipe for an admixture of an oil that is supposed to be rubbed into a healthy ear to enlarge it. Ḍalhaṇa's version (1.16.7, [Su 1938: 77](#)) of the admixture has five additional ingredients, namely, prickly chaff-flower (*apāmārga*), Withania (*aśvagandhā*), giant potato (*kṣīraśuklā*), the 'sweet' savour (*madhuravarga*)⁷⁴ and 'milk flower' (*payasyā* → *vidāri*)⁷⁵. It also has beggarweed (*vidārigandhā*) instead of milk flower (*vidāri*).⁷⁶ This method of redacting a recipe of Nepalese version appears to be somewhat typical in so far as most of the ingredients of the original were retained and new ones simply added.

Perhaps, Dr Madhu could add a comment on whether these additional ingredients would change the effects of the treatment in any significant way?

73 *yavamadhukamañjiṣṭhāgandharvahastamūlair madhughṛtapragāḍhair ālepayet* (SS.1.16.5) → *madhukairañḍamūlamañjiṣṭhāyavatilakair madhughṛtapragāḍhair ālepayet* (1.16.7, [Su 1938: 77](#)).

74 The items which exemplify the 'sweet' savour (*madhuravarga*) are enumerated at SS.1.42.11.

75 *Pueraria tuberosa* (Willd.) DC. (ADPS 510, IMP 1.792f., AVS 4.391; not Dymock 1.424f. See GJM supplement 444, 451, IMP 1.187, but IMP 3.1719 = *Ipomoea mauritiana*, Jacq.).

76 *arkālarkabalātibalānantāvidārīmadhukajalaśūkaprativāpan tailam pācayitvā* (SS.1.16.14) → *arkālarkabalātibalānantāpāmārgāśvagandhāvidārigandhākṣīraśuklājalaśūkamadhuravargapayasyāprativāpan tailam vā pācayitvā* (1.16.19, [Su 1938: 79](#)).

The Printed Editions

The careful survey of printed editions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* by Meulenbeld lists no fewer than 44 entries.⁷⁷ These range from the first edition by Madhusūdana Gupta (1835) to editions in the 1970s. The number of reprints and editions since that time might almost double that number. Translations begin with Hessler's Latin translation in 1844 and continue up to the present in scores of publications in many languages.⁷⁸

The Vulgate

The great ayurvedic scholar Yādavaśarman Trivikrama Ācārya produced three successive editions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* with the commentary of Ḍaḷhaṇa, in 1915, 1931 and 1938. These editions, especially the last, are generally considered the most scholarly and reliable editions of the work, and have been constantly reprinted up to the present day.⁷⁹ We refer to the last of these editions as "the vulgate."

The 1915 edition was based on three manuscripts. The 1931 edition used another seven manuscripts plus two printed editions. For his final 1938 edition, Ācārya used a further three manuscripts.⁸⁰ These sources are described as follow, with an overview in Table 2.

The sources of the 1915 edition

- 1 Calcutta, Royal Asiatic Society. Covers the *sūtra*, *nidāna*, *śārīra* and *kalpa sthānas*.
- 2 Jaipur, Pandit Gaṅgādharaḥṭṭaśarman, lecturer at the Royal Sanskrit University. Covers the *cikitsāsthāna* and the *uttaratantra*.
- 3 Bundi, my great friend the royal physician Paṃ. Śrīprasādaśarman. Covers the *uttaratantra*.

⁷⁷ [HIML](#): IIB, 311–314.

⁷⁸ Zysk 1984: E.g., [HIML](#): IIB, 314–315.

⁷⁹ See also the study of these editions by Klebanov ([2021a](#): §1.2) and Wujastyk ([2013](#): 143–144).

⁸⁰ The following account of the sources is paraphrased from Y. T. Ācārya and N. R. Ācārya's own account of his sources ([Su 1938](#): 22).

The sources of the 1931 edition

- 1 Vārāṇasī, professor of literature, the great Gaurīnāthapāṭhaka. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *nidānasthāna* and *uttaratantra*.
- 2 Ahmedabad. My friend Sva. Vā. Vaidya Raṇachoḍalāla Motīlālaśarman. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.
- 3 From the personal library of my great friend Sva. Vā. Vaidya Murārajīśarman. Extremely old. No commentary. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.
- 4 Puṇe, BORI library. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.⁸¹
- 5 Puṇe, BORI library. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Complete. With some damaged folia.
- 6 Bombay, Asiatic Society. Incomplete.⁸²
- 7 Varanasi, the private library of Vaidya Tryambakaśāstrī. Covers the *cikitsāsthāna*. The variant readings of this MS were compiled by Prof.
- 8 A printed edition together with the commentary *Suśrutasandīpana-bhāṣya* by Professor Hārāṇacandra Cakravārtti. Complete work. This is the 1910 Calcutta edition numbered “t” by Meulenbeld ([HIML](#): IB, 312).⁸³
- 9 A printed edition of the first 43 chapters of the *sūtrasthāna*, printed in Bengali script, with the commentaries *Bhānumatī*, *Nibandhasaṅgraha*, edited by Vijayaratnasena and Nīśikāntasena. This is the 1886 Calcutta edition numbered “g” by Meulenbeld ([HIML](#): IB, 311).⁸⁴

The sources of the 1938 edition

- 1 Gwalior, from the library of my great friend Paṃ. Rāmeśvaraśāstrin Śukla. Covers the *sūtra*, *nidāna*, *śārīra*, *cikitsā* and *kalpasthānas*.

81 Not one of the three MSS of the *śārīrasthāna* described in H. D. Sharma 1939.

82 Possibly MS Mumbai AS B.I.3 or MS Mumbai AS B.D.109 (Velankar 1925–30: v. 1, # 212 and 213). But both these have the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. The first covers only the *śārīrasthāna*; the second may be complete, but Velankar calls it only “disorderly.”

83 Bhaṭṭācārya 1910–7.

84 Sena et al. 1886–93.

85 Covers chapters 1–43 only.

86 Covers chapters 1–9 only.

Table 2: The sources of Yādavaśarman T. Ācārya's three editions: manuscript coverage (●) and print coverage (○).

edition source	1915			1931									1938		
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3
<i>sthāna</i>															
<i>sū.</i>	●							●	?		○	○ ⁸⁵	●		●
<i>nī.</i>	●			●				●	?		○		●	●	●
<i>śā.</i>	●				●	●	●	●	?		○		●		●
<i>cī.</i>		●						●	?	●	○		●		● ⁸⁶
<i>ka.</i>	●							●	?		○		●		
<i>utt.</i>		●	●	●				●	?		○				

- 2 Bikaner, from the library of the Royal Palace, supplied by Paṃ. Candrasekharaśāstrin. Contains the commentary *Nyāyacandrikāpañjikā-vyākhyā* by Gayadāsa. Covers the *nidānasthāna*.

This is almost certainly MS Bikaner Anup 4390.⁸⁷

- 3 Kathmandu, located in the private library of the Royal Guru Hemarāja Śarman. An extremely old palm-leaf manuscript. Readings from this MS were compiled by Paṃ Nityānandaśarman Jośi and sent to Ācārya. Covers from the beginning of the work to the end of the ninth chapter of the *cikitsāsthāna*. The siglum for this manuscript in footnotes was ता for तालपत्रपुस्तके.

Evaluation

Estimates show that there are approximately 230 extant manuscript witnesses for the *Suśrutasamhitā*.⁸⁸ Many of these manuscripts cover only one or more of its chapters. Nevertheless, this is an order of magnitude more evidence than was considered by Ācārya for his vulgate editions.

While the descriptions provided by Ācārya of his source materials

⁸⁷ See Dominik Wujastyk, "MS Bikaner AnupLib 4390." *Pandit*. <<http://panditproject.org/entity/108068/manuscript>>.

⁸⁸ This figure is arrived at by summing the MSS mentioned in NCC and in the NGMCP. The real figure could be many scores higher.

seems at first to be moderately comprehensive, Table 2 reveals the underlying paucity of textual sources for these editions. At first, it appears that fifteen manuscripts were consulted. However, we quickly see that two of the sources were other people's printed editions, and one of those covered less than a quarter of the work (no. 9 of 1931). That reduces the manuscript base to 13 manuscripts. Ācārya does not appear to have seen two of the manuscripts at all, having been sent collations prepared for him by others (7 of 1931 and 3 of 1938). Thus, Ācārya's final edition was based on the personal consultation of eleven partial manuscripts. One of them remains unidentified (6 of 1931). Only a single manuscript covers the whole of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, no. 5 of the 1931 edition. Manuscript 1 of 1938 is the next most complete, but it omits the *uttaratantra*, which comprises a third of the work. Manuscript 1 of the 1915 edition is third in size, but it still omits both of the longest chapters, and thus offers less than half the work. For the rest, the evidence is spotty, with each part of the work being supported by only between four and eight manuscripts, excluding the printed editions.

Two sources stand out for their historical importance. The first is no. 3 of 1931, which Ācārya calls "extremely old." It covered the *śārīrasthāna* only, and unfortunately we know nothing of the later history of this manuscript. The second is no. 3 of 1938, which is one of the important Nepalese manuscripts being considered in the present project. Ācārya's remarks and references to Hemarājaśarman's introduction to the *Kāśyapasaṃhitā* allow us to identify this manuscript as MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333.⁸⁹ But that manuscript covers the whole work, not just up to the ninth chapter of the *cikitsāsthāna* as Y. T. Ācārya and N. R. Ācārya stated.⁹⁰ Perhaps the editors only received collations for this portion of the manuscript and did not know that it was a witness for the whole work.

The 1939 edition

In 1939, Yādavaśarman Trivikrama Ācārya and Nandakiśora Śarman co-edited an edition of the *sūtrasthāna* of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that was published by the Swami Laxmi Ram ayurvedic centre in Jaipur, and printed at the

89 [Su 1938](#): 22; Hemarāja Śarman [1938](#): 56–57. Discussed by Klebanov ([2021a](#): §1.1, 2.3). See also [HIML](#): IIB, 25–41; Wujastyk [2003](#): 161–169.

90 [Su 1938](#): 22.

famous Nirṇayasāgara Press in Mumbai (see Fig. 1).⁹¹ The text was edited on the basis of the following sources.

For the *Bhānumatī*

1. A printed edition. Covered the *Bhānumatī* up to chapter Su.sū.40. The siglum was मु for *mudrita*.⁹²
2. A manuscript in the India Office Library library provided through the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune.⁹³ This manuscript covered the *Bhānumatī* b up to the end of the *sūtrasthāna*. The siglum was ह for हस्तलिखित.⁹⁴

For the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*

1. A palm leaf manuscript from Hemarājaśarman's personal library.⁹⁵ The siglum was ता for ताडपत्र.
2. His own published edition. The siglum was ड for डल्हणसंमतः पाठः.⁹⁶
3. Hārāṇacandra Cakravartī's published edition with his own commentary.⁹⁷ The siglum was हा.

Evaluation

The main innovation of this publication was to present the only surviving part of the commentary on the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* by the great eleventh-

91 Su 1939. The description of the sources below is based on Yādavaśarman T. Ācārya's remarks in his introduction (pp. 3–4). See also the remarks on this edition by Klebanov (2021b: 7). On the Swami Laxmi Ram centre, see Hofer 2007.

92 Sena et al. 1886–93. The manuscript on which this edition was based is probably in the library of the Calcutta Sanskrit College, and described in H. Sastri and Gui 1895–1917: v. X.1, which is not available to me. See also HIML: IB, 495, n. 57 for mention of this manuscript. The reference at Rama Rao et al. 2005: 217 to CACL accession number 97 in Bengali script may be this manuscript.

93 At this time, manuscripts from Britain were routinely lent to scholars in India and vice versa.

94 Wujastyk 2021; MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908 (PanditProject #109978, consulted on July 03, 2021).

95 I.e., MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333.

96 Su 1938. It is noteworthy that Ācārya refers to his 1938 edition as representing “the Ḍalhaṇa recension.”

97 Bhaṭṭācārya 1910–7.

चरके—“लभोपायो हि शस्तानां रसावीनां रसायनम्” (च. चि. अ. १ पा. १) । पारिशेष्याद्वाजीकरणतन्त्रम् । अवाजिनं वाजीकुर्वन्ति येन तद्वाजीकरणम् । ‘अन्येषामपि दृश्यते’ (पा. अ. ६।३।१३७) इति दीर्घत्वम् । येन वाऽत्यर्थं स्त्रीषु व्यज्यते तद्वाजीकरणम् । तदुक्तं चरके—“येन नारीषु सामर्थ्यं वाजिवल्लभते नरः । प्रजेन्नाप्यधिकं येन वाजीकरणमेव तत्” (च. चि. अ. २, पा. ४) इति ॥ ५ ॥

अथास्य प्रत्येकाङ्गलक्षणसमासः—तत्र, शल्यं नाम विविधतृणकाष्ठपाषाणपांशुलोदलोष्टास्थिवालनखपूयास्त्रावदुष्टव्रणान्तर्गर्भशल्योद्धरणार्थं षष्ठ्या विधानैः, यन्त्रशस्त्रक्षाराग्निप्रणिधानव्रणविनिश्चयार्थं च; शालाक्यं नामोर्ध्वजत्रुगतानां श्रवणनयनवदनघ्राणादिसंश्रितानां व्याधीनामुपशमनार्थं; कायचिकित्सा नाम सर्वाङ्गसंश्रितानां व्याधीनां ज्वररक्तपित्तशोफोन्मादापसारकुष्ठमेहातिसारादीनामुपशमनार्थं; भूतविद्या नाम देवांसुरगन्धर्वयक्षरक्षःपितृपिशाचनैलग्रहाष्टुपष्टचेतसां शान्तिकर्मबलिहरणादिग्रहोपशमनार्थं; कौमारभृत्यं नाम कुमारभरणधात्रीक्षीरदोषसंशोधनार्थं दुष्टस्तन्यग्रहसमुत्थिनां च व्याधीनामुपशमनार्थम्; अगदतन्त्रं नाम सर्पकीटलृतामूषकादिदृष्टविषव्यञ्जनार्थं विविधविषसंयोगोपशमनार्थं च; रसायनतन्त्रं नाम वयःस्थापनमायुर्मेधावलंकरणं रोगापहरणसमर्थं च; वाजीकरणतन्त्रं नामारूपदुष्टक्षीणशुष्करेतसामाप्यार्थेनप्रसादोपचयजनननिमित्तं प्रहर्षणजननार्थं च ॥ ६ ॥

शल्यग्रविशेषाश्च शालुं प्रतिलक्षणं संक्षेपेणाह—अथास्येत्यादि । एकमेकमङ्गं प्रति लक्षणानां समासः संक्षेपः प्रत्येकाङ्गलक्षणसमासः । तृणादीनां, तथा दुष्टव्रणस्य, तथाऽन्तर्गत(र्भशल्य)स्य उद्धरणार्थमिति प्रत्येकमुद्धरणशब्दः संबध्यते । दुष्टव्रणस्यान्तस्तृणाद्याहरणार्थमित्यन्ये । षष्ठ्या विधानैरिति द्विव्रणीयोचैरपतर्पणाद्यै रक्षाविधानान्तैः; इत्थंभूतलक्षणे तृतीया । जत्रु ग्रीवामूलं, जत्रुण ऊर्ध्वमूर्ध्वजत्रु । घ्राणादीत्यादिग्रहणाच्छिरःकपालादिग्रहणम् । उत्तरतन्त्रे प्रतिपादितक्रमप्राप्त्या ज्वरानन्तरमतीसारः पठितः, तस्यान्ते पाठोऽतिसारस्य सर्वाङ्गीणदोषारब्धत्वात्, अन्येषामपि तन्मध्यपाठेन सर्वाङ्गीणदोषारब्धत्वप्रतिपादनव्यतिक्रमं वदन्ति । शान्तिकर्म बलिहरणादिना ग्रहाणां देवादीनामुपशमो यस्तदर्थः; यदि वा ग्रहणं ग्रहो देवानामावेशस्तदुपशमार्थम् । दुष्टस्तन्यग्रहसमुत्थितानामिति दुष्टस्तन्येन

१ ‘सर्वशरीरावस्थितानां’ व्याधीनामुपशमकरणार्थं, ज्वरशोफयुग्मरक्तपित्तोन्मादापसारप्रमेहातीसारादीनां च’ इति ता. । २ ‘देवदानव’ इति ता. । ३ ‘विनायकनागग्रहोप-सृष्टचेतसां’ इति ता. । ४ ‘विषवेगोपशमनार्थं’ इति ता. । ५ ‘शुक्राप्यायन’ इति ता. । ६ ‘घ्राणादीनां शल्यान्तानां’ इति सु. । ७ ‘अन्ये तु तस्यान्ते पाठेन’ इति पा० । ८ ‘ग्रहणाद्’ इति सु. ।

Figure 1: A page of the 1939 *Bhānumatī* edition, showing the variant readings in the footnotes.

century medical scholar Cakrapāṇidatta, namely the *Bhānumatī*.⁹⁸ A secondary purpose was to present the text of the *sūtrasthāna* as read in MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333, that had recently been brought to the editors' attention. In their judgement, the Kathmandu manuscript presented a text that was closer to what Cakrapāṇidatta had before him than the text according to Ḍalhaṇa. This was the first *Suśrutasamhitā* edition in which Ācārya used sigla to identify the sources from which variant readings were reported, so while it has limitations, it for the first time enables us to get some idea of origins of the text (see Figure 1).

Ācārya noted in his introduction that the manuscripts containing the Ḍalhaṇa's commentary all came together with the root-text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*, and thus the main *Suśrutasamhitā* text reflected the readings chosen by Ḍalhaṇa. But the manuscripts of the *Bhānumatī* contained the commentary alone, without the root-text, and had many explanations based on different readings of the root-text than those of Ḍalhaṇa. In many of these cases it was hard to know what the text that Cakrapāṇidatta had before him. But Ācārya noted that Cakrapāṇidatta had a text before him that had much in common with the text of the Nepalese manuscript.⁹⁹

There is compelling evidence that Cakrapāṇidatta's *Bhānumatī* commentary once covered the whole text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.¹⁰⁰ The loss of the rest of the work ranks amongst the greatest disasters in Āyurvedic literature. Remarkably, the whole *Bhānumatī* may still have existed in the early twentieth century. In 1903, Palmyr Cordier reported being privately informed of a complete copy of the work in a personal manuscript collection in Benares.¹⁰¹

The Manuscripts

Our edition results from considering the textual evidence of three manuscripts, all of which were preserved and most likely produced in Nepal, in Kathmandu valley, to be more precise. Klebanov (2021a: §2.1) furnishes a comprehensive description of the individual manuscripts, quotes and

98 HIML: IA, 374–375 and IB, 495–496.

99 Su 1939: 3–4. See discussion by Klebanov (2021b: 7).

100 HIML: IA, 375.

101 Cordier 1903: 332.

translates their colophons and thoroughly examines various problems involved in their interpretation. That is why we will present only the key data essential for the study of our edition in the present paper. In referring to the manuscripts, we use the sigla K, N and H, which correspond to the initial letters in the names of the libraries and collection where the respective bundles were discovered.

Siglum K: The MS has been preserved at the Kaiser Shamsheer (KL) library in Kathmandu, accession number KL 699. It was microfilmed and catalogued by the NGMPP/ NGMCP as C 80-7.¹⁰² The MS comprises 152 palm-leaf folios that originally belonged to several different codicological units written by different scribes.¹⁰³ The folios are 53.5 × 4.4 cm in size and have two string holes. The text is written in the so-called transitional Gupta script, with six to eight lines per folio.¹⁰⁴ The MS is incomplete and contains a large part of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* as well as the *Sauśrutaniḥṣṭu*.¹⁰⁵ The date stated in the colophon at the end of the compendium is verified for Sunday, April 13, AD 878. However, some controversy is involved in interpreting the exact roles of two persons mentioned in the same concluding remarks, someone Śrī Harṣacandra and Vaidya Vasuvarman. Klebanov (2021a: 16) thinks that the former “either sponsored the copying enterprise or wrote the manuscript himself” and that he subsequently “donated it to Vaidya Vasuvarman on the condition that he (Vasuvarman) would study the text and explain it to others. The second condition was that the manuscript should remain in the family and not be given away either for sale or as a pawn. If the manuscript sat unused, it should be returned to Śrī Harṣacandra.”¹⁰⁶

Siglum N: This MS is kept at the National Archives Kathmandu (NAK), under accession number 1-1079 क. It was microfilmed twice by the

102 See http://catalogue-old.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/C_80-7_Suśrutasaṃhitā (accessed on October 22, 2021).

103 Bhattarai (2020: 46) and Klebanov (2021a: 11) agree that four to five scribes were involved in the manuscript’s production.

104 Codicological features of the manuscript, such as the layout, peculiarities of the script, various ornamental and text-dividing symbols and many more, were scrutinized in Bhattarai (2020).

105 See Klebanov (2021a: 11) for a detailed description of the content.

106 See Klebanov (2021a: 13–17) for a translation and a study of the colophon, as well as an exposition of different positions related to its interpretation.

NGMPP as A 45-5(1) and A 1267-11(2).¹⁰⁷ The MS comprises 65 palm-leaf folios, 56 × 5 cm in size, with two string holes each, and it is bundled together in a composite manuscript with at least one other medical work. The text is written in a variety of Newari script, with ca. seven lines per folio. Although the text contained in the MS does not cover the entire *Suśrutasamhitā* and breaks off abruptly in the second chapter of the *śārīrasthāna*, the actual MS, as a codicological unit, appears complete, that is, no leaf seems to be missing from the originally unitary artefact. Based on paleographic considerations, the MS can be dated tentatively to the 12th or 13th century.

Siglum H: The MS belongs to the historical collection of Hemarāja Śarman (fl. 1878-1953) and is currently kept at the NAK under accession number NAK 5-333. It is microfilmed twice by the NGMPP as B 29-19 and B 30-15, but the latter microfilm is incomplete.¹⁰⁸ The MS comprises 435 palm-leaf folios, 34 × 5 cm in size, with one string-hole in the middle. It is written in a type of Newari script that is more recent than the one used in N, with approximately six lines per folio. The MS is exceptionally well-preserved and complete, containing the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* as well as the *Sauśrutaniḥṣṭu*. The final colophon identifies the scribe of the MS as Vaidya Amarasimhaka, son of Kamaladatta, and states the date on which he concluded the copying of the text. Both reading, that is, deciphering the actual characters, and interpretation of the concerned passage involve diverging opinions, all of which concur, however, in assigning the MS to the 16th century. Klebanov (2021a: 21–26) gives an analytical account of the views expressed in literature, considers further options and puts forward his understanding that the MS was completed on Sunday, July 29, AD 1543.

Palaeographical features

- śrita for śṛta.
- yātri for yāṭṛ (Su.ka.1.63)

¹⁰⁷ See http://ngmcp.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/A_45-5_Suśrutasamhitā (accessed on October 22, 2021)/

¹⁰⁸ See http://ngmcp.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/B_29-19_Suśrutasamhitā (accessed on October 22, 2022).

- punarṇavā (Su.ka.1.61)
- ś and s in KL 699.
- b and v in KL 699 and NAK 5-333.
- cha and ccha
- line-fillers
- ṇ for n (punarṇavā)
- vyājī-kṛ for vājī-kṛ

Editorial Principles

Method

The data for the critical edition comes from the witnesses of the Nepalese version, which are MS KL 699, NAK 5-333 and NAK 1-1079. Diplomatic transcriptions of SS.1.16 of these manuscripts have been created by researchers of the [Suśruta Project](#) according to a subset of TEI Guidelines that has been formulated by Charles Li.¹⁰⁹ MS NAK 5-333 was transcribed first because its script is easy to read, the scans are clear, and it is the most complete of the manuscript witnesses. Then, MS KL 699 and MS NAK 1-1079 were transcribed.

The diplomatic transcripts were uploaded to Charles Li's platform Saktumiva, which automatically collates them. An electronic text of the vulgate of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, which was transcribed without the commentaries by Tsutomu Yamashita and Yasutaka Muroya on the basis of Ācārya's 1931 and 1938 Bombay editions,¹¹⁰ has also been included in the collation.

Saktumiva's automatic collation function standardises punctuation and orthographic variants according to filters which can be turned off or on. These filters enable the editors to ignore *daṇḍas*, numbers and *puṣpikās* in the transcripts, as well as orthographic variants, such as *ba* and *va*, certain germinated consonants, and *visarga* variants. On the basis of the automatic collation, Jason Birch created a provisional edition of SS.1.16, which the project's researchers read together at weekly seminars. Manuscript images were routinely checked to verify the transcripts, particularly when a reading was uncertain; the commentaries of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa were

¹⁰⁹ These guidelines are at <https://saktumiva.org/wiki/tei>, accessed 20/10/2021.

¹¹⁰ This e-text is available on the SARIT website; <https://sarit.indology.info/susrutasaṃhitā.xml?view=div>, accessed 20/8/2021.

read, and variant readings reported by these commentators were included in notes to the edition. Also, various reference books were consulted, such as the Nadkarni (1954) and V. Joṣī and N. H. Joṣī (1968) and Meulenbeld (HIML), to elucidate the meaning of technical terms and identify relevant information in other medical works.

An initial draft of the translation and many annotations were written by Dominic Wujastyk during the seminars as the Project researchers discussed the text's meaning. The transcripts, provisional edition and translation were uploaded to the project's repository at Github on a weekly basis. Therefore, the project's work has been publicly available as it evolves. The following software tools have been selected by Wujastyk for the procedures described above:

1. [oXygen XML editor](#) (which has plugins for Github and TEI, and can validate the code).
2. [Saktumiva](#) (a platform for producing and publishing critical editions of Sanskrit texts).
3. [Quick Palaeographer](#) (a browser-based tool for reading MS images and developing a catalogue of character shapes).
4. [Filezilla](#) (document transfer to Saktumiva).
5. [Github](#) (document sharing, security and versioning).
6. [LaTeX](#) (document preparation).
7. [qdpmp](#) (project management).

Stemma

The data from transcripts collated by Saktumiva can be exported as a FASTA file and aligned according to characters, syllables or words by a program called Helayo. The resulting NEXUS file can be read by phylogenetics software to build a stemmatic tree.¹¹¹ This procedure was done with transcripts of several chapters of the Nepalese witnesses, and the results confirmed the editors' provisional stemmatic hypothesis that K and H are more closely related to one another than K and N.¹¹² Given the early date of K and the small number of other surviving witnesses of the Nepalese version, the relationship between the manuscripts at our

111 This process is discussed in greater detail by Charles Li at <https://chchch.github.io/sanskrit-alignment/docs/index.html#tree>, accessed 21/8/2021.

112 See section 'Features of the Manuscript Transmission' for further discussion of this.

disposal is reasonably clear and, in the case of SS.1.16, the manuscript data was largely confined to N and H owing to a missing folio of K. Rather than have to assess numerous variant readings from a large number of witnesses, the challenge of editing has been to repair the text where it has become corrupt in the few witnesses available to us.

The Edition and Apparatus

The critical edition of SS.1.16 in this article retains many of the peculiarities of MS KL 699 because the editors have endeavoured to present to the reader an archetype of the text that was transmitted by this ninth-century manuscript. Therefore, the Sanskrit has been standardised as minimally as possible and, although the text has been corrected and repaired wherever it was corrupt in the witnesses, it has not been normalized or conventionalized to the extent of many modern editions of Sanskrit works.

The editors have assumed that the authors of the Nepalese *Suśrutasaṃhitā* were familiar with Pāṇinian Sanskrit and, although there are some non-standard spellings and grammatical forms in the text, there are very few instances of hyper-Sanskritization, Buddhist-hybrid Sanskrit or Epic forms that would suggest that this assumption is unreasonable. Therefore, the editors of SS.1.16 have opted to retain some unusual features of the Sanskrit in MS KL 699 when they are grammatically correct. For example, in external *sandhi*, the class nasal is usually used at the end of a word instead of an *anusvāra* (e.g., 1.16.3, °*vācanan dhātry*°), although the *anusvāra* is sometimes used (1.16.15, *udakaṃ dhānyāmla*°). In most cases, the consonant following a *repha* is doubled, but this is not always the case.¹¹³ Since these inconsistencies seem inherent to the transmission of the text and may have even been authorial, the critical edition reflects them as they occur in K and, when the testimony of K is not available, the witness most similar to K, which is H.

The Nepalese manuscripts often have an *anusvāra* before a *daṇḍa* at the end of a sentence or verse. Whether these *anusvāras* should be changed to the consonant *m* is a moot question because there is no Pāṇinian concept of

¹¹³ Examples of the germination of consonants are *karṇṇa* (1.16.1 ff), *muhūrta* (1.16.2), *pūrva* (1.16.2), *gandharva* (1.16.5), °*mūlair mmadhu*° (1.16.5), *vartti* (1.16.6) and *punar vvidhyet* (1.16.6). Examples where it does not occur in 1.16 are °*ārtham* (1.16.8,19), *kuryāt* (1.16.16, 32), °*pālir vallūra*° (1.16.10); °*pālir vyāyojimaḥ* (1.16.10) and *dīrghaika*° (1.16.10).

‘end-of-sentence’ and his rules on *sandhi* are contingent on the close contact of sounds (*saṃhitā*). However, it is reasonable to assume that at the end of a verse, paragraph or sentence the speakers would have paused for breath or thought, so *sandhi* should be applied, in which case a final *anusvāra* or class nasal of the following consonant is changed to *m*. Nonetheless, this remains an assumption about how the text would be pronounced. Therefore, in a critical edition, inserting *daṇḍas* and changing *anusvāras* to *m* before them are subjective decisions by the editors. The scribal use of *daṇḍas* and *anusvāras* in the Nepalese manuscripts can be seen in the digital edition if one switches off the filters for ignoring *daṇḍas* and final *anusvāra* variants.

refs?

Unconventional spellings and grammatical forms have been retained and noted in the annotations to the translation. However, the editors have corrected scribal errors and repaired corruptions in the transmitted text with conjectures wherever possible. Therefore, although the edition retains many of the peculiarities of the Nepalese manuscripts, it is not a diplomatic transcript or a hybrid of diplomatic and critical editing because the features of the transmitted text have been retained or changed deliberately, and the reasons for doing so are given in either the introduction or, in more specific cases, the annotations to the translation.

Printed Edition

[To be written when the printed edition of SS.1.16 is finalised]

Digital Edition

Instructions for reading the digital edition have been provided by Charles Li on [Saktumiva](#). In brief, you can generate the apparatus by choosing a base text and one or more of the other witnesses. You can also choose to hide or ignore in varying degrees TEI tags, punctuation and orthographical variants in the transcripts of the witnesses. On the right side of the text, the digital edition displays an apparatus that is negative in so far as the lemma and its witnesses are not included. This apparatus truncates variants wherever possible.

For example, as seen in Figure 2, the apparatus for the highlighted words *bahutvanivedanāyāṃ* is on the right side between the purple square brackets. This entry means that the editors have chosen to read

[16.4] śoṇitabahutvanivedanāyāñ cānyadeśaviddham iti jā-
nīyāt | nirupadravatā taddeśaviddhaliṅgam ||3||*

Edit

{ A: °hutvena vedanayā
N: °hutveti vedanās
H: °nāyāc } A: °vatayā
A: °viddham A: [ADD] iti ||

notes ▼

Figure 2: The digital edition of SS.1.16.3

°bahutvanivedanāyāñ, which is the reading of K, whereas A has °bahutvena nivedanayā, N °bahutveti vedanās and H °bahutvanivedanāyāc. The final *c* in the reading of H is italicised because it has been marked by the transcriber as unclear.

A positive apparatus is available if you highlight with the cursor one or more words, and even entire passages or verses, and click on the collapsed menu icon. As seen in Figure 3, the positive apparatus of °bahutvanivedanāyāñ appears in a pop-up window in which the lemma and variants are aligned according to letters, and the variations are highlighted in yellow.




Figure 3: The witnesses to a selected passage of SS.1.16.3

In both the negative and positive apparatuses of the digital edition, you must infer conjectures and corrections by the editors. Testimonia and notes

are in the apparatus on the right side of the “provisional edition” text. They give an opportunity for the editors to provide scholarly commentary of various kinds, but the editors cannot write comments directly into the textual apparatus itself, since it is constructed live each time the text is displayed.

Critical Edition of Sūtrasthāna 16

The first layer of variants gives those of the Nepalese MSS (K, N and H) ; the second layer is those of the vulgate edition, Trivikramaja Ācārya 1938 (A). When we adopt a reading of A against the manuscripts, we note that in the first layer of variants. A wavy underline (*xyz*) marks an unclear reading.

athātaḥ karṇṇavyadhavidhim vyākhyāsyāmaḥ ||1||

rakṣābhūṣaṇanimittam bālasya karṇṇau vyadhayet | tau ṣaṣṭhe māse
saptame vā śuklapakṣe praśasteṣu tithikaraṇamuhūrttanakṣatreṣu
kṛtamaṅgalasvastivācanaṃ¹ dhātryaṅke kumāram
5 upaveśyābhisāntvayamāno² bhiṣag vāmahastenākṛṣya karṇṇan daivakṛte
chidre dakṣiṇahastena ṛju vidhyet | pūrvvan dakṣiṇaṃ kumārasya vāmaṇ
kanyāyāḥ | pratanuṃ sūcyā bahalam ārayā ||2||

śoṇitabahutvanivedanāyāñ cānyadeśaviddham iti jānīyāt | nirupadravatā
taddeśaviddhaliṅgam ||3||³

¹The compound *kṛtamaṅgalasvastivācanaṃ* is an emendation based on the similar text at Su.śā.3.2.25.

²The *ātmanepada* participle is a permitted form, although the vulgate has the *parasmaipada*. Ḍalhaṇa records the alternative reading *bhakṣyaviśeṣair vā* before *bālakṛīḍanakaiḥ pralobhya* in the vulgate.

³At this point, witness K is missing a folio, so the rest of this chapter is constructed on the basis of witnesses N and H.

1 vyākhyāsyāmaḥ] vyā K. **3** saptame] om. N. **4** °maṅgalasvastivācanaṃ] A ; °maṅgalaṃ svastivācanaṃ K, H, N. **4** dhātryaṅke] dhātryaṅko K. **4** kumāram] kumārakam N. **6** ṛju] rjum N H. **6** kumārasya] kumārarasya N. **7** pratanuṃ] pratanū N H. **8** °bahutvanivedanāyāñ] °bahutveti vedanāś N ; °bahutva nivedanāyāñ H.

1 karṇṇavyadhavidhim] karṇavyadhabandhavidhim adhyāyaṃ A. **1** vyākhyāsyāmaḥ] add. yathovāca bhagavān dhanavatariḥ || A. **2** vyadhayet] vidhyete A. **2** māse] māsi A. **4** dhātryaṅke] add. kumāradharāṅke vā A. **5** upaveśyābhisāntvayamāno] upaveśya bālakṛīḍanakaiḥ pralobhyābhisāntvayan A. **5** karṇṇan] karṇam A. **6** chidre] chidra A. **6** chidre] add. ādityakarāvabhāsite śanaiḥ śanair A. **6** ṛju] rju A. **6** vidhyet] add. pratanukaṃ sūcyā bahalam ārayā A. **6** pūrvvan] pūrvam A. **7** kanyāyāḥ] kumāryāḥ A. **7** ārayā] add. tataḥ praveśayet praveśayet || A. **8** °bahutvanivedanāyāñ] °bahutvena vedanayā A. **8** °dravatā] °dravatayā A. **9** °viddhaliṅgam] °vidddham iti A.

tatra yadṛcchāviddhāyām sirāyām ajñena jvaradāhaśvayathuvedanāgranthimanyāstambhāpatānakaśirograhakarṇṇaśūlāni bhavanti ||4||

doṣasamudayād apraśastavyadhād vā tatra varttim apahr̥tya
yavamadhukamañjiṣṭhāgandharvvahastamūlair
5 mmadhughṛtapragāḍhair ālepayet | surūḍhañ cainam punar vvidhyet
||5||⁴

samyagviddham āmatailapariṣeṇopacaret | tryahāt tryahād varttim
sthūlatarān kurvvīta pariṣekañ ca tam eva ||6||

atha vyapagatadoṣopadrave karṇṇe pravarddhanārthaṃ
10 laghupravarddhanakām āmuñcet ||7||

evaṃ samvarddhitāḥ karṇṇaś chidyate tu dvidhā nṛṇām |
doṣato vābhighātād vā sandhānān tasya me śṛṇu ||8||

tatra samāsenā pañcadaśasandhānākṛtayo bhavanti |⁵ tad yathā |
nemīsandhānakaḥ | utpalabhedyakaḥ | vallūrakaḥ | āsaṅgimaḥ |

⁴Dalhaṇa (1.16.6) stated that some do not read *surūḍhañ cainam punar vvidhyet*.

⁵Cakrapāṇi (1.16.9–13) and Dalhaṇa (1.16.10) pointed out that others read *pañcadaśakarṇṇakṛtayaḥ* (instead of *pañcadaśasandhānākṛtayaḥ*). Dalhaṇa (1.16.10) also mentioned that some read *samunnatasamobhayapālīḥ* (instead of *vṛttāyatasamobhayapālir*) and others do not read *saṃkṣiptādayaḥ pañcāsādhyaḥ*.

1 °śvayathu° *em.*] °śvayathur N; °śvayathur H. **4** °gandharvvahastamūlair] °gandharvahastamūlai N. **7** °pariṣeṇopa°] °pariṣekaṇopa° H. **8** °tarām] A; °tarīm N; °tarīñ H. **9** karṇṇe] *add.* lam N; *add.* lam H. **10** laghu°] la° N. **11** nṛṇām] nṛṇā N. **12**] A; doṣato N H. **13** °sandhānā°] °sandhā° N.

1 tatra] tatrājñena A. **1** yadṛcchāviddhāyām] yadṛcchayā viddhāsu A. **1** sirāyām] sirāsu A. **1** sirāyām] *add.* kālikāmarmarikālohitikāsūpadravā bhavanti | tatra kālikāyām A. **1** jvara°] jvaro **1** °dāha°] dāhaḥ **1** °śvayathu° *em.*] śvayathur A. **1** °vedanā°] *add.* ca bhavati marmarikāyām vedanā jvaro A. **1–2** °granthi°] granthayaś A. **1–2** °granthi°] *add.* ca lohitikāyām A. **2** bhavanti] *add.* teṣu yathāsvaṃ pratikurvīt || kliṣṭajihmāpraśastasūcīvyadhād gāḍhataravartitvād A. **3** vā] *add.* yatra saṃrambho vedanā vā bhavati A. **3** apahr̥tya] upahr̥tyāsu A. **4** yavamadhuka°] madhukairanḍamūla° A. **4** °mañjiṣṭhāgandharvvahastamūlair] °mañjiṣṭhāyavatilakalkair A. **5** ālepayet] *add.* tāvad yāvat surūḍha iti || A. **5** vvidhyet] *add.* vidhānaṃ tu pūrvoktam eva || A. **7** samyag°] tatra samyag° A. **7** āmatailapariṣeṇopacaret] āmatailena pariṣecayet A **7** tryahād] *add.* ca A. **8** kurvvīta] dadyāt A. **10** °pravarddhanakām] °vardhanakām A. **10** āmuñcet] kuryāt A. **11** samvarddhitāḥ] vivardhitāḥ A. **12** sandhānān] sandhānaṃ A. **13** °daśasandhānākṛtayo] °daśakarṇabandhākṛtayaḥ A. **13** bhavanti] *om.* A. **14** nemi°] nemi° A.

- gaṇḍakarṇṇaḥ | āhāryaḥ | nirvvedhimaḥ | vyāyojimaḥ | kapāṭasandhikaḥ |
 arddhakapāṭasandhikaḥ | saṅkṣiptaḥ | hīnakarṇṇaḥ | vallīkarṇṇaḥ |
 yaṣṭīkarṇṇaḥ | kākauṣṭhaḥ | iti | teṣu tatra pṛthulāyatasamobhayapālir
 nemīsandhānakaḥ | vṛttāyatasamobhayapālir utpalabhedyakaḥ |
 5 hrasvavṛttasamobhayapālir vallūrakarṇṇakaḥ | abhyantaradīrghaikaḥ |
 āsaṅgimaḥ | bāhyadīrghaikaḥ | ggaṇḍakarṇṇakaḥ | apālir ubhayato'py
 āhāryaḥ | pīṭhopamapālir nirvvedhimaḥ | aṇusthūlasamaviṣamapālir
 vyāyojimaḥ | abhyantaradīrghaikaḥ | itarālpapālīḥ kapāṭasandhikaḥ |
 bāhyadīrghaikaḥ | itarālpapālīḥ cārddhakapāṭasandhikaḥ | tatraite
 10 daśakarṇṇasandhivikalpā bandhyā bhavanti | teṣān nāmabhir evākṛtayaḥ
 prāyeṇa vyākhyātāḥ | saṅkṣiptādayaḥ pañcāsādhyāḥ | tatra śuṣkaśaṅkulir
 itarālpapālīḥ saṅkṣiptaḥ | anadhiṣṭhānapālīḥ paryantayoś ca kṣīṇamāṃso
 hīnakarṇṇaḥ | tanuviṣamapālir vallīkarṇṇaḥ | granthitamāṃsaḥ
 stabdhasirātatasūkṣmapālir yaṣṭīkarṇṇaḥ |
 15 nirmmāṃsasamkṣiptāgrālpasāṇitapālīḥ kākauṣṭha iti | baddheṣv api
 dāhapākasrāvaśophayuktā na siddhim upayānti ||9||⁶

⁶The vulgate passage inserted between 9 and 10 (from *bhavanti cātra* to *śāstravit*) was probably also absent in the version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* commented on by Cakrapāṇi, who cited it in his commentary as being “read by some” in regard to the joins (*sandhāna*) that they describe.

2 arddhakapāṭasandhikaḥ] om. N. 3 kākauṣṭhaḥ] kākauṣṭhabhaḥ H. 3 iti] ti H. 3 °yatasamo°] A; °yasamo° H; °tasamo° N. 4 °bhedyakaḥ] °bhedyāḥ N; °bhedakaḥ H. 5 vallūra°] valūra° N. 6 bāhya] A; bāhyaika N H. 6 ubhayato'py] ubhayato py N. 7 aṇusthūla°] aṣusthūla° H 8 kapāṭa°] kavāṭa° H. 9 cārddhakapāṭa° em.] vārddhakavāṭa° H; cārddhakavāpa° N. 12 paryantayoś ca] om. N. 13 granthitamāṃsaḥ] °granthitamāṃsaḥ N H. 15 nirmāṃsa°] A; nimāsa° N; nirmmāṃsa° H. 16 °srāva°] °srāva° H. 16 °sopha°] °sopha° N.

2 °sandhikaḥ | arddha°] °sandhiko 'rddha° A 3 yaṣṭī°] yaṣṭi° A. 3 kākauṣṭhaḥ] kākauṣṭhaka A. 3 tatra] om. A. 4 nemi°] nemi° A. 5 vallūra°] vallūrakāḥ A. 7 pīṭhopamapālir] add. ubhayataḥ kṣīṇaputrikāśrito A. 7 aṇusthūla°] sthūlāṇu° A. 9 cārddha°] ardha° A. 9 tatraite] tatra A. 10 daśakarṇṇasandhivikalpā] daśaite karṇabandhavikalpāḥ A. 10 bandhyā bhavanti] sādhyāḥ A. 10 teṣān] teṣāṃ A. 10 nāmabhir] svanāmabhir A. 11 śuṣkaśaṅkulir] add. utsannapālir A. 12 ca] om. A. 13 °śamapālir] °śamālpapālir A. 13 granthitamāṃsaḥ] grathitamāṃsa° A. 14 °sirātatasūkṣma°] °sirāsaṃtatasūkṣma° A. 15 kākauṣṭha] kākauṣṭhaka A. 15 api] add. tu śopha A. 16 °dāha°] add. °rāga° A. 16 °pāka°] add. °piḍakā° A. 16 °sopha°] om. A.

ato 'nyatamasya bandhañ cikīrṣuḥ
 agropaharaṇīyoktopasambhṛtasambhāraḥ viśeṣataś cātropaharet⁷
 surāmaṇḍakṣīram udakaṃ dhānyāmlakapālacūrṇṇaṇ ceti | tato 'ṅganāṃ
 5 puruṣaṃ vā grathitakeśāntaṃ laghubhuktavantam āptaiḥ supariḡrhitam
 ca kṛtvā bandhān upadhārya chedyabhedyalekhyavyadhanair upapādyā
 karṇṇaṣoṇitam avekṣyaitad duṣṭam aduṣṭam veti tato vātaduṣṭe
 dhānyāmlodakābhyāṃ pittaduṣṭe śītodakapayobhyāṃ śleṣmaduṣṭe
 surāmaṇḍodakābhyāṃ prakṣālyā karṇṇam punar avalikhet | anunnatam
 10 ahīnam aviṣamañ ca karṇṇasandhin niveśya sthitaraktaṃ sandarśya
 madhughr̥tenābhyajya picuplotayor anyatareṇāvaguṇṭhya nātigāḍhan
 nātiśīthilaṃ sūtreṇāvabadhya kapālacūrṇṇenāvākīryācārikam upadiśet |
 divivraṇīyoktena cānnenopacaret ||10||

vighaṭṭanan divāsvapnaṃ vyāyāmam atibhojanam |

⁷viśeṣataś cāgropaharaṇīyāt of the MSS has been emended to viśeṣataś cātropaharet to make sense of the list of ingredients, which is in the accusative case. Also, the repetition of agropaharaṇīyāt in the Nepalese version suggests that its second occurrence, which does not make good sense here, is a dittographic error.

2 ato] tato N. 3 °paharaṇīyo°] °pasamharaṇīyo° N. 3 cātropaharet] A; cāgropaharaṇīyāt N H. 5 puruṣaṃ] puruṣaṇ N. 6 ca kṛtvā] A; om. N H. 6 upadhārya] upapādyā H. 7 °ṣoṇitam avekṣyaitad] °ṣoṇitata avekṣyetad N. 7 aduṣṭam] aduṣṭaś N. 7 veti] A; ceti N H. 8 dhānyāml°] dhānyāvlo° N 8 śītodaka°] śītodako° N. 9 avalikhet] avalikheta N. 10 °sandhin] °sandhiṃ N 11 °guṇṭhya] °guṇṭhyo H. 11 °gāḍhan] °gāḍhaṃ N. 12 °badhya] °baddha N. 13 cānnenopacaret] upapocaret N. 14 inserted passage] add. || bha || N. 14 vighaṭṭanan] vighaṭṭanaṃ N.

1 inserted passage] bhavanti cātra | yasya pālīdvayam api karṇasya na bhaved iha | karṇapīṭhaṃ same madhye tasya viddhvā vivardhayet || bāhyāyām iha dīrghāyām sandhir ābhyantaro bhavet | ābhyantarāyām dīrghāyām bāhyasandhir udāhṛtaḥ || ekaiva tu bhavet pālīḥ sthūlā prthivī sthīrā ca yā | tāṃ dvidhā pātayitvā tu chittvā copari sandhayet || gaṇḍād utpāṭya māṃsena sānubandhena jīvātā | karṇapālīm āpāles tu kuryān nirlikhya śāstravit || A. 2 'nyatamasya] 'nyatamaṃ A. 3 °sambhāraḥ] °sambhāraṃ A. 4 surāmaṇḍakṣīram] surāmaṇḍaṃ kṣīram A. 4 dhānyāmlakapāla°] dhānyāmlaṃ kapāla° A. 6 bandhān] bandhaṃ A. 6 °vyadhanair] add. upapannair A. 7 avekṣyaitad] avekṣya A. 7 tato] tatra A. 8 dhānyāmlodakā°] dhānyāmlōṣṇodakā° A. 9 °maṇḍodakā°] °maṇḍoṣṇodakā° A. 9 karṇṇam] karṇau A. 9 avalikhet | anunnatam] avalikhyānunnatam A. 10 °sandhin] °sandhiṃ A 10 niveśya] sanniveśya A. 10 sandarśya] sandadhyāt A. 10 sandarśya] add. tato A. 11 nātigāḍhan] sūtreṇānavagāḍhaman A. 12 nāti°] ati° A. 12 sūtreṇāvabadhya] ca baddhvā A. 13 cānnenopacaret] ca vidhānenopacaret A. 14 inserted passage] bhavati cātra | A. 14 vighaṭṭanan] vighaṭṭanaṃ A.

vyavāyam agnisantāpam vākśramañ ca vivarjjayet ||11||

nātiśuddharaktam atipravṛttaraktam kṣīṇaraktam vā sandadhyāt | sa hi
vātaduṣṭe raktabaddho'rūḍho paripuṭānavān bhavati | pittaduṣṭe
gāḍhapākarāgavān | śleṣmaduṣṭe stabdhakarṇṇaḥ kaṇḍūmān
5 atipravṛttasrāvaḥ śophavān kṣīṇālpamāṃso na vṛddhim upaiti ||12||

sa yadā rūḍho nirupadravaḥ karṇṇo bhavati tadainam śanaiḥ śanair
abhivarddhayet | anyathā samrambhādāhapākavedanāvān bhavati | punar
api chidyeta ||13||

athāpraduṣṭasyābhivarddhanārtham abhyaṅgaḥ |
10 godhāpratudaviṣkirānūpaudakavasāmajjāpayastailam gaurasarṣapajañ ca
yathālābham
saṃbhrītyārkālarkabalātibalānantāvidārīmadhukajalaśūkaprativāpan
tailam pācayitvā svanuguptan nidadhyāt ||14||⁸

⁸Dalhaṇa (1.16.18) noted that some read *rājasarṣapajam* in the place of *gaurasarṣapajam*. This reading appears to have been accepted by Cakrapāṇi (1.16.18–20), who glosses *rājasarṣapaja* as *śvetasarṣapa*. Cakrapāṇi also said that some read *sarpis* in the place of *payas*. In the compound beginning with *arka*, Dalhaṇa noted that some read *arkapuṣṭi*.

1 agnisantāpam] āgnisantāpa N. **1** vivarjjayet] varjayet N. **2** °śuddha°] °suddha° N. **2** °vṛttaraktam] °vṛttam raktam N. **3** raktabaddho'rūḍho *em.*] raktavaddho rūḍho N; raktabaddho rūḍho H. **3** °puṭānavān] °puṭavām N; °puṭānavām H. **3** °duṣṭe] °duṣṭai N. **4** °śleṣma°] śleṣa° N. **4** °karṇṇaḥ] °varṇṇaḥ N. **5** °srāvaḥ] °śrāvaḥ H. **5** kṣīṇālpā°] kṣīṇo lpa° N. **6** rūḍho] rūḍho N. **7** °pākavedanāvān] °pākarāgavedanāvān N; °pākavedanāvām H. **9** athāpra°] athāsyāḥ pra° H. **9** °duṣṭasyābhivarddhanārtham] °duṣṭasyāvivardhanārtham N. **12** °ārkālarkabalāti°] °ārkālakavalāti° N. **12** °prativāpan] °prativāpaṃ N. **13** °guptan] °guptam N. **13** nidadhyāt] nidadyāt N.

2 nāti°] na cāśu° A. **3** raktabaddho'rūḍho *em.*] rakte rūḍho 'pi A. **3** bhavati] *om.* A. **4** gāḍhapākarāgavān] dāhapākarāgavedanāvān A. **4** stabdha°] stabdhaḥ A. **5** °vṛttasrāvaḥ śophavān] °vṛttarakte śyāvaśophavān A. **5** kṣīṇālpā°] kṣīṇo lpa° A. **6** *inserted passage*] āmatailena trirātram pariṣecayet trirātrāc ca picuṃ parivartayet | A. **6** rūḍho] surūḍho A. **6** karṇṇo] savarṇo A. **7** anyathā] ato 'nyathā A. **7** °pākavedanāvān] °pākarāgavedanāvān A. **7** bhavati] *om.* A. **8** api] *om.* A. **8** chidyeta] chidyate vā A. **9** athāpra°] athāsyāpra° A. **9** abhyaṅgaḥ] *add.* tad yathā A. **10** °majjāpayastailam] °majjānau payaḥ sarpis tailam A. **12** °balānantā°] °balānantāpā-mārgāśvagandhā A. **12** °vidārīmadhukajalaśūka°] °vidārīgandhākṣīraśūklājalaśūka-madhuravargapayasā° **12** °prativāpan] °prativāpaṃ A. **13** tailam] *add.* vā A. **13** °guptan] °guptam A.

svedito marditaṅ karṇṇam anena mrakṣayed budhaḥ |
tato'nupadravaḥ samyag balavāṃś ca vivarddhate ||15||⁹

ye tu karṇṇā na varddhante snehasvedopapāditāḥ |
teṣāṃ apāṅge tv abahiḥ kuryāt prachānam eva ca ||16||¹⁰

5

amitāḥ karṇṇabandhās tu vijñeyāḥ kuśalair iha |

⁹N has a *kākapāda* after *ane*, but the missing letter (one would expect 'na') has not been supplied in a margin or elsewhere.

¹⁰Ḍalhana (1.16.23) noted that some read *teṣāṃ apāṅgacchedyaṃ hi kāryam ābhyantaram bha-
vet*.

1 svedito] svadito N. **1 anena**] ane Ṛ N. **2 tato'nupadravaḥ**] tato nupadravaḥ H;
tato nupadravam N. **4 abahiḥ**] avarhi N. **4 kuryāt**] kuyāt N. **4 prachānam**] pra-
channam H. **4 teṣāṃ...||16||**] *om.* K. **5 °bandhās**] °bandho H. **5 tu**] stu H.

1 svedito marditaṅ] sveditonmarditaṃ A. **1 anena mrakṣayed budhaḥ**] snehenai-
tena yojayet A. **3 inserted passage**] yavāśvagandhāyaṣṭyāhvais tilaiś codvartanaṃ hi-
tam | śatāvaryaśvagandhābhyāṃ payasyair aṇḍajīvanaiḥ || tailaṃ vipakvaṃ sakṣīram a-
bhyāṅāt pālivardhanam | A. **3 snehasvedopa°**] svedasnehopa° A. **4 apāṅge tv aba-
hiḥ**] apāṅgadeśe tu A. **4 ca**] tu A. **5 inserted passage**] bāhyacchedaṃ na kurvīta
vyāpadaḥ syus tato dhruvāḥ || baddhamātraṃ tu yaḥ karṇaṃ sahasaivābhivardhayet | ā-
makośī samādhmātaḥ kṣipram eva vimucyate || A.

yo yathā suniviṣṭaḥ syāt tat tathā yojayed bhiṣak ||17||¹¹

jātaromā suvartmā ca śliṣṭasandhiḥ samah sthiraḥ |
surūḍho 'vedano yas tu taṃ karṇṇaṃ varddhayec chanaiḥ
||18||

5

viśleṣitāyām atha nāsikāyām
vakṣyāmi sandhānavidhiṃ yathāvat |
nāsāpramāṇaṃ pṛthivīruhāṇām

¹¹Dalhaṇa (1.16.26) stated that some read *suniviṣṭaḥ* (the reading of the Nepalese version) instead of *suviṣṭaḥ*.

1 yojayed] yojaye N. **2 suvartmā**] suparmā N ; suvarmmā H. **2 °sandhiḥ**] °sandhim N. **3 tu em.**] tat N H. **5 nāsikāyām**] nāsikāyā N. **7 °pramāṇaṃ**] °pramāṇa° N. **7 °vīruhāṇām**] °vīruhāṇam N.

1 suniviṣṭaḥ] suviṣṭaḥ A. **1 syāt**] taṃ A. **1 yojayed bhiṣak**] viniyojayet A. **1 inserted passage**] (karṇapālyāmayān nṛṇāṃ punar vakṣyāmi suśruta ! || karṇapālyāṃ prakupitā vātapittakaphās trayah || 1 || dvidhā vā'py atha saṃsṛṣṭāḥ kurvanti vividhā rujaḥ | visphoṭaḥ stabdhata śophaḥ pālyāṃ doṣe tu vātike dāhavisphoṭajananaṃ śophaḥ pākaś ca paittike | kaṇḍūḥ saśvayathuḥ stambho gurutvaṃ ca kaphātmake || 3 || yathādoṣaṃ ca saṃśodhya kuryāt teṣāṃ cikitsitam | svedābhyaṅgapariṣekaiḥ pralepāsrgvimokṣaṇaiḥ || 4 || mṛdvīm kriyāṃ bṛṃhaṇīyair yathāsvaṃ bhojanais tathā | ya evaṃ vetti doṣāṇāṃ cikitsāṃ kartum arhati || 5 || ata ūrdhvaṃ nāmalingair vakṣye pālyāṃ upadravān || atpātakaś cotpuṭakaḥ śyāvaḥ kaṇḍūyuto bhṛśam || 6 || avamanthaḥ sakaṇḍūko granthiko jambulas tathā || srāvī ca dāhavāṃś caiva śṛṇv eṣāṃ kramaśah kriyāṃ || 7 || apāmārgaḥ sarjarasaḥ pāṭalālakucatvacau || utpātake pralepaḥ syāt tailam ebhiś ca pācayet || 8 || śāmpākaśigru-pūṭikān godāmedo 'tha tadvasāṃ || vārāhaṃ gavyam aiṇeyam pittaṃ sarpiś ca saṃsṛjet || 9 || lepam utpuṭake dadyāt tailam ebhiś ca sādhitam || gaurīm sugandhām saśyāmām anantām taṇḍulīyakam 10 śyāve pralepanam dadyāt tailam ebhiś ca sādhitam || pāṭhām rasāñjanaṃ kṣaudraṃ tathā syād uṣṇakāñjikam 11 dadyāl lepam sakaṇḍūke tailam ebhiś ca sādhitam || vraṇībhūtasya deyaṃ syād idaṃ tailam vijānatā || 12 || madhukakṣīrakā-kolijīvakādyair vipācitam || godhāvarāhasarpāṇām vasāḥ syuḥ kṛtabṛṃhaṇe || 13 || pralepanam idaṃ dadyād avasicyāvamanthake || prapaunḍarikam madhukam samaṅgām dhavam eva ca || 14 || tailam ebhiś ca śāmpakvaṃ śṛṇu kaṇḍūmataḥ kriyāṃ || sahadavā viśvadevā ajākṣīraṃ sasaindhavam etair ālepanam dadyāt tailam ebhiś ca sādhitam || 15 || granthike guṭikāṃ pūrvam srāvayed avapāṭya tu || tataḥ saindhavacūrṇam tu ghrṣṭvā lepam pradāpayet || 16 || likhitvā tatsrutam ghrṣṭvā cūrṇair lodhrasya jambule || kṣīreṇa pratisāryainam śuddham saṃropayet tataḥ || 17 || madhuparṇī madhūkam ca ma madhukam madhunā saha || lepaḥ srāviṇi dātavyas tailam ebhiś ca sādhitam 18 pañcavalkaiḥ samadhukaiḥ piṣṭais taiś ca ghṛtānvitaiḥ || jīvakādyaiḥ sasarpīṣkair dahyamānam pralepayet || 19 ||) A. **3 yas**] ca A. **5 viśleṣitāyām**] viśleṣitāyās tv A. **5 nāsikāyām**] nāsikāyā A.

patraṃ grhītvā tv avalambi tasya ||19||¹²

tena pramāṇena hi gaṇḍapārśvād
utkr̥tya vadhraṃ tv atha nāsikāgram |
vilikhya cāśu pratisandadhīta
5 taṃ sādhubaddham bhiṣag apramattaḥ ||20||

susīvitam samyag ato yathāvan
nāḍīdvayenābhisamīkṣya nahyet |
unnāmayitvā tv avacūrṇayīta
pattāṅgayaṣṭimadhukāñjanaś ca ||21||

10 saṃchādya samyak picunā vraṇan tu
tailena siñced asakṛt tilānām |
ghṛtañ ca pāyyaḥ sa naraḥ sujīrṇe
snigdho virecyāḥ svayathopadeśam ||22||

15 rūḍhañ ca sandhānam upāgataṃ vai
tadvadhraśeṣam tu punar nikṛntet |
hīnam punar varddhayitum yateta
samañ ca kuryād ativṛddhamāṃsam
||23|| iti om ||

¹²Cakrapāṇidatta said that others read *nāsāsandhānavidhim* here. Ḍalhaṇa (1.16.27–31) stated that some read, *chinnām tu nāsikāṃ dṛṣṭvā vayaḥsthasya śarīriṇaḥ | nāsānūrūpaṃ saṃchchīdya patraṃ gaṇḍe niveśayet ||*

1 patraṃ] patra N. **3 vadhraṃ**] vandhra H. **5 °baddham**] °vaddha° N. **6 susīvitam em.**] susīvita N; suśīvitam H. **6--9 susīvitam...||21||**] *om.* K. **9 pattāṅga° em.**] pattrāṅga° H; pattaṅga° N. **10 vraṇan tu**] vraṇa tun N. **13 virecyāḥ**] A; virecyā N H. **13 °deśam**] °deśaḥ N. **14 sandhānam**] sandhām N. **14 upāgataṃ**] upāgataś H. **14 vai**] cai H. **15 °śeṣam**] °seṣan N. **16 yateta**] yatetaḥ N. **17 °māṃsam**] °mānsam N. **18 om**] *om.* N. **14--18 rūḍhañ...om**] *om.* K.

3 vadhraṃ] baddham A. **5 taṃ**] tat A. **5 °baddham**] °bandhair A. **6 susīvitam em.**] susaṃhitam A. **7 nahyet**] baddhvā A. **8 unnāmayitvā**] pronnāmya cainām A. **8 avacūrṇayīta**] avacūrṇayet tu **9 pattāṅga° em.**] pataṅga° A. **10 vraṇan tu**] sitena A. **13 svayatho°**] sa yatho° A. **14 vai**] syāt A. **15 tadvadhra°**] tad ardha° A. **16 hīnam**] hīnam A. **17 samañ**] samām A. **17 °māṃsam**] °māṃsām A. **18 om**] *om.* A. **19 inserted passage**] nāḍīyogaṃ vinauṣṭhasya nāsāsandhānavad vidhim | ya evam eva jānīyāt sa rājñāḥ kartum arhati || A.

Translation of Sūtrasthāna 16

- 1 Now we shall expound the method for piercing the ear.¹¹⁴
- 2 One may pierce a child's ears for the purpose of preserving and decorating. On renowned days, half days, hours and constellations the physician, with a calming presence, sits the boy, who has received a benediction and the recitation of a blessing,¹¹⁵ on the lap of a wet-nurse.¹¹⁶ Then, he should pull the ear with his left hand and pierce straight through with his right hand at a naturally-occurring cleft.¹¹⁷ For a boy, do the

¹¹⁴ The topic of piercing the ear (*karṇavyadha*) is not discussed in the *Carakasamhitā* (HIML: IB, 326, n. 175), but it is mentioned in some texts that followed the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, such as the *Kaśāpyasaṃhitā* (HIML: IIA, 30). Also, the instrument for piercing the ear is described in the *Aṣṭāṅgaśāstrīdayasaṃhitā* 1.26.26 (Ah 1939: 321). In the versions of the text known to Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) and Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 125), the heading of this chapter is “the method of piercing and joining the ear” (*karṇavyadhabandhavidhi*), instead of the Nepalese version’s “the method of piercing the ear” (*karṇavyadhavidhi*). The topic of joining the ear (*karṇabandha*) is discussed in passages 17–20 of the Nepalese version. However, it appears that only subsequent redactors reflected its importance by including it in chapter headings.

The Nepalese version also omits the opening remark on Dhanvantari that appears in subsequent versions of the text. For a discussion of the frame story in the Nepalese version, see Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Parameswaran, et al. 2021. Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) and Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 125) state that only the ears of healthy people should be pierced, and they quote the lost authority Bhoja to affirm this: “When piercing the ears of children who are free of disease at these times, their ear flaps and apertures, as well as limbs, increase” (for the Sanskrit, see Su 1938: 76).

¹¹⁵ The causative form *vyādhayet* is known in Classical Sanskrit (Whitney 1885: 166). The compound *kṛtamaṅgalasvastivācanaṃ* “who has received a benediction and the recitation of a blessing” is an emendation based on the similar text at 3.2.25 (Su 1938: 346). Cf. also 3.10.8, 24 (Su 1938: 388, 390) that have slightly different formulations.

¹¹⁶ The versions of 1.16.3 known to Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 126) and Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) have the additional compound *kumāradharāṇike* (“on the lap of one who holds the child”) after *dhātryaṇike*. The gender of *kumāradhara* is made clear by Ḍalhaṇa’s gloss “a man who holds the child.” Also, both versions add *bālakrīḍanakaiḥ pralobhya* (“having enticed with children’s toys”) to indicate that the child should be tempted with toys to stay on the assistant’s lap. According to Ḍalhaṇa on 1.16.3 (Su 1938: 76), the toys include replica elephants, horses, bulls and parrots. Ḍalhaṇa further mentions that others read *bhakṣyaviśeṣair vā* (“or by special treats”) before *bālakrīḍanakaiḥ*, but we see no trace of these small kindnesses in our witnesses.

¹¹⁷ The versions of 1.16.3 of Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 126) and Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) add that this naturally-occurring cleft is illuminated by a ray of sunshine (*ādityakarāvabhāsite*).

- right ear first; for a girl, do the left one. Use a needle on a thin ear; an awl (*ārā*) on a thick one.¹¹⁸
- 3 One may know that it was pierced in the wrong place if there is excess blood or pain. The absence of side-effects is a sign that it has been pierced in the right place.¹¹⁹
 - 4 In this context, if an ignorant person randomly pierces a duct (*sirā*) there will be fever, burning, swelling (*śvayathu*), pain, lumps (*granthi*), paralysis of the nape of the neck (*manyāstambhā*), convulsions (*apatānaka*), headache or sharp pain in the ear.¹²⁰
 - 5 Having removed the wick (*vartti*) at that place because of the accumulation of humours or an unsatisfactory piercing,¹²¹ he should smear it

The syntax of this slightly long sentence is unusual in beginning with the dual object *tau* “the two (ears)” at the start of the sentence, which is remote from the main verb. The other singular accusatives referring to the ear being pierced are governed by absolutes.

- 118 Ḍalhaṇa on 1.16.3 (Su 1938: 76) clarifies that the awl is a shoe-maker’s knife for piercing leather. He also cites the authority of “the notes of Lakṣmaṇa” (*Lakṣmaṇa-ṭippaṇaka*) on the issue of the thickness of the needle. *The Notes of Lakṣmaṇa* is not known from any earlier or contemporary sources and was presumably a collection of glosses on the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that was available to Ḍalhaṇa in twelfth-century Bengal. See Meulenbeld (HIML: IA, 386).
- 119 At this point, MS Kathmandu KL 699 is missing a folio, so the rest of this chapter is constructed on the basis of witnesses MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333 and MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1079.
- 120 This passage is significantly augmented in Cakrapāṇidatta’s and Ḍalhaṇa’s versions, to outline the specific problems caused by piercing three ducts called *kālikā*, *marmikā* and *lohitikā* (1.16.4 (Su 1939: 126) and 1.16.5 (Su 1938: 77) respectively). In fact, the order of the problems mentioned in the Nepalese version has been retained in the other versions and divided between each duct. Cakrapāṇidatta’s commentary on 1.16.4 (Su 1939: 126) cites several verses attributed to Bhoja on the problems caused by piercing these three ducts in the ear flap: ‘*Lohitikā*, *marmikā* and the black ones are the ducts situated in the earflaps. Listen in due order to the problems that arise when they are pierced. Paralysis of the nape of the neck and convulsions, or sharp pain arise from piercing *lohitikā*. Pain and lumps are thought to arise from piercing *marmikā*. Piercing *kālikā* gives rise to swelling, fever and burning.’
- 121 In addition to these reasons, 1.16.6 of Ḍalhaṇa at 1.16.6 (Su 1938: 77), added “because of piercing with a painful, crooked and unsatisfactory needle” (*kliṣṭajihmā-praśastasūcīvyadhāt*) and “because of a wick that is too thick” (*gāḍhataravartitvāt*). Ḍalhaṇa was aware of the reading in the Nepalese version because in his commentary on 1.16.6 (Su 1938: 77) he noted that some read “because of the accumulation of humours” rather than “because of piercing with a painful, crooked and unsatisfactory needle or because of a wick that is too thick.” On the concept of humoral accumula-

with barley, liquorice, Indian madder (*mañjiṣṭhā*), and the root of the castor oil tree (*gandharvahaṣṭa*), thickened with honey and ghee. And when it has healed well, one should pierce it again.¹²²

- 6 He should treat the properly-pierced ear by sprinkling it with raw sesame oil. After every three days one should make a thicker wick (*varti*) and do the very same sprinkling.
 - 7 Once the ear is free from humours or side-effects, one should put in a light dilator (*pravardhanakā*) in order to enlarge it enough.¹²³
 - 8 *A person's ear enlarged in this way can split in two, either as a result of the humours¹²⁴ or a blow.*
Listen to me about the ways of joining (sandhāna) it can have.
 - 9 Here, there are, in brief, fifteen ways of mending the ear flap.¹²⁵ They are as follows: Rim-join (*nemīsandhānakāḥ*), Lotus-splittable (*utpalabhedyaka*), Dried Flesh (*vallūraka*), Fastening (*āsaṅgima*), Cheek-ear (*gaṇḍakarṇa*), Take away (*āhārya*), Ready-Split (*nirvedhima*), Multi-joins (*vyāyojima*), Door-hinge (*kapāṭasandhika*), Half door-hinge (*ardhakapāṭasandhika*), Compressed (*saṁkṣipta*), Reduced-ear (*hīnakarṇa*), Creeper-ear (*vallīkarṇa*), Stick-ear (*yaṣṭīkarṇa*), and Crow's lip (*kākaṣṭha*).¹²⁶
- In this context, among these,

“Rim-join” (*nemīsandhānaka*): both flaps are wide, long, and equal.

tion (*samudāya*), see the important analysis by Meulenbeld (1992).

- 122 The description of the drug is ambiguous: the word “root” could be taken with each plant, or just with the last. The vulgate reads just “castor oil root” so we assume that is the traditional interpretation.
- 123 Cakrapāṇidatta on 1.16.6 (Su 1939: 127) and Ḍalhaṇa on 1.16.8 (Su 1938: 77) pointed out that the dilator can be made of wood, such as that of the prickly chaff flower (*apāmarga*), the neem tree (*nimba*) and the cotton plant (*kārpāsa*). Ḍalhaṇa added that it can also be made of lead (*sīsaka*) and should have the shape of the datura flower (*dhattūrapuṣpa*).
- 124 Ḍalhaṇa on 1.16.9 (Su 1938: 77) notes that the word *doṣa* here can refer to either a humour, such as wind (*vāta*), as we have understood it, or a disease generated from a humour.
- 125 The Nepalese version uses the word *sandhāna* to refer to joining a split in an ear flap, which is consistent with the terminology in the verse cited above (8). However, 1.16.10 of Ḍalhaṇa's version (Su 1938: 77) uses the term *bandha* here and at the very beginning of the chapter (i.e., 1.16.1) to introduce the topic of repairing the ear.
- 126 For an artist's impression of these different kinds of joins in the ear flap, see Majno 1975: 290 (reproduced as Figure 3.2 in Wujastyk 2003: 154).

“Lotus-splittable” (*utpalabhedyaka*): both flaps are round, long, and equal.

“Dried flesh” (*vallūraka*): both flaps are short, round, and equal.

“Fastening” (*āsaṅgima*): one flap is longer on the inside.

“Cheek-ear” (*gaṇḍakarna*): one flap is longer on the outside.¹²⁷

“Take-away” (*āhārya*): the flaps are missing, in fact, on both sides.

“Ready-split” (*nirvedhima*): the flaps are like a dais (*pīṭha*).

“Multi-joins” (*vyāyojima*): one flap is small, the other thick, one flap is equal, the other unequal.

“Door-hinge” (*kapāṭasandhika*): the flap on the inside is long, the other is small.

“Half door-hinge” (*ardhakapāṭasandhika*): the flap on the outside is long, the other is small.

“These ten options (*vikalpa*) for joins (*sandhi*) of the ear should be bound. They can mostly be explained as resembling their names.¹²⁸ The five from compressed (*saṃkṣipta*) on are incurable.¹²⁹ Among these, “compressed” has a dry ear canal and the other flap is small. “Reduced ear” has flaps that have no base and have wasted flesh on their edges. “Creeper-ear” has flaps that are thin and uneven. “Stick-ear” has lumpy (*granthita*) flesh and the flaps are stretched thin and have stiff (*stabdha*) ducts (*sirā*). “Crow-lip” has a flap without flesh with compressed (*saṃkṣipta*) tips and little blood. Even when

127 For an artist’s impression of this join, see Majno 1975: 291 (reproduced as Figure 3.3 in Wujastyk 2003: 155).

128 Cakrapāṇidatta on 1.16.9–13 (Su 1939: 128–129) and Ḍalhaṇa on 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77–78) provide examples of how the names of these joins describe their shapes. For example, the rim-join (*nemīsandhānaka*) is similar to the join of the rim of a wheel (*cakradhārā*).

129 Ḍalhaṇa on 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77–78) mentions that some do not read the statement that only five are incurable, and they understand the causes of unsuccessful joins given below (i.e., heat, inflammation, suppuration and swelling) as also pertaining to the first ten when they do heal.

they are bound up, they do not heal because they are hot, inflamed, suppurating (*srāva*), or swollen.¹³⁰

- 10 A person wishing to perform a join of any of these should therefore have supplies specially prepared according to the recommendations of the “Preparatory Supplies” chapter.¹³¹ And in this regard, he should particularly gather¹³² decanted liquor (*surāmaṇḍa*), milk, water, fermented rice-water (*dhānyāmla*), and powdered earthenware crockery (*kapālacūrṇa*).¹³³

Next, having made the woman or man tie up the ends of their hair, eat lightly and be firmly held by qualified attendants, the physician considers the joins (*bandha*) and then applies them by means of cutting (*chedya*), splitting (*bhedya*), scarification (*lekhyā*), or piercing (*vyadhana*).¹³⁴ Next, he should examine the blood of the ear to know whether it is tainted (*duṣṭa*) or not. If it is tainted by wind, the ear should be bathed with fermented rice-water (*dhānyāmla*) and water; if tainted by cholera, then cold water and milk should be used; if tainted by phlegm, then decanted liquor (*surāmaṇḍa*) and water should be used, and then he should scarify it again.

The vulgate verses missing in the Nepalese version here are worth noting because they are explicit about a skin-flap graft remaining connected to the site of removal.

130 The version of 1.16.11–13 known to Ḍalhaṇa (*Su* 1938: 78) has four verses (*śloka*) at this point that are not in the Nepalese manuscripts. The additional verses iterate the types of joins required for ear flaps that are missing, elongated, thick, wide, etc. All four verses were probably absent in the version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* known to Cakrapāṇidatta. He cites the verses separately in his commentary, the *Bhānumatī* (*Su* 1939: 128–129), introducing each one as ‘some people read’ (*ke cit paṭhanti*). However, in Trikamajī Ācārya’s edition of the *Sūtrasthāna* of the *Bhānumatī*, the root text is largely identical to the one commented on by Ḍalhaṇa (*Su* 1938), even in instances like this where Cakrapāṇidatta’s commentary indicates that he was reading a different version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

131 *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 1.5 (*Su* 1938: 18–23), probably verse 6 especially that lists the equipment and medications that a surgeon should have ready.

132 The reading in the Nepalese manuscripts of *viśeṣataś cāgropaharaṇīyāt* has been emended to *viśeṣataś cātropaharet* to make sense of the list of ingredients, which is in the accusative case. Also, the repetition of *agropaharaṇīyāt* in the Nepalese version suggests that its second occurrence, which does not make good sense here, is a dittographic error.

133 The term *kapālacūrṇa* is unusual. Ḍalhaṇa (*Su* 1938: 79) defines it as the powder of fragments of fresh earthen pots and Cakrapāṇidatta (*Su* 1939: 129) as the powder of earthenware vessels.

134 There are syntactic difficulties in this sentence. We have adopted the reading in Ḍalhaṇa’s version (*Su* 1938: 78), which has *ca kṛtvā* following *suparigrhītaṃ*. It is likely that a verb, such as *kṛtvā*, dropped out of the Nepalese transmission.

After arranging the join in the ear so that it is neither proud, depressed, nor uneven, and observing that the blood has stopped, one should anoint it with honey and ghee, bandage each ear with cotton (*picu*) and gauze (*plota*), and bind it up with a thread, neither too tightly nor too loosely. Then, the physician should sprinkle earthenware powder on it and provide medical advice (*ācārika*). And he should supplement with food as taught in the “Two Wound” chapter.¹³⁵

- 11 *One should avoid rubbing, sleeping during the day, exercise, overeating, sex, getting hot by a fire, or the effort of speaking.*
- 12 One should not make a join when the blood is too pure, too copious, or too thin.¹³⁶ For when the ear is tainted by wind, then it is obstructed by blood (*raktabaddha*), unhealed and will peel. When tainted with choler, it becomes pinched (*gāḍha*), septic (*pāka*) and red. When tainted by phlegm, it will be stiff (*stabdha*) and itchy. It has excessively copious suppuration (*srāva*) and is *śopha* (*puffed up*). It has a small amount of wasted (*kṣīṇa*) flesh and it will not grow.¹³⁷
- 13 When the ear is properly healed and there are no complications, one may very gradually start to expand it. Otherwise, it may be inflamed (*saṃrambha*), burning, septic or painful. It may even split open again.
- 14 Now, massage for the healthy ear, in order to enlarge it. One should gather as much as one can the following: a monitor lizard (*godhā*), scavenging (*pratuda*) and seed-eating (*viṣkīra*) birds, and creatures that live in marshes or water,¹³⁸ fat, marrow, milk, and sesame oil, and white mustard oil.¹³⁹ Then cook the oil with an admixture

135 *Suśrutasamhitā* 4.1 (Su 1938: 396–408).

136 1.16.17 of Ḍalhaṇa’s version (Su 1938: 79) reads “impure” for the Nepalese “too pure,” which would appear to make better medical sense. Emending the text to *nāśuddha-* for *nātīśuddha-* in the Nepalese recension would yield the same meaning as the Ḍalhaṇa’s version.

137 In his edition of *Suśrutasamhitā*, Ācārya (Su 1938: 79 n. 1) includes in parentheses the following treatment for these conditions, which according to a footnote is not found in the palm-leaf manuscript he used: ‘One should sprinkle it with raw sesame oil for three days and one should renew the cotton bandage after three days’ (*āmatailena trirātram pariṣecayet trirātrāc ca picuṃ parivartayet*).

138 For such classifications, see Zimmermann (1999) and Smith (1994).

139 Ḍalhaṇa’s version of 1.16.19 (Su 1938: i) includes ghee (*sarpis*). However, Ḍalhaṇa’s remarks on this passage and Cakrapāṇidatta’s on 1.16.18 (Su 1939: 130) indicate that they knew of this recipe, perhaps similar to the Nepalese one, that did not include ghee (). Ḍalhaṇa also noted that others simply read four oils, beginning with

think more about the compound structure here?

(*prativāpa*) of the following: purple calotropis (*arka*), white calotropis (*alarka*), country mallow (*balā*), ‘strong Indian mallow’ (*atibalā*), country sarsaparilla (*anantā*), beggarweed (*vidāri*), liquorice (*madhuka*) and hornwort (*jalaśūka* → *jalanīlikā*¹⁴⁰).¹⁴¹ This should then be deposited in a well-protected spot.

- 15 *The wise man who has been sweated should rub the massaged (mardita) ear with it.*
 *Then it will be free of complications, and will enlarge properly and be strong.*¹⁴²
- 16 *Ears which do not enlarge even when sweated and oiled, should be scarified at the edge of the hole (apāṅga), but not outside it.*¹⁴³
- 17 *In this tradition, experts know countless repairs to ears. So a physician who is very intent (suniviṣṭa) on working in this way may repair (yojayed) them.*¹⁴⁴

fat and without milk, whereas Cakrapāṇidatta said that some say it is made with four oils and milk.

- 140 Ceratophyllum demersum, L. This name is not certain. In fact, Ḍalhaṇa on 1.16.19 (Su 1938: 79) notes that some people interpret it as a poisonous, hairy, air-breathing, underwater creature.
- 141 The version of 1.16.19 known to Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 79) adds several ingredients to this admixture, including *apāmārga*, *aśvagandhā*, *kṣīraśuklā*, *madhuravarga* and *payasyā*. Also, it has *vidārigandhā* instead of *vidāri*. When commenting on 1.16.19, Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 79) notes that some do not read *madhuravarga* and *payasyā*. Therefore, there were probably other versions of this recipe with fewer ingredients, as seen in the Nepalese version.
- 142 For these aims (i.e., healing and enlarging the ear), the text known to Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 79) has an additional verse and a half describing an ointment for rubbing the ear (*udvartana*) and sesame oil (*taila*) cooked with various medicines for massage. Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 131) does not comment on these verses, nor verse 15 of the Nepalese version, and so the version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* known to him may not have included them.
- 143 Ḍalhaṇa’s version of 1.16.23 (Su 1938: 79–80) adds another hemistich that states more explicitly that the scarification should not be done on the outside of hole as it will cause derangement.
- 144 After verse 17, the 1938 edition of Ācārya (Su 1938: 80) has in parentheses nineteen verses on diseases of the ear lobes, treatments and complications. It is possible that these verses were in some of the witnesses used by Ācārya to construct the text as they occur in other manuscripts, such as MS Hyderabad Osmania 137-3 (b). However, Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 132) and Ḍalhaṇa (Su 1938: 80) state that some read about the diseases of the ear lobes in this chapter whereas others read about them in the chapter on various treatments (*miśrakacikitsa*) (SS 5.25), which does indeed begin

- 18 If an ear has grown hair, has a nice hole, a firm join, and is strong
and even, well-healed, and free from pain, then one can enlarge it
slowly.¹⁴⁵
- 19 Now I shall describe the proper method of making a repair when a nose
is severed. First, take from the trees a leaf the same size as the man's
nose and hang it on him.
- 20 Next, having cut a slice of flesh (*vadhra*)¹⁴⁶ with the same measure-
ments off the cheek, the end of the nose is then scarified.¹⁴⁷ Then the
undistracted (*apramatta*) physician, should quickly put it back to-
gether so that it is well joined (*sādhubaddha*).
- 21 Having carefully observed that it has been sewn up properly, he should
then fasten it along with two tubes.¹⁴⁸ Having caused it to be
raised,¹⁴⁹ the powder of sappanwood (*pattāṅga*),¹⁵⁰ liquorice and
Indian barberry.¹⁵¹ should be sprinkled on it.
- 22 The wound should be covered properly with cotton (*picu*) and should
be moistened repeatedly with sesame oil. Ghee should be given to

añjana

with a discussion of the disease *paripōṭa*. Ḍalhaṇa goes on to say that some believe that these verses were not composed by sages and, therefore, do not read them.

- 145 The order of verses 17 and 18 are reversed in Ḍalhaṇa's version (*Su 1938*: 80).
- 146 The version of 1.16.28b known to Ḍalhaṇa (*Su 1938*: 81) reads "bound, connected (*bad-dham*)" instead of "slice of flesh (*vadhra*)." This is a critical variant from the surgical point of view. If the slice remains connected, it will have a continuing blood supply. This is one of the effective techniques that so astonished surgeons witnessing a similar operation in Pune in the eighteenth century (see Wujastyk 2003: 67–70).
- 147 Or 1.16.20 could be mean, '... off the cheek, it is fixed to the end of the nose, which has been scarified.' Unfortunately, the Sanskrit of the Nepalese version is not unambiguous on the important point of whether or not the flap of grafted skin remains connected to its original site on the cheek. However, Ḍalhaṇa (*Su 1938*: 81) clarifies the meaning of the vulgate here by stating that one should supply the word 'flesh' when reading 'connected,' thus indicating that he understood the flesh to be connected to the face.
- 148 Ḍalhaṇa noted that the two tubes should be made of reed (*nala*) or the stalk of the leaf of castor oil plant (*eraṇḍapatranāla*) (on 1.16.21 (*Su 1938*: 81)). They should not be made of lead or betel nut because the weight will cause them to slip down.
- 149 The Sanskrit term *unnāmayitvā* in 1.16.21 is non-Pāṇinian.
- 150 *Caesalpinia sappan*, L. For *pattāṅga* there are manuscript variants *pattrāṅga* (MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333) and *patṭaṅga* (MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1079). Also, MS Kathmandu KL 699 (f. 14r:1) has *pattrāṅga* in a verse in 1.14 (cf. 1.14.36 (*Su 1938*: 66)). The text known to Ḍalhaṇa has *pataṅga* (1.16.29 (*Su 1938*: 81)) and this term is propagated in modern dictionaries.
- 151 *Berberis aristata*, DC. Ḍalhaṇa understands it as elixir salve (*rasāñjana*) (*Su 1938*: 81).

23 *the man to drink. His digestion being complete, he should be oiled
and purged in accordance with the instructions specific to him.¹⁵²
And once healed and really come together, what is left of that slice of
flesh (vadhra) should then be trimmed.¹⁵³ If it is reduced (hīna),
however, one should make an effort to stretch it, and one should
make its overgrown flesh smooth.¹⁵⁴*

152 The expression *svayathopadeśa* is ungrammatical but supported in all available witnesses.

153 The vulgate transmission has lost the word *vadhra* and replaced it with *ardha* “half,” which makes little sense in this surgical context.

154 Ḍalhaṇa accepted a verse following this, 1.16.32 (Su 1938: 81), which points out that the procedure for joining the nose is similar to that of joining the lips without fusing the ducts. He noted that earlier teachers did not think this statement on the nose and lips was made by sages, but he included it because it was accepted by Jejjāṭa, Gayadāsa and others, although they did not comment on it because it was easy to understand. Cakrapāṇidatta also did not comment on this additional verse (Su 1939: 133).

Abbreviations

- Ah 1939 Kumṭe, Aṇṇā Moreśvara, Navare, Kṛṣṇaśāstrī, and Parādkar, Hariśāstrī (1939) (eds.), श्रीमद्वाग्भटविरचितम् अष्टाङ्गहृदयम्, श्रीमदरुणदत्तविरचितया सर्वाङ्गसुन्दराख्यया व्याख्यया, हेमाद्रिप्रणीतया आयुर्वेदरसायनाह्वया टीकया च समुल्लसितम् = *The Astāṅgahṛidaya* (6th edn., Mumbayyām: Nirṇayasāgara Press), [ark:/13960/t3tt6967d](http://13960/t3tt6967d).
- Anup *Anup Sanskrit Library* (n.d.).
- Apte Apte, Vaman Shivaram (1992), *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company), ISBN: 4-653-00038-7; Reprinted from Gode and Karve 1957–9.
- AS *Asiatic Society* (n.d.).
- As 1980 Āṭhavale, Ananta Dāmodara (1980) (ed.), *Aṣṭāṅgasan̄grahaḥ. Śrīmad Vṛddhāvāgbhaṭaviracitaḥ Induvyākhyāsahitaḥ* (Pune: Maheśa Ananta Āṭhavale, Śrīmad Ātreya Prakāśanam), [ark:/13960/t9773bb9z](http://13960/t9773bb9z).
- Bhela 1921 Mookerjee, Ashutosh and Ananta Krishna Shastri, Vedantabisharad (1921) (eds.), *The Bhela Samhita. Sanskrit Text* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta), [ark:/13960/t3sv3157j](http://13960/t3sv3157j); Based on two copies made of the Thanjavur codex unicus (MS Thanjavur TMSSML 10773, Burnell 1880: 63–4, P. P. S. Sastri 1933: #11085).
- Bhela 2000 Krishnamurthy, K. H. (2000), *Bhela-saṃhitā. Text with English Translation, Commentary and Critical Notes* (Haridas Ayurveda Series, 8; Varanasi: Chaukhambha Visvabharati).
- BL *British Library* (n.d.).
- Ca. 1941 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1941) (ed.), महर्षिणा पुनर्वसुनोपदिष्टा, तच्छिष्येणाग्निवेशेन प्रणीता, चरकदृढबलाभ्यां प्रतिसंस्कृता चरकसंहिता, श्रीचक्रपाणिदत्तविरचितया आयुर्वेददीपिकाव्याख्यया संवलित्ता (3rd edn., Mumbayyām: Nirṇaya Sagara Press), [URL](http://13960/t3sv3157j), accessed 01/01/2018.
- HIML Meulenbeld, Gerrit Jan (1999–2002), *A History of Indian Medical Literature*, 5 vols. (Groningen: E. Forsten), ISBN: 9069801248.

IOLR	Eggeling, Julius et al. (1887–1935), <i>Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office</i> (London: Secretary of State for India).
KL	<i>Kaiser Library</i> (n.d.).
MW	Monier-Williams, Monier, Leumann, E., Cappeller, C., et al. (1899), <i>A Sanskrit–English Dictionary Etymologically and Philologically Arranged, New Edition</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press); 1970 reprint.
NAK	<i>National Archives of Kathmandu</i> (n.d.).
NCC	Raghavan, V. et al. (1949–), <i>New Catalogus Catalogorum, an Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors</i> , 39 vols. (Madras University Sanskrit Series; Madras: University of Madras); v.1: revised edition, 1968.
NGMCP	NGMCP (2014), ‘Nepal-german Manuscript Cataloguing Project. Online Title List and Descriptive Catalogue’, Universität Hamburg and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, URL .
NK	Nadkarni, K. M. (1982a), <i>Dr. K. M. Nadkarni’s Indian Materia Medica, with Ayurvedic, Unani-tibbi, Siddha, Allopathic, Homeopathic, Naturopathic & Home Remedies, Appendices & Indexes ... in Two Volumes</i> , ed. A. K. Nadkarni, 2 vols. (3 ed., revised and enlarged by A. K. Nadkarni, Bombay: Popular Prakashan), ISBN: 8171541429, URL .
RORI	<i>Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute</i> (n.d.).
Su 1889	Bhaṭṭācāryya, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara (1889) (ed.), सुश्रुतः. सूत्र-निदान-शरीर-चिकित्सा-कल्पोत्तर-तन्त्र-कल्पित आयुर्वेद. भगवता धन्वन्तरिणोपदिष्टः सुश्रुतनामधेयेन तच्छिष्येण विरचितः (3rd edn., Calcutta: Saratī Press), ark : / 13960 / t1nh6j09c ; HIML: IB, 311, edition b.
Su 1915	Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1915) (ed.), सुश्रुतसंहिता, सुश्रुतेन विरचिता, वैद्यवरश्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाख्यव्याख्यया समुल्लसिता, आचार्योपाह्वेन त्रिविक्रमात्मजेन यादवशर्मणा संशोधिता = <i>The Sushrutasamhita of Sushruta, the Nibandhasangraha Commentary</i>

- of *Shri Dalhaṇāchārya* (Mumbayyām: Nirṇayasāgaramudrā-
yantrālaye), [ark : / 13960 / t3sv0mt50](https://nirṇayasāgaramudra.org/ark:/13960/t3sv0mt50), accessed 29/07/2020;
HIML: IB, 312 edition *v.
- Su 1931 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1931) (ed.), सुश्रुत-
संहिता, वैद्यवरश्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाख्यव्याख्या
समुल्लसिता, महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता, सूत्र-निदान-शारीर-चिकित्सा-
कल्पस्थानोत्तरतन्त्रात्मकः. आचार्योपाह्वेन त्रिविक्रमात्मजेन यादवशर्मणा
संशोधिता = *The Sushrutasaṃhitā of Sushruta with the Niban-
dhasangraha Commentary of Shree Dalhaṇāchārya* (2nd edn.,
Mumbayyām: Pāṇḍuraṅga Jāvajī at the Nirṇayasāgaramudrā-
yantrālaye), [ark : / 13960 / t9j41sg94](https://nirṇayasāgaramudra.org/ark:/13960/t9j41sg94), accessed 09/06/2020;
HIML: IB, 312 edition *v.
- Su 1938 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama and Ācārya, Nārāyaṇa
Rāma (1938) (eds.), श्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाख्य-
व्याख्या निदानस्थानस्य श्रीगयदासाचार्यविरचितया न्यायचन्द्रिकाख्यप-
ञ्जिकाव्याख्या च समुल्लसिता महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता
(3rd edn., Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press), [ark : / 13960 /
t09x0sk1h](https://nirṇayasāgaramudra.org/ark:/13960/t09x0sk1h); HIML: IB, 313, edition cc ('the vulgate').
- Su 1938² Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama and Ācārya, Nārāyaṇa
Rāma (2004) (eds.), महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता,
श्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाख्यव्याख्या निदानस्थानस्य श्री-
गयदासाचार्यविरचितया न्यायचन्द्रिकाख्यपञ्जिकाव्याख्या च समुल्लसिता
(Vārāṇasī: Caukhambhā Kṛṣṇadāsa Akādamī); Reprint of
the third, 1938 edition (Su 1938).
- Su 1939 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama and Śarman, Nandakiśora
(1939) (eds.), सुश्रुतसंहितायाः सूत्रस्थानम्. श्रीचक्रपाणिदत्तविरचितया
भानुमतीव्याख्याया समेतम् = *Sushrut-saṃhitā (sūtra Sthān) with
Bhānumatī Commentary by Chakrapāṇi Datta with Introduction
by Gaṇanāth Sen (Śrīsvāmī Lakṣmīrāma Nidhi Grantha-
mālā = Shri Swāmī Lakshmi Rām Trust Series, 1; [Jaipur]:
Śyāmasundara Śarman)*, [ark : / 13960 / t54g0d12m](https://nirṇayasāgaramudra.org/ark:/13960/t54g0d12m); Printed at
the Nirṇayasāgara Press, Bombay.
- Su 1945 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikramācārya and Ācārya, Nārāy-
aṇa Rāma (1945) (eds.), महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता
(मूलमात्रा). पाठान्तर-परिशिष्टादिभिः संवलितः = *the Suśrutasaṃhitā*

- of *Suśruta with Various Readings, Notes and Appendix etc.* (Mumbāi: Nirṇayasāgarākhyamudraṇālaye), [URL](#).
- TMSSML *Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji Saraswati Mahal Library* (n.d.).
- Viṣṇudh. Śarman, Madhusūdāna and Śarman, Mādhavaprasāda (1912) (eds.), *विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणम्* = [*Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*] (Mumbai: Khemarāja Śrīkrṣṇadāsa at the Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press), [ark : / 13960 / t6qz6fr23](#); Lithograph format. Edited on the basis of a manuscript belonging to the astrologer Śudhākaraśarman of the Varanasi Sanskrit Pāṭhaśālā.

Index of Manuscripts

The numbers after the comma refer to pages in this document.

- | | |
|--|---|
| Bikaner Anup 4390: 25 | London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908: 13 , 27 |
| Kathmandu KL 699: 3 , 15 , 47 , 53 | Mumbai AS B.D.109: 24 |
| Kathmandu NAK 1-1079: 3 , 47 , 53 | Mumbai AS B.I.3: 24 |
| Kathmandu NAK 1-1146: 10 | |
| Kathmandu NAK 5-333: 3 , 26f , 29 , 47 ,
53 | Thanjavur TMSSML 10773: 55 |

References

- Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1941) (ed.), *महर्षिणा पुनर्वसुनोपदिष्टा, तच्छिष्येणाग्निवेशेन प्रणीता, चरकदृढबलाभ्यां प्रतिसंस्कृता चरकसंहिता, श्रीचक्रपाणिदत्तविरचितया आयुर्वेददीपिकाव्याख्यया संवलिता* (3rd edn., Mumbayyām: Nirnaya Sagara Press), [URL](#), accessed 01/01/2018.
- Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikramācārya and Ācārya, Nārāyaṇa Rāma (1945) (eds.), *महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता (मूलमात्रा). पाठान्तर-परिशिष्टादिभिः संवलिता* = *the Suśrutasaṃhitā of Suśruta with Various Readings, Notes and Appendix etc.* (Mumbāi: Nirṇayasāgarākhyamudraṇālaye), [URL](#).

- Adriaensen, Rob, Barkhuis, Roelf, and Ruijters, Jean-Louis (1984), 'An English Translation of Suśrutasaṃhitā, Nidānasthāna 1, 1–39, Together with Gayadāsa's Nyāyacandrikā', in Gerrit Jan Meulenbeld (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Priorities in the Study of Indian Medicine* (Groningen: Forsten), 277–310.
- Adriaensen, Rob C. R., Barkhuis, Roelf, and Ruijters, Jean-Louis (1984), 'An English Translation of Suśrutasaṃhitā, Nidānasthāna 1, 1–39, Together with Gayadāsa's Nyāyacandrikā', in Gerrit Jan Meulenbeld (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Priorities in the Study of Indian Medicine* (Groningen: Forsten), 277–310.
- Agrawala, V. S. (1963), *India As Known to Pāṇini: A Study of the Cultural Material in the Aṣṭādhyāyī* (2nd edn., Varanasi: Prthvi Prakashan); First published in 1953.
- Angermeier, Vitus (2020), *Regenzeiten, Feuchtgebiete, Körpersäfte. Das Wasser in der klassischen indischen Medizin* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften).
- Baber, Zaheer (1996), *The Science of Empire: Scientific Knowledge, Civilization, and Colonial Rule in India* (Albany: State University of New York Press).
- Barceloux, Donald G. (2008), *Medical Toxicology Of natural Substances. Foods, Fungi, Medicinal Herbs, Plants, And venomous Animals* (Hoboken, NJ, etc.: John Wiley & Sons), 1196 pp., ISBN: 047172761X, [URL](#).
- Bausi, Alessandro et al. (2015), *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies. An Introduction* (Hamburg: Tredition). DOI: [10.5281/ZENODO.46784](#).
- Bendall, Cecil (1883), *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit, Manuscripts in The, University Library, Cambridge: With Introductory Notices and Illustrations of the Palaeography and Chronology of Nepal and Bengal* (Cambridge: University Press), [ark:/13960/t03x8vz7b](#).
- Bhaṭṭācārya, Candrakānta (1910–7) (ed.), सुश्रुतसंहिता प्रथमखण्डम् सूत्रस्थानात्मकम् हाराणचन्द्रचक्रवर्तिकविराजविरचितसुश्रुतार्थसन्दीपनभाष्य-समेतम्...चन्द्रकान्त भट्टाचार्य-प्रमुखैः संशोधितम् = [The Suśrutasaṃhitā with the Commentary Suśrutārthasandīpanabhāṣya by Hārāṇacandra Cakravartī] (Kalikātā: Satya Press); Edition "t" in [HIML](#): IB, 312.
- Bhattarai, Bidur (2020), *Dividing Texts. Conventions of Visual Text-Organisation in Nepalese and North Indian Manuscripts* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures; Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter), 388.

- Birch, Jason, Wujastyk, Dominik, Klebanov, Andrey, Parameswaran, Madhu K., et al. (2021), 'Further Insight into the Role of Dhanvantari, the Physician to the Gods, in the Suśrutasaṃhitā', *Academia Letters*. DOI: [10.20935/AL2992](https://doi.org/10.20935/AL2992).
- Birch, Jason, Wujastyk, Dominik, Klebanov, Andrey, Rimal, Madhusudan, et al. (2021), 'Ḍalhaṇa and the Early 'Nepalese' Version of the Suśrutasaṃhitā'. DOI: [10.20935/al3733](https://doi.org/10.20935/al3733).
- Bollée, Willem (2010), 'Remarks on the Cultural History of the Ear in India', in Nalini Balbir (ed.), *Svasti: Essays in Honour of Professor Hampa Nagarajaiah for His 75th Birthday* (Bangalore: K. S. Mudappa Smaraka Trust), 141–67, [URL](#), accessed 23/01/2022.
- Breton, P. (1826), 'On the Native Mode of Couching', *Transactions of the Medical and Physical Society of Calcutta*, 2: 341–82, [ark : / 13960 / t3dz8nn5t](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:13960-t3dz8nn5t), [URL](#), accessed 02/06/2021.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2016), *How the Brahmins Won: From Alexander to the Guptas* (Leiden: Brill). DOI: [10.1163/9789004315518](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004315518).
- (2021), 'Patañjali's Āryāvarta = Śuṅga realm?', *Academia Letters*. DOI: [10.20935/al291](https://doi.org/10.20935/al291); Article 291.
- Bronner, Yigal (2021) (ed.), 'The Pandit Project' (30 Sept.), [URL](#).
- Burghart, Marjorie (2016), 'The TEI Critical Apparatus Toolbox: Empowering Textual Scholars through Display, Control, and Comparison Features', *Journal of the Text Encoding Initiative*, 10/Issue 10. DOI: [10.4000/jtei.1520](https://doi.org/10.4000/jtei.1520), [URL](#), accessed 12/12/2017.
- (2017), 'Textual Variants', in Marjorie Burghart, James Cummings, and Elena Pierazzo (eds.), *Digital Editing of Medieval Texts: A Textbook* (DEMM), [URL](#), accessed 04/07/2021.
- Burnell, Arthur Coke (1880), *A Classified Index to the Sanskrit Mss. in the Palace at Tanjore* (London: Trübner), [ark : / 13960 / t4xh86j61](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:13960-t4xh86j61); Bheḷasaṃhitā described on pp. 67 ff.
- Carpue, J. C. (1816), *An Account of Two Successful Operations for Restoring a Lost Nose from the Integuments of the Forehead...Including Descriptions of the Indian and Italian Methods* (London: Longman et al.), [ark : / 13960 / t2q57fn42](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:13960-t2q57fn42), accessed 20/03/2019.

- Cone, Margaret (2001), *A Dictionary of Pāli* (Oxford: The Pali Text Society), ISBN: 0 86013 394 x.
- Cordier, P. (1903), 'Récentes découvertes de mss. médicaux sanscrits dans l'Inde (1898–1902)', *Muséon, Nouvelle Série*, 4: 321–52, [ark : / 13960 / t26b2j457](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:fr:sh-ark:/13960/t26b2j457), accessed 02/01/2020; Reprinted in Roşu 1989: 539–70.
- Coult, Ro. (1731), 'An Account of the Diseases of Bengall', in *Indian Science and Technology in the Eighteenth Century* (Impex India), 141 f., 276.
- Crawford, D. G. (1930), *Roll of the Indian Medical Service, 1615–1930* (London, Calcutta, Simla: Thacker).
- Das, Rahul Peter (2003), *The Origin of the Life of a Human Being. Conception and the Female According to Ancient Indian Medical and Sexological Literature* (Indian Medical Tradition; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas), ISBN: 81-208-1998-5.
- Dave, K. N. (1985), *Birds in Sanskrit Literature* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), ISBN: 0-89581-676-8, [ark : / 13960 / t2c94cv80](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:fr:sh-ark:/13960/t2c94cv80).
- Deshpande, Vijaya (1999), 'Indian Influences on Early Chinese Ophthalmology: Glaucoma As a Case Study', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 62: 306–22. DOI: [10.1017/S0041977X00016724](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X00016724).
- (2000), 'Ophthalmic Surgery: A Chapter in the History of Sino-indian Medical Contacts', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 63/3: 370–88, ISSN: 0041-977X. DOI: [10.1017/s0041977x00008454](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0041977x00008454).
- Dimitrov, Dragomir and Tamot, Kashinath (2007), 'Kaiser Shamsher, His Library and His Manuscript Collection', *Kaiser Shamsher, His Library and His Manuscript Collection*, 3 (Jan.): 26–36, [URL](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2345678).
- Dutt, Uday Chand (1922), *The Materia Medica of the Hindus...with a Glossary of Indian Plants by George King. Revised Edition...by Binod Lall Sen and Ashutosh Sen and Pulin Krishna Sen* (Krishnadas Sanskrit Studies; 3rd edn., Calcutta: Madan Gopal Dass for the Adi-Ayurveda Machine Press), [URL](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2345678), accessed 04/10/2017; Reprinted Varanasi: Chowkhamba Saraswatibhavan, 1980.
- Edgerton, Franklin (1939), 'The Epic Triṣṭubh and Its Hypermetric Varieties', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 59/2: 159–74. DOI: [10.2307/594060](https://doi.org/10.2307/594060).

- Edgerton, Franklin (1953), *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Vol. 2: *Dictionary* (William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series; New Haven: Yale University Press).
- Eggeling, Julius et al. (1887–1935), *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office* (London: Secretary of State for India).
- Elliot, Robert Henry (1918), *The Indian Operation of Couching for Cataract: Incorporating the Hunterian Lectures Delivered before the Royal College of Surgeons of England on February 19 and 21, 1917* (London: H. K. Lewis).
- Emeneau, M. B. (1969), 'Sanskrit Syntactic Particles – "kila, khalu, nūnam"', *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 11/4: 241–68.
- Falk, Harry (1991), 'Silver, Lead and Zinc in Early Indian Literature', *South Asian Studies*, 7/1: 111–7. DOI: [10.1080/02666030.1991.9628430](https://doi.org/10.1080/02666030.1991.9628430).
- Fan, Ka Wai (2005), 'Couching for Cataract and Sino-indian Medical Exchange From the Sixth to the Twelfth Century AD', *Clinical and Experimental Ophthalmology*: 188–90. DOI: [10.1111/j.1442-9071.2005.00978.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9071.2005.00978.x); Unaware of Deshpande 1999; 2000.
- Fitzgerald, James L. (2009), 'A Preliminary Study of the 681 Triṣṭubh Passages of the Mahābhārata', in Robert P. Goldman and Muneo Tokunaga (eds.), *Epic Undertakings* (Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publisher), 95–117.
- Gaṇapatiśāstrī, T. (1920–5), *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpāḥ* (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 70; Anantaśayane: Rājākīyamudraṇayantrālaye), ark:/13960/t4pk5sj0j.
- Gode, P. K. and Karve, C. G. (1957–9) (eds.), *Revised and Enlarged Edition of Prin. V. S. Apte's the Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Poona: Prasad Prakashan), ark:/13960/t3gx47212, accessed 20/10/2017.
- Gombrich, Richard (1979), '“He cooks softly”: dverbs in Sanskrit grammar', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 42/2 (June): 244–56. DOI: [10.1017/s0041977x0014580x](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0041977x0014580x).
- Gupta, Sri Madhusudana (1835–6) (ed.), *Āyur-veda-prakāśa* [also Called *Suśruta-saṃhitā*] by Suśruta. the Suśruta, or System of Medicine, Taught by Dhanwantari, and Composed by His Disciple Suśruta, 2 vols. (Calcutta: Education Press and Baptist Mission Press), ark:/13960/t6841qw6x.

- Harimoto, Kengo (2011), 'In Search of the Oldest Nepalese Manuscript', *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 84/1-4: 85-106, ISSN: 0392-4866, [URL](#), accessed 08/09/2019.
- (2014), 'Nepalese Manuscripts of the Suśrutasamhitā', *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyu)*, 62/3: 23-29 (1087-1093). DOI: [10.4259/ibk.62.3_1087](#), [URL](#), accessed 08/09/2019.
- (pre-published), '[Preliminary Edition of the Nepalese MSS of the Suśrutasamhitā, adhyāyas 1.1-3, 6.4]'; Unpublished document dated 2010.
- Hayashi, Takao (2017), 'The Units of Time in Ancient and Medieval India', *History of Science in South Asia*, 5/1: 1-116. DOI: [10.18732/h2ht0h](#).
- Hemarāja Śarman (1938) (ed.), काश्यपसंहिता (वृद्धजीवकीयं तन्त्रं वा) महर्षिणा मारीचकश्यपेनोपदिष्टा ... हेमराजशर्मणा लिखितेन विस्तृतेन उपोद्धातेन सहिता ... सत्यपाल भिषगा कृतया विद्योतिनी हिन्दीव्याख्या ... समुल्लसिता (1st edn., Mumba: Nirṇayasāgara Press), [URL](#), accessed 02/02/2018.
- Hendley, T. Holbein (1895), *A Medico-topographical Account of Jeypore, Based on the Experience of Twenty Years' Service As a Residency Surgeon and Thirteen As Superintendent of Dispensaries at Jeypore, Rajputana* (Calcutta: Calcutta Central Press Company).
- Hessler, Franciscus (1844-55), *Suśrutas Ayurvēdas: Id Est Medicinae Systema a Venerabili D'hanvantare Demonstratum a Susruta Discipulo Compositum; Nunc Primum Ex Sanskrita in Latinum Sermonem Vertit, Introductionem, Annotationes Et Rerum Indice Franciscus Hessler* (Erlangen: Ferdinandum Enke), [URL](#), accessed 04/11/2017.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf (1893-1912) (ed.), *The Bower Manuscript: Facsimile Leaves, Nagari Transcript, Romanised Transliteration and English Translation with Notes* (New Imperial Series, 22; Calcutta: Government of India and under the patronage of the Bengali Government, Archaeological Survey of India), [ark:/13960/t05z1bg4q](#).
- (1897), *Suśrutasamhitā = The Suśruta-Samhitā or the Hindū System of Medicine According to Suśruta Translated from the Original Sanskrit* (Bibliotheca Indica, 911; Calcutta: Asiatic Society), [ark:/13960/t8pd1kw9r](#), accessed 03/01/2018; No more published; Hoernle does not state which edition he is translating, but it includes the "Dhanvantari phrase".

- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf (1906a), 'Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine I: The Commentaries on Suśruta', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*: 283–302, [URL](#), accessed 26/06/2019.
- (1906b), 'Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine II: On Some Obscure Anatomical Terms', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 4: 915–41, [URL](#), accessed 25/06/2019.
- (1907a), 'Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine II: On Some Obscure Anatomical Terms (Continued from the the Journal, 1906, p. 941)', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*: 1–18, [URL](#), accessed 25/06/2019.
- (1907b), *Studies in the Medicine of Ancient India: Osteology or the Bones of the Human Body* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), [ark:/13960/t1pg9cq8b](#).
- Hofer, Theresia (2007), 'Swami Laxmi Ram's Ayurvedic Pharmacy in Jaipur, India', *Wellcome History*, 34: 2–3, [URL](#), accessed 01/07/2021.
- Holwell, J. Z. (1767), *An Account of the Manner of Inoculating for the Small Pox in the East Indies With...Observations on The...Mode of Treating That Disease in Those Parts* (London: T. Becket & P. A. de Hondt), [ark:/13960/t3ws9h63c](#).
- Jack, David Morton (1884), 'A Thesis on Cataract in India: Its Pathology and Treatment', Wellcome Library, London, MS.3007, [URL](#), accessed 02/06/2021.
- Jośī, Veṇīmādhavaśāstrī and Jośī, Nārāyaṇa Harī (1968), *Āyurvedīya Mahākośaḥ arthāt Āyurvedīya Śabdakośaḥ Saṃskṛta–Saṃskṛta* (Mumbai: Mahārāṣṭra Rājya Sāhitya āṇi Saṃskṛti Maṇḍala), [URL](#).
- Kangle, R. P. (1969), *The Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra* (2nd edn., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), ISBN: 81-208-0042-7, [ark:/13960/t3gz6qh1s](#), accessed 23/09/2021.
- Keith, Arthur Berriedale (1908), review of A. F. Rudolf Hoernle (1907), 'Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine II: On Some Obscure Anatomical Terms (Continued from the the Journal, 1906, p. 941)', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*: 1–18, [URL](#), accessed 25/06/2019, in *Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1/62: 134–9, [URL](#), accessed 17/04/2021.

- Klebanov, Andrey (2010), 'The *Nepalese Version of the Suśrutasamhitā and Its Interrelation with Buddhism and the Buddhists', MA thesis (Hamburg: Hamburg University, Sept.), [URL](#), accessed 08/09/2019.
- (2021a), 'On the Textual History of the Suśrutasamhitā (1): A Study of Three Nepalese Manuscripts', to be published in *eJIM: Electronic Journal of Indian Medicine*, [URL](#), accessed 09/09/2019.
- (2021b), 'On the Textual History of the Suśrutasamhitā, (2): An Anonymous Commentary and its Identified Citations', in Toke Lindegaard Knudsen, Jacob Schmidt-Madsen, and Sara Speyer (eds.), *Body and Cosmos: Studies in Early Indian Medical and Astral Sciences in Honor of Kenneth G. Zysk* (Leiden, Boston: Brill), 110–39.
- Kuist, James M. (1982), *The Nichols File of The Gentleman's Magazine* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press), ISBN: 0-299-08480-9, [ark:/13960/t53g2ct2z](#).
- Lariviere, Richard W. (2003), *The Nāradaśmṛti. Critically Edited with an Introduction, annotated Translation, and Appendices* (2nd edn., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), ISBN: 8120818040; First edition: Philadelphia, 1989.
- Leffler, Christopher T. et al. (2020), 'The History of Cataract Surgery: From Couching to Phacoemulsification', *Annals of Translational Medicine*, 8/22: 1551–97, ISSN: 2305-5847. DOI: [10.21037/atm-2019-racs-04](#), [URL](#), accessed 02/11/2020.
- Lienhard, Siegfried (1978), 'On the Meaning and Use of the Word Indragopa', *Indologica taurinensia*, 6: 177–88, [URL](#), accessed 06/02/2021; The indragopa is a 'red velvet mite'.
- Longmate, Barak (1794), 'A Curious Chirurgical Operation', *The Gentleman's Magazine and Historical Chronicle*, 64.4 (Oct.): 883, 891, 892; I am grateful to the late John Symons of the Wellcome Library who identified the author 'B. L.' as the journalist Barak Longmate. See also Kuist [1982](#): 87.
- Majno, Guido (1975), *The Healing Hand. Man and Wound in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), [URL](#), accessed 26/08/2021.

- Malamoud, Charles (1996), 'Paths of the Knife: Carving up the Victim in Vedic Sacrifice', in *Cooking the World: Ritual and Thought in Ancient India*. Translated from the French by David White (Delhi, Bombay, etc.: Oxford University Press), 169–80.
- Manucci, Niccolò (1907–8), *Storia Do Mogor or, Mogul India, 1653–1708 by Niccolao Manucci, Venetian; Translated with Introduction and Notes, by William Irvine* (The Indian Texts Series; London: J. Murray), [URL](#), accessed 04/10/2021.
- Masai, François (1950), 'Principes et conventions de l'édition diplomatique', *Scriptorium*, 4: 177–93. DOI: [10.3406/scrip.1950.2294](#).
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1953–72), *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen; a Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag).
- McHugh, James (2021), *An Unholy Brew: Alcohol in Indian History and Religions* (New York: Oxford University Press), 416 pp., ISBN: 9780199375936, [URL](#).
- Meulenbeld, Gerrit Jan (1974), *The Mādhavanidāna and Its Chief Commentary: Chapters 1–10. Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Leiden: Brill), ISBN: 978-90-04-03892-9; Meulenbeld provided a supplement to his 1974 listing of plant identities as an appendix in Das [2003](#).
- (1984), 'The Surveying of Sanskrit Medical Literature', in id. (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Workshop on Priorities in the Study of Indian Medicine* (Groningen: Forsten), 37–56.
- (1989), 'The Search for Clues to the Chronology of Sanskrit Medical Texts As Illustrated by the History of Bhaṅgā (cannabis Sativa Linn.)', *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, 15: 59–70.
- (1992), 'The Characteristics of a Doṣa', *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society*, 2/1: 1–5, [URL](#), accessed 31/08/2021.
- (2008), *The Mādhavanidāna with "Madhukośa," the Commentary by Vijayarakṣita and Śrīkaṇṭhadatta (Ch. 1-10). Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass); Meulenbeld provided a supplement to his 1974 listing of plant identities as an appendix in Das [2003](#).
- (2011), 'The Relationships between Doṣas and Dūṣyas: A Study on the Meaning(s) of the Root Murch-/mūrch', *eJournal of Indian Medicine*, 4/2: 35–135, [URL](#), accessed 13/10/2017.

- Miles, M. (1999), 'Personal Communication', Mar.; Letter of 4 March.
- Moureau, Sébastien. (2015), 'The Apparatus Criticus', in Alessandro Bausi et al. (eds.), *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies: An Introduction* (Hamburg: Tredition), 348–52, ISBN: 978-3-7323-1768-4, [URL](#), accessed 04/07/2021.
- Mukhopādhyāya, Girindranāth (1913), *The Surgical Instruments of the Hindus, with a Comparative Study of the Surgical Instruments of the Greek, Roman, Arab, and the Modern European (sic) Surgeons* (Calcutta: Calcutta University), [ark: 13960/t1zd2pq29](#), accessed 29/01/2018; Vol.2: [ark:/13960/t9r25qd8m](#). Reprinted as a single volume, New Delhi, 1987.
- Nadkarni, K. M. (1954), *Dr. K. M. Nadkarni's Indian Materia Medica, with Ayurvedic, Unani-tibbi, Siddha, Allopathic, Homeopathic, Naturopathic & Home Remedies, Appendices & Indexes ... in Two Volumes*, ed. A. K. Nadkarni, 2 vols. (3 ed., revised by A. K. Nadkarni, Bombay: Popular Prakashan), [ark:/13960/t6rz4h160](#).
- (1982a), *Dr. K. M. Nadkarni's Indian Materia Medica, with Ayurvedic, Unani-tibbi, Siddha, Allopathic, Homeopathic, Naturopathic & Home Remedies, Appendices & Indexes ... in Two Volumes*, ed. A. K. Nadkarni, 2 vols. (3 ed., revised and enlarged by A. K. Nadkarni, Bombay: Popular Prakashan), ISBN: 8171541429, [URL](#).
- (1982b), *Dr. K. M. Nadkarni's Indian Materia Medica, with Ayurvedic, Unani-tibbi, Siddha, Allopathic, Homeopathic, Naturopathic & Home Remedies, Appendices & Indexes ... in Two Volumes*, ed. A. K. Nadkarni, 2 vols. (3 ed., revised and enlarged by A. K. Nadkarni, Bombay: Popular Prakashan), ISBN: 8171541429, [URL](#).
- Narayana, Ala and Thrigulla, Saketh Ram (2011), 'Tangible Evidences of Surgical Practice in Ancient India', *Journal of Indian Medical Heritage*, 16: 1–18, [URL](#), accessed 02/06/2021.
- NGMCP (2014), 'Nepal-german Manuscript Cataloguing Project. Online Title List and Descriptive Catalogue', Universität Hamburg and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, [URL](#).
- Oberlies, Thomas (2003), *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit* (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, 5; Berlin: De Gruyter), ISBN: 9783110144482. DOI: [10.1515/9783110899344](#).

- Olivelle, Patrick (2005), *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Manava-dharmasastra*, With the editorial assistance of Suman Olivelle (South Asia research; New York: Oxford University Press), ISBN: 0195171462.
- (2013), *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra. a New Annotated Translation* (New York: Oxford University Press), ISBN: 9780199891825. DOI: [10 . 1093 / acprof : osobl / 9780199891825.003.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199891825.003.0001).
- Osbaldeston, Tess Anne and Wood, R. P. A. (2000), *Dioscorides. De Materia Medica. Being an Herbal with Many Other Medicinal Materials Written in Greek in the First Century of the Common Era. a New Indexed Version in Modern English* [Introductory Notes by R. P. Wood] (Johannesburg: IBIDIS Press), ISBN: 0-620-23435-0, [URL](#).
- Pandey, Anshuman (2012), 'Proposal to Encode the Newar Script in ISO/IEC 10646', [URL](#).
- Pass, Gregory (2003), *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (Chicago: American Library Association), ISBN: 0-8389-8218-2, [URL](#).
- Pillay, V. V. (2010), 'Common Indian Poisonous Plants', in D. A. Warrell, T. M. Cox, and J. D. Firth (eds.), *Oxford Textbook of Medicine* (5th edn., Oxford University Press), 1371–5. DOI: [10 . 1093 / med / 9780199204854 . 003.090302](https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780199204854.003.090302).
- (2013), *Modern Medical Toxicology* (New Delhi: Jaypee Brothers Pvt. Ltd), ISBN: 9789350259658.
- Pillay, Vijay V. and Sasidharan, Anu (2019), 'Oleander and Datura Poisoning: An Update', *Indian Journal of Critical Care Medicine*, 23/Supplement 4: 5250–5. DOI: [10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23302](https://doi.org/10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23302).
- Preisendanz, Karin (2007), 'The Initiation of the Medical Student in Early Classical Āyurveda: Caraka's Treatment in Context', in Birgit Kellner et al. (eds.), *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ. Papers Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday. Part 2*, ii, 2 vols. (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 70.2; Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische Und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien), 629–68, ISBN: 9783902501097, [URL](#).

- Price, Kenneth M. (2013), 'Electronic Scholarly Editions', in Ray Siemens and Susan Schreibman (eds.), *A Companion to Digital Literary Studies* (Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd), 434–50. DOI: [10 . 1002 / 9781405177504 . ch24](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405177504.ch24), URL, accessed 04/07/2021.
- Rai, Saurav Kumar (2019), 'Invoking 'Hindu' Ayurveda: Communalisation of the Late Colonial Ayurvedic Discourse', *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, 56/4: 411–26. DOI: [10 . 1177 / 0019464619873820](https://doi.org/10.1177/0019464619873820); Online first.
- Rama Rao, B. et al. (2005), *Sanskrit Medical Manuscripts in India* (New Delhi: Central Council for Research in Ayurveda & Siddha), [ark : / 13960 / t88h7763b](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:in:ccrsm:13960-t88h7763b).
- Rây, Priyadarshan, Gupta, Hirendra Nath, and Roy, Mira (1980), *Suśruta Saṃhita (a Scientific Synopsis)* (New Delhi: Indian National Science Academy), [ark : / 13960 / t64511t6v](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:in:ccrsm:13960-t64511t6v), accessed 13/09/2019.
- Rhys Davids, Thomas William and Stede, William (1921–5), *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* (London: The Pali Text Society), URL.
- Rimal, Madhusudana and Wujastyk, Dominik (2022), 'MS Kathmandu NAK 1/1146', Pandit Project (18 May), URL.
- Roşu, Arion (1989), *Un demi-siècle de recherches āyurvédiques. Gustave Liétard et Palmyr Cordier: Travaux sur l'histoire de la médecine indienne* (Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne).
- Saha, Mridula (2015), *The History of Indian Medicine Based on the Vedic Literature Satapatha Brahmana* (Kolkata: The Asiatic Society), ISBN: 978-9381574294.
- Sastri, Hrishikesh and Gui, Siva Chandra (1895–1917), *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of Calcutta Sanskrit College* (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press).
- Sastri, P. P. S. (1933), *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji's Sarasvati Mahal Library Tanjore: Natya, Sangita, Kamasutra, Vaidya & Jyotisa, nos. 10650–11737* (Srirangam: Sri Vani Vilas Press), [ark : / 13960 / t3nw8bc12](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:in:ccrsm:13960-t3nw8bc12).

- Śāstrī, Vardhamāna Pārśvanātha (1940) (ed.), उग्रादित्याचार्यकृत कल्याणकारक (राष्ट्रभाषानुवादसहित) = *The Kalyāṇa-kāraṇam of Ugrādityacharya, Edited with Introduction, Translation, Notes, Indexes and Dictionary* (Sakhārāma Nemacanda Gramthamālā, 129; Solāpura: Seṭha Goviṇḍajī Rāvajī Doṣī), ark:/13960/t2q617g4d.
- Scott, H. (1817), 'Some Remarks on the Arts of India, with Miscellaneous Observations on Various Subjects', *Journal of Science and the Arts*, 2: 67–72, ill. after 133, ark:/13960/t9870jt4g; Breton 1826: 358–363 cites Scott's description of cataract couching.
- Sena, Gaṅgāprasād et al. (1886–93) (eds.), सुश्रुतसंहिता...दल्लनाचार्य-कृत-निबन्ध-संग्रह, चक्रपाणिदत्त-कृत-भानुमती-टीका...वङ्गानुवाद...इरेजि प्रतिशब्द (Calcutta: Maṇirāma Press); Edition "g" in [HIML](http://HIML.org): IB, 311.
- Sharma, Har Dutt (1939), *Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Collections of Manuscripts Deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XVI, Part I, Vaidyaka* (Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Government Manuscripts Library, XVI.I; Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute), ark:/13960/t0ms6rc70, accessed 23/10/2019.
- Sharma, Priya Vrat (1972), *Indian Medicine in the Classical Age* (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office).
- (1975), *Āyurved Kā Vaijñānik Itihās* (Jayakṛṣṇadāsa Āyurveda Granthamālā; Vārāṇasī: Caukhambā Orientalia).
- (1982), *Ḍalhaṇa and his Comments on Drugs* (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal).
- (1999–2001a), *Suśruta-Saṃhitā, with English Translation of Text and Ḍalhaṇa's Commentary Alongwith (sic) Critical Notes*, 3 vols. (Haridas Ayurveda Series, 9; Varanasi: Chaukhambha Visvabharati).
- (1999–2001b), *Suśruta-Saṃhitā, with English Translation of Text and Ḍalhaṇa's Commentary Alongwith (sic) Critical Notes*, 3 vols. (Haridas Ayurveda Series, 9; Varanasi: Chaukhambha Visvabharati).
- Shastri, R. Shama (1920) (ed.), बोधायनगृह्यसूत्रम् *The Bodhāyana Grihyasutra* (Mysore: University of Mysore), ark:/13960/t2t492622.
- Singh, Thakur Balwant and Chuneekar, K. C. (1972), *Glossary of Vegetable Drugs in Brhatrayi* (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office).

- Singhal, G. D. et al. (1972–82), *Diagnostic [and Other] Considerations in Ancient Indian Surgery* (Varanasi: Singhal Publications); A translation of the *Suśrutasamhitā* in 10v.
- Sircar, Dinesh Chandra (1987), '6. Rākshashkhālī (Sundarban) Plate; Śaka 1118', *Epigraphia Indica* (1953–54), 30: 42–3.
- Sivarajan, V. V. and Balachandran, Indira (1994), *Ayurvedic Drugs and Their Plant Sources* (New Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta: Oxford & IBH Publishing).
- Sleeman, W. H. (1893), *Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official* (London: Constable), [ark:/13960/t22c4bx7w](http://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t22c4bx7w), accessed 14/03/2018; V. 2 at <http://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t2s52bq7w>.
- Smith, Brian K. (1994), *Classifying the Universe: The Ancient Indian Varṇa System and the Origins of Caste* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press), ISBN: 0-19-508498-5.
- Spink, M. S. and Lewis, G. L. (1973) (eds.), *Albucasis on Surgery and Instruments: A Definitive Edition of the Arabic Text with English Translation and Commentary* (London: Wellcome Institute of the History of Medicine).
- Srikantha Murthy, K. R. (2000–2), *Illustrated Suśruta Samhitā: Text, English Translation, Notes, Appendices and Index* (Jaikrishnadas Ayurveda Series, 102; 1st edn., Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia).
- Steingass, F. (1930), *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary Including the Arabic Words and Phrases to Be Met with in Persian Literature* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner).
- Strauss, Bettina (1934), 'Das Giftbuch des Šānāq: eine Literaturgeschichtliche Untersuchung', *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin*, 4/2: [89]–[152] followed by Arabic text.
- Suvedī, K. S. and Tivārī, N. (2000) (eds.), *Sauśrutanighaṇṭuḥ: granthādaḥ viśṛjyānāṃ granthavaiśiṣṭyaprakāśakenopodghātena avasāne ca dravyāṇāṃ anekabhāṣānāṃ āvalī- paryāyasaṅgrahābhyaṃ samalāṅkṛtaḥ Suśrutasamhitāyāṃ prayuktānāṃ auśadhadravyāṇāṃ paryāya-guṇakarmavarṇātmako pūrvagranthaḥ* (Belajhūṇḍī, Dān: Mahendrasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālayaḥ).
- Tavernier, Jean-Baptiste (1684), *Collections of Travels through Turkey (sic), into Persia, and the East-Indies* (London: M. Pitt).
- The Unicode Consortium (1991–2020), 'The Unicode Standard 13.0, NewaRange: 11400–1147F', [URL](http://www.unicode.org), accessed 20/07/2021.

- Thorburn, S. S. (1876), *Bannu; or Our Afghan Frontier* (London: Trübner & Co.), [URL](#), accessed 10/09/2019; Reprinted Lahore: Niaz Ahmad, 1978.
- UNESCO (2013), 'International Memory of the World Register Susruta Samhita (Nepal)', UNESCO, [URL](#), accessed 11/09/2019.
- Unschuld, Paul Ulrich (1984), *Medicine in China: A History of Ideas* (Berkeley: University of California Press), ISBN: 0520050231.
- Valiathan, M. S. (2007), *The Legacy of Suśruta* (Hyderabad, Chennai, etc.: Orient Longman).
- Velankar, H. D (1925–30), *Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskr̥ta and Prākṛta Manuscripts in the Library of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Bombay: Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay), [ark:/13960/t53g00h0n](#); Biswas #0115.
- Warrier, P. K., Nambiar, V. P. K., and Ramankutty, C. (1994–6) (eds.), *Indian Medicinal Plants: A Compendium of 500 Species. Vaidyaratnam P. S. Varier's Arya Vaidya Sala, Kottakal* (Madras: Orient Longman).
- Watt, George (1889–96), *A Dictionary of the Economic Products of India* (Calcutta: Dept. Revenue and Agriculture, Government of India), [URL](#), accessed 28/04/2021.
- (1908), *The Commercial Products of India, Being an Abridgement of "the Dictionary of the Economic Products of India"* (London: John Murray), [ark:/13960/t9t14xh3x](#).
- Whitney, William Dwight (1885), *The Roots, Verb-forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. A Supplement to his Sanskrit Grammar* (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel), [ark:/13960/t3qv3p906](#).
- Wilson, H. H. (1823), 'On the Medical and Surgical Sciences of the Hindus', *The Oriental Magazine and Calcutta Review*, 1: 207–12, 349–56, [URL](#).
- Wren, R. C. (1956), *Potter's New Cyclopaedia of Botanical Drugs and Preparations*, ed. R. W. Wren (Rustington, Sussex: Health Science Press), [ark:/13960/t14n65c9g](#).
- Wujastyk, Dagmar (2012), *Well-mannered Medicine: Medical Ethics and Etiquette in Classical Ayurveda* (New York: Oxford University Press). doi: [10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199856268.001.0001](#).

- Wujastyk, Dagmar (2019), 'Iron Tonics: Tracing the Development from Classical to Iatrochemical Formulations in Ayurveda', *HIMALAYA, the Journal of the Association for Nepal and Himalayan Studies*, 39/1, ISSN: 2471-3716, [URL](#), accessed 23/07/2019.
- Wujastyk, Dominik (1993), 'Indian Medicine', in W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (eds.), *Companion Encyclopedia of the History of Medicine*, i (London: Routledge), chap. 33, 755–78, ISBN: 0-415-04771-4, [URL](#).
- (2002), 'Cannabis in Traditional Indian Herbal Medicine', in Ana Salema (ed.), *Āyurveda at the Crossroads of Care and Cure. Proceedings of the Indo-European Seminar on Ayurveda held at Arrábida, Portugal, in November 2001* (Lisbon: Centro de História de Além-Mar, Universidade Nova de Lisboa), 45–73, ISBN: 972-98672-5-9, [URL](#), accessed 27/05/2019.
- (2003), *The Roots of Ayurveda: Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings* (Penguin Classics; 3rd edn., London, New York, etc.: Penguin Group), ISBN: 0-140-44824-1.
- (2004), 'Agni and Soma: A Universal Classification', *Studia Asiatica: International Journal for Asian Studies*, IV–V, ed. Eugen Ciurtin: 347–70, ISSN: 1582-9111, [URL](#).
- (2013), 'New Manuscript Evidence for the Textual and Cultural History of Early Classical Indian Medicine', in *Medical Texts and Manuscripts in Indian Cultural History*, ed. Dominik Wujastyk, Anthony Cerulli, and Karin Preisendanz (New Delhi: Manohar), 141–57, [URL](#).
- (2021), 'MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908', [URL](#).
- Yano, Michio (1986), 'A Comparative Study of *Sūtrasthānas*: Caraka, Suśruta, and Vāgbhaṭa', in Teizo Ogawa (ed.), *History of Traditional Medicine: Proceedings of the 1st and 2nd International Symposia on the Comparative History of Medicine—East and West* (Osaka: Division of Medical History, the Taniguchi Foundation), 325–44.
- Zimmermann, F. (1983), 'Suśrutasamhita. Essay review.', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 57/2: 291–3, ISSN: 00075140, [URL](#).
- Zimmermann, Francis (1999), *The Jungle and the Aroma of Meats* (2nd edn., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), ISBN: 8120816188.
- Zysk, Kenneth G. (1984), 'An Annotated Bibliography of Translations into Western Languages of Principle Sanskrit Medical Treatises', *Clio Medica*, 19/3–4: 281–91.

- Zysk, Kenneth G. (1985), *Religious Healing in the Veda: With Translations and Annotations of Medical Hymns from the Rgveda and the Atharvaveda and Renderings from the Corresponding Ritual Texts* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society), ISBN: 0871697572.
- (1986), 'The Evolution of Anatomical Knowledge in Ancient India with Special Reference to Cross-cultural Influences', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 106: 687–705. DOI: [10.2307/603532](https://doi.org/10.2307/603532).
- (2000), *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery* (Indian Medical Tradition; 2nd edn., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass); First published 1991. Reprint of 1998 edition.

Glossary

the 'sweet' savour

- *madhuravarga*: 22

'strong indian mallow'

- *atibalā*: 52

a slice of flesh

- *vadhra*: 19

ācārika

- medical advice: 51

accumulation

- *samudāya*: 48

admixture

- *prativāpa*: 52

āhārya

- take away: 48

alarka

- white calotropis:

52

anantā

- country

sarsaparilla: 52

apāmarga

- prickly chaff

flower: 48

apāmārga

- prickly

chaff-flower: 22

apāṅga

- edge of the hole:

52

apatānaka

- convulsions: 47

apramatta

- undistracted: 53

ārā

- awl: 47

ardhakapāṭasandhika

- half door-hinge:

48

arka

- purple calotropis:

52

āsāṅgima

- fastening: 48

aśvagandhā

- withania: 22

atibalā

- 'strong indian

mallow': 52

awl

- *ārā*: 47

baddham

- bound, connected:

53

balā

- country mallow:

52

bandha

- joins: 19, 50

bandha, sandhāna, sandhi

- joining: 19

beggarweed

- *vidāri*: 52

- *vidārigandhā*: 22

bhedya

- splitting: 50

bound, connected

- *baddham*: 53

cakradhārā

- rim of a wheel: 49

castor oil tree

- *gandharvahasta*: 48

chedya

- cutting: 50

cheek-ear

- *gaṇḍakarna*: 48

compressed

- *saṃkṣipta*: 49

compressed

- *saṃkṣipta*: 48

compressed

- *saṃkṣipta*: 49

convulsions

- *apatānaka*: 47

cotton

- *picu*: 51, 53

cotton plant

- *kārpāsa*: 48

country mallow

- *balā*: 52

country sarsaparilla

- *anantā*: 52

creeper-ear

- *vallīkarṇa*: 48

crow's lip

- *kākaustha*: 48

cutting

- *chedya*: 50

dais

- *pīṭha*: 49

datura flower

- *dhattūrapuṣpa*: 48

decanted liquor

- *surāmaṇḍa*: 50

dhānyāmla

- fermented

rice-water: 50

dhattūrapuṣpa

- *datura flower*: 48

dilator

- *pravardhanakā*: 48

door-hinge

- *kapāṭasandhika*: 48

dried flesh

- *vallūraka*: 48

duct

- *sirā*: 47

ducts

- *sirā*: 49

duṣṭa

- tainted: 50

edge of the hole

- *apāṅga*: 52

elixir salve

- *rasāñjana*: 53

eraṇḍapatranāla

- stalk of the leaf of

castor oil plant: 53

fastening
 - āsaṅgima: 48
 fermented rice-water
 - dhānyāmla: 50
 fever
 - jvara: 20
 gāḍha
 - pinched: 51
 gaṇḍakarṇa
 - cheek-ear: 48
 gandharvahasta
 - castor oil tree: 48
 gauze
 - plotā: 51
 ghee
 - sarpis: 51
 giant potato
 - kṣīraśuklā: 22
 godhā
 - monitor lizard: 51
 granthi
 - lumps: 47
 granthita
 - lumpy: 49
 half door-hinge
 -
 ardhakapāṭasandhika:
 48
 hīna
 - reduced: 54
 hīnakarṇa
 - reduced-ear: 48
 indian madder
 - mañjiṣṭhā: 48
 inflamed
 - saṃrambha: 51
 joining
 - bandha, sandhāna,
 sandhi: 19
 joins
 - bandha: 19, 50
 - sandhi: 49

jvara
 - fever: 20
 kākauṣṭha
 - crow's lip: 48
 kapālacūrṇa
 - powdered
 earthenware
 crockery: 50
 kapāṭasandhika
 - door-hinge: 48
 kaṇṇavyadha
 - piercing the ear:
 46
 kārṇpāsa
 - cotton plant: 48
 kṣīṇa
 - wasted: 51
 kṣīraśuklā
 - giant potato: 22
 lead
 - sīsaka: 48
 lekhyā
 - scarification: 50
 liquorice
 - madhuka: 52
 lotus-splittable
 - utpalabhedyaka: 48
 lumps
 - granthi: 47
 lumpy
 - granthita: 49
 madhuka
 - liquorice: 52
 madhuravarga
 - the 'sweet'
 savour: 22
 mañjiṣṭhā
 - indian madder:
 48
 manyāstambhā
 - paralysis of the
 nape of the neck: 47
 mardita

- massaged: 52
 massaged
 - mardita: 52
 may repair
 - yojayed: 52
 medical advice
 - ācārika: 51
 milk flower
 - vidāri: 22
 miśrakacikitsa
 - various
 treatments: 52
 monitor lizard
 - godhā: 51
 multi-joins
 - vyāyojima: 48
 nala
 - reed: 53
 neem tree
 - nimba: 48
 nemīsandhānaka
 - rim-join: 49
 nemīsandhānakāḥ
 - rim-join: 48
 nimba
 - neem tree: 48
 nirvedhima
 - ready-split: 48
 obstructed by blood
 - raktabaddha: 51
 ointment for rubbing
 the ear
 - udvartana: 52
 options
 - vikalpa: 49
 pain
 - vedanā: 20
 pāka
 - septic: 51
 paralysis of the nape of
 the neck
 - manyāstambhā: 47
 pattāṅga

- sappanwood: 53
picu
 - cotton: 51, 53
 piercing the ear
 - *kaṇṇavyadha*: 46
 piercing
 - *vyadhana*: 50
 pinched
 - *gāḍha*: 51
pīṭha
 - dais: 49
plota
 - gauze: 51
 powdered earthenware
 crockery
 - *kapālacūrṇa*: 50
prativāpa
 - admixture: 52
pratuda
 - scavenging: 51
pravardhanakā
 - dilator: 48
 prickly chaff flower
 - *apāmarga*: 48
 prickly chaff-flower
 - *apāmārga*: 22
puffed up
 - *śopha*: 51
 purple calotropis
 - *arka*: 52
raktabaddha
 - obstructed by
 blood: 51
rasāñjana
 - elixir salve: 53
 ready-split
 - *nirvedhima*: 48
 reduced
 - *hīna*: 54
 reduced-ear
 - *hīnakarṇa*: 48
 reed
 - *nala*: 53
 rim of a wheel
 - *cakradhārā*: 49

rim-join
 - *nemīsandhānaka*:
 49
 rim-join
 - *nemīsandhānakaḥ*:
 48
sādhubaddha
 - well joined: 53
saṃkṣipta
 - compressed: 49
 - compressed: 48
saṃrambha
 - inflamed: 51
samudāya
 - accumulation: 48
sandhāna
 - ways of joining:
 48
sandhi
 - joins: 49
 sappanwood
 - *pattāṅga*: 53
sarpis
 - ghee: 51
 scarification
 - *lekhyā*: 50
 scavenging
 - *pratuda*: 51
 seed-eating
 - *viṣkira*: 51
 septic
 - *pāka*: 51
 sesame oil
 - *taila*: 52
sirā
 - duct: 47
 - ducts: 49
sīsaka
 - lead: 48
 slice of flesh
 - *vadhra*: 53f
śopha
 - *puffed up*: 51
 splitting
 - *bhedya*: 50

srāva
 - suppurating: 50
 - suppuration: 51
stabdha
 - stiff: 49, 51
 stalk of the leaf of castor
 oil plant
 - *eraṇḍapatranāla*: 53
 stick-ear
 - *yaṣṭīkarṇa*: 48
 stiff
 - *stabdha*: 49, 51
suniviṣṭa
 - very intent: 52
 suppurating
 - *srāva*: 50
 suppuration
 - *srāva*: 51
surāmaṇḍa
 - decanted liquor:
 50
śvayathu
 - swelling: 47
 swelling
 - *śvayathu*: 47
taila
 - sesame oil: 52
 tainted
 - *duṣṭa*: 50
 take away
 - *āhārya*: 48
udvartana
 - ointment for
 rubbing the ear: 52
 undistracted
 - *apramatta*: 53
utpalabhedyaka
 - lotus-splittable:
 48
vadhra
 - a slice of flesh: 19
 - slice of flesh: 53f
vallīkarṇa

- creeper-ear: 48
vallūraka
 - dried flesh: 48
 various treatments
 - *miśrakacikitsa*: 52
vartī
 - wick: 48
vartti
 - wick: 47
vāta
 - wind: 48
vedanā
 - pain: 20
 very intent
 - *sunivīṣṭa*: 52
vidāri

- beggarweed: 52
 - milk flower: 22
vidārigandhā
 - beggarweed: 22
vikalpa
 - options: 49
viṣkira
 - seed-eating: 51
vyadhana
 - piercing: 50
vyāyojima
 - multi-joins: 48
 wasted
 - *kṣīṇa*: 51
 ways of joining
 - *sandhāna*: 48

well joined
 - *sādhubaddha*: 53
 white calotropis
 - *alarka*: 52
 wick
 - *vartī*: 48
 - *vartti*: 47
 wind
 - *vāta*: 48
 withania
 - *aśvagandhā*: 22
yaṣṭikarṇa
 - stick-ear: 48
yojayed
 - may repair: 52

Glossary of Medical Substances

myrobalan abhayā. Terminalia chebula, Retz. See ADPS 172, NK #2451, Potter 214. 3

Todo list

■ Get page number for Wuja-2003.	8
■ the referent of this is not so clear. 'this alternative reading'?	15
■ [...] suggesting that some of the readings accepted by D were ancient, if not original. (?)	16
■ Perhaps, Dr Madhu could add a comment on whether these ad- ditional ingredients would change the effects of the treatment in any significant way?	22
■ refs?	35
■ The vulgate verses missing in the Nepalese version here are worth noting because they are explicit about a skin-flap graft remain- ing connected to the site of removal.	50
■ think more about the compound structure here?	51
■ añjana	53