

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

Dominik Wujastyk Jason Birch Andrey Klebanov
Madhu K. Parameswaran Madhusudan Rimal
Deepro Chakraborty Harshal Bhatt Vandana Lele
Paras Mehta

Draft of 2023-01-09
© The authors.

Contents

Introduction	4
Importance of SS.1.16 in the History of Medicine	6
The Transmission of the Work	11
The Nepalese Version	11
The Versions of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḑalhaṇa	13
Cakrapāṇidatta and the Nepalese version	17
Differences between the Nepalese and subsequent versions of SS 1.16	18
Comparative therapeutics	26
The Printed Editions	29
The vulgate	29
The 1939 edition	32
The Manuscripts	35
Editorial Principles	38
Method	38
Stemma	40
The Edition and Apparatus	40
Digital Edition	41
Printed Edition	43
Critical Edition of Sūtrasthāna 16	45
Translation of Sūtrasthāna 16	53
Abbreviations	61
Bibliography	69
Botanical sourcebooks	89
Glossary and Index of Medical Substances	93

Introduction

The *Compendium of Suśruta* (*Suśrutasamhitā*) 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 and reprints of the early twentieth-century editions continue to be reprinted frequently.

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 *Suśrutasamhitā* in the Kaiser Library, Kathmandu, previously unknown to contemporary scholarship, was brought to international attention by Dimitrov and Tamot.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 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.⁷ Generally speaking, the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* is shorter

¹ The edition princeps was that of Gupta (1835–6). A selection of prominent studies 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; and Meulenbeld's magnum opus HIML.

² HIML: IB, 311 ff.

³ HIML: IA, 203–389.

⁴ Dimitrov and Tamot 2007.

⁵ Harimoto 2011: 87–88.

⁶ UNESCO 2013.

⁷ Klebanov 2010; 2021a.

and sometimes clearer than the versions commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta (*fl.* eleventh century) and Ḏalhaṇa (*fl.* twelfth century). The version of the *Suśrutasanhitā* commented on by Ḏalhaṇa has formed the basis of modern printed editions and translations, such as those of Yadavaśarman Trivikramātmaja Ācārya and others.⁸ Some of the changes in the text between the Nepalese version and what we might call the Ḏalhaṇa 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 *Uttaratanaṭra* 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.⁹

In the case of the *Suśrutasanhitā*, 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 *Uttaratanaṭra*, and before the text was fixed as a result of the authority of the major commentators, Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḏalhaṇa.¹⁰ It is in this sense that we use the expression, “Ḏalhaṇa’s version,” when referring to the vulgate text of the *Suśrutasanhitā*.

The present study offers a critical edition and annotated translation of

⁸ Su 1915; Su 1938; P. V. Sharma 1999–2001b. Note that Ācārya himself referred to this text as “Ḏalhaṇa’s version” (see footnote 124 below).

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ The roles of earlier commentators including Jejāṭa, Gayadāsa and Candraṭa in closing the text and influencing Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḏalhaṇa remains an open research problem.

the sixteenth chapter of the *Ślokasthāna*, the first book of the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.¹¹ 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 addresses some of the challenges of editing the Nepalese manuscripts and the salient differences between the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 1.16 and the text as known to Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḏalhaṇa. 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 Ḏalhaṇa'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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

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.¹² 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.¹³ The Brāhmaṇa literature of the only slightly later period contained more detailed descriptions of animal butchery in the context of religious sacrifice that involved the enumeration of internal organs and bones.¹⁴ This exemplifies an early Sanskrit vocabulary for internal parts of bodies. However, this is not the same as anatomical dissection, whose methods and intentions are quite

¹¹ This book is called the *Sūtrasthāna* in later versions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. Note that the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* itself used the name *Ślokasthāna* 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 *Ślokasthāna* itself, at 1.1.40 of the Nepalese version.

¹² Zysk [1985](#): 70–71.

¹³ Translation by Hoernle ([1907b](#): §43, §100). Further bibliography: [HIML: IIB, 819](#).

¹⁴ Malamoud [1996](#); Saha [2015](#).

different. As Keith pointed out long ago, the enumeration of the bones in the *Brāhmaṇas* was derived from correspondences with the numbering of various verse forms, not from anatomical observation.¹⁵ With the *Suśrutasamhitā*, we find ourselves in the presence of something quite different and far more sophisticated from the medical point of view, where the body was studied specifically for medical and surgical purposes.¹⁶ The text gives us a historical window onto a school of professionalised medicine, including surgical practice, that existed almost 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.¹⁷ The author of the *Suśrutasamhitā* claimed that surgery was the most ancient and most efficacious of the eight branches of medical knowledge.¹⁸ Anecdotal discussion with contemporary surgeons suggests that many details in the descriptions could only have been written by a practising surgeon: it is beyond reasonable doubt that elaborate surgical techniques were a reality amongst those whose practices were recorded in the *Suśrutasamhitā*.¹⁹

Torn ear lobes

The *Suśrutasamhitā*'s description of the repair of torn ear lobes is unique for its time.²⁰ Majno, a practising surgeon, noted that, "through the habit of

¹⁵ Keith 1908.

¹⁶ Zysk 1986. The *Carakasamhitā* too has brief descriptions of surgical techniques, but the *Suśrutasamhitā* goes into greater detail.

¹⁷ Wilson 1823; Mukhopādhyāya 1913; V. Deshpande 2000; Wujastyk 2003; Valiathan 2007; Narayana and Thrigulla 2011 and many other studies.

¹⁸ *Suśrutasamhitā* 1.1.15–19 (Su 1938: 4).

¹⁹ Leffler et al. 2020 provide a detailed discussion of the *Suśrutasamhitā*'s surgical technique in the case of ophthalmic cataract, with references for further reading. The manuscript account by Jack (1884) provides a fascinating quantitative comparison of traditional couching operations with his contemporary methods (MS London Wellcome 3007).

²⁰ 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 de-

stretching their earlobes, the Indians became masters in a branch of surgery that Europe ignored for another two thousand years".²¹ The different types of mutilated ear lobe that the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* described are not always easy to understand from the Sanskrit: the illustrations supplied in Majno's text greatly help with the visualization of the most likely scenarios.²²

Rhinoplasty

One of the best-known surgical techniques associated with *Suśrutasaṃhitā* is rhinoplasty, the repair or rebuilding of a severed nose. The history of this operation has been discussed by Wujastyk, and a translation of the Sanskrit passage from the vulgate edition of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* was given.²³ This fascinating technique is certainly old in South Asia, having been witnessed by travellers from Niccolo Manucci in the seventeenth century onwards.²⁴ Many witnesses, including the most famous, Cruso and Findlay,²⁵ described an operation that differs from *Suśrutasaṃhitā* in that it takes the grafting skin from the forehead, not the cheek. But the nineteenth-century operation witnessed by Thorburn is especially interesting, since the technique followed the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* exactly in taking flesh from the cheek, rather than the forehead.²⁶

As noted by Meulenbeld, none of the extant commentators – Jejjata, Gayadāsa, Cakrapāṇi or Ḏalhaṇa – explained the technique in any detail beyond short lexical glosses.²⁷ This suggests that the commentators may not all have known the technique at first-hand.

scription of ear diseases.

²¹ Majno 1975: 291.

²² Majno 1975: 290–291; reproduced with permission in Wujastyk 2003: 92–93.

²³ Wujastyk 2003: 67–70, 99–100. See also HIMAL: IB, 327–328, note 186, for further literature and reflections.

²⁴ Manucci 1907–8: v. 2, 301.

²⁵ Longmate 1794: 883, 891 f.

²⁶ Thorburn 1876: 352–353.

²⁷ HIMAL: IB, 328. Ḏalhaṇa noted cryptically, on 1.16.27–31 (Su 1938: 81a), that a rather different version of the text, cast in śloka metre, was also known to him from other sources. Ḏalhaṇa's variant bears a resemblance to the description of the operation given in printed editions of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā* at Utt.18.59–65 (Ah 1939: 841).

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.²⁸ This ensured the blood flow essential to keeping the skin alive while it healed in its new location.²⁹ The Sanskrit of the vulgate is ambiguous on this critical point and the wording of the Nepalese version is unclear. However, Ḑalhaṇa clarified the meaning of the vulgate here by stating that when reading the expression “connected,” one should understand “connected flesh”.³⁰ He thus indicated that he understood the flesh to be connected to the face.³¹ 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 Ḑalhaṇa 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 names and characteristics of different types of earlobe, the vulgate cites some summary verses from an unknown source.³² 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.³³

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

“Living” [flesh] means “together with blood”.³⁴

²⁸ See Wujastyk 2003: 67–70.

²⁹ This surgical innovation distinguished the “Hindu Method” from sixteenth-century European methods associated with Gaspar Tagliacozzo and others (see, e.g., Carpuet 1816: *passim*).

³⁰ *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 1.16.28 (Su 1938: 81).

³¹ See p. 60 below.

³² 1.16.11–14 (Su 1938: 78).

³³ 1.16.14 (Su 1938: 78): गण्डादुत्पात्र्य मांसेन सानुबन्धेन जीवता । कर्णपालीमापालेस्तु कुर्यान्निर्लिख्य शास्त्र-वित्। Cf. the translation of the whole passage by Wujastyk (2003: 94).

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

Thus, Ḏalhaṇa'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 vulgate text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* at a time after the Nepalese version as recorded in 878 CE, but at the latest by the time of Ḏalhaṇa in the twelfth century.

If we can assume that the descriptions of ear-surgery and rhinoplasty were part of a single professional tradition of surgical method, then the above passage, in the context of ear-lobe repair, 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 moved from the professional competence of scholar-physicians (*vaidyas*) to that of barber-surgeons (*Ambaṣṭhas* and others)? Or 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.

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 by Klebanov,³⁵ 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 script which was not used outside of the region.

Furthermore, we speak of a single “version” because these manuscripts attest to a specific line of transmission of the text. That is to say, in terms of stemmatic analysis they share a common ancestor or hyparchetype, while at the same time, they bear no signs of significant contamination. This hypothesis was first postulated by Klebanov (2010) and later reiterated 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 highlighted 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 relevant textual excerpts with four printed editions, alternative readings reported by several commentators, parallel passages in other texts, and with a number of additional manuscripts of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. This analysis demonstrated that the text of

³⁵ Klebanov 2021a: 2–3.

the *Suśrutasamhitā* supported by the Nepalese MSS of our study differs evidentially from all these other sources. But the mere fact of Nepalese provenance does not guarantee that a manuscript transmits the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. For example, Klebanov also established that in spite of its Nepalese provenance, MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1146,³⁶ does not support the “Nepalese version” and need not be taken into consideration when reconstructing the readings of the latter’s hyparchetype. Thus, we do not feel that it is justified to use the technical term “Nepalese recension,” since at least two recensions of the work are preserved in manuscripts from Nepal. Nevertheless, we wish to indicate the provenance of the oldest witnesses. However, more than two hundred manuscripts of the *Suśrutasamhitā* are preserved in different libraries across South Asia and until they have been studied and placed into a stemmatic relationship with our present witnesses, any hard assumption about the regional character of the transmission line remains premature.³⁷ What can be said with certainty is that the Nepalese version preserves many archaic features of an early version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* and that some of these features have already been identified in other manuscripts of this work have been studied briefly.

Our research group builds upon the above hypothesis about the existence of a distinct Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* and concentrates primarily on the study of this text in its own right and, additionally, frequent comparison to the version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* promulgated by the late medieval commentator Dalhana and recorded in the widely-used Su 1938. The present study of SS 1.16 also considers the readings found in Su 1939, that reflects Cakrapāṇidatta’s readings, and incorporates various observations made by both medieval commentators, Cakrapāṇidatta and Dalhana, into the notes of the edition and some annotations of the translation.

The current study and several earlier publications furnish a catalogue of uniform features that are characteristic of the Nepalese version and set it apart from the vulgate version.³⁸ These features of the Nepalese version include orthographic variants, peculiarities in the structure and structuring

³⁶ Rimal and Wujastyk 2022.

³⁷ For a list of known manuscript copies of the *Suśrutasamhitā*, see the sources mentioned in footnote 116 below.

³⁸ Earlier publications include Harimoto 2011; Wujastyk 2013b; Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Parameswaran, et al. 2021; Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. 2021.

elements, as well as the actual wording of the text. As argued elsewhere in this article, many of these variants appear to represent 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.

Additionally, we want to make it clear that we do not think that the Nepalese version provides a so-called original text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. Rather, the Nepalese version is a witness to a hyparchetype, not the archetype, of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. The Nepalese version 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 Ḏalhaṇa in the twelfth century and that is reproduced in most printed editions of the . The oldest reconstructable text will only come into focus when all surviving witnesses for the work have been 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 Uttaratantra, that has a somewhat independent character.

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

The Versions of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḏalhaṇa

The commentaries of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḏalhaṇa, titled *Bhānumatī* and *Nibandhasaṅgraha* respectively, are based on similar but not identical versions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. Both versions differ significantly from the

Nepalese version.³⁹ Ḏalhaṇa 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.⁴⁰ Ḏalhaṇa also had several manuscripts of the *Suśrutasamhitā* available to him, as we know because he frequently mentioned their variant readings.⁴¹

In addition to the fine-grained issues raised by the relationship between these commentators, there are added issues introduced by the way the editors of the printed versions of these commentaries handled the texts. The most obvious difficulty is that Y. T. Ācārya and N. Šarman's text of the *Sūtrasthāna* as commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta ([Su 1939](#)) simply duplicated the main text of that section from Y. T. Ācārya and N. R. Ācārya's edition of Ḏalhaṇa's commentary ([Su 1938](#)).⁴² This duplication of the root text in the two books creates the entirely misleading impression that both commentators had the same *Suśrutasamhitā* text before them.⁴³ However, there is much evidence, including in the chapter treated in the present study, that this was not the case.

To give a concrete example, Ḏalhaṇa commented on four verses, SS 1.16.11–14, as part of his root text, that Cakrapāṇidatta cited separately only in his commentary.⁴⁴ Cakrapāṇidatta had introduced each verse with “some people say” (केचित्पठन्ति). This clearly indicated that these verses

39 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).

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

41 See [HIML](#): IA, 377. Meulenbeld drew attention to Ḏalhaṇa'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, Ḏalhaṇa noted that certain readings known to the earlier commentators Jejjīṭa and Gayadāsa were, “not to be found in current manuscripts” (स च वर्तमानपुस्तकेषु न दृश्यते).

42 There are a few exceptions where Cakrapāṇidatta glossed a word or compound that is different to the one glossed by Ḏalhaṇa. For example, in SS 1.16.18, Cakrapāṇidatta glossed राजसर्षप् whereas Ḏalhaṇa glossed गौरसर्षप्. The editors reflected this in the root texts of the *Bhānumatī* ([Su 1939](#): 130) and *Nibandhasaṅgraha* ([Su 1938](#): 79) respectively.

43 A similar situation exists with the edition of the *Yogasūtravivaraṇa* by Rama Sastri and Krishnamurthi Sastri ([1952](#)) that is printed with the base text of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* taken the edition of Āgāśe and Āpāte ([1904](#)) which is significantly different from that on which Śaṅkara was commenting (Maas [2013](#): 77–78).

44 [Su 1938](#): 78 and [Su 1939](#): 128–129 respectively.

स्वेदितोन्मर्दितं कर्णं छेहैनैतेन योजयेत् ॥
 अथानुपद्रवः सम्यग्बलवांशं विवर्धते ॥ १९ ॥
 (यवाऽश्वगन्धायष्ट्राहैस्तिलैश्चोद्दर्तनं हितम् ॥
 शतावर्यश्वगन्धाभ्यां पयस्यैरण्डजीवनैः ॥ २० ॥
 तैलं विपकं सक्षीरमध्यङ्कात् पालिवर्धनम् ॥)

 कर्णवर्धनार्थं सम्मर्दनोग्नेहैहमाह—तथा गोवेद्यादि । प्रतुदा लङ्घादयोऽजपान-
 वक्ष्याः, विकिरा लावादयः, आनुपा महियादयः । राजसंपूर्णः वेतसंपूर्णः, तथा
 तैलम्, एव हि लैहोऽथम् । पश्यक्षात्र पाकार्थं इशान्तरानुकेश्वर्तुर्युणमेव । ये हु पयःस्थाने
 सर्वः पठान्त, तन्मते जलसाध्योऽथम् । अन्ये हु चतुःलैहैव पयःस्थार्थं पठन्ति ।
 अर्कः अर्कमेदः, जलव्याको जलतुणासक्तो भवति 'जलसौकृ' इति प्रसिद्धः । प्रतीवापः
 कलकः । ये लत्र मधुरार्थं पठन्ति पयसां च, तन्मते पयसा क्षीरविद्यारी । तैलं वेति
 तैलमेव वा ॥ १९-२० ॥

स्वेदितोन्मर्दितं कर्णं छेहैनैतेन योजयेत् ॥
 अथानुपद्रवः सम्यग्बलवांशं विवर्धते ॥ २० ॥
 अस तैलस्यावचारणमाह,—स्वेदितोन्मर्दितमित्यादि ॥ २० ॥
 यवाऽश्वगन्धायष्ट्राहैस्तिलैश्चोद्दर्तनं हितम् ॥
 अभ्यक्ष्योद्दर्तनमाह,—यवेत्यादि ॥—

 शतावर्यश्वगन्धाभ्यां पयस्यैरण्डजीवनैः ॥ २१ ॥
 तैलं विपकं सक्षीरमध्यङ्कात् पालिवर्धनम् ॥
 कर्णपालिविकृद्धार्थमपरं तैलमाह,—शतावर्यश्वगन्धाभ्यामि-
 ल्यादि । शतावर्यादिकल्केन लैहचतुर्थाशेन केवलक्षीरेण चतुर्गु-
 णेन तैलमत्र पचनीयम् । पयसा अर्कुषी । जीवनैः काको-
 ल्यादिवैः ॥ २१ ॥—

Figure 1: The text as it appears in Cakrapāṇi (left) and Ḏalhaṇa (right) (Su 1939: 130, Su 1938: 79).

were not in the version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* upon which he was commenting. But a century or so later they had become part of the main text that was read by Ḏalhaṇa. In spite of this, the editors Y. T. Ācārya and N. Śarman included these verses in their 1939 edition of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* with Cakrapāṇidatta's commentary as if they had been part of the main text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that Cakrapāṇidatta read. Such cases make it hard to maintain clarity about the fact that these two important commentators were responding to different versions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

Another example of these issues is the fact that Cakrapāṇidatta did not acknowledge or comment on some verses that appear in what we might call “Ḍalhaṇa’s version” of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. This is an *argumentum ex silentio*. After all, it is possible that he may not have remarked on a verse because its meaning was clear. But in some cases, the commentarial convention of citing the first words of a new verse or passage leads us to suspect the absence of a verse in the root text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

For example, there is a prose passage at SS 1.16.18 that Cakrapāṇidatta commented on in his *Bhānumatī* (Fig. 1, left).⁴⁵ It is followed by several verses also in the main text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that elaborate on the content of the prose passage.⁴⁶ Ḏalhaṇa commented on these explanatory verses (Fig. 1, right), citing keywords that show they all formed part of

45 Su 1939: 130, i.e., अथाप्रदुष्टस्याभिवर्धनार्थम् ... निदध्यात् । It is numbered Su.1.16.19 in Ḏalhaṇa’s *Nibandhasaṅgraha* (Su 1938: 79).

46 SS 1.16.19–23 in Su 1939, i.e., स्वेदितो ..., यवाश्व ..., तैलं ..., तेषाम् ..., वद्ध

(नाडीयोगं विनौष्टस्य नासासन्धानवद्विधिम् ॥
 य पद्मेव जानीयात् स राज्ञः कर्तुमर्हति ॥ ३१ ॥)
 इति सौश्रुते शल्यतन्त्रे सूत्रस्थाने कर्णव्यधवन्धविधिर्नाम
 पोडशोऽध्यायः ॥ १६ ॥

Figure 2: *Suśrutasamhitā* 1.16.31 in the 1939 printed edition.

the main text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* that was before him.⁴⁷ However, Cakrapāṇidatta's older commentary showed no awareness of the first few verses in this group, SS 1.16.19–21ab.⁴⁸ Apparently, they were *not* part of the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* 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 *Suśrutasamhitā* known to him. Incidentally, the editors remarked in a footnote that verses 20–21a were not in the Nepalese manuscript that they consulted. This shows that the version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* that Cakrapāṇidatta knew is similar to the Nepalese version, at least in this particular case.⁴⁹

A similar instance 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 Dalhaṇa but not by Cakrapāṇidatta (see Fig. 2).⁵⁰ This verse was almost certainly not in the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* known to Cakrapāṇidatta.

The manuscript on which the editors' edition of Cakrapāṇidatta's *Bhānumatī* commentary was mainly based, MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908, does not include the root text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.⁵¹ Therefore, it requires a careful reading of the commentary itself to

47 1.16.19–23 ([Su 1938](#): 79–80).

48 [Su 1939](#): 130–131.

49 [Su 1939](#): 130, n. 2.

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

51 This observation is based on an examination of the opening passage MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908. The MS is described in IOLR: v. 1.5, 928, #2647. The section "The 1939 Edition," on p. 32 below, describes the sources that the editors used for that edition.

reverse-engineer, as it were, what its author, Cakrapāṇidatta, was seeing in the manuscripts of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that he had before him in the eleventh century. But there is no evidence that they included the verses SS 1.16.19–21ab and 31 that are printed in the *Su* 1939 edition as if they were present to Cakrapāṇidatta.

Cakrapāṇidatta and the Nepalese version

We have already seen one case where Cakrapāṇidatta's version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* was more similar to the older Nepalese version than to the later version of Ḏalhaṇa. There is more evidence for this. For example, SS 1.16.5 of the Nepalese version begins with the compound दोषसमुद्यात्; Cakrapāṇidatta began his comment on this passage by glossing this very expression. By contrast, Ḏalhaṇa's version inserted two compounds, क्षिरजिह्वाप्रशस्तसूचीव्यधात् and गाढतर्वर्तिल्वात्, before this.⁵² It appears that Cakrapāṇidatta was not aware of the compounds that Ḏalhaṇa saw in his later version, but was indeed reading a text similar to the Nepalese version.⁵³

If one looks beyond SS 1.16, there are further instances where the Nepalese version and the root text as read by Cakrapāṇidatta have the same reading, but Ḏalhaṇa mentioned it as an alternative that is, “read by others.” For example, the Nepalese version of SS 1.1.22 begins त्रास्मिज्ञाखे..., which is also the reading commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta.⁵⁴ However, Ḏalhaṇa commented on अस्मिज्ञाखे and stated that “others read त्रास्मिज्ञाखे”.⁵⁵

Another example is the reading of षष्ठा विधानैः in Ḏalhaṇa's commentary on SS 1.1.8.1 that is not in his main text but that he ascribes to “some others”.⁵⁶ This reading is likely to be derived from the expression षष्ठाभिधानैः in the main text of the Nepalese version, and to have been rewritten before Ḏalhaṇa's time because it was hard to understand.⁵⁷

⁵² 1.16.6 (*Su* 1938: 77).

⁵³ 1.16.5 (*Su* 1939: 126–127).

⁵⁴ 1.1.20 (*sic*) (*Su* 1939: 17).

⁵⁵ 1.1.22 (*Su* 1938: 5).

⁵⁶ 1.1.8.1 (*Su* 1938: 3).

⁵⁷ See the discussion by Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. (2021: 4–5).

Differences between the Nepalese and subsequent versions of SS 1.16

Several differences between the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* as reconstructed on the basis of the Nepalese MSS and as found in its multiple contemporary printed editions have already been pointed out in previous publications. For example, Klebanov listed differences in the chapter sequences as they affect the overall organization and structuring of themes and elements of the text.⁵⁸ Others have explored variations in the frame story of the work as a whole.⁵⁹ Klebanov discussed the interchangeable use of two titles for the first book of the text, namely “*Ślokasthāna*” and “*Sūtrasthāna*.” He also discussed another feature of the Nepalese version, namely the additional colophons found at the end of each book and also at the end of each decade of chapters of the work.⁶⁰

The greater internal coherence of the Nepalese version

In an exemplary investigation of textual variants in the Nepalese version, Harimoto studied the classification of snakes in SS 5.4 and revealed that the Nepalese version preserves a text that is internally more consistent and coherent than the versions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* found in different printed sources.⁶¹

Klebanov contributed some further general remarks and examples of substantive differences between the Nepalese and vulgate versions, and provided two more case studies.⁶² The first dealt with the list of skin lesions associated with urinary disease.⁶³ Their signs and pathogenesis are described in the *Nidānasthāna* and their treatment in the *Cikitsāsthāna*.⁶⁴ This list of skin lesions exemplifies a case where the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* is internally more coherent than that commented on by Dalhaṇa. The incoherence of Dalhaṇa’s version was already identified by

⁵⁸ Klebanov 2021a: 27 f.

⁵⁹ Wujastyk 2013b; Klebanov 2021a: 28-32; Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Parameswaran, et al. 2021; Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. 2021: 2-4.

⁶⁰ Klebanov 2021a: 32-44.

⁶¹ Harimoto 2011: 101-104.

⁶² Klebanov 2021a: 44-55.

⁶³ प्रमेहपिटका in the Nepalese spelling.

⁶⁴ *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 2.6 (Su 1938: 289-294) and 4.12 (Su 1938: 454-455) respectively.

an earlier commentator, Gayadāsa (fl. ca. 1000), who proposed a textual conjecture that corresponds to the reading of the Nepalese version.⁶⁵

The second case study by Klebanov focussed on the variation in the list of bodily winds (प्राण) in SS 3.4.⁶⁶ This discussion too relied upon Gayadāsa's learned remarks. He commented on a version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* corresponding to the Nepalese version and reported an alternative reading and its interpretation preferred by another ancient commentator, Jejjata (fl. ca. 650 – c. 750). It is Jejjaṭa's reading that is known to modern readers of the *Suśrutasamhitā* from the vulgate version of the text.

As the present study demonstrates, many features pertaining to the actual content of the Nepalese version continue to come to light as we proceed with our study of the manuscripts. On the whole, these observations indicate that many features of the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* are likely to go back to an early state of the work that was common to other versions of the compendium. However, there are also textual features, such as the text-structuring colophons concluding every tenth chapter, are likely to have occurred within a local Nepalese transmission of the text and it is unlikely that they will be attested in MSS from other regions, when a study of those is done. When evaluating the Nepalese readings historically, it is necessary to keep in mind that there is plentiful evidence that Ḏalhaṇa's version of the text also included extremely early readings and variants, suggesting that some of the readings accepted by Ḏalhaṇa were ancient, if not original. Each case has to be weighed, and we are not yet in a position to make definitive judgments about the early divergence of textual recensions.

The detailed comparison that follows of 1.16 of the Nepalese version with Ḏalhaṇa's *Nibandhasaṅgraha* unfolded as the chapter was edited. The differences appear to emanate largely from attempts in Ḏalhaṇa's version to standardise, simplify or clarify the language that appears in the Nepalese version, to add and redact information, and introduce changes to recipes and therapies. Examples from 1.16 have been provided to demonstrate these general observations which, we expect, will be supported by a larger survey of the text.

65 MS Kathmandu KL 699 was copied a century or more before Gayadāsa's time, so its version cannot have been influenced by Gayadāsa's innovations or suggestions. The reverse is more likely, although we are still uncertain of whether Gayadāsa was aware of the Nepalese version. Being from Bengal, it is not unlikely that he knew it.

66 Klebanov 2021a.

Transpositions

Figure 3 reveals the extent to which 1.16 of the Nepalese version was redacted to create the one known by Ḏalhaṇa. In this particular case, twenty-seven verses have been added in the vulgate. Eight of these verses (11–14, 21–22ab, 23cd–24, 32) 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 Ḏalhaṇa. These verses cover additional diseases of the ear lobes, with their treatment and complications. Although Ḏalhaṇa conceded that some predecessors 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, but Ḏalhaṇa's comments prompted him to place them in parentheses.⁶⁷ Be this as it may, this large block of verses is not present in the Nepalese version.

One can also see in Figure 3 that verses 17 and 18 of the Nepalese version were transposed in the redaction of Ḏalhaṇa's version, where they are numbered 26 and 25 respectively. Although this only occurs once in 1.16, such transposing of verses and even their hemistiches is common in the redaction of other chapters of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.

Apart from the addition of verses, the redacting of the version known to Ḏalhaṇa involved many small, yet sometimes significant, changes that are described below.⁶⁸

Changing Spelling, Sandhi and Syntax

Later commentators like Ḏalhaṇa often made efforts to standardise, simplify or improve the language of the Nepalese version. Such changes in-

⁶⁷ Ācārya (Su 1938: 80) did not state that these verses were absent in some or all of his manuscripts, which he usually did in a footnote if this was the case. A broader survey of manuscripts would be helpful for establishing whether these verses were part of the transmission of the *Suśrutasamhitā* in other parts of India. For example, they are present in MS Hyderabad Osmania 137-3(b).

⁶⁸ The present study focusses on the commentary of Ḏalhaṇa, but many of the same investigations could be made with regard to the surviving parts of the other early commentaries. See the discussion below, p. 35.

Nepalese version Ḏalhaṇa'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

Figure 3: A Comparison of verses in 1.16 of the Nepalese and Ḏalhaṇa's versions.

clude the standardising of spelling,⁶⁹ sandhi,⁷⁰ and verbal forms,⁷¹ as well as interventions to simplify and clarify syntax.⁷² These efforts often involved splitting compounds.⁷³ In some instances, these changes improved

69 For example, पत्ताङ्ग (SS 1.16.21) → पतङ्ग (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81). For more information on this, see footnote 179 to the translation.

70 For example, ऋहस्तेन ऋजु (SS 1.16.2) → ऋहस्तेन जर्जु (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

71 For example, उच्चामयिता (SS 1.16.21) → प्राप्नम्य (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81); अवचूर्णयीत (SS 1.16.21) → उपहरेत (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81).

72 For example, शोणितबहुत्वनिवेदनायां चान्यदेशविद्धमिति जानीयात् । निरुपद्रवता तदेशविद्धलिङ्गम् । (SS 1.16.3) → शोणितबहुत्वेन वेदनया चान्यदेशविद्धमिति जानीयात् । निरुपद्रवतया तदेशविद्धम् इति । (1.16.4, Su 1938: 76); आमतैलपरिषेकेणोपचरेत् (SS 1.16.6) → आमतैलेन परिषेचयेत् (1.16.7, Su 1938: 77); सुपरिगृहीतं (SS 1.16.10) → सुपरिगृहीतं च कृत्वा (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78); अनेन (SS 1.16.15) → स्त्रहै-नैतेन (1.16.20, Su 1938: 79).

73 For example, यदच्छाविद्धायां सिरायाम् (SS 1.16.4) → यदच्छया विद्धासु सिरासु (1.16.5, Su 1938: 76); धान्यामृकपालचूर्ण (SS 1.16.10) → धान्यामृं कपालचूर्ण (1.16.20, Su 1938: 78).

the grammar,⁷⁴ or altered the meaning.⁷⁵ However, some prefixes of verbal forms,⁷⁶ case endings,⁷⁷ and indeclinables were changed for less apparent reasons.⁷⁸ There is also a tendency to replace uncommon words with generic ones,⁷⁹ add indeclinables,⁸⁰ omit the verb “to be” at the end of sentences,⁸¹ and introduce verses after a prose passage with the phrase भवति चात्र.⁸²

Technical Terms

There is evidence of standardising and altering technical terminology in versions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* subsequent the Nepalese one. Two examples of this in *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 1.16 are the terms for “joins” (बन्ध) and “a slice of flesh” (वध). The Nepalese version uses three terms for “joining” splits in the ear flaps and the flesh of nose (बन्ध, सन्धान, सन्धि). Redactors of subsequent versions appear to have tried to standardise this terminology by replacing सन्धान and सन्धि with बन्ध in prose passages.⁸³ However, the use of the term सन्धान was retained in verses, perhaps because of the metrical challenges of making such a change or perhaps because the verses had greater traditional authority. Also, the names of joins which incorporate सन्धान and सन्धि remained the same.⁸⁴

74 For example, सुरामण्डकीरम् (SS 1.16.10) → सुरामण्डं क्षीरम् (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78).

75 For example, क्षीणाल्पमांसः (SS 1.16.12) → क्षीणोऽल्पमांसः (1.16.17, Su 1938: 79).

76 For example, सम्वर्द्धितः (SS 1.16.8) → विवर्द्धितः (1.16.9, Su 1938: 77); निवेश्य (SS 1.16.10) → सन्निवेश्य (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78); अववध्य (SS 1.16.10) → च बद्धा (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78).

77 For example, मासे (SS 1.16.2) → मासि (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

78 For example, अपि (SS 1.16.13) → वा (1.16.18, Su 1938: 79); च (SS 1.16.16) → तु (1.16.23, Su 1938: 79); तु (SS 1.16.18) → च (1.16.25, Su 1938: 80).

79 For example, प्रक्षयेत् (SS 1.16.15) → योजयेत् (1.16.20, Su 1938: 79); नद्येत् (SS 1.16.21) → बद्धा (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81).

80 For example, [absent] (SS 1.16.6) → च (1.16.7, Su 1938: 77); [absent] (SS 1.16.10) → तत्र (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78); [absent] (SS 1.16.12) → अपि (1.16.17, Su 1938: 79).

81 The words भवति or भवन्ति are omitted four times in Dalhana’s version (1.16.10 (twice), 1.16.17 and 1.16.18 (Su 1938: 77, 79)).

82 For example, [absent] (SS 1.16.11) → भवति चात्र (1.16.16, Su 1938: 79).

83 For example, पञ्चदशसन्धानाकृतयः (SS 1.16.9) → पञ्चदशवन्धाकृतयः (see 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77)); दशकर्णसन्धिविकल्पाः (SS 1.16.9) → कर्णबन्धविकल्पाः (see 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77))

84 These names are नेमीसन्धानक, कपाटसन्धिक, and अर्धकपाटसन्धिक in SS 1.16.9 (cf. 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77)).

The Nepalese version contains the rather obscure term वश्र for the slice of flesh that a surgeon cuts from the cheek in order to construct a new nose.⁸⁵ Modern dictionaries define वश्र as a leather strap or a slice of bacon,⁸⁶ the latter of which is more indicative of its meaning in the Nepalese version. This word was written out of subsequent versions,⁸⁷ and it was not mentioned as an alternative reading by either Cakrapāṇidatta or Dalhaṇa, which suggests that its use and meaning may not have been known to them. However, वश्र was used by the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā* in the context of rhinoplasty, so it likely to be the correct reading in the Nepalese version.⁸⁸

Augmenting the Text

Apart from adding whole passages and verses (as seen in Figure 3), 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,⁸⁹ and phrases added to elaborate on diseases and treatments.⁹⁰ 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) said that the wick in a newly pierced ear should be removed because of aggravated humours or a culpable piercing whereas the version known to Dalhaṇa (1.16.6 ([Su 1938](#): 77)) included two further reasons, namely, because of piercing with a painful, crooked and unrecommended needle or because of a wick that is too thick.

⁸⁵ SS 1.16.20 and 23.

⁸⁶ [Apte](#): 1385; [MW](#): 917.

⁸⁷ वश्रम् (SS 1.16.20) → बद्धम् (SS 1.16.28, [Su 1938](#): 81) and तद्वप्तशेषं (SS 1.16.23) → तद्वप्तशेषं (SS 1.16.31, [Su 1938](#): 81).

⁸⁸ Utt.18.62 ([Ah 1939](#): 841). This may suggest some independence between the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* as transmitted to its direct commentators and as transmitted to Vāgbhaṭa. The word वश्र is old, occurring, also in the form वश्रि, from the *Atharvaveda* onwards (Mayrhofer 1986–2001: v. 2, 521–522).

⁸⁹ For example, छिद्रे (1.16.2, [Su 1938](#): 76) → छिद्र आदित्यकरावभासिते (1.16.3, [Su 1938](#): 76); [absent] (1.16.2) → शनैः शनैः (1.16.3); [absent] (SS 1.16.3) → आश्य (1.16.5, [Su 1938](#): 77).

⁹⁰ For example, घात्यङ्के (SS 1.16.2) → घात्यङ्के कुमारधराङ्के वा (1.16.3); [absent] (SS 1.16.2) → बालकीडनकैः प्रलोभ्य (1.16.3); [absent] (SS 1.16.3) → पिचुवर्ति प्रवेशयेत् (1.16.5).

Some of the split ear flaps in Ḏalhaṇa's version have additional characteristics,⁹¹ and a list of four symptoms associated with incurable joins in the Nepalese version (SS 1.16.19) was increased to six in Ḏalhaṇa'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 Ḏalhaṇa (1.16.5, *Su 1938*: 76–77) classifies these symptoms according to three ducts called कालिका, मर्मरिका and लोहितिका, which results in some repetition of the symptoms mentioned.⁹²

Transposing Words, Verses and Passages

A close comparison of the Nepalese version with the vulgate 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.⁹³ 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 Ḏalhaṇa'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.

91 For example, पीठोपमपालिर्निर्विधिमः (1.16.9, *Su 1938*: 77) → पीठोपमपालिरुभयतः क्षीणपुत्रिकाश्रितो निर्विधिमः (1.16.10, *Su 1938*: 77); इतराल्पपालिः संक्षिप्तः (SS 1.16.9) → उत्सन्नपालिरितराल्पपालिः संक्षिप्तः (1.16.10); तनुविषमपालिः (SS 1.16.9) → तनुविषमाल्पपालिः (1.16.10).

92 In Ḏalhaṇa's version (1.16.5, *Su 1938*: 76–77), the symptoms of fever and pain (ज्वर, वेदना) 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 कालिका, मर्मरिका and लोहितिका, but he does not gloss or comment on the passage known to Ḏalhaṇa.

93 For example, अपुस्थूल० (SS 1.16.9) → स्थूलाण्ज० (1.16.10, *Su 1938*: 77); तत्रैते दशकर्ण० (SS 1.16.9) → तत्र दशैते कर्ण० (1.16.10, *Su 1938*: 77); नातिगाढन्नातिशिथिलं सूत्रेणाववध्य (SS 1.16.9) → सूत्रेणानवगाढमनतिशिथिलं च वद्धा (1.16.10, *Su 1938*: 77); पूर्वन्दक्षिणं कुमारस्य वामङ्गल्न्यायाः | प्रतनुं सूच्या बहलमारया (SS 1.16.2) → प्रतनुकं सूच्या बहलमारया। पूर्व दक्षिणं कुमारस्य वामङ्गल्न्यायाः (1.16.3, *Su 1938*: 76).

Redacting Recipes and Elaborating on Treatments

Some of the additional text in subsequent versions of the *Suśrutasanhitā* 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 Dalhaṇa's version (Su 1938: 76), which contains a statement that the physician should insert a wick of cotton after the ear has been pierced.⁹⁴ This statement anticipates the instructions in 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 Dalhaṇa's version elucidates the role of the wick in the procedure of piercing the ear.

A similar clarification occurs in Dalhaṇa's version at 1.16.18 (Su 1938: 70),⁹⁵ which reiterates the cure for an ear tainted by a humour that was described earlier in 1.16.7.⁹⁶ The reiteration is quite apt because it follows a passage that outlines the various symptoms of ear disease arising from each of the three humours.⁹⁷ 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 Dalhaṇa's version, the treatment is reiterated.

In Dalhaṇa'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 ointment that should be applied to a pierced ear that has not healed. In Dalhaṇa's version, the recipe was rewritten to include sesame seeds.⁹⁸ 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. Dalhaṇa's version of the admixture has five additional ingredients, namely, **prickly chaff-flower**, **Withania**, **milk-white**, **sweet plants** and

⁹⁴ For example, [absent] (SS 1.16.2) → पिञ्चुवर्ति प्रवेशयेत् (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

⁹⁵ Corresponding to SS 1.16.13 in the Nepalese version, lines 50–51 of the edition.

⁹⁶ SS 1.16.6 in the Nepalese version, lines 13–14 of the edition.

⁹⁷ Dalhaṇa 1.16.17 (Su 1938: 79), corresponding to Nepalese SS 1.16.12, lines 46–49 of the edition.

⁹⁸ Nepalese version SS 1.16.5 (lines 11–12): यवमधुकमञ्जिषागन्धवैरस्तमूलैर्मधुघृतप्रगाढैरालेपयेत् which become, in Dalhaṇa 1.16.7 (Su 1938: 77): मधुकैरण्डमूलमञ्जिषायवतिलक्तैर्मधुघृतप्रगाढैरालेपयेत्.

Indian ipecac.⁹⁹ It also has beggarweed instead of Indian kudzu.¹⁰⁰

The general tendency in redacting a recipe from the Nepalese version was to preserve most ingredients of the original and to add new ones.

Comparative therapeutics

For at least two reasons, it is interesting to compare the text materials of the *Suśrutasamhitā* 1.16 with parallel materials found in other texts, including the *Carakasamhitā*, the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha*, and the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā*. The latter two works, both ascribed to Vāgbhaṭa, can safely be dated to a period after the composition of the *Suśrutasamhitā* but before the commentator Ḏalhaṇa, thus throwing light on a period of development for which witnesses are limited and also also broadly the period at which the Nepalese version was current. Secondly, the manner in which Vāgbhaṭa's works incorporate and modify materials from the *Suśrutasamhitā* can help us to understand how recipes and therapies evolved within specific lines of textual transmission.

The materials presented in *Suśrutasamhitā* 1.16 are parallel to those in two chapters of the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha*, namely Uttarasthāna, chapters 1 and 22, titled “*bālopacaraṇīya*” and “*karṇarogapratिशेदha*,” and *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā*, Uttarasthāna 1 and 18 with the same chapter names.¹⁰¹

First, let us take up the end of passage 2 (line 6) in the edition of the Nepalese version below, corresponding to SS 1.16.3 (Su 1938:76) in Ḏalhaṇa's version. The Nepalese version says nothing, while Ḏalhaṇa's version says “one should insert a cloth wick” (पिचुवर्ति प्रवेशयेत्). A little later, both versions say, “one should remove the wick”.¹⁰² It seems likely that the editor of Ḏalhaṇa's version added the initial phrase about inserting the wick because it seemed necessary to say that the wick was applied before being removed. The older Nepalese version seems slightly less coherent on this point, but is perhaps represents an earlier recension

99 Ḏalhaṇa's version 1.16.7 (Su 1938:77).

100 Nepalese version SS 1.16.14 (lines 52–54): अर्कालर्कबलातिवलानन्ताविदारीमधुकजलशूकप्रतिवाप-
न्तैलम्पाचयित्वा which become, in Ḏalhaṇa 1.16.19 (Su 1938:79): अर्कालर्कबलातिवलानन्तापा-
मागाध्यगन्धाविदारिगन्धाक्षीरशुक्राजलशूकमधुरवर्गपयस्याप्रतिवापं तैलम्बा पाचयित्वा.

101 As 1980: 619–629 and 734–744 and Ah 1939: 777–781 and 837–841, respectively.

102 तत्र वर्त्तिमपहृत्य in the Nepalese version (line 11), and the less clear तत्र वर्त्तिमुपहृत्य in
Ḏalhaṇa's version (1.16.6 (Su 1938:77)).

on the principle of *lectio difficilior potior*. Both the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* and the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṁhitā* describe first inserting a thread in the pierced earlobe and subsequently replacing it every third day.¹⁰³ In this respect, they agree with Ḏalhaṇa’s version.

Secondly, it is interesting to consider again the recipe prescribed to treat the vitiation of humours in the pierced ear, mentioned above. A slightly modified recipe is found in the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* 6.1.63 (As 1980: 626), but the same is not present in *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṁhitā*. As pointed out above, Ḏalhaṇa’s version adds a paste of sesame seeds (*tilakalka*) to the recipe attested by the Nepalese version. In the parallel version of recipe found in the printed editions of *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha*, honey (मधु) is missing, but ghee (आज्ज्य) is found. However, when checking the manuscripts of the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha*, one of them,¹⁰⁴ reads आज्ज्यैः instead of आज्ज्यैः(यवैरण्डजटायष्टीमञ्जिष्ठाज्ज्यैः प्रलेपयेत्). Interestingly, the paste of sesame seeds (*devtilakalka*) of Ḏalhaṇa’s version is not present in the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* and is replaced by *devjatā*, which is most probably spikenard.

Since the paste of sesame seeds (तिलकल्क) is the main differentiating factor between the recipe versions attested by the Nepalese version and Ḏalhaṇa’s version, a general review of the contexts its use in the major texts may be enlightening. References for the paste of sesame seeds (तिलकल्क) are found in the texts shown in Table 1. Among them, references with

<i>Text</i>	<i>Instances of तिलकल्क</i>
<i>Carakasaṁhitā</i>	6
<i>Suśrutasaṁhitā</i>	11
<i>Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha</i>	16
<i>Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṁhitā</i>	4

Table 1: Sesame seed paste (तिलकल्क) in different texts.

the combination of the paste of sesame seeds (तिलकल्क), ghee (devghṛta) and honey (मधु) are not rare either, with four instances each in *Suśrutasaṁhitā* and *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* and two instances in *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṁhitā*. A

¹⁰³ 6.1.58 (As 1980: 626) and 6.1.36 (Ah 1939: 780) respectively.

¹⁰⁴ MS Mumbai, Asiatic Society 162, catalogue no. BD 263/1–6

add refs.

combination of the paste of sesame seeds (तिलकल्क), ghee (घृत) and honey (मधु) has also been specifically quoted as a healing recipe.¹⁰⁵

refs

Another matter of interest is the combination of ghee and honey. We find many instances where this unique combination alone or in combination with other drugs is used in a variety of clinical contexts including those prescribed for the healing of ulcers or surgical wounds.¹⁰⁶

This material evidence points to the general trend from the older Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* to the more recent version of *Dalhana* that recipes start with an intact central core of a few drugs, here consisting of ghee and honey, that is transmitted to the later versions of texts but supplemented by later physicians resulting in ever larger recipes in subsequent versions of the text.

¹⁰⁵ See *Suśrutasamhitā* Sū 11.22ab, *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* Sū 38.21 and *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā* Sū 30.34.

¹⁰⁶ E.g., *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* Sū 37.30 for क्षतकण्ठ and *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* Ci 17.22 for healing of the surgical wound in उदरोग.

The Printed Editions

The careful survey of printed editions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* by Meulenbeld lists no fewer than 44 entries.¹⁰⁷ 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 began with Hessler's Latin translation in 1844 and continue up to the present in scores of publications in many languages.¹⁰⁸

The vulgate

The great ayurvedic scholar Yādavaśarman Trivikrama Ācārya produced three successive editions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* with the commentary of Ḟalhaṇa, 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.¹⁰⁹ 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.¹¹⁰ These sources were described by Ācārya as follows; we provide 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 Gaṅgādharabhaṭṭaśarman, lecturer at the Royal Sanskrit University. Covers the *cikitsāsthāna* and the *uttaratatantra*.
- 3 Bundi, my great friend the royal physician Paṇḍ. Śrīprasādaśarman
Covers the *uttaratatantra*.

¹⁰⁷ [HIML](#): IIB, 311–314.

¹⁰⁸ E.g., Zysk 1984; [HIML](#): IIB, 314–315.

¹⁰⁹ See also the studies of these editions by Klebanov (2021a:§1.2) and Wujastyk (2013b: 143–144).

¹¹⁰ The following account is paraphrased from Y. T. Ācārya and N. R. Ācārya's own account of their 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 Raṇachodālāla Motīlālaśarman. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.
- 3 From the personal library of my great friend Sva. Vā. Vaidya Murāra-jīśarman. Extremely old. No commentary. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.
- 4 Puṇe, BORI library. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *śārīra-sthāna*.¹¹¹
- 5 Puṇe, BORI library. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Complete. With some damaged folia.
- 6 Bombay, Asiatic Society. Incomplete.¹¹²
- 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 *Suśrutasaṇḍipanabhbāṣya* by Professor Hārāṇacandra Cakravārtti. Complete work. This is the 1910 Calcutta edition numbered “t” by Meulenbeld.¹¹³
- 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 Niśikāntasena. This is the 1886 Calcutta edition numbered “g” by Meulenbeld.¹¹⁴

The sources of the 1938 edition

- 1 Gwalior, from the library of my great friend Paṇ. Rāmeśvaraśāstrin Śukla. Covers the *sūtra*, *nidāna*, *śārīra*, *cikitsā* and *kalpasthāna*.
- 2 Bikaner, from the library of the Royal Palace, supplied by Paṇ. Candrasekharaśāstrin. Contains the commentary *Nyāyacandrikāpañjikāvyākhyā* by Gayadāsa. Covers the *nidānasthāna*. This is almost certainly MS Bikaner Anup 4390.¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ Not one of the three MSS of the *śārīrasthāna* described in H. D. Sharma 1939.

¹¹² 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.”

¹¹³ HML: IB, 312; Bhaṭṭācārya 1910–7.

¹¹⁴ HML: IB, 311; Sena et al. 1886–93.

¹¹⁵ See Dominik Wujastyk, “MS Bīkāner AnupLib 4390.” Pandit. <<http://panditproject.org/entity/108068/manuscript>>.

<i>edition</i>	1915			1931						1938					
<i>source</i>	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3
<i>sthāna</i>															
<i>sū.</i>	●						●	?			○	○ [†]	●		●
<i>ni.</i>	●			●			●	?			○		●	●	●
<i>śā.</i>	●			●	●	●	●	?			○		●		●
<i>ci.</i>		●					●	?	●		○		●		● ^{††}
<i>ka.</i>	●						●	?			○		●		
<i>utt.</i>		●	●	●			●	?			○				

[†] Covers chapters 1–43 only. ^{††} Covers chapters 1–9 only.

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

3 Kathmandu, located in the private library of the Royal Guru Hema-rāja Śarman. An extremely old palm-leaf manuscript. Readings from this MS were compiled by Paṇ Nityānandaśarman Joṣī 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*.¹¹⁶ Although most of these manuscripts cover only parts of the whole work, they amount to approximately twenty times the evidence that was used by Ācārya for his vulgate editions.

While the descriptions provided by Ācārya of his source materials 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

¹¹⁶ This figure is arrived at by summing the MSS mentioned by Raghavan et al. (NCC:v. 39, 373–375) and in the NGMCP. The real figure could be many scores higher. Cf. the overview at Wujastyk et al. 2020.

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 *Suśrutasamhitā*, no. 5 of the 1931 edition. Manuscript 1 of 1938 is the next most complete, but it omits the *uttaratana*, 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 *Kāśyapasamhitā* allow us to identify this manuscript as MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333.¹¹⁷ The editors of the vulgate, Y. T. Ācārya and N. R. Ācārya, stated that this manuscript covered up to the ninth chapter of the *cikitsāsthāna*, but in fact it covers the whole work.¹¹⁸ 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 *Suśrutasamhitā* that was published by the Swami Laxmi Ram ayurvedic centre in Jaipur, and printed at the famous Nirṇayasāgara Press in Mumbai (see Fig. 4).¹¹⁹ The text was edited

¹¹⁷ Su 1938: 22; Hemarāja Śarman 1938: 56–57. Discussed by Klebanov (2021a: §1.1, 2.3). See also HML: IIB, 25–41; Wujastyk 2003: 161–169.

¹¹⁸ Su 1938: 22.

¹¹⁹ 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

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 मृ for मुद्रित.¹²⁰
2. A manuscript in the India Office Library library provided through the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune.¹²¹ This manuscript covered the *Bhānumatī* up to the end of the *sūtrasthāna*. The siglum was ह for हस्तलिखित.¹²²

For the *Suśrutasamhitā*

1. A palm leaf manuscript from Hemarājaśarman's personal library.¹²³ The siglum was ता for ताडपत्र.
2. His own published edition. The siglum was ड for डल्हणसंमतः पाठः.¹²⁴
3. Hārāṇacandra Cakravarti's published edition with his own commentary.¹²⁵ The siglum was हा.

Evaluation

The main innovation of this publication was to present the only surviving part of the commentary on the *Suśrutasamhitā* by the great eleventh-century medical scholar Cakrapāṇidatta, namely the *Bhānumatī*.¹²⁶ A secondary purpose was to present the text of the *sūtrasthāna* as read in MS

¹²⁰ 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 CSCL accession number 97 in Bengali script may be this manuscript.

¹²¹ At this time, manuscripts from Britain were routinely lent to scholars in India and vice versa.

¹²² Wujastyk 2021 b; MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908 (PanditProject #109978, consulted on July 03, 2021).

¹²³ I.e., MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333.

¹²⁴ Su 1938. It is noteworthy that Ācārya refers to his 1938 edition as representing “the Dalhana version.”

¹²⁵ Bhaṭṭācārya 1910–7.

¹²⁶ HIML: IA, 374–375 and IB, 495–496.

१ अध्यायः]

सुश्रुतसंहिता

३१

चरके—“लभोपयो हि शस्तानां रसादीनां रसायनम्” (च. चि. अ. १ पा. १) । पारिशेष्याद्वाजीकरणतत्त्वम् । अवाजिनं वाजीदुर्बेन्ति येन तद्वाजीकरणम् । ‘अन्वेषामपि दृश्यते’ (पा. अ. ६।३।१३७) इति शीर्घलम् । येन वाऽत्यर्थं शीषु व्यज्यते तद्वाजी-करणम् । तदुक्तं चरके—“येन नारीषु सामर्थ्यं वाजिवलभते नरः । व्रजेचाप्यधिकं येन वाजीकरणमेव तद्” (च. चि. अ. २, पा. ४) इति ॥ ५ ॥

अथास्य प्रत्येकाङ्गलक्षणसमासः—तत्र, शल्यं नाम विविधरुणकाष्ठ-पाषाणपांशुलोहलोष्टास्थिवालनखपूयास्तावदुष्ट्रवणान्तर्गम्भेशलयोद्धरणा-र्थं षष्ठ्या विधानैः, यच्चशास्त्रक्षाराद्विप्रणिधानवणविनिश्चयार्थं च; शा-लाक्यं नामोर्ध्वंजनुगतानां श्रवणनयनवदनभ्राणादिसंभितानां व्याधी-नामुपशमनार्थं; कायचिकित्सा नाम सर्वाङ्गसंभितानां व्याधीनां ज्वर-रक्तपित्तशोषोन्मादापस्मारकुष्ठमेहातिसारादीनामुपशमनार्थं; भूत-विद्या नाम देवौसुरगन्धर्वयक्षरक्षःपितृपिशाचनैग्रहाद्युपसृप्तचेतसां शान्तिकर्मवलिहरणादिग्रहोपशमनार्थं; कौमारभूत्यं नाम कुमारभर-णधात्रीक्षीरदोपसंशोधनार्थं दुष्टस्तन्यग्रहसमुत्थिनां च व्याधीनामुप-शमनार्थम् ; अगदतत्रं नाम सर्पकीटलूतामूषकादिदृष्टविषव्यक्षनार्थं विविधविर्खंसंयोगोपशमनार्थं च; रसायनतत्रं नाम वयःश्वापनमायुर्मे-धावलकरणं रोगापहरणसमर्थं च; वाजीकरणतत्रं नामावपदुष्टक्षीणशु-ष्करेतसामाप्यायेनप्रसादोपचयजननिसितं प्रदृष्टं जननार्थं च ॥ ६ ॥

शल्याङ्गविशेषात् ज्ञातुं प्रतिलक्षणं संक्षेपेणाह—अथायेत्यादि । एकमेकमहें प्रति लक्ष-णानां समासः संक्षेपः प्रत्येकाङ्गलक्षणसमासः । तृणादीनां, तथा दुष्ट्रवणाय, तथाऽन्तर्गत(भैशल्य)स्य उद्धरणार्थमिति प्रत्येकमुद्धरणशब्दः संवृद्धते । दुष्ट्रवणस्यान्तस्तुणाद्य-हरणार्थमित्यन्ते । षष्ठ्या विधानैरिति द्वितीयोक्तरपत्रपाणीचैरक्षाविधानान्तैः; इस्तंभूतलक्षणे तृतीया । जनु ग्रीवामूलं, जनुण ऊर्ध्वमूर्धजनु । प्राणादीत्यादिग्रहणाच्छरःकपालादिग्रह-णम् । उत्तरतत्रे प्रतिपादितकमप्राप्त्या ज्वरानन्तरमतीसारः पठितः, तस्यान्ते पाठेऽतिसारस्य सर्वाङ्गीणदोपारव्यत्तात्, अन्येपामपि तन्मध्यपाठेन सर्वाङ्गीणदोपारव्यत्तलप्रतिपादना-व्यतिक्रमं चदन्ति । शान्तिकर्मवलिहरणादिना ग्रहाणां देवादीनामुपशमो यस्तदर्थः; यदि वा ग्रहणं ग्रहो देवानामावेचास्तुदुपशमार्थम् । दुष्टस्तन्यग्रहसमुत्थितानामिति दुष्टस्तन्येन

१ ‘सर्वंशरीरावस्थितानां शीर्घादीनांमुपशमकरणार्थं ज्वरशोफगुच्छरक्तपित्तोन्मादापसार-प्रमेहादीसारादीनां च’ इति ता. । २ ‘देवदानव०’ इति ता. । ३ ‘विनायकनागग्रहोप-सृष्ट्येतसा’ इति ता. । ४ ‘विषवेगोपशमनार्थं’ इति ता. । ५ ‘शुक्राप्यायन०’ इति ता. । ६ ‘शुणादीनां शल्यान्तानां’ इति मु. । ७ ‘अन्ये तु तस्यान्ते पाठेन’ इति पा० । ८ ‘ग्रहणाद०’ इति मु. ।

Figure 4: A page of the 1939 *Bhānumati* edition, showing the variant readings in the footnotes.

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 Ḏalhaṇa. 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 4).

Ācārya noted in his introduction that the manuscripts containing Ḏalhaṇa's commentary all came together with the root-text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*, and thus the main *Suśrutasamhitā* text reflected the readings chosen by Ḏalhaṇa. 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 Ḏalhaṇa. In many of these cases it was hard to infer what readings 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.¹²⁷

There is compelling evidence that Cakrapāṇidatta's *Bhānumatī* commentary once covered the whole text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.¹²⁸ 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.¹²⁹

The Manuscripts

Our edition is based on the textual evidence of three manuscripts. All three were produced in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal and preserved in libraries there. Klebanov (2021a: §2.1) provided a comprehensive description of the individual manuscripts, quotes and 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

¹²⁷ Su 1939: 3–4. See discussion by Klebanov (2021b: 7).

¹²⁸ HIML: IA, 375.

¹²⁹ Cordier 1903: 332.



Figure 5: Folio 17r of MS Kathmandu Kaiser Library 699.

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 (Fig. 5) The MS has been preserved at the Kaiser Shamsher (KL) library in Kathmandu, accession number KL 699. It was microfilmed and catalogued by the NGMPP/ NGMCP as C 80-7.¹³⁰ The MS comprises 152 palm-leaf folios that originally belonged to several different codicological units written by different scribes.¹³¹ 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.¹³² The MS is incomplete and contains a large part of the *Suśrutasamhitā* as well as the *Sauśrutanighaṇṭu*.¹³³ The date stated in the colophon at the end of the compendium is verified for Sunday, April 13, 878 CE. However, some controversy is involved in interpreting the exact roles of two persons mentioned in the same concluding remarks, someone called 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

¹³⁰ See http://catalogue-old.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/C_80-7_Suśrutasamhitā (accessed on October 22, 2021).

¹³¹ Bhattacharai (2020: 46) and Klebanov (2021a: 11) agree that four to five scribes were involved in the manuscript's production.

¹³² 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 Bhattacharai (2020).

¹³³ Klebanov (2021a: 11) provided a detailed description of the content.



Figure 6: Folios 30r and 30v of MS Kathmandu National Archives 1-1079.

pawn. If the manuscript sat unused, it should be returned to Śrī Harṣacandra.¹³⁴

Siglum N (Fig. 6) This MS is kept at the National Archives Kathmandu (NAK), under accession number 1-1079 ट. It was microfilmed twice by the NGMPP as A 45-5(1) and A 1267-11(2).¹³⁵ 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 twelfth or thirteenth century.

Siglum H (Fig. 7) The MS belongs to the historical collection of Hemarāja Sarman (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.¹³⁶ The manuscript 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

¹³⁴ Klebanov (2021a: 13–17) gave a translation and study of the colophon, as well as an exposition of different positions related to its interpretation.

¹³⁵ See [http://ngmcp.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/A_45-5_\(Suśrutasamhitā\)](http://ngmcp.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/A_45-5_(Suśrutasamhitā)) (accessed on October 22, 2021)/

¹³⁶ See http://ngmcp.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/mediawiki/index.php/B_29-19_Suśrutasamhitā (accessed on October 22, 2021).




Figure 7: Folios 22v and 23r of MS Kathmandu National Archives 5-333.

per folio. The MS is exceptionally well-preserved and complete, containing the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* as well as the *Sauśrutanighaṇṭu*. 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 sixteenth 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, 1543 CE.

In future publications, palaeographical features of these witnesses will be described.

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.¹³⁷ MS NAK 5-333 was transcribed first because its script is relatively easy to read, the scans are clear, and it is the most complete of the manuscript witnesses. Following that, MS KL 699 and MS NAK 1-1079 were transcribed.

The diplomatic transcriptions were uploaded to Li's manuscript collation platform Saktumiva, chapter by chapter as they were completed. An electronic edition of the vulgate of the *Suśrutasamhitā*, that was transcribed, without the commentaries, by Tsutomu Yamashita and Yasutaka Muroya on the basis of Ācārya's 1931 and 1938 Bombay editions has also been included in the collation.¹³⁸

Saktumiva's collation function standardises punctuation and orthographic variants according to filters which can be turned off or on. These filters enable the editors to ignore दण्ड, numbers and पुष्पिका in the transcripts, as well as orthographic variants, such as ब and बः, certain germinated consonants, and विसर्ग 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 Dalhana were read, and variant readings reported by these commentators were included in notes to the edition. Also, various reference books were consulted, such as Nadkarni (1954) and V. Jośī and N. H. Jośī (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 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 software tools used in the project have been described on the project website.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ These guidelines are at <https://saktumiva.org/wiki/tei>, accessed 20/10/2021.

¹³⁸ This electronic edition is also available on the SARIT website; <https://sarit.indology.info/susrutasamhita.xml?view=div>, accessed 20/8/2021. The version at Saktumiva has received several corrections and the intention is to merge these back into the SARIT version eventually.

¹³⁹ <http://sushrutaproject.org>, consulted 15 September 2022.

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.¹⁴⁰ 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.¹⁴¹ 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 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 *Suśrutasamhitā* 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, ०वाचनस्यात्य०), although the *anusvāra* is sometimes

¹⁴⁰ 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.

¹⁴¹ See section 'Features of the Manuscript Transmission' for further discussion of this.

used (1.16.15, उदकं धान्याश०). In most cases, the consonant following a रेफ is doubled, but this is not always the case.¹⁴² 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 दण्ड at the end of a sentence or verse. Whether these *anusvāras* should be changed to the consonant म् is a moot question because there is no Pāṇinian concept of ‘end-of-sentence’ and his rules on *sandhi* are contingent on the close contact of sounds (*samhitā*). 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 म्. Nonetheless, this remains an assumption about how the text would be pronounced. Therefore, in a critical edition, inserting *dandas* and changing *anusvāras* to म् before them are subjective decisions by the editors. The scribal use of *dandas* and *anusvāras* in the Nepalese manuscripts can be seen in the digital edition if one switches off the filters for ignoring *dandas* 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.

Digital Edition

The editors are producing both printed and digital editions of the Nepalese *Suśrutasamhitā*. Since the print and digital environments differ markedly, each edition has its own format.

¹⁴² Examples of the germination of consonants are कर्ण (1.16.1 ff), मुहूर्त (1.16.2), पूर्व (1.16.2), गन्धव्य (1.16.5), ॐूले॒र् म्मधु० (1.16.5), वर्ति॑ (1.16.6) and पुनर्विघ्येत् (1.16.6). Examples where it does not occur in 1.16 are ॐार्थम् (1.16.8,19), कुर्यात् (1.16.16, 32), ॐपालि॑ व॒ष्ट्र० (1.16.10); ॐपालिव्यायोजिमः (1.16.10) and दीर्घेक० (1.16.10).

d **NE** **K** m kumārasya vāmañ kanyā
 pratanum sūcyā bahalam ārayā ||2||

(A: tataḥ N, H: pratanū)
 A: [ADD] picuvartīm A: [OM]
 A: praveśayet ||

Figure 8: The digital edition of SS.1.16.3

Instructions for reading the digital edition have been provided by Li at [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 intelligently truncates variants where possible.

For example, as seen in Figure 8, the apparatus for the words *pratanum sūcyā bahalam ārayā* is on the right side of the display. This entry means that the editors have chosen to read *pratanum*, which the reader must infer is attested by K, whereas A has *tataḥ* and N and H *pratanū*. Witness A has added the word *picuvartīm* after *tataḥ*, omitted *sūcyā bahalam*,¹⁴³ and has *praveśayet* instead of *ārayā*, which is attested by all of the Nepalese witnesses.

A popup on a dark background, as shown in Figure 8, displays the manuscript sigla for the witnesses that support the selected reading, which is labelled “NE” (“New Edition”). As seen in Figure 9, the positive apparatus of *pratanum sūcyā bahalam ārayā* appears in a pop-up window in which the lemma and variants are aligned according to letters, and the variations are highlighted in yellow. The positive apparatus can be expanded by highlighting one or more words, and even entire passages or verses, and clicking on the collapsed menu icon.

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.

¹⁴³ The omitted words are displayed by hovering the cursor over [OM] adjacent to A in the apparatus.

SP: pratanum	sūcyā bahalam ārayā
A: tataḥ [ADD] picuvartim [OM]	praveśayet
K: pratanum	sūcyā bahalam ārayā
N: pratanū	sūcyā bahalam ārayā
H: pratanū	sūcyā bahalam ārayā

Figure 9: The witnesses to a selected passage of SS.1.16.3

Printed Edition

The printed edition of SS.1.16 in this article has four layers of footnotes. The first layer reports the witnesses that have been collated. Line numbers and lemmata have been used to identify the witnesses that have been collated for a particular section of the text, as seen in the following example.

१–७ अथातः – ०विद्वलिङ्गम्] MSS K, H, and N

The above entry means that a textual passage beginning with अथातः on line 1 and ending with ०विद्वलिङ्गम् on line 7 is attested by manuscripts K, H and N. This layer also indicates passages that are missing or omitted in a particular witness.

The second layer of footnotes reports the variant readings of the Nepalese witnesses. This apparatus is negative, that is to say, only the testimony of the variant readings have been reported, and not that of the lemma. The following entry is an example of the apparatus' syntax:

५ प्रतनुं] प्रतनू N H

This entry means that on line five of the edition the editors have chosen to read प्रतनुं, instead of प्रतनू, which is attested by witnesses N and H. The reader can infer that प्रतनुं is attested by K because the first layer of footnotes indicate that K has been collated here. In prose passages, the lemmata and variants consist of corresponding words and, in verses, corresponding syllables. Emendations by the editors are indicated by the abbreviation *em.*, and omissions and suppletions in the witnesses are indicated by *om.* and *add.*, respectively. A wavy line under a letter means that it is unclear to the editors. If some text has been deleted by a scribe, it is underscored by double lines, and the scribe's substitution is appended in quotation marks.

There are small notational variations between the online digital edition and the printed edition presented here. For example, a scribal “crow’s foot” mark (काकपद), often indicating a marginal insertion, is displayed as

N: aneX]

in the digital edition, and as

१ अनेन] अने X N.

in print.

The third layer of footnotes contains the variant readings of the vulgate, which have been presented in the same format as the second layer. If a reading of the vulgate has been accepted by the editors against different readings in the Nepalese witnesses, the siglum for the vulgate (i.e., A) has been placed next to lemma in the second layer of footnotes.

The fourth layer of footnotes notes includes various testimonia and notes. The testimonia mainly consists of the variant readings noted by the commentators Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḟalhaṇa. Those known to Gayadāsa may be added in future publications. The notes include brief comments on certain emendations and editorial decisions. More elaborate discussions on such issues have been included in the annotations to the translation.

In the printed edition below, the numbering of passages has been adjusted to follow the text of the Nepalese version of the work. The numbering of the corresponding passages in the vulgate is presented in small digits in the right margin.

Critical Edition of Sūtrasthāna 16

अथातः कर्णव्यधविधिं व्याख्यास्यामः ॥ १ ॥

1.16.1

रक्षाभूषणनिमित्तम्बालस्य कर्णाणौ व्यधयेत्। तौ षष्ठे मासे सप्तमे वा शु-
क्रपक्षे प्रशस्तेषु तिथिकरणमुहूर्तनक्षत्रेषु कृतमङ्गलस्वस्तिवाचनं^१ धात्र्य-
ङ्के कुमारमुपवेश्याभिसान्त्वयमानो^२ भिषग्वामहस्तेनाकृष्ण कर्णन्दैवकृते
छिद्रे दक्षिणहस्तेन ऋजु विध्येत्। दक्षिणं कुमारस्य वामङ्गन्यायाः। प्रतनुं
सूच्या बहलमारया ॥ २ ॥

1.16.3

शोणितबहुत्वेऽतिवेदनायां चान्यदेशविद्धमिति जानीयात्। निरुपद्रवता
तदेशविद्धलिङ्गम् ॥ ३ ॥

1.16.4

तत्र यद्यच्छाविद्धायां सिरायामज्जेन ज्वरदाहश्वयथुवेदनाग्रन्थिमन्या-
स्तम्भापतानकशिरोग्रहकर्णशूलानि भवन्ति ॥ ४ ॥

1.16.5

Witnesses

१--८ अथातः--०विद्धलिङ्गम्] MSS K, H, and N

९ तत्र] MSS H and N. From here to the end of 1.16, MS K is missing a folio.

MS variants

१ व्याख्यास्यामः] व्या K. २ सप्तमे] om. N. ३ ०मङ्गलस्वस्तिवाचनं] A; ०मङ्गलं स्वस्तिवाचनं K, H, N. ३--४
धात्र्यङ्के] धात्र्यङ्को K. ४ कुमार] कुमारकम् N. ५ ऋजु] ज्ञुम् N H. ५ प्रतनुं] प्रतनू N H. ९ ०श्वयथु०] em.; ०श्वयथु० N; ०श्वयथु० H.

Variants from Su 1938

१ कर्णव्यधविधिं] कर्णव्यधवन्यविधिमध्यायं A. १ व्याख्यास्यामः] add. यथोवाच भगवान्यन्वन्तरिः॥ A. २ व्य-
धयेत्] विध्येते A. २ मासे] मासि A. ३--४ धात्र्यङ्के] add. कुमारधराङ्के वा A. ४ मुपवेश्याभिसान्त्वयमानो] उपवेश्य बालकीडनकैः प्रलोभ्याभिसान्त्वयन् A. ४ कर्णन्] कर्ण A. ५ छिद्रे] छिद्र A. ५ छिद्रे] add. आदि-
त्यकरावभासिते शनैः शनैर् A. ५ ऋजु] ज्ञु A ५ विध्येत्] add. प्रतनुकं सूच्या बहलमारया A. ५ कन्यायाः] कुमार्याः A. ६ आरया] add. ततः पिचुर्वर्ति प्रवेशयेत्॥ A. ७ बहुत्वे] बहुत्वेन A. ७ ऽतिवेदनायां] वेदनया A.
७ ०द्रवता] ०द्रवतया A. ८ ०विद्धलिङ्गम्] ०विद्धमिति A. ९ तत्र] तत्राज्ञान A. ९ यद्यच्छाविद्धायां] यद्यच्छावि-
द्धासु A. ९ सिरायाम्] सिरासु A. ९ सिरायाम्] add. कालिकामर्मरिकालोहितिकासूपद्रवा भवन्ति। तत्र कालिकायां A.
९ ज्वरो] ज्वरो ९ ०दाह०] दाहः ९ ०श्वयथु०] श्वयथु० A. ९ ०वेदना०] add. च भवति मर्मरिकायां वेदना ज्वरो A. ९ ०ग्रन्थि�०] ग्रन्थयश A. ९ ०ग्रन्थि�०] add. च लोहितिकायां A. १० भवन्ति] add. तेषु यथास्वं प्रतिकुर्वीत॥ क्षिणिजिह्वाप्रशस्तसूचीव्याधाद्वाटतरवर्तित्वाद् A.

Notes

^१The compound कृतमङ्गलस्वस्तिवाचनं is an emendation based on the similar text at 3.2.25 (Su 1938: 346).

^२The *ātmanepada* participle is a permitted form, although the vulgate has the *parasmaipada*. Dalhana, on 1.16.3 (Su 1938: 76), recorded the alternative reading भक्षयिशोर्वैर्वा before बालकीडनकैः प्रलोभ्य in the vulgate.

दोषसमुदयादप्रशस्तव्यधाद्वा तत्र वर्त्तिमपहृत्य यवमधुकमज्जिष्ठागन्ध-
र्वहस्तमूलैर्मधुघृतप्रगाढैरालेपयेत्। सुरुद्वैनम्पुनर्विध्येत्॥५॥^३

1.16.6

सम्यग्विद्वमामतैलपरिषेकेणोपचरेत्। अ्यहात्यहाद्वर्त्ति स्थूलतरीङ्^४
कुर्वीत परिषेकञ्च तमेव॥६॥

1.16.7

अथ व्यपगतदोषोपद्रवे कण्णैलंप्रवर्द्धनार्थं लघुप्रवर्द्धनकमामुच्चेत्
॥७॥

1.16.8

एवं सम्वर्द्धितः कण्णशिछद्यते तु द्विधा नृणाम्।
दोषतो वाभिघाताद्वा सन्धानान्तस्य मे शृणु॥८॥

1.16.9

तत्र समासेन पञ्चदशसन्धानाकृतयो भवन्ति।^५ तद्यथा। नेमीसन्धा-
नकः। उत्पलभेद्यकः। वल्लूरकः। आसज्जिमः। गण्डकण्णः। आहार्यः।
निर्वेधिमः। व्यायोजिमः। कपाटसन्धिकः। अर्द्धकपाटसन्धिकः। सङ्क-

MS variants

११--१२ ०गन्धर्वहस्तमूलैर्] ०गन्धर्वहस्तमूलै N. १३ ०परिषेकेणोप०] ०परिषेकेणोप० H. १३ ०तरीङ्] ०तरीं N
१५ लघुप्रवर्द्धनकम्] लूप्रवर्द्धनकम् N; प्रवर्द्धनकम् “मै” H. १५--१६ आमुच्चेत्] em.; मुच्चेत् N H. १७ नृणाम्]
नृणा N. १८] A; दोषटो N H. १९ ०सन्धाना०] ०सन्धा० N. २१ अर्द्धकपाटसन्धिकः] om. N.

Variants from Su 1938

११ वा] add. यत्र संरम्भो वेदना वा भवति A. ११ अपहृत्य] उपहृत्याशु A. ११--१२ यवमधुक०] मधुकैरण्डमूल०
A. ११--१२ ०मज्जिष्ठागन्धर्वहस्तमूलैर्] ०मज्जिष्ठायवतिलकलकैर् A. १२ आलेपयेत्] add. तावद्यावत्सुरुद्ध इति॥
A. १२ विध्येत्] add. विधानं तु पूर्वोक्तमेव॥ A. १३ सम्यग्०] तत्र सम्यग्० A. १३ आमतैलपरिषेकेणोपचरेत्]
आमतैलेन परिषेचयेत् A. १३ अ्यहाद्] add. च A. १३ ०तरीङ्] ०तरां A. १४ कुर्वीत] दद्यात् A. १५ उलंप्र-
वर्द्धनार्थं] om. A. १५ लघुप्रवर्द्धनकम्] लघुव० A. १५--१६ आमुच्चेत्] कुर्यात्॥ A. १७ सम्वर्द्धितः] विवर्द्धितः
A. १८ सन्धानान्] सन्धानं A. १९ ०दशसन्धानाकृतयो] ०दशकण्ठन्धाकृतयः A. १९ भवन्ति] om. A. २०
नेमी०] नेमि० A. २१ ०सन्धिकः। अर्द्ध०] ०सन्धिकोऽर्द्ध० A

Notes

^३Dalhaṇa, on 1.16.6 ([Su 1938:77](#)), stated that some do not read सुरुद्वैनम्पुनर्विध्येत्.

^४The unusual form स्थूलतरी is supported by both manuscripts and we have retained it in spite of only meagre evidence for the form in epic Sanskrit.

⁵Cakrapāṇidatta, on 1.16.9–13 ([Su 1939:128](#)), and Dalhaṇa, on 1.16.10 ([Su 1938:78](#)), pointed out that others read पञ्चदशकण्ठकृतयः (instead of पञ्चदशसन्धानाकृतयः). At the same place, Dalhaṇa also mentioned that some read समुन्नतसमोभयपालिः (instead of वृत्तायतसमोभयपालिर्) and others do not read संक्षिप्तादयः पञ्चासाध्याः.

सः। हीनकर्णः। वल्लीकर्णः। यष्टीकर्णः। काकौष्ठः। इति। तेषु तत्र
 पृथुलायतसमोभयपालिनैमीसन्धानकः। वृत्तायतसमोभयपालिरुत्पलभे-
 द्यकः। हस्ववृत्तसमोभयपालिर्वल्लूरकर्णकः। अभ्यन्तरदीर्घैकपालिरास-
 ज्ञिमः। बाह्यदीर्घैकपालिर्गण्डकर्णकः। अपालिरुभयतोऽप्याहार्यः। पी-
 ठोपमपालिनिर्वेधिमः। अणुस्थूलसमविषमपालिर्व्यायोजिमः। अभ्यन्त-
 २५ रदीर्घैकपालिरितराल्पपालिः कपाटसन्धिकः। बाह्यदीर्घैकपालिरितराल्प-
 पालिश्वार्द्धकपाटसन्धिकः। तत्रैते दशकर्णसन्धिविकल्पा बन्ध्या भवन्ति।
 तेषाम्नामभिरेवाकृतयः प्रायेण व्याख्याताः। संक्षिप्तादयः पञ्चासाध्याः। तत्र
 ३० शुष्कशाष्कुलिरितराल्पपालिः संक्षिप्तः। अनधिष्ठानपालिः पर्यन्तयोश्च क्षी-
 णमांसो हीनकर्णः। तनुविषमपालिर्वल्लीकर्णः। ग्रन्थितमांसः स्तब्धसि-
 राततसूक्ष्मपालिर्यष्टीकर्णः। निर्माससंक्षिप्ताग्राल्पशोणितपालिः काकौष्ठ
 इति। बद्धेष्वपि दाहपाकस्नावशोफयुक्ता न सिद्धिमुपयान्ति ॥९॥^६

1.16.10

MS variants

२२ काकौष्ठः] काकौष्ठः H. २२ इति] ति H. २३ ०यतसमो०] A; ०यसमो० H; ०तसमो N. २४ ०भेदकः] ०भेद्यः N; ०भेदकः H. २४ वल्लूर०] वल्लूर० N. २५ बाह्य] A; बाह्यैक N H. २६ अणुस्थूल०] अशुस्थूल० H
 २७ कपाट०] कवाटा० H. २८ चार्द्धकपाट०] em.; चार्द्धकवाट० H; चार्द्धकवाप० N. ३० पर्यन्तयोश्च] om. N.
 ३१ ग्रन्थितमांसः] ०ग्रन्थितमान्सः] N H. ३२ निर्मास०] A; निर्मास० N; निर्मान्स० H. ३३ ०म्नाव०] ०श्राव० H.
 ३३ ०शोफ०] ०सोफ० N.

Variants from Su 1938

२२ यष्टी०] यष्टि० A. २२ काकौष्ठः] काकौष्ठक A. २२ तत्र] om. A. २३ नैमी०] नैमि० A. २४ वल्लूर०] वल्लूरकः A. २५-२६ पीठोपमपालिर्] add. उभयतः क्षीणपुत्रिकाश्रितो A. २६ अणुस्थूल०] स्थूलाणु० A. २८ चार्द्ध०] अर्ध० A. २८ तत्रैते] तत्र A. २८ दशकर्णसन्धिविकल्पा] दशैते कर्णवन्धिविकल्पाः A. २८ बन्ध्या भवन्ति] साध्याः A. २९ तेषान्] तेषां A. २९ नामाभिर्] स्वनामाभिर् A. ३० शुष्कशाष्कुलिर्] add. उत्सन्धपालिर् A. ३० च] om. A. ३१ ०घमपालिर्] ०घमाल्पपालिर् A. ३१ ग्रन्थितमांसः] ग्रन्थितमान्स० A. ३१-३२ ०सिराततसूक्ष्म०] ०सिरासंततसूक्ष्म० A. ३२ काकौष्ठ] काकौष्ठक A. ३३ अपि] add. तु शोफ A. ३३ ०दह०] add. ०राग० A. ३३ ०पाक०] add. ०पिङ्कग० A. ३३ ०शोफ०] om. A. ३४ inserted passage] भवन्ति चात्र। यस्य पालिद्वयमपि कर्णस्य न भवेदिह। कर्णपीठं समे मध्ये तस्य विद्धा विवर्धयेत्॥ बाह्यायामिह दीर्घायां सन्धिराभ्यन्तरो भवेत्। आभ्यन्तरायां दीर्घायां बाह्यसन्धिरुदाहृतः॥ एकैव तु भवेत्पालिः स्थूला पृथ्वी स्थिरा च या। तां द्विया पाटयित्वा तु छित्त्वा चोपरि सन्धयेत्॥ A.

Notes

^६The vulgate passage inserted between 9 and 10 (from भवन्ति चात्र to शास्त्रवित्) was probably also absent in the version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* commented on by Cakrapāni, who cited it in his commentary as being “read by some” in regard to the joins (सन्धान) that they describe (1.16.9-13 (*Su* 1939: 128)).

अतोऽन्यतमस्य बन्धन्विकीर्षुः अग्रोपहरणीयोक्तोपसमृतसम्भारः
 विशेषतश्चात्रोपहरेत्^७ सुरामण्डक्षीरमुदकं धान्यामूकपालचूर्णंश्चेति। त-
 तोऽज्ञनां पुरुषम्वा ग्रथितकेशान्तं लघुभुक्तवन्तमासैः सुपरिगृहीतं च कृत्वा
 बन्धानुपधार्य छेद्यभेदलेख्यव्यधनैरुपपाद्य कर्णशोणितमवेक्ष्यैतद्वृष्टमदु-
 ष्टम्वेति ततो वातदुष्टे धान्यामूलोदकाभ्यां पित्तदुष्टे शीतोदकपयोभ्यां श्लेष्मदुष्टे
 सुरामण्डोदकाभ्यां प्रक्षाल्य कर्णम्पुनरवलिखेत्। अनुन्नतमहीनमविषमञ्च
 कर्णसन्धिन्निवेश्य स्थितरक्तं सन्दर्श्य मधुघृतेनाभ्यज्य पिचुप्लोतयोरन्य-
 तरेणावगुण्ठ्य नातिगाढन्नातिशिथिलं सूत्रेणावबध्य कपालचूर्णेनावकी-
 र्याचारिकमुपदिशेत्। द्वित्रणीयोक्तेन चान्नेनोपचरेत् ॥ १० ॥

1.16.15

४५

विघट्नन्दिवास्वप्नं व्यायाममतिभोजनम् ।
 व्यवायमग्निसन्तापम्वाकश्रमञ्च विवर्जयेत् ॥ ११ ॥

1.16.16

नातिशुद्धरक्तमतिप्रवृत्तरक्तं क्षीणरक्तं वा सन्दध्यात्। स हि वातदुष्टे

MS variants

३५] ततो N. ३५ ०पहरणीयो०] ०पसंहरणीयो० N. ३६ चात्रोपहरेत्] A; चाग्रोपहरणीयात् N H. ३७ पुरुषम्]
 पुरुषज्[N. ३७ च कृत्वा] A; om. N H. ३८ उपधार्य] उपपाद्य H. ३८ ०शोणितमवेक्ष्यैतद्] ०शोणितत अवेक्ष्येतद्
 N. ३८-३९ अदुष्टम्] अदुष्टश् N. ३९ वेति] A; चेति N H. ३९ धान्यामूलो० N ३९ शीतोदक०]
 शीतोदको० N. ४० अवलिखेत्] अवलिखेत N. ४१ ०सन्धिन्] ०सन्धिं N ४१-४२ ०गुण्ठ्य] ०गुण्ठ्यो H. ४२
 ०गाढन्] ०गाढं N. ४२ ०वध्य] ०वद्ध N. ४३ चान्नेनोपचरेत्] उपपोचरेत् N. ४३ ॥ १० ॥] add. भ N. ४४
 विघट्नन्] विघट्नं N. ४५ अग्निसन्तापम्] आग्निसन्ताप N. ४५ विवर्जयेत्] वर्जयेत् N. ४६ ०शुद्ध०] ०सुद्ध०
 N. ४६ ०वृत्तरक्तं] ०वृत्तं रक्तं N.

Variants from Su 1938

३५ अतोऽन्यतमस्य] ऽन्यतमं A. ३५ ०सम्भारः] ०सम्भारं A. ३६ सुरामण्डक्षीरम्] सुरामण्डक्षीरम् A. ३६
 धान्यामूकपाल०] धान्यामूंकपाल० A. ३८ बन्धान्] बन्धम् A. ३८ ०व्यधनैर्] add. उपपन्नैर् A. ३८ अवेक्ष्यैतद्]
 अवेक्ष्य A. ३९ ततो] तत्र A. ३९ धान्यामूलोदकां] धान्यामूलोदकां A. ४० ०मण्डोदकां] ०मण्डोदकां A.
 ४० कर्णम्] कर्णी A. ४० अवलिखेत्] अनुन्नतम्] अवलिख्यानुन्नतम् A. ४१ ०सन्धिन्] ०सन्धिं A ४१ निवेश्य]
 सन्धिन्निवेश्य A. ४१ सन्दर्श्य] सन्दध्यात् A. ४१ सन्दर्श्य] add. ततो A. ४२ नातिगाढन्] सूत्रेणानवगाढमन् A.
 ४२ नातिं] अतिं A. ४२ सूत्रेणावबध्य] च बद्धा A. ४३ चान्नेनोपचरेत्] च विधानेनोपचरेत् A. ४३ ॥ १० ॥]
 add. भवति चात्रा। A. ४४ विघट्नन्] विघट्नं A. ४६ नातिं] न चाशु० A.

Notes

^७विशेषतश्चात्रोपहरणीयात् of the MSS has been emended to विशेषतश्चात्रोपहरेत् to make sense of the list of ingredients, which is in the accusative case. Also, the repetition of अग्रोपहरणीयात् in the Nepalese version suggests that its second occurrence, which does not make good sense here, is a dittographic error.

रक्तबद्धोऽरुद्धो परिपुटनवान्भवति। पित्तदुष्टे गाढपाकरागवान्। श्लेष्मदुष्टे
स्तब्धकण्णः कण्डूमानतिप्रवृत्तस्नावः शोफवान्क्षीणाल्पमांसो न वृद्धिमु-
पैति ॥ १२ ॥

1.16.17

५० स यदा रुद्धो निरुपद्रवः कण्णो भवति तदैनं शनैः शनैरभिवर्द्धयेत्।
अन्यथा संरम्भदाहपाकवेदनावान्भवति। पुनरपि छिद्येत् ॥ १३ ॥

1.16.18

अथाप्रदुष्टस्याभिवर्द्धनार्थमभ्यङ्गः। गोधाप्रतुदविष्करानूपौदकवसाम-
ज्जापयस्तैलं गौरसर्षपजञ्च यथालाभं संभृत्याकार्लक्बलातिवलानन्तावि-
दारीमधुकजलशूकप्रतिवापन्तैलम्पाचयित्वा स्वनुगुप्तन्निदध्यात् ॥ १४ ॥^c

1.16.19

५५ स्वेदितो मर्दितङ्कण्णमनेन म्रक्षयेद्दुधः।
ततोऽनुपद्रवः सम्यग्बलवांश्च विवर्द्धते ॥ १५ ॥⁹

1.16.20

MS variants

४७ रक्तबद्धोऽरुद्धो] em.; रक्तबद्धो रुद्धो N; रक्तबद्धो H. ४७ ०पुटनवान्] ०पुटवाम् N; ०पुटनवाम् H. ४७ ०दु-
ष्टे] ०दुष्टैN. ४७ श्लेष्म०] श्लेष० N. ४८ ०कण्णः] ०वण्णः N. ४८ ०स्नावः] ०श्वावः H. ४८ क्षीणाल्प०] क्षीणो
ल्प० N. ५० रुद्धो] रुद्धो N. ५१ ०पाकवेदनावान्] ०पाकरागवेदनावान् N; ०पाकवेदनावाम् H. ५२ अथाप्र०]
अथास्या प्र० H. ५२ ०दुष्टस्याभिवर्द्धनार्थम्] ०दुष्टस्याविवर्धनार्थम् N. ५३-५४ ०आकार्लक्बलातिं०] ०आकार्लक-
बलातिं० N. ५३-५४ ०प्रतिवापन्] ०प्रतिवापं N. ५४ ०गुप्तन्] ०गुप्तं N. ५४ निदध्यात्] निदध्यात् N. ५५
स्वेदितो] स्वेदितो N. ५५ अनेन] अने X N. ५६ ततोऽनुपद्रवः] ततो नुपद्रवः H; ततो नुपद्रवम् N.

Variants from Su 1938

४७ रक्तबद्धोऽरुद्धो] रक्ते रुद्धोपि A. ४७ भवति] om. A. ४७ गाढपाकरागवेदनावान् A. ४८
स्तब्ध०] स्तब्धः A. ४८ ०वृत्तस्नावः शोफवान्] ०वृत्तरक्ते श्यावशोफवान् A. ४८ क्षीणाल्प०] क्षीणोऽल्प० A. ५०
inserted passage] आमतैलेन त्रिरात्रं परिषेचयत्तिरात्राच्च पिञ्च परिवर्तयेत्। A. ५० रुद्धो] सुरुद्धो A. ५० कण्णो]
सवर्णो A. ५१ अन्यथा] अतोऽन्यथा A. ५१ ०पाकवेदनावान्] ०पाकरागवेदनावान् A. ५१ भवति] om. A. ५१
अपि] om. A. ५१ छिद्येत्] छिद्यते वा A. ५२ अथाप्र०] अथास्याप्र० A. ५२ अभ्यङ्गः] add. तद्यथा A. ५२-
५३ ०मज्जापयस्तैलं] ०मज्जानौ पयः सर्पिस्तैलं A. ५३-५४ ०बलानन्ताऽ] ०बलानन्तापामार्गश्वगन्धा A. ५३-५४
०विदारीमधुकजलशूक०] ०विदारिगन्धाक्षीरशुक्राजलशूकमधुरवर्गपयस्या० ५३-५४ ०प्रतिवापन्] ०प्रतिवापं A. ५४
तैलम्] add. वा A. ५४ ०गुप्तन्] ०गुप्तं A. ५५ स्वेदितो मर्दितङ्क] स्वेदितोन्मर्दितं A. ५५ अनेन म्रक्षयेद्दुधः] स्वेनैतैन योजयेत् A.

Notes

^cDalhaṇa, on 1.16.19 (Su 1938: 79), noted that some read राजसर्षपजं in the place of गौरसर्षपजं. This reading appears to have been accepted by Cakrapāṇi, who glossed राजसर्षपज as श्वेतसर्षप (1.16.18-20 (Su 1939: 130)). Cakrapāṇi also said that some read sarpis in the place of पयस. In the compound beginning with अर्क, Dalhaṇa noted that some read अर्कपुष्टी.

⁹N has a काकपाद after अने, but the missing letter (one would expect 'न') has not been supplied in a margin or elsewhere.

ये तु कण्णा न वर्द्धन्ते स्नेहस्वेदोपपादिताः।
तेषामपाङ्गे त्वबहिः कुर्यात्प्रछानमेव च ॥ १६ ॥ ^{१०}

1.16.22cd--23ab

अमिताः कण्णबन्धास्तु विज्ञेयाः कुशलैरिह ।
यो यथा सुनिविष्टः स्यात्तत्था योजयेद्द्विषक् ॥ १७ ॥ ^{११}

६०

1.16.26.1

जातरोमा सुवर्त्मा च श्लिष्टसन्धिः समः स्थिरः ।
सुरुद्गोऽवेदनो यस्तु तं कण्णं वर्द्धयेच्छनैः ॥ १८ ॥

1.16.25

MS variants

^{५८} अबहिः] अवर्हि N. ^{५८} कुर्यात्] कुयात् N. ^{५८} प्रछानम्] प्रछन्नम् H. ^{५९} ०वन्धास्] ०वन्धो H. ^{५९} तु] स्तु H. ^{६०} योजयेद्] योजये N. ^{६१} सुवर्त्मा] सुपर्त्मा N; सुवर्त्मा H. ^{६१} ०सन्धिः] ०सन्धिम् N. ^{६२} तु] em.; तत् N H.

Variants from Su 1938

^{५७} inserted passage] यवाश्वगन्धायष्टाहौस्तिलैश्चोद्वर्तनं हितम्। शतावर्यश्वगन्धाभ्यां पयस्यैरण्डजीवनैः ॥ तैलं विपकं सक्षीरमध्यज्ञात्यालिवर्धनम्। A. ^{५७} स्नेहस्वेदोप०] स्वेदस्वेहोप० A. ^{५८} अपाङ्गे त्वबहिः] अपाङ्गदेशे तु A. ^{५८} च] तु A. ^{५९} inserted passage] बाद्यच्छेदं न कुर्वत व्यापदः स्युस्ततो ध्रुवाः ॥ बद्धमात्रं तु यः कर्णं सहसैवाभिवर्धयेत्। आमकोशी समाधातः क्षिप्रमेव विमुच्यते ॥ A. ^{६०} सुनिविष्टः] सुविशिष्टः A. ^{६०} स्यात्] तं A. ^{६०} योजयेद्द्विषक्] विनियोजयेत् A. ^{६०} inserted passage] (कर्णपाल्यामयान्नां पुनर्वश्यामि सुश्रुत !)। कर्णपाल्यां प्रकुपिता वातपित्तकफाक्षयः ॥ १ ॥ द्विधा वाऽप्यथ संसृष्टाः कुर्वन्ति विविधा रूजः। विस्कोटः स्तव्यता शोफः पाल्यां दोषे तु वातिके दाहविस्फोटजननं शोफः पाकश्च पैत्तिके। कण्डूः सश्यथुः स्तम्भो गुरुत्वं च कफात्मके ॥ ३ ॥ यथादोषं च संशोध्य कुर्यात्तेषां चिकित्सितम्। स्वेदाभ्यज्ञपरीषेकैः प्रलेपासुनिविष्टाणैः ॥ ४ ॥ मृद्दीं क्रियां वृहणीयैर्यथास्वं भोजनैस्तथा। य एवं वेत्ति दोषाणां चिकित्सां कर्तुमहति ॥ ५ ॥ अत ऊर्ध्वं नामलिङ्गैर्वक्ष्ये पाल्यामुपद्रवान्॥ अत्पाटकश्चोत्पुटकः इयावः कण्डूयुतो भृशम्॥ ६ ॥ अवमन्थः सकण्डुको ग्रन्थिको जम्बुलस्तथा॥ स्नावी च दाहवांशैव शृणवेषां क्रमशः क्रियाम्॥ ७ ॥ अपामार्गः सर्जरसः पाटलालकुचत्वचौ ॥ उत्पाटके प्रलेपः स्यात्तैलमेभिश्च पाचयेत्॥ ८ ॥ शम्पाकशिशुपूतीकान्नोदामेदोऽथ तद्वस्ताम्॥ वाराहं गव्यमैषेण पित्तं सर्पिशं संसृजेत्॥ ९ ॥ लेपमुत्पुटके दयात्तैलमेभिश्च साधितम्॥ गौरीं सुगन्ध्यां सश्यामामनन्तां तण्डुलीयकम्॥ १० ॥ इयावे प्रलेपनं दयात्तैलम् एभिश्च साधितम्॥ पाठां रसाङ्गनं क्षीद्रं तथा स्यादुष्णाकाञ्जिकम्॥ ११ ॥ दयाल्लेपं सकण्डुके तैलमेभिश्च साधितम्॥ ब्रणीभूतस्य देयं स्यादिदं तैलं विजानता ॥ १२ ॥ मधुकक्षीरकाकोलीजीवकार्यैविपाचितम्॥ गोधावराहस्यपाणां वसाः स्युः कृतवृंहणे ॥ १३ ॥ प्रलेपनमिदं दयादवसिच्यावमन्थके॥ प्रपौण्डरीकं मधुकं समझां ध्वमेव च ॥ १४ ॥ तैलमेभिश्च संपकं शृणु कण्डूमतः क्रियाम्॥ सहदेवा विश्वदेवा अजाक्षीरं ससैन्यवमेतरालेपनं दयात्तैलम् एभिश्च साधितम्॥ १५ ॥ ग्रन्थिके गुटिकां पूर्वं स्नावयेदवपाट्य तु ॥ ततः सैन्यवच्चर्णं तु घृष्णा लेपं प्रदापयेत्॥ १६ ॥ लिखित्वा तत्त्वतं घृष्णा चूर्णैर्लोधस्य जम्बुले॥ क्षीरेण प्रतिसायैनं शुद्धं संरोपयेत्ततः ॥ १७ ॥ मधुपर्णी मधुकं च म मधुकं मधुना सह ॥ लेपः स्नाविणि दातव्यस्तैलमेभिश्च साधितम्॥ १८ ॥ पञ्चवल्कैः समधुकैः पिष्टैस्तैश्च धृतान्वितैः ॥ जीवकार्यैः सर्पिष्कैर्दद्यमानं प्रलेपयेत्॥ १९ ॥) A. ^{६२} यस्तु] च A.

Notes

^{१०} Dalhana, on 1.16.23 (Su 1938: 80), noted that some read तेषामपाङ्गच्छेद्यं हि कार्यमाभ्यन्तरं भवेत्.

^{११} Dalhana, on 1.16.26 (Su 1938: 80), stated that some read सुनिविष्टः (i.e., the reading of the Nepalese version) instead of सुविशिष्टः.

विश्वेषितायामथ नासिकायां
वक्ष्यामि सन्धानविधिं यथावत् ।
नासाप्रमाणं पृथिवीरुहाणां
पत्रं गृहीत्वा त्ववलम्बि तस्य ॥ १९ ॥ १२

६५

1.16.27

तेन प्रमाणेन हि गण्डपार्श्वाद्
उत्कृत्य वद्रं त्वथ नासिकाग्रम् ।
विलिख्य चाशु प्रतिसन्दधीत
तं साधुबद्धमिषगप्रमत्तः ॥ २० ॥

७०

1.16.28

सुसीवितं सम्यगतो यथावन्
नाडीद्वयेनाभिसमीक्ष्य नह्येत् ।
उन्नामयित्वा त्वचूर्ण्यीत
पत्ताङ्गयष्टीमधुकाङ्गनैश्च ॥ २१ ॥

1.16.29

७५

संछाद्य सम्यक्षिप्तचुना ब्रणन्तु
तैलेन सिञ्चेदसकृत्तिलानाम् ।
घृतञ्च पात्यः स नरः सुजीण्णे
स्त्रिग्धो विरेच्यः स्वयथोपदेशाम् ॥ २२ ॥

1.16.30

MS variants

६३ नासिकायां] नासिकाया N. ६५ प्रमाणं] प्रमाण० N. ६५ वीरुहाणां] वीरुहाणम् N. ६६ पत्रं] पत्र N.
६८ वद्रं] वन्ध H. ७० बद्धम्] बद्ध० N. ७१ सुसीवितं] em.; सुसीवित N; सुशीवित H. ७४ पत्ताङ्ग०] em.;
पत्ताङ्ग० H; पत्ताङ्ग० N. ७५ ब्रणन्तु] ब्रण तुन N. ७८ विरेच्यः] A; विरेच्य N H. ७८ देशम्] देशः N.

Variants from Su 1938

६३ विश्वेषितायाम्] विश्वेषितायास्त्व A. ६३ नासिकायां] नासिकाया A. ६८ वद्रं] बद्रं A. ७० तं] तत् A. ७०
बद्धम्] बन्धैर् A. ७१ सुसीवितं] सुसीवित A. ७२ नह्येत्] बद्धा A. ७३ उन्नामयित्वा] प्रोन्नम्य चैनाम A. ७३
अवचूर्ण्यीत] अवचूर्ण्येत् ७४ पत्ताङ्ग०] पत्ताङ्ग० A. ७५ ब्रणन्तु] सितेन A. ७८ स्वयथो०] स यथो० A.

Notes

^{१२}Cakrapāṇidatta, on 1.16.26 (Su 1939: 133), said that others read नासासन्धानविधिम् here. Dala-hana, on 1.16.27–31 (Su 1938: 81), stated that some read, छिन्नां तु नासिकां द्वावयःस्थस्य शरीरिणः। नासानुरूपं संच्छिद्य पत्रं गण्डे निवेशयेत्॥

८०

रुदच्च सन्धानमुपागतं वै
 तद्वधशेषं तु पुनर्निकृन्तेत्।
 हीनम्पुनवद्वयितुं यतेत
 समच्च कुर्यादितिवृद्धमांसम् ॥ २३ ॥

1.16.31

इति ओम्॥

MS variants

७९ सन्धानम्] सन्धाम् N. ७९ उपागतं] उपागतश् H. ७९ वै] चै H. ८० शेषं] ०सेषन् N. ८१ यतेत्]
 यतेतः N. ८२ ०मांसम्] ०मान्सम् N. ८३ ओम्] om. N.

Variants from Su 1938

७९ वै] स्यात् A. ८० तद्वध०] तदर्थ० A ८१ हीनम्] हीनां A. ८२ समज्] समां A. ८२ ०मांसम्] ०मांसाम्
 A. ८३ ओम्] om. A. ८४ inserted passage] नाडीयोगं विनौष्ठस्य नासासन्धानवद्वयिम्। य एवमेव जानीयात्स
 राज्ञः कर्तुमहति॥ A.

Translation of Sūtrasthāna 16

- 1 Now we shall expound the method for piercing the ear.¹⁴⁴
- 2 One may pierce a child's ears for the purpose of preserving and decorating. During the bright fortnight, when the child is in the sixth or seventh month, 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,¹⁴⁵ on the lap of a wet-nurse.¹⁴⁶ Then, he should pull the ear with his left hand and pierce

¹⁴⁴ The topic of piercing the ear (कन्धनव्यध) is not discussed in the *Carakasamhitā* (HIML: IB, 326, n. 175), but it is mentioned in some texts that followed the *Suśrutasamhitā*, such as the *Kaśipyasamhitā* (HIML: IIA, 30). Also, the instrument for piercing the ear is described in the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā* 1.26.26 (Ah 1939: 321). In the versions of the text known to Ḏalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) and Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 125), the heading of this chapter is “the method of piercing and joining the ear” (कर्णव्यधबन्धविधि), instead of the Nepalese version’s “the method of piercing the ear” (कर्णव्यधविधि). The topic of joining the ear (कर्णबन्ध) 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. Ḏalhaṇa (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).

Some texts use the adjective कर्ण-वेघनी rather than व्यधनी.

¹⁴⁵ The causative form व्यधयेत् is known in Classical Sanskrit (Whitney 1885: 166).

The compound कृतमङ्गलस्वस्तिवाचनं “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.

¹⁴⁶ The versions of 1.16.3 known to Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 126) and Ḏalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) have the additional compound कुमारधराङ्के (“on the lap of one who holds the child”) after धात्र्यङ्के. The gender of कुमारधर is made clear by Ḏalhaṇa’s gloss “a man who holds the child.” Also, both versions add बालकीडनकैः प्रलोभ्य (“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 Ḏalhaṇa on 1.16.3 (Su 1938: 76), the toys include replica elephants, horses, bulls and parrots. Ḏalhaṇa further mentions that others read भक्ष्यविशेषैर् वा (“or by special treats”) before बालकीडनकैः; but we see no trace of these small kindnesses in our witnesses.

straight through with his right hand at a naturally-occurring cleft.¹⁴⁷ For a boy, do the right ear first; for a girl, do the left one. Use a needle on a thin ear; an awl on a thick one.¹⁴⁸

- 3 One may know that it was pierced in the wrong place if there is excess blood or too much pain. The absence of side-effects is a sign that it has been pierced in the right place.¹⁴⁹
- 4 In this context, if an ignorant person randomly pierces a duct there will be fever, burning, swelling, pain, lumps, paralysis of the nape of the neck, convulsions, headache or sharp pain in the ear.¹⁵⁰
- 5 Having removed the wick (वर्ति) because of the accumulation of humours or an unsatisfactory piercing at that location,¹⁵¹ he should smear

¹⁴⁷ The versions of 1.16.3 of Cakrapāṇidatta ([Su 1939: 126](#)) and Ḏalhaṇa ([Su 1938: 76](#)) add that this naturally-occurring cleft is illuminated by a ray of sunshine (आदित्यकरावभासिते).

The syntax of this slightly long sentence is unusual in beginning with the dual object तौ “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.

¹⁴⁸ Ḏalhaṇa 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” (*Lakṣmaṇatippanaka*) 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 *Suśrutasanhitā* that was available to Ḏalhaṇa in twelfth-century Bengal. See Meulenbeld ([HIML: IA, 386](#)).

¹⁴⁹ 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.

¹⁵⁰ This passage is significantly augmented in Cakrapāṇidatta’s and Ḏalhaṇa’s versions, to outline the specific problems caused by piercing three ducts called कालिका, मर्मिका and लोहितिका (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: ‘लोहितिका, मर्मिका 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 लोहितिका. Pain and lumps are thought to arise from piercing मर्मिका. Piercing कालिका gives rise to swelling, fever and burning.’

¹⁵¹ In addition to these reasons, 1.16.6 of Ḏalhaṇa at 1.16.6 ([Su 1938: 77](#)), added “because of piercing with a painful, crooked and unsatisfactory needle” (क्रियजिह्वाप्रशस्तसूचीव्यधात) and “because of a wick that is too thick” (गाढतरवर्तित्वात). Ḏalhaṇa was aware of

it with barley, liquorice, Indian madder, and the root of the castor oil tree, thickened with honey and ghee. And when it has healed well, he should pierce it again.¹⁵²

- 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 and do the very same sprinkling.
- 7 Once the ear is free from humours or side-effects, one should put in a light dilator (प्रवर्धनक) in order to enlarge it enough.¹⁵³
- 8 *A person's ear enlarged in this way can split in two, either as a result of the humours¹⁵⁴ or a blow.*

Listen to me about the ways of joining it can have.

- 9 Here, there are, in brief, fifteen ways of mending the ear flap.¹⁵⁵ They are as follows: Rim-join (नेमीसन्धानक), Lotus-splittable (उत्पलभेद्यक), Dried Flesh (वल्लूरक), Fastening (आसङ्गिम), Cheek-ear (गण्डकर्ण), Take away (आहार्य), Ready-Split (निर्विधिम), Multi-joins (व्यायोजिम), Door-hinge (कपाटसन्धिक), Half door-hinge (अर्धकपाटसन्धिक), Compressed (संक्षिप्त), Reduced-ear (हीनकर्ण), Creeper-ear (वल्लीकर्ण), Stick-ear (यष्टीकर्ण), and

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 accumulation (समुदाय), see the important analysis by Meulenbeld (1992).

¹⁵² 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.

¹⁵³ Cakrapāṇidatta on 1.16.6 (Su 1939: 127) and Dalhana 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, the neem tree and the cotton plant. Dalhana added that it can also be made of lead and should have the shape of the datura flower. The manuscripts have variant readings for लघुप्रवर्धनकम् आमुच्चेत् at this point that include a scribal emendation, none of which construe plausibly. It is possible that the unusual verb form आ+√मुच् puzzled the scribes and caused the implausible scribal readings and emendations.

¹⁵⁴ Dalhana on 1.16.9 (Su 1938: 77) notes that the word दोष here can refer to either a humour, such as wind, as we have understood it, or a disease generated from a humour.

¹⁵⁵ The Nepalese version uses the word सन्धान 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 Dalhana’s version (Su 1938: 77) uses the term बन्ध here and at the very beginning of the chapter (i.e., 1.16.1) to introduce the topic of repairing the ear.

Crow's lip (काकोष).¹⁵⁶

In this context, among these,

- Rim-join: both flaps are wide, long, and equal.
- Lotus-splittable: both flaps are round, long, and equal.
- Dried flesh: both flaps are short, round, and equal.
- Fastening: one flap is longer on the inside.
- Cheek-ear: one flap is longer on the outside.¹⁵⁷
- Take-away: the flaps are missing, in fact, on both sides.
- Ready-split: the flaps are like a dais (पीठ).
- Multi-joins: one flap is small, the other thick, one flap is equal, the other unequal.
- Door-hinge: the flap on the inside is long, the other is small.
- Half door-hinge: the flap on the outside is long, the other is small.

These ten options for joins of the ear should be bound. They can mostly be explained as resembling their names.¹⁵⁸ The five from compressed (संक्षिप्त) on are incurable.¹⁵⁹ 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 flesh and the flaps are stretched thin and have stiff ducts. “Crow-lip” has a flap without flesh with compressed tips and little blood. Even when they are bound up, they do not heal because they are hot, inflamed, suppurating, or swollen.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁶ 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).

¹⁵⁷ For an artist's impression of this join, see Majno 1975: 291 (reproduced as Figure 3.3 in Wujastyk 2003: 155).

¹⁵⁸ Cakrapānidatta on 1.16.9–13 (Su 1939: 128–129) and Dalhaṇa 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 (नेमीसन्धानक) is similar to the join of the rim of a wheel (चक्रधारा).

¹⁵⁹ Dalhaṇa 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.

¹⁶⁰ The version of 1.16.11–13 known to Dalhaṇa (Su 1938: 78) has four verses (श्लोक) 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 *Suśrutasamhitā* known to Cakrapāṇi-

- 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.¹⁶¹ And in this regard, he should particularly gather¹⁶² decanted liquor (सुरामण्ड), milk, water, fermented rice-water, and powdered earthenware crockery (कपालचूर्ण).¹⁶³ 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 and then applies them by means of cutting, splitting, scarification, or piercing.¹⁶⁴ Next, he should examine the blood of the ear to know whether it is tainted or not. If it is tainted by wind, the ear should be bathed with fermented rice-water and water; if tainted by choler, then cold water and milk should be used; if tainted by phlegm, then decanted liquor and water should be used, and then he should scarify it again.
- 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 and gauze (लोत), 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 (आचारिक). And he should supplement

datta. He cites the verses separately in his commentary, the *Bhānumatī* (Su 1939: 128–129), introducing each one as ‘some people read’ (के चित्पठन्ति). However, in Trikamajī Ācārya’s edition of the *Sūtrasthāna* of the *Bhānumatī*, the root text is largely identical to the one commented on by Dalhaṇa (Su 1938), even in instances like this where Cakrapānidatta’s commentary indicates that he was reading a different version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. See further the discussion on p. 9 above.

¹⁶¹ *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 1.5 (Su 1938: 18–23), probably verse 6 especially that lists the equipment and medications that a surgeon should have ready.

¹⁶² The reading in the Nepalese manuscripts of विशेषतश्चात्रोपहर्णीयात् has been emended to विशेषतश्चात्रोपहरेत् to make sense of the list of ingredients, which is in the accusative case. Also, the repetition of अयोपहरणीयात् in the Nepalese version suggests that its second occurrence, which does not make good sense here, is a dittographic error.

¹⁶³ The term कपालचूर्ण is unusual. Dalhaṇa (Su 1938: 79) defines it as the powder of fragments of fresh earthen pots and Cakrapānidatta (Su 1939: 129) as the powder of earthenware vessels.

¹⁶⁴ There are syntactic difficulties in this sentence. We have adopted the reading in Dalhaṇa’s version (Su 1938: 78), which has च कृत्वा following सुपरिगृहीतं. It is likely that a verb, such as कृत्वा, dropped out of the Nepalese transmission.

with food as taught in the “Two Wound” chapter.¹⁶⁵

- 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.¹⁶⁶ For when the ear is tainted by wind, then it is obstructed by blood, unhealed and will peel. When tainted with choler, it becomes pinched (गाढ), septic and red. When tainted by phlegm, it will be stiff and itchy. It has excessively copious suppuration and is swollen. It has a small amount of wasted (क्षीण) flesh and it will not grow.¹⁶⁷
- 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 (संरम्भ), 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, scavenging and seed-eating birds, and creatures that live in marshes or water,¹⁶⁸ fat, marrow, milk, and sesame oil, and white mustard oil.¹⁶⁹ Then cook the oil with an admixture of the following: purple calotropis, white calotropis, heart-leaf sida, country mallow, country sarsaparilla, Indian kudzu, liquorice, and hornwort.¹⁷⁰ This should then be depos-

think more
about the
compound
structure
here?

¹⁶⁵ *Suśrutasamhitā* 4.1 ([Su 1938: 396–408](#)).

¹⁶⁶ 1.16.17 of Dalhaṇa’s version ([Su 1938: 79](#)) reads “impure” for the Nepalese “too pure,” which would appear to make better medical sense. Emending the text to नातिशुद्ध- for नाशुद्ध- in the Nepalese recension would yield the same meaning as the Dalhaṇa’s version.

¹⁶⁷ 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’ (आमतैलेन त्रिरात्रं परिषेचयेत्तिरात्राच्च पिञ्चं परिवर्तयेत्).

¹⁶⁸ For such classifications, see the analyses by Zimmermann ([1999](#)) and Smith ([1994](#)).

¹⁶⁹ Dalhaṇa’s version of 1.16.19 ([Su 1938: 79](#)) includes ghee. However, Dalhaṇa’s remarks on this passage and Cakrapāṇidatta’s on 1.16.18 ([Su 1939: 130](#)) indicate that they knew a version of this recipe, perhaps similar to the Nepalese one, that did not include ghee. Dalhaṇa also noted that others simply read four oils, beginning with fat and without milk, whereas Cakrapāṇidatta said that some say it is made with four oils and milk.

¹⁷⁰ The version of of this verse known to Dalhaṇa (vulgate ([Su 1938: 79](#))) adds several ingredients to this admixture, including prickly chaff-flower, *Withania*, milk-white, sweet plants and Indian ipecac. Also, it has beggarweed instead of Indian kudzu. When commenting on 1.16.19, Dalhaṇa ([Su 1938: 79](#)) noted that some do not read

ited in a well-protected spot.

- 15 *The wise man who has been sweated should rub the massaged ear with it.*
*Then it will be free of complications, and will enlarge properly and be strong.*¹⁷¹
- 16 *Ears which do not enlarge even when sweated and oiled, should be scarified at the edge of the hole, but not outside it.*¹⁷²
- 17 *In this tradition, experts know countless repairs to ears. So a physician who is very intent on working in this way may repair them.*¹⁷³
- 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.*¹⁷⁴
- 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 (वश),¹⁷⁵ with the same measurements,*

sweet plants and Indian ipecac. Therefore, at his time there were other versions of this recipe circulating, with fewer ingredients, as seen in the Nepalese version.

171 For these aims (i.e., healing and enlarging the ear), the text known to Dalhana (*Su 1938*: 79) had an additional verse and a half describing an ointment for rubbing the ear and sesame oil cooked with various medicines for massage. Cakrapāṇidatta (*Su 1939*: 131) did not comment on these verses, nor verse 15 of the Nepalese version, and so the version of the *Suśrutasanhitā* known to him may not have included them.

172 Dalhana's version of 1.16.23 (*Su 1938*: 79–80) added another hemistich that stated more explicitly that the scarification should not be done on the outside of hole as it will cause derangement.

173 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 Dalhana (*Su 1938*: 80) stated that some read about the diseases of the ear lobes in this chapter whereas others read about them in the chapter on various treatments (मिश्रकचिकित्स) (SS 5.25), which does indeed begin with a discussion of the disease परिपोट. Dalhana went on to say that some believe that these verses were not composed by sages and, therefore, do not read them.

174 The order of verses 17 and 18 is reversed in Dalhana's version (*Su 1938*: 80).

175 The version of 1.16.28b known to Dalhana (*Su 1938*: 81) reads "bound, connected (ब-ञ्चम)" instead of "slice of flesh (वश)." 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).

off the cheek, the end of the nose is then scarified.¹⁷⁶ Then the undistracted physician, should quickly put it back together so that it is well joined.

21

Having carefully observed that it has been sewn up properly, he should then fasten it along with two tubes.¹⁷⁷ Having caused it to be raised,¹⁷⁸ the powder of sappanwood,¹⁷⁹ liquorice and Indian barberry,¹⁸⁰ should be sprinkled on it.

anjana

22

The wound should be covered properly with cotton and should be moistened repeatedly with sesame oil. Ghee should be given to the man to drink. His digestion being complete, he should be oiled and purged in accordance with the instructions specific to him.¹⁸¹

23

And once healed and really come together, what is left of that slice of flesh (वध्र) should then be trimmed.¹⁸² If it is reduced, however, one should make an effort to stretch it, and one should make its overgrown flesh smooth.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁶ 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, Ḏalhaṇa (*Su 1938*: 81) clarified 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.

¹⁷⁷ Ḏalhaṇa noted that the two tubes should be made of reed or the stalk of the leaf of castor oil plant (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.

¹⁷⁸ The Sanskrit term उन्नामयित्वा in 1.16.21 is non-Pāṇinian.

¹⁷⁹ Caesalpinia sappan, L. For पत्ताङ्ग there are manuscript variants पत्ताङ्ग (MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333) and पत्तङ्ग (MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1079). Also, MS Kathmandu KL 699 (f. 14r:1) has पत्ताङ्ग in a verse in 1.14 (cf. 1.14.36 (*Su 1938*: 66)). The text known to Ḏalhaṇa has पतङ्ग (1.16.29 (*Su 1938*: 81)) and this term is propagated in modern dictionaries.

¹⁸⁰ Berberis aristata, DC. Ḏalhaṇa understood it as elixir salve (रसाङ्गन) (*Su 1938*: 81).

¹⁸¹ The expression स्वयथोपदेश is ungrammatical but supported in all available witnesses.

¹⁸² The vulgate transmission has lost the word वध्र and replaced it with अर्ध “half,” which makes little sense in this surgical context.

¹⁸³ Ḏalhaṇa accepted a verse following this, 1.16.32 (*Su 1938*: 81), which pointed 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 Jejjāta, 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	Kumte, Aṇṇā Moreśvara, Navare, Kṛṣṇāśāstrī, and Parādkar, Hariśāstrī (1939) (eds.), श्रीमद्भाग्मटविरचितम् अष्टाङ्गहृदयम्, श्रीमद्रुणदत्तविरचितया सर्वाङ्गसुन्दरारब्ध्या व्याख्य्या, हेमाद्रिप्रणीतया आयुर्वेदरसायनाहृया टीकया च समुल्ल-सितम् = <i>The Astāṅgahṛidaya</i> (6th edn., Mumbayyām: Nirṇayasāgara Press), ark:/13960/t3tt6967d .
Anup	<i>Anup Sanskrit Library</i> (n.d.).
Anup	<i>Anup Sanskrit Library</i> (n.d.).
Apte	Apte, Vaman Shivaram (1992), <i>The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary</i> (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company), ISBN: 4-653-00038-7; Reprinted from Gode and Karve 1957–9.
AS	<i>Asiatic Society</i> (n.d.).
As 1980	Āṭhavale, Anamta Dāmodara (1980) (ed.), <i>Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgrahāḥ</i> . Śrīmad Vṛddhavāgbhaṭaviracitāḥ Induvyākhyāsahitāḥ (Puṇe: Maheśa Anamta Āṭhavale, Śrīmad Ātreyā Prakāśanam), ark:/13960/t9773bb9z .
Bhela 1921	Mookerjee, Ashutosh and Ananta Krishna Shastri, Vedantabisharad (1921) (eds.), <i>The Bhela Samhitā. Sanskrit Text</i> (Calcutta: University of Calcutta), ark:/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, तच्छुष्येणाग्निवेशेन प्रणीता, चरकदृढबलाभ्यां प्रतिसंस्कृता चरकसंहिता, श्रीचकपाणिदत्तविरचितया आयुर्वेददीपिकाव्याख्या संवलिता (3rd edn., Mumbaiyām: Nirnaya Sagara Press), [URL](#), 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), *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office* (London: Secretary of State for India).
- KL Kaiser Library (n.d.).
- MN Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1932) (ed.), महामतिश्रीमाधवकरप्रणीतं माधवनिदानम् श्रीविजयरक्षित-श्रीकण्ठदत्ताभ्यां विरचितया मधुकोशाख्यव्याख्या, श्रीवाचस्पति-वैद्यविरचितया आतङ्कदर्पणव्याख्याया विशिष्टांशेन च समुल्लसितम् = *Mādhavanidāna* by *Mādhavakara* with the Two Commentaries, *Madhukosha* by *Vijayarakshita* & *Shrīkanthadatta* and *Ātankadarpaṇa* by *Vāchaspati Vaidya* (3rd edn., Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press), [ark :/ 13960 / t66452x0h](#); Reprinted Varanasi: Chowkhambha, 1986.
- MW Monier-Williams, Monier, Leumann, E., Cappeller, C., et al. (1899), *A Sanskrit–English Dictionary Etymologically and Philologically Arranged, New Edition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press); 1970 reprint.
- NAK National Archives of Kathmandu (n.d.).

- NCC Raghavan, V. et al. (1949–), *New Catalogus Catalogorum, an Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*, 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](#).
- RORI *Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute* (n.d.).
- Su 1889 Bhaṭṭācāryya, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara (1889) (ed.), सुश्रुतः. सूत्र-निदान-शारीर-चिकित्सा-कल्पोत्तर-तत्त्व-कल्पित आ-युर्वेद. भगवता धन्वन्तरिणोपदिष्टः सुश्रुतनामधेयेन तच्छिष्येण विरचितः (3rd edn., Calcutta: Saratī Press), [ark:/13960/t1nh6j09c](#); [HML](#): IB, 311, edition b.
- Su 1915 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1915) (ed.), सुश्रुतसंहिता, सुश्रुतेन विरचिता, वैद्यवरश्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाख्यव्याख्यया समुद्धसिता, आचार्योपाहेन त्रिविक्रमात्मजेन यादवशर्मणा संशोधिता = *The Sushrutasamhitā of Sushruta, the Nibandhasangraha Commentary of Shri Dalhāṇāchārya* (Mumbayyāṁ: Nirṇayasāgaramudrāyantrālaye), [ark:/13960/t3sv0mt50](#), accessed 29/07/2020; [HML](#): IB, 312 edition *v.
- Su 1931 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1931) (ed.), सुश्रुतसंहिता, वैद्यवरश्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाख्यव्याख्यया समुद्धसिता, महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता, सूत्र-निदान-शारीर-चिकित्सा-कल्पस्थानोत्तरतत्त्वात्मकः. आचार्योपाहेन त्रिविक्रमात्मजेन यादवशर्मणा संशोधिता = *The Sushrutasamhitā of Sushruta with the Nibandhasangraha Commentary of Shree Dalhāṇāchārya* (2nd edn., Mumbayyāṁ: Pāṇḍuraṅga Jāvajī at the Nirṇayasāgaramudrāyantrālaye), [ark:/13960/t9j41sg94](#), accessed 09/06/2020; [HML](#): IB, 312 edition *v.

- Su 1938 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama and Ācārya, Nārāyaṇa Rāma (1938) (eds.), श्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहारब्धव्याख्यया निदानस्थानस्य श्रीगयदासाचार्यविरचितया न्यायचन्द्रिकारब्धपञ्जिकाव्यारब्धया च समुद्धसिता महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता (3rd edn., Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press), [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 निबन्धसंग्रहारब्धव्याख्यया निदानस्थानस्य श्रीगयदासाचार्यविरचितया न्यायचन्द्रिकारब्धपञ्जिकाव्यारब्धया च समुद्धसिता (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-saṅhitā* (*sūtra Sthān*) with *Bhānumati* Commentary by Chakrapāṇi Datta with Introduction by Gaṇanāth Sen (Śrīsvāmi Lakṣmīrāma Nidhi Granthamālā = Shrī Swāmī Lakshmī Rām Trust Series, 1; [Jaipur]: Śyāmasundara Śarman), [ark : / 13960 / t54g0d12m](#); Printed at the Nirṇayasāgara Press, Bombay.
- Su 1945 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikramācārya and Ācārya, Nārāyaṇa Rāma (1945) (eds.), महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता (मूलमात्रा). पाठान्तर-परिशिष्टादिभिः संवलिता = *the Suśrutasaṅhitā of Suśruta with Various Readings, Notes and Appendix etc.* (Mumbāi: Nirṇayasāgarākhyamudraṇālaye), [URL](#).
- TMSSML *Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji Saraswati Mahal Library* (n.d.).
- Viṣṇudh. Śarman, Madhusūdana 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 first comma refer to pages.)

Bikaner Anup 4390, 30

Hyderabad Osmania 137-3(b), 20, 59

Kathmandu KL 699, 4, 19, 54, 60

Kathmandu NAK 1-1079, 4, 54, 60

Kathmandu NAK 1-1146, 12

Kathmandu NAK 5-333, 4, 32, 33, 35, 54, 60

Kathmandu National Archives 1-1079, 37

London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908, 16, 33

London Wellcome 3007, 7

Mumbai AS B.D.109, 30

Mumbai AS B.I.3, 30

Mumbai, Asiatic Society 162, 27

Thanjavur TMSSML 10773, 61

Bibliography

Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1941) (ed.), महर्षिणा पुनर्वसुनोपदिष्टा, तच्छिष्येणाग्निवेशेन प्रणीता, चरकटृष्णबलाभ्यां प्रतिसंस्कृता चरकसंहिता, श्रीचक्रपाणिदत्तविरचितया आयुर्वेददीपिकाव्याख्या संवलिता (3rd edn., Mumbaiyām: 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.

Āgāśe, Ve. Śā. Rā. Rā. Kāśīnātha Śāstrī and Āpaṭe, Hari Nārāyaṇa (1904) (eds.), *Vācaspatimiśraviracitaṭīkāsanīvalitavyāsabhāṣyasametāni Pātañjalayogaśūtrāṇī Tathā Bhojadevaviracitarājamaṛtaṇḍābhidhavṛtti-sametāni Pātañjalayogaśūtrāṇī* (Ānandāśramasāṃskṛtagranthāvalih, 47; Puṇyākhya-pattana: Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya), [ark :/ 13960 / t40s27g36](#).

- Agrawal, 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).
- Bakker, Hans T. (2019), “Some Methodological Considerations with Respect to the Critical Edition of Puranic Literature,” in *Holy Ground: Where Art and Text Meet* (Leiden: Brill), 175–84. doi: 10.1163/9789004412071_010.
- 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](https://doi.org/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 हाराणचन्द्रचक्रवर्तीकविराजविरचितसुश्रुतार्थसन्दीपनभाष्य-समेतम्...चन्द्रकान्त भट्टाचार्य-प्रमुखैः संशोधितम् = [The Suśrutasaṃhitā with the Commentary Suśrutārthaśandīpanabhāṣya by Hārāṇacandra Cakravarti] (Kaliṅgātā: 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), “Dalhaṇa and the Early ‘Nepalese’ Version of the Suśrutasamhitā.” doi: [10.20935/a13733](https://doi.org/10.20935/a13733).
- Bole, P. V. and Vaghani, Yogini (1986), *Field Guide to the Common Trees of India* (Bombay, Delhi, Oxford, etc.: World Wildlife Fund – India and Oxford University Press), ISBN: 0-19-561595-6; 4th reprint.
- 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, [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/a1291](https://doi.org/10.20935/a1291); 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; Bhelasamhitā 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, accessed 20/03/2019.

- Chadha, Gita and Thomas, Renny (2022) (eds.), *Mapping Scientific Method: Disciplinary Narrations* (Science and Technology Studies; Abingdon and New York: Routledge). doi: [10.4324/9781003298908](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003298908).
- Chopra, R. N., Chopra, I. C., Handa, K. L., et al. (1958), *Chopra's Indigenous Drugs of India* (2nd edn., Calcutta: Dhur & Sons), [ark:/13960/t9673t140](https://ark.org/ark:/13960/t9673t140).
- Chopra, R. N., Chopra, I. C., and Varma, B. S. (1969), *Supplement to Glossary of Indian Medicinal Plants* (Reprint 1986, New Delhi: National Institute of Science Communication), ISBN: 8185038872.
- Chopra, R. N., Nayar, S. L., and Chopra, I. C. (1956), *Glossary of Indian Medicinal Plants* (3rd reprint, 1992, New Delhi: Council of Scientific and Industrial Research); vol. 2: R. N. Chopra, I. C. Chopra, and Varma ([Chopra GIMP suppl.](#)).
- 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://ark.org/ark:/13960/t26b2j457), accessed 02/01/2020; Reprinted in Roșu [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).
- Dave, K. N. (1985), *Birds in Sanskrit Literature* (Delhi: Motilal BanarsiDass), ISBN: 0-89581-676-8, [ark:/13960/t2c94cv80](https://ark.org/ark:/13960/t2c94cv80).
- Deshpande, Madhav M. (2010), "Pañca Gauḍa and Pañca Drāviḍa: Contested Borders of a Tradition Classification," in Klaus Karttunen (ed.), *Anantam Śāstram. Indological and Linguistic Studies in Honour of Bertil Tikkannen* (Studia Orientalia, 108; Helsinki: Finnish Oriental Society), 29–58, ISBN: 9789519380742.
- 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](#).
- 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](#), accessed 04/10/2017; Reprinted Varanasi: Chowkhamba Saraswatibhavan, 1980.
- Dymock, William, Warden, C. J. H., and Hooper, David (1890), *Pharmacographia Indica: A History of the Principal Drugs of Vegetable Origin Met with in British India* (London, Bombay, Calcutta: Kegan Paul), [URL](#), accessed 24/10/2022.
- 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).
- (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, nū-nam”,” *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 Fromthe 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 V. 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 Banarsi Dass Publishers), 95–117.
- Ganapatiśāstrī, T. (1920–5), *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpaḥ* (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 70; Anantaśayane: Rājakīyamudraṇayantrālaye), [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).
- Griffiths, Mark (1994), *The New Horticultural Society Index of Garden Plants* (London: Macmillan).
- 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 Suśrutasaṃhitā," *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū)*, 62/3: 23–29 (1087–1093). doi: [10.4259/ibk.62.3_1087](https://doi.org/10.4259/ibk.62.3_1087), [URL](#), accessed 08/09/2019.
- (pre-published), "[Preliminary Edition of the Nepalese MSS of the Suśrutasaṃhitā, 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](https://doi.org/10.18732/h2ht0h).
- Hemarāja Śarman (1938) (ed.), काश्यपसंहिता (वृद्धजीवकीयं तत्रं वा) महर्षिणा मारीच-कश्यपेनोपदिष्टा ... हेमराजशर्मणा लिखितेन विस्तृतेन उपोद्घातेन संहिता ... सत्यपाल भिषगा कृतया विद्योतिनी हिन्दीव्याख्यया ... समुल्लिप्तिता (1st edn., Mumbai: 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 Ayurvédas: 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), *Suśrutasan̄hitā = The Suṣruta-Saṃhitā or the Hindū System of Medicine According to Suṣruta 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".

— (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 Mahākośah arthāt Āyurvedīya Śabdakośah Saṃskṛta-Saṃskṛta* (Mum̄bai: Mahārāṣṭra Rājya Sāhitya āṇi Saṃskṛti Mamḍala), [URL](#).
- Kangle, R. P. (1969), *The Kauṭīlya 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," *eJIM: Electronic Journal of Indian Medicine*, 12/1: 1–64. doi: [10.21827/ejim.12.1.37385](https://doi.org/10.21827/ejim.12.1.37385).
- (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 Nāradasmṛti. 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-ras-04](https://doi.org/10.21037/atm-2019-ras-04), URL, accessed 02/11/2020.
- Lienhard, Siegfried (1978), "On the Meaning and Use of the Word Indragopa," *Indologica taurinensis*, 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.
- Maas, Philipp André (2013), "A Concise Historiography of Classical Yoga Philosophy: leslie," in Eli Franco (ed.), *Historiography and Periodization of Indian Philosophy* (Vienna: Sammlung de Nobili), 53–90, URL, accessed 27/05/2016.
- 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/scr.1950.2294](https://doi.org/10.3406/scr.1950.2294).
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1953–72), *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen; a Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag).

- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1986–2001), *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag), ISBN: 3-533-03826-2.
- 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 (1974a), “Sanskrit Names of Plants and their Botanical Equivalents,” in id., *The Mādhavanidāna and Its Chief Commentary: Chapters 1–10. Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Leiden: Brill), chap. Appendix Four, 520–611, [ark:/13960/t25b8q97g](#).
- (1974b), *The Mādhavanidāna and Its Chief Commentary: Chapters 1–10. Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Leiden: Brill), ISBN: 978-90-04-03892-9, [ark:/13960/t25b8q97g](#).
- (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.
- (1988), “G. J. Meulenbeld’s Additions to his ‘Sanskrit Names of Plants and their Botanical Equivalents’,” in Rahul Peter Das, *Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume: Surapālas Vṛksāyurveda* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), chap. Appendix 1, 425–65, ISBN: 9783515046633; Supplement to [GJM1](#).
- (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).
- (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-dharmasāstra*, 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.
- 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.
- (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.
- Preisendanz, Karin (2007), "The Initiation of the Medical Student in Early Classical Āyurveda: Caraka's Treatment in Context," in Birgit Kellner et al. (eds.), *Pramānakūrtih. 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, [URL](#), accessed 04/07/2021.
- Rādhākāntā Deva, Rājā (1876), *Śabdakalpadrumah* = *Shabda Kalpadrumah, Or, the Tree Bearing All the Words That May Be Wished For* (Calcutta: Baradākānta Mitra & Co. at the New Bengal Press), [URL](#), accessed 23/11/2017.
- 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; 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](#).
- Rama Sastri and Krishnamurthi Sastri, S. R. (1952) (eds.), पातञ्जलयोग-सूत्रभाष्यविवरणम्। (शाङ्करभगवत्यादप्रणीतम्) = *Pātñjala*[sic]-yogaśūtra-bhāṣya Vivaraṇam of Śaṅkara-Bhagavatpāda. Critically Edited with Introduction (Madras Government Oriental Series, 94; Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library), [ark:/13960/t7jq3m14w](#), accessed 20/10/2017.
- Râẏ, Priyadarjan, Gupta, Hirendra Nath, and Roy, Mira (1980), *Suśruta Samhita (a Scientific Synopsis)* (New Delhi: Indian National Science Academy), [ark:/13960/t64511t6v](#), accessed 13/09/2019.
- Rhys Davids, Thomas William and Steede, 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](#).
- Roelli, Philipp (2020) (ed.), *Handbook of Stemmatology* (Berlin: De Gruyter). doi: 10.1515/9783110684384.
- Roşu, Arion (1989), *Un demi-siècle de recherches ayurvédiques. 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.
- Sarukkai, Sundar (2016), "Translation As Method: Implications for History of Science," in Bernard Lightman, Gordon McOuat, and Larry Stewart (eds.), *The Circulation of Knowledge Between Britain, India and China* (Leiden: BRILL), 309–29. doi: [10.1163/9789004251410_014](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004251410_014).
- 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.
- Śāstrī, Vardhamāna Pārśvanātha (1940) (ed.), उग्रादित्याचार्यकृत कल्याणकारक (राष्ट्रभाषानुवादसहित) = *The Kalyāṇa-kārakam of Ugrādityacharya, Edited with Introduction, Translation, Notes, Indexes and Dictionary* (Sakhārāma Nemacāmḍa Gramthamālā, 129; Solāpura: Setha Goviṁdajī Rāvajī Dośī), 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.
- Semeka-Pankratov, Elena (1979), "A Semiotic Approach to the Polysemy of the Symbol *nāga* in Indian Mythology," in Irene Portis Winner and Jean Umiker-Sebeok (eds.), *Semiotics of Culture* (Approaches to Semiotics, 53; The Hague, Paris, NY: Mouton), 237–90. doi: [10.1515/9783110823134-009](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110823134-009); The contents of this volume were published simultaneously in *Semiotica* (1/3) 1979 (**seme-1979b**).
- Sena, Gaṅgāprasād et al. (1886–93) (eds.), सुश्रुतसंहिता...दल्लनाचार्य-कृत-निवन्ध-संग्रह, चक्रपाणिदत्त-कृत-भानुमती-टीका...वज्ञानुवाद...इरेजि प्रतिशब्द (Calcutta: Maṇirāma Press); Edition "g" in [HML](https://www.humanitiesindia.org/HML): 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), *Dalhaṇa and his Comments on Drugs* (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal).
- (1999–2001a), *Suśruta-Saṃhitā, with English Translation of Text and Dalhaṇa'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 Dalhaṇa'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 Chunekar, K. C. (1972), *Glossary of Vegetable Drugs in Brhattrayī* (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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā* in 10v.
- Sircar, Dinesh Chandra (1987), “6. Rākshaskhāli (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, 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 Saṃhitā: Text, English Translation, Notes, Appendices and Index* (Jaikrishnadas Ayurveda Series, 102; 1st edn., Varanasi: Chaukhamba 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), [ark:/13960/s25bwz0337d](#); Reprint, Delhi: Oriental Reprint, 1973.
- Strauss, Bettina (1934), “Das Giftbuch des Śāṇāq: 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 Tīvārī, N. (2000) (eds.), *Sauśrutanighanṭuh: granthādau vistrtena granthavaisiṣṭyaprakāśakenopodghātēna avasāne ca dravyāṇām anekabhāṣāṇām āvalī- paryāyasaṅgrahābhyaṁ samalaṅkṛtaḥ Suśrutas- aṇihitāyāṁ prayuktānām auṣadhadravyāṇām paryāya-guṇakarmavariṇātma- pūrvagranthaḥ* (Belajhundī, Dān: Mahendrasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālayaḥ).
- Tavernier, Jean-Baptiste (1684), *Collections of Travels through Turky (sic), into Persia, and the East-Indies* (London: M. Pitt).
- The Unicode Consortium (1991–2020), “The Unicode Standard 13.0, Ne- waRange: 11400–1147F,” [URL](#), 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* (Berke- ley: 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 Sanskrita 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/t8cg7dm79>.
- 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>.
- Wren, R. C., Williamson, Elizabeth M., and Evans, Fred J. (1994), *Potter's New Cyclopaedia of Botanical Drugs and Preparations* (Saffron Walden: C. W. Daniel Company Ltd.); Reprint of revised 1988 edition.
- 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](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199856268.001.0001).
- (2013a), “Perfect Medicine. Mercury in Sanskrit Medical Literature,” *Asian Medicine: Tradition & Modernity*, 8/1 (Sept.): 15–40, ISSN: 1573-4218. doi: [10.1163/15734218-12341278](https://doi.org/10.1163/15734218-12341278).
- (2019), “Iron Tonics: Tracing the Development from Classical to Iatrocchemical 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](#).

- Wujastyk, Dominik (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](#).
- (2013b), "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](#).
- (2021a), "A New Translation of Carakasamhitā, Vimānasthāna, Chapter 1, Based on the Vienna Critical Edition," 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), chap. 6, 77–109. doi: [10.1163/9789004438224_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004438224_007).
- (2021 b), "MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908," [URL](#).
- Wujastyk, Dominik, SKSEC Team, and Kessler, O. (2020), "Suśrutasamhitā," PanditProject (6 Oct.), [URL](#), accessed 14/09/2022.
- 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.
- (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 Banarsi-dass); First published 1991. Reprint of 1998 edition.

Botanical sourcebooks

- ADPS Sivarajan, V. V. and Balachandran, Indira (1994), *Ayurvedic Drugs and Their Plant Sources* (New Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta: Oxford & IBH Publishing).
- AVS 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).
- Chopra GIMP suppl. Chopra, R. N., Chopra, I. C., and Varma, B. S. (1969), *Supplement to Glossary of Indian Medicinal Plants* (Reprint 1986, New Delhi: National Institute of Science Communication), ISBN: 8185038872.
- Chopra, GIMP Chopra, R. N., Nayar, S. L., and Chopra, I. C. (1956), *Glossary of Indian Medicinal Plants* (3rd reprint, 1992, New Delhi: Council of Scientific and Industrial Research); vol. 2: R. N. Chopra, I. C. Chopra, and Varma ([Chopra GIMP suppl.](#)).
- Chopra's IDG Chopra, R. N., Chopra, I. C., Handa, K. L., et al. (1958), *Chopra's Indigenous Drugs of India* (2nd edn., Calcutta: Dhur & Sons), [ark:/13960/t9673t140](#).
- CIPP 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](#).

- Dutt 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](#), accessed 04/10/2017; Reprinted Varanasi: Chowkhamba Saraswatibhavan, 1980.
- Dymock Dymock, William, Warden, C. J. H., and Hooper, David (1890), *Pharmacographia Indica: A History of the Principal Drugs of Vegetable Origin Met with in British India* (London, Bombay, Calcutta: Kegan Paul), [URL](#), accessed 24/10/2022.
- GJM1 Meulenbeld, Gerrit Jan (1974a), "Sanskrit Names of Plants and their Botanical Equivalents," in id., *The Mādhavanidāna and Its Chief Commentary: Chapters 1–10. Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Leiden: Brill), chap. Appendix Four, 520–611, [ark:/13960/t25b8q97g](#).
- GJM2 Meulenbeld, Gerrit Jan (1988), "G. J. Meulenbeld's Additions to his "Sanskrit Names of Plants and their Botanical Equivalents"," in Rahul Peter Das, *Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume: Surapālas Vṛkṣāyurveda* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), chap. Appendix 1, 425–65, ISBN: 9783515046633; Supplement to GJM1.
- GVDB Singh, Thakur Balwant and Chunekar, K. C. (1972), *Glossary of Vegetable Drugs in Brhattrayī* (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office).
- IGP Griffiths, Mark (1994), *The New Horticultural Society Index of Garden Plants* (London: Macmillan).
- Nadkarni Nadkarni, K. M. (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](#).

Trees

Bole, P. V. and Vaghani, Yogini (1986), *Field Guide to the Common Trees of India* (Bombay, Delhi, Oxford, etc.: World Wildlife Fund – India and Oxford University Press), ISBN: 0-19-561595-6; 4th reprint.

Glossary and Index of Medical Substances

beggarweed (*vidārigandhā*) → śālaparṇī.
Desmodium gangeticum (L.) DC. See
Dymock: v. 1, 428, **GJM1**: 602, cf.
Nadkarni: #1192; **ADPS**: 382, 414 and
AVS: v. 2, 319, 4.366 are confusing,
26, 58

country mallow (*atibalā*) Abutilon
indicum, (L.) Sweet, but may be other
kinds of mallow, e.g., Sida rhombifolia,
L.. See **Nadkarni**: #11, **IGP**: 1080,
Nadkarni: #2300, **ADPS**: 71, 77, 58

country sarsaparilla (*anantā*)
Hemidesmus indicus, (L.) R. Br. See
ADPS: 434, **AVS**: v. 3, 141–5,
Nadkarni: #1210. But see **GVDB**: 13 for
complications that may suggest that it
is to be equated with *sārivā*, which may
sometimes be Cryptolepis or
Ichnocarpus frutescens R. Br.
(**GVDB**: 429–431), 58

giant potato (*kṣiravidārī*) possibly →
kṣiraśukla. Ipomoea mauritiana, Jacq.
See **ADPS**: 510, **AVS**: v. 3, 222, **AVS**: v. 3,
1717 ff, 93, 94

heart-leaf sida (*balā*) Sida cordifolia, Linn.
See **ADPS**: 71, **Nadkarni**: #2297, 58

Holostemma creeper (*jīvanti*) →
sūryavallī? Holostemma ada-kodien,
Schultes. See **ADPS**: 195, **AVS**: v. 3, 167,
Nadkarni: #1242, **AVS**: v. 3, 1619, 94

hornwort (*jalaśūka*) ← *jalaniśikā*.
Ceratophyllum demersum, L. See

AVS: v. 2, 56, **IGP**: 232. Singh and
Chunekar (**GVDB**: 166) suggest
pondweed. Ḏalhaṇa noted on 1.16.19
(Su 1938: 79) that some people
interpret it as a poisonous, hairy,
air-breathing, underwater creature, 58

Indian ipecac (*payasyā*) Uncertain.
Possibly Tylophora indica (Burm.f.)
Merr. Perhaps a synonym of
sun-flowered, giant potato, purple
roscoea, and plants like asthma plant
and Gulf sandmat (**GVDB**: 237–238),
26, 58, 59, 94

Indian kudzu (*vidārī*) → *payasyā*.
Pueraria tuberosa (Willd.) DC. See
ADPS: 510, **AVS**: v. 1, 792 f,
AVS: v. 4, 391; not **Dymock**: v. 1, 424 f.
See GJM supplement 444, 451,
AVS: v. 1, 187, but **AVS**: v. 3, 1719 =
Ipomoea mauritiana, Jacq, 26, 58

liquorice (*madhuka*) Glycyrrhiza glabra, L.
See **AVS**: v. 3, 84, **Nadkarni**: #1136, 58

milk-white (*kṣiraśuklā*) An unidentified
plant. **GVDB**: 126: see **purple roscoea**
and **giant potato**, 25, 58, 94

plants like asthma plant and Gulf
sandmat (*kṣirīṇī*) various milky plants,
perhaps including Euphorbia hirta
Linn. (asthma plant) and E.
microphylla Heyne (Gulf sandmat)
(**GVDB**: 127), 93

pondweed (*śaivāla*) Zannichellia palustris

- L. or Zannichellia palustris L.
Sometimes identified with *dūrvā*.
[GVDB](#): 409, [93](#)
- prickly chaff-flower (*apāmārga*)
Achyranthes aspera, L. See [GJM1](#): 524 f,
[AVS](#): v. 1, 39, [ADPS](#): 44 f, [AVS](#): v. 3,
2066 f, [Dymock](#): v. 3, 135, [25](#), [58](#)
- purple calotropis (*arka*) *Calotropis gigantea*, (L.) R. Br. See [ADPS](#): 52,
[AVS](#): v. 1, 341, [Nadkarni](#): #427, [Wren et al.](#) 1994: 57, [Chopra's IDG](#): 305–308,
[58](#)
- purple roscoea (*ksīrakākoli*) [GVDB](#): 89
notes that many physicians use *Roscoea procera* Wall. in this context. But the identification is uncertain. Possibly connected to [milk-white](#) or [giant potato](#)., [93](#)
- spikenard (*jaṭāmāṇsi*) *Nardostachys jatamansi* DC [GVDB](#): 163, etc, [27](#)
- sun-flowered (*arkapuṣpi*) Maybe identical to [Indian ipecac](#), [giant potato](#) and similar sweet, milky plants. See [GVDB](#): 24, 127, 238, 441, 443 for discussion. For discussion in the context of [Holostemma creeper](#), see [ADPS](#): 195 and [AVS](#): v. 3, 171. The etymology of the name suggests *Helianthus annus* Linn., but this plant is native to the Americas., [93](#)
- sweet plants (*madhuravarga*) The sweet plants are enumerated at [SS 1.42.11](#). See also [GVDB](#): 127, [25](#), [58](#), [59](#)
- white calotropis (*alarka*) *Calotropis procera*, (Ait.) R. Br. See [Nadkarni](#): #428, [Chopra](#), [GIMP](#): 46b, [Chopra's IDG](#): 305–308, [58](#)
- Withania (*aśvagandhā*) *Withania somnifera* (L.) Dunal. See [AVS](#): v. 5, 409 f, [Dymock](#): v. 2, 566 f., [Chevallier](#) 150, [25](#), [58](#)

Todo list

[] add refs.	28
[] refs	28
[] refs?	41
[] think more about the compound structure here?	58
[] añjana	60