

On the Plastic Surgery of the Ears and Nose

On the Plastic Surgery of the Ears and Nose

The Nepalese Version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*

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



The Suśruta Project is funded in part by funding from the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Le projet Suśruta est financé en partie par des fonds du Conseil canadien de recherches en sciences humaines. Insight Grant no. 435-2020-1077.



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada



ORCID®

Dominik Wujastyk <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0216-6381>

Jason Birch <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3569-9993>

Andrey Klebanov <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5241-9434>

Madhu K. Parameswaran <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4854-4344>

Deepro Chakraborty <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8852-9934>

Vandana Lele <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3232-1112>

Paras Mehta <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8762-016X>

Harshal Bhatt <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9331-0988>

Madhusudan Rimal <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9069-4445>

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.



This book is published under the Creative Commons
Attribution License CC BY-SA 4.0.



Published at Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing (HASP), 2023

Heidelberg University / Heidelberg University Library

Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing (HASP),

Grabengasse 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany

<https://hasp.ub.uni-heidelberg.de>

The electronic open access version of this work is permanently available on the website of Heidelberg Asian Studies Publishing: <https://hasp.ub.uni-heidelberg.de>
urn: urn:nbn:de:bsz:16-hasp-1203-0

doi: <https://doi.org/10.11588/hasp.1203>

Text © 2023, The Authors

Typeset by Dominik Wujastyk using X_ET_EX, with T_EX Gyre Pagella and Sanskrit 2003. The critical edition was typeset using Saktumiva and reLEDMAC.

Cover illustration [To come]: © National Archives of Nepal

ISBN: 978-3-948791-63-6 (Paperback)

ISBN: 978-3-948791-62-9 (PDF)

Contents

Preface	vii
1 Introduction	1
Importance of SS.1.16 in the History of Medicine	3
Torn ear lobes	5
Rhinoplasty	5
The skin flap	6
2 The Transmission of the Work	9
The Nepalese Version	9
The Versions of Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḏalhaṇa	12
Cakrapāṇidatta and the Nepalese version	15
Differences between the Nepalese and later versions of <i>Sū- śrutasāṃhitā</i> 1.16	16
The greater internal coherence of the Nepalese version	16
Transpositions	18
Changing Spelling, Sandhi and Syntax	19
Technical Terms	20
Augmenting the Text	21
Transposing Words, Verses and Passages	22
Redacting Recipes and Elaborating on Treatments . .	22
Comparative therapeutics	24
3 The Printed Editions	27
The vulgate	27
The sources of the 1915 edition	27
The sources of the 1931 edition	28
The sources of the 1938 edition	29
Evaluation	29
The 1939 edition	31

For the Bhānumatī	31
For the Suśrutasaṃhitā	31
Evaluation	33
4 The Manuscripts	35
Editorial Principles	39
Method	39
Stemma	40
The Edition and Apparatus	41
Digital Edition	42
Printed Edition	44
5 Critical edition of Sūtrasthāna 16	46
6 Translation of Sūtrasthāna 16	57
Abbreviations	65
Index of Manuscripts	68
Bibliography	71
Botanical sourcebooks	93
Glossary	95
Glossary and Index of Medical Substances	99

Preface

The *Compendium of Suśruta* (Sanskrit: *Suśrutasamhitā*) is a world classic of ancient medicine, comparable in age and importance to the Hippocratic Corpus and the Huangdi Neijing. It is a substantial treatise, written in the Sanskrit language, that presents a systematic, scholarly form of medicine for diagnosing and treating the many ailments that patients presented in South Asia two thousand years ago. *The Compendium* is a text written by physicians for physicians and is one of the founding treatises of the indigenous medical system of India, Ayurveda. As such, it still informs indigenous medical practice in India and Ayurvedic complementary and alternative medicine internationally.

Amongst historians of medicine, *The Compendium* is perhaps most famous for its passages describing remarkable forms of surgery. These techniques were used in South Asia and beyond: *The Compendium's* method of couching for cataract circulated in China in the seventh century and a form of facial plastic surgery described in *The Compendium* was witnessed by British surgeons in India in the eighteenth century and subsequently formed the basis of certain types of facial reconstruction as practised even today.

In 2007, a previously unknown manuscript of *The Compendium* from the uncatalogued collections of the Kaiser Library in Kathmandu was announced in a scholarly publication. This manuscript, MS Kathmandu KL 699, is datable to 878 CE, almost a thousand years before any other known manuscript of the work. Furthermore, it became clear that two other manuscripts in Kathmandu were close copies of KL 699, albeit from later dates.

These exciting discoveries provide a kind of time machine by which we can directly examine the medical thought of Nepalese physicians of the ninth century. We can also start to see the changes and additions to the text that have happened in the last millennium. Almost all of these later changes to the text have tended to obscure

its clarity and directness, banalizing the language and inflating the recipes. Through the critical study of MS Kathmandu KL 699 and its companions we are beginning to recover an older, more authentic and more meaningful version of this medical classic.

This book presents a single chapter from *The Compendium* that is of unique interest to medical history. The book also lays out the basic parameters and methods of the project that will also apply to future publications. The members of the Suśruta Project have already read, edited and translated several other chapters. These materials are already available in digital format through the project website.¹ It is our intention to continue to publish both digitally and in print. We are currently preparing a critical edition and annotated translation of the *Kalpasthāna*, *The Compendium*'s book on plant and animal poisons and their remedies.

Beyond the present funded project, the important work of editing and translating the other five books of the treatise remains for the future. Therefore the present book aims to establish an academically sound model for disseminating this older version of *The Compendium* to an international audience that will pave the way for future editions of the rest of the work.

When one sees an authorial collaboration such as the present book, it is natural to be curious about who did what. The bulk of the words of this book were co-written by myself and Jason Birch. Andrey Klebanov contributed an important section describing the manuscripts; Madhu K. Paramesvaran wrote about the evolution of recipes through time. The text of the translation was a fully collaborative effort, arising out of weekly seminar meetings that we all attended and to which we all contributed. Usually, Jason or I would present a first draft, and that was discussed word by word, together with re-visiting difficult manuscript readings and refining the critical edition. Additionally, Vandana Lele, Harshal Bhatt, Madhusudan Rimal and Deepro Chakraborty and Paras Mehta all spent many hours carefully transcribing the old Nepalese manuscripts so that the text could be edited using the methods of Digital Humanities. The book could not have been written without the participation of the whole project team.

I would like to thank other project participants who have also contributed to the project at different times, including Jane Allred, Devayani Shenoy and Gauri Vyaghrambhare.

¹ Wujastyk et al. 2021–

On a personal note, I would like to thank my friends and former colleagues from the University of Vienna, especially Karin Preisendanz, Philip Maas and Alessandro Graheli, from whom I learned and continue to learn so much about Indology and textual criticism, and my wife Dagmar Wujastyk, discussions with whom inform and improve all my scholarly efforts.

The project owes its existence to Canada's Social Science and Humanities Research Council who have generously funded the work through an Insight Grant. I am grateful to my academic home, the University of Alberta, for hosting and supporting the project.

— Dominik Wujastyk
Edmonton 2023

1 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,

¹ The edition princeps was that of Gupta (1835–36). 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 1999–2001; 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.

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 and sometimes clearer than the versions commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta (*fl.* eleventh century) and Ḏalhaṇa (*fl.* twelfth century). The version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* 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,⁹ consist of the addition and loss of numerous verses, changes to medical recipes, and reordering of chapters, especially in the *Uttaratatantra* 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.¹⁰

In the case of the *Suśrutasamhitā*, the Nepalese manuscripts appear to present us with the last recoverable snapshot of this stage of the work when it was still open to absorbing new materials, most notably the *Uttaratatantra*, and before the text was fixed as a result of the authority of the major commentators, Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḏalhaṇa.¹¹ It is

⁷ Klebanov 2010; 2021a.

⁸ Su 1915; Su 1938; P. V. Sharma 1999–2001. Note that Ācārya himself referred to this text as “Ḏalhaṇa’s version” (see footnote 18 below).

⁹ For discussion of “the vulgate,” represented by Su 1938, see p. 27 below.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ The roles of earlier commentators including Jejjīṭa, Gayadāsa and Candraṭa in

in this sense that we use the expression, “Ḍalhaṇa’s version,” when referring to the vulgate text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.

The present study offers a critical edition and annotated translation of the sixteenth chapter of the *Ślokasthāna*, the first book of the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.¹² 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 *Suśrutasamhitā*¹³ and the text as known to Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa. The notes to the edition incorporate alternative readings mentioned by the commentators. The annotations to the translation discuss the following topics: instances where the text is uncertain; non-standard spellings and syntax; the meaning of technical and obscure terms; relevant remarks by the commentators; ambiguities in the identification of medical ingredients, in particular, plant names; and the additional compounds, verses and passages in Ḍalhaṇa’s version of the text. In short, this is a pilot study for undertaking a complete edition and translation of the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.

Importance of SS.1.16 in the History of Medicine

Simple forms of surgery have a long history in South Asia. In works datable to at least 1200 BCE we learn how a reed was used as a catheter to cure urine retention.¹³ 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.¹⁴ The Brāhmaṇa literature of the only slightly later period

closing the text and influencing Cakrapāṇidatta and Ḍalhaṇa remains an open research problem.

¹² This book is called the *Sūtrasthāna* in later versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. Note that the *Suśrutasamhitā* 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.

¹³ Zysk [1985](#): 70–71.

¹⁴ Translation by Hoernle ([1907b](#): §43, §100). Further bibliography: [HIML](#): IIB, 819.

contained more detailed descriptions of animal butchery in the context of religious sacrifice that involved the enumeration of internal organs and bones.¹⁵ 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 different. As Keith pointed out long ago, the enumeration of the bones in the *Brahmanas* was derived from correspondences with the numbering of various verse forms, not from anatomical observation.¹⁶ With the *Suśrutasanhitā*, 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.¹⁷ 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 *Suśrutasanhitā* 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.¹⁸ The author of the *Suśrutasanhitā* claimed that surgery was the most ancient and most efficacious of the eight branches of medical knowledge.¹⁹ 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 *Suśrutasanhitā*.²⁰

¹⁵ Malamoud 1996; Saha 2015.

¹⁶ Keith 1908.

¹⁷ Zysk 1986. The *Carakasanhita* too has brief descriptions of surgical techniques, but the *Suśrutasanhitā* goes into greater detail.

¹⁸ Wilson 1823; Mukhopādhyāya 1913; V. Deshpande 2000; Wujastyk 2003b; Valiathan 2007; Narayana and Thrigulla 2011 and many other studies.

¹⁹ *Suśrutasanhitā* 1.1.15–19 (*Su* 1938: 4).

²⁰ Leffler et al. (2020) provide a detailed discussion of the *Suśrutasanhitā*'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 nineteenth-century methods (MS London Wellcome 3007).

Torn ear lobes

The *Suśrutasamhitā* described otoplasty for the repair of torn ear lobes.²¹ A similar, but not identical, procedure was described by Celsus in the early first century CE.²² Majno, writing as a practising surgeon, noted that,²³

...through the habit of stretching their earlobes, the Indians became masters in a branch of surgery that Europe ignored for another two thousand years.

The different types of mutilated ear lobe that the *Suśrutasamhitā* 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.²⁴

Rhinoplasty

One of the best-known surgical techniques associated with *Suśrutasamhitā* is rhinoplasty, the repair or rebuilding of a severed nose. The history of this operation has been discussed by Wujastyk, and a translation of the Sanskrit passage from the vulgate edition of the *Suśrutasamhitā* was given.²⁵ This fascinating technique is certainly old in South Asia, having been witnessed by travellers from Niccolo Manucci in the seventeenth century onwards.²⁶ Many witnesses, including the most famous, Cruso and Findlay,²⁷ described an operation that differs from *Suśrutasamhitā* in that it takes the grafting skin from the forehead, not the cheek. But the operation witnessed by Thorburn in the nineteenth century is especially interesting, since the technique followed the *Suśrutasamhitā* exactly in taking flesh from the cheek, rather than the forehead.²⁸

²¹ Schiffman 2013: 43 briefly summarized early otoplasty history. The comprehensive study of ears in the history of Indian culture by Bollée (2010) oddly omits reference to *Suśrutasamhitā*'s surgery, although it mentions the text's description of ear diseases.

²² *De Medicina*, book VII, ¶8–9 (Spencer 1935–38: v. 3, 359–365).

²³ Majno 1975: 291.

²⁴ Majno 1975: 290–291; reproduced with permission in Wujastyk 2003b: 92–93.

²⁵ Wujastyk 2003b: 67–70, 99–100. See also HIMAL: IB, 327–328, note 186, for further literature and reflections. Once again, a similar but simpler technique was described by Celsus in *De Medicina* book VII, ¶10 (Spencer 1935–38: v. 3, 365–367).

²⁶ Manucci 1907–08: v. 2, 301.

²⁷ Longmate 1794: 883, 891f.

²⁸ Thorburn 1876: 352–353.

As noted by Meulenbeld, none of the extant commentators – Jējjāṭa, Gayadāsa, Cakrapāṇi or Ḑalhaṇa – explained the technique in any detail beyond short lexical glosses.²⁹ This suggests that the commentators may not all have known the technique at first-hand.

The skin flap

It is worth highlighting here a point of critical surgical 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.³⁰ This ensured the blood flow essential to keeping the skin alive while it healed in its new location.³¹ 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”.³² He thus indicated that he understood the flesh to be connected to the face.³³ 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.³⁴ The last of these verses says,

²⁹ HIML: IB, 328. Ḑalhaṇa 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. Ḑalhaṇa’s variant bears a resemblance to the description of the operation given in printed editions of the *Aṣṭāigahṛdayasāṃhitā* at Utt.18.59–65 ([Ah 1939: 841](#)).

³⁰ See Wujastyk [2003b](#): 67–70.

³¹ This surgical innovation distinguished the “Hindu Method” from sixteenth-century European methods associated with Gaspar Tagliacozzo and others (see, e.g., Carpué [1816](#): *passim*).

³² *Suśrutasāṃhitā* 1.16.28 ([Su 1938: 81](#)).

³³ See p. [64](#) below.

³⁴ 1.16.11–14 ([Su 1938: 78](#)).

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.³⁵

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

“Living” [flesh] means “together with blood”.³⁶

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. This 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.

35 1.16.14 (Su 1938: 78): गण्डादुत्पाद्य मांसेन सानुवन्धेन जीवता । कर्णपालीमापालेस्तु कुर्यान्निर्लिख्य शास्त्रवित्। Cf. the translation of the whole passage by Wujastyk (2003b: 94).

36 1.16.14 (Su 1938: 78): जीवेति शोणितसहितेनेत्वर्थः।

2 The Transmission of the Work

The Nepalese Version

In the present study 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,¹ 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 this designation 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 by him (2021b) as the result of a systematic analysis of two complete chapters, SS 1.3 and SS 1.15, and several shorter excerpts from the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* transmitted in the Nepalese manuscripts. On the one hand, these studies highlighted

¹ Klebanov 2021a: 2–3.

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 the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. For example, Klebanov also established that in spite of its Nepalese provenance, MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1146,² 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 versions of the work are preserved in manuscripts from Nepal. Also, the word "recension" suggests conscious editorial intervention at some point in the transmission, for which we do not yet have evidence.³ At the same time, we do wish to indicate the provenance of the oldest witnesses.

More than two hundred manuscripts of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 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.⁴ What can be said with certainty is that the Nepalese version preserves many archaic features of an early transmission of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā* and concentrates primarily on the study of this text in its own right and, additionally, frequently compares it with the version of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* promulgated by the late medieval commentator

² Rimal and Wujastyk 2022.

³ Editorial terminology in this area is not absolute: "recension," "version" and "redaction" are sometimes used interchangeably, or differently in various communities of scholars. See Roelli and Macé 2015: 164 ff.

⁴ For a list of known manuscript copies of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, see the sources mentioned in footnote 10 below.

Ḍalhaṇa 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 Ḍalhaṇa, 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.⁵ These features of the Nepalese version include orthographic variants, peculiarities in the structure and structuring elements, as well as the actual wording of the text. As argued elsewhere in this article, many of these variants appear to represent an archaic version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. This is partly because they preserve a version of the text that appears to be less edited, that is, more rudimentary in content and original in expression, that in turn suggests that it precedes later editorial intervention. 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 *Suśrutasamhitā*. Rather, the Nepalese version is a witness to a hyparchetype, not the archetype, of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. 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 Dalhaṇa in the twelfth century and that is reproduced in most printed editions of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. 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

⁵ Earlier publications include Harimoto [2011](#); Wujastyk [2013b](#); Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Parameswaran, et al. [2021](#); Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. [2021](#).

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.⁶ 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.⁷ Ḏalhaṇa also had several manuscripts of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* available to him, as we know because he frequently mentioned their variant readings.⁸

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. Śarman’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](#)).⁹ This duplication of the root text in the two books

⁶ See [HIML: IA 374–379](#) on these authors. Meulenbeld already noted that “the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 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](#)).

⁷ [HIML: IB, 499, n. 162](#).

⁸ 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).

⁹ 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 राजसर्प whereas Ḏalhaṇa glossed गौरसर्प. The editors reflected this in the root texts of the *Bhānumatī* ([Su 1939: 130](#)) and *Nibandhasaṅgraha*

creates the entirely misleading impression that both commentators had the same *Suśrutasaṃhitā* text before them.¹⁰ 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, Dalhaṇa commented on four verses, SS 1.16.11–14, as part of his root text, that Cakrapāṇidatta cited separately only in his commentary.¹¹ Cakrapāṇidatta had introduced each verse with “some people say” (केचित्पठन्ति). This clearly indicated that these verses 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 Dalhaṇa. In spite of this, the editors Y. T. Ācārya and N. Šarman 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 for the reader to clearly see that these two important commentators were responding to different versions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

Furthermore, the duplication of the root text is questionable in instances where Cakrapāṇidatta did not acknowledge or comment on some verses that appear in what we might call “Dalhaṇa’s version” of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. In some cases, this is an *argumentum ex silentio* because it is possible that Cakrapāṇidatta may not have remarked on a verse when its meaning was obvious. However, in other cases, the commentarial convention of citing the first words of a new verse or passage suggests 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 *Bhānumati* (Fig. 2.1, left).¹² It is followed by several verses also in the main text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that elaborate on the content of the prose passage.¹³ Dalhaṇa commented on these explanatory verses (Fig. 2.1, right), citing keywords

(Su 1938: 79) respectively.

¹⁰ 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 Āgāse and Āpate (1904) which is significantly different from that on which Śaṅkara was commenting (Maas 2013: 77–78).

¹¹ Su 1938: 78 and Su 1939: 128–129 respectively.

¹² Su 1939: 130, i.e., अथप्रदृष्टस्याभिवर्धनार्थम् ... निदध्यात्। It is numbered Su.1.16.19 in Dalhaṇa’s *Nibandhasaṅgraha* (Su 1938: 79).

¹³ SS 1.16.19–23 in Su 1939, i.e., स्वेदितो ..., यवाश्व ..., तैलं ..., तेषाम् ..., वद्ध

सेदितोन्मर्दिंतं कर्णं स्नेहैनैतेन योजयेत् ॥
 अथातुषद्वः सत्यन्वलवांशं विवर्धते ॥ १९ ॥
 (गच्छाश्वगन्धायायाहाँहस्तिलेक्षोद्धरीनं हितम् ॥
 शाश्वर्यश्वगन्धाम्पां पयस्यैरप्तव्याचेऽः ॥ २० ॥
 तैङ्गं विपक्षं सर्वीरमध्यङ्गात् पालिश्चनम् ॥)

कणिवर्धनार्थं सम्बद्धेनोलिलेनगाह—तथा गोविधारि । . प्रस्तुता लग्नायोज्ज्वल-
 वक्ष्या: विजिरा लालाद्यः, आनूपा महिपादवः । राजसर्वः देवतसर्वः, तदा
 तैलम्, एवं दि लेहोन्यम् । पर्वताक्षं पाकार्थं इवान्तरात् जेवलयुग्मेन । ये हु पर्वतस्याने
 सर्पिः पठन्ति, तन्मते जलसाप्तोऽयम्; अन्ये हु चतुःस्नेहैनैतेन पवस्याम्यं पठन्ति ।
 अलङ्कः शक्तेदेव, लग्नाक्षो जलतुयाक्षो भवति “जलतुयाः” इति प्रविदिः । प्रतीपापः
 कलः । ये लत्र मधुरार्थं पठन्ति पवस्यां च, तन्मते पवस्या शीरविशारी । तैङ्गं वेति
 तैलमेव च ॥ १९-२० ॥

सेदितोन्मर्दिंतं कर्णं स्नेहैनैतेन योजयेत् ॥
 अथातुषद्वः सम्बग्वलवांशं विवर्धते ॥ २० ॥
 अथ तैलाश्वर चारणमाह,—सेदितोन्मर्दितमित्यादि ॥ २० ॥
 यवाश्ववर्यश्वगन्धायायाहाँहस्तिलेक्षोद्धरीनं हितम् ॥
 अभ्यक्तस्योद्दर्तनमाह,—यवेलादि ॥—

शतावर्यश्ववर्यश्वाभ्यां पपस्यैरप्तव्याजीवनैः ॥ २१ ॥
 तैलं विपक्षं सक्षीरमध्यङ्गात् पालिवर्धनम् ॥
 कणिवर्धनार्थमर्त तैलमाह,—शतावर्यश्ववर्यश्वाभ्यामि-
 सादि । शतावर्यश्विकलेन लेहचतुयाक्षेन केवलक्षीणं चतुर्यु-
 मेन तैलमत्र पवनीयम् । पवस्या अर्कपुणी । जीवनैः काको-
 ल्यादिद्रवैः ॥ २१ ॥—

Figure 2.1: The text as it appears in Cakrapāṇī (left) and Dalhana (right) (Su 1939: 130, Su 1938: 79).

that show they all formed part of the main text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that was before him.¹⁴ However, Cakrapāṇidatta’s older commentary showed no awareness of the first few verses in this group, SS 1.16.19–21ab.¹⁵ Apparently, they were *not* part of the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* as he knew it. In spite of that, the editors printed these verses in their edition of Cakrapāṇidatta’s work as if they were indeed part of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* known to 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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that Cakrapāṇidatta knew is similar to the Nepalese version, at least in this particular case.¹⁶

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 Dalhana but not by Cakrapāṇidatta (see Fig. 2.2).¹⁷ This verse was almost certainly not in the text of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.¹⁸ Therefore, it requires a careful reading of the commentary itself to reverse-engineer,

¹⁴ 1.16.19–23 (Su 1938: 79–80).

¹⁵ Su 1939: 130–131.

¹⁶ Su 1939: 130, n. 2.

¹⁷ The verse begins नारीयोगं विनौष्ठस्य. It is printed in the vulgate as 1.16.32 (Su 1938: 81), with Dalhana’s commentary. It is printed in parentheses as 1.16.31 in the edition of the *Bhānumatī* (Su 1939: 133).

¹⁸ 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. 31 below, describes the sources that the editors used for that edition.

(नाडीयोगं विनौष्टस्य नासासन्धानविद्विधिम् ॥
 य पवमेव जानीयात् स राज्ञः कर्तुमहृति ॥ ३१ ॥)
 इति सौश्रुते शब्दयतन्त्रे सूत्रस्थाने कर्णव्यधवन्धविधिर्नाम
 पोडशोऽध्यायः ॥ १६ ॥

Figure 2.2: *Suśrutasanīhitā* 1.16.31 in the 1939 printed edition.

as it were, what its author, Cakrapāṇidatta, was seeing in the manuscripts of the *Suśrutasanīhitā* 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 *Suśrutasanīhitā* 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, क्षिएजिह्वाप्रशस्तसूचीव्यधात् and गाढतरवर्तित्वात्, before this.¹⁹ 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.²⁰

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 तत्रास्मिन्ज्ञास्वे..., which is also the reading commented on by Cakrapāṇidatta.²¹ However, Ḏalhaṇa commented on अस्मिन्ज्ञास्वे and stated that “others read तत्रास्मिन्ज्ञास्वे”.²²

Another example is the reading of पष्ठा विधानैः in Ḏalhaṇa's commentary on SS 1.1.8.1 that is not in his main text but that he ascribes

¹⁹ 1.16.6 ([Su 1938](#): 77).

²⁰ 1.16.5 ([Su 1939](#): 126–127).

²¹ 1.1.20 (*sic*) ([Su 1939](#): 17).

²² 1.1.22 ([Su 1938](#): 5).

to “some others”.²³ 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 Dalhana’s time because it was hard to understand.²⁴

Differences between the Nepalese and later versions of *Suśrutasamhitā* 1.16

Several differences between the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* 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.²⁵ Others have explored variations in the frame story of the work as a whole.²⁶ Klebanov discussed the interchangeable use of two titles for the first book of the text, namely “*Ślokasthāna*” and “*Sūtrasthāna*.²⁷ 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.²⁸

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 *Suśrutasamhitā* found in different printed sources.²⁸

Klebanov contributed some further general remarks and examples of substantive differences between the Nepalese and vulgate versions, and provided two more case studies.²⁹ The first dealt with the list of skin lesions associated with urinary disease.³⁰

²³ 1.1.8.1 (*Su* 1938: 3).

²⁴ See the discussion by Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. (2021: 4–5).

²⁵ Klebanov 2021a: 27 f.

²⁶ Wujastyk 2013b; Klebanov 2021a: 28–32; Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Parameswaran, et al. 2021; Birch, Wujastyk, Klebanov, Rimal, et al. 2021: 2–4.

²⁷ Klebanov 2021a: 32–44.

²⁸ Harimoto 2011: 101–104.

²⁹ Klebanov 2021a: 44–55.

³⁰ प्रमेहपिटका in the Nepalese spelling.

Their signs and pathogenesis are described in the *Nidānasthāna* and their treatment in the *Cikitsāsthāna*.³¹ This list of skin lesions exemplifies a case where the Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* is internally more coherent than that commented on by Dalhaṇa. The incoherence of Dalhaṇa's version was already identified by an earlier commentator, Gayadāsa (fl. ca. 1000), who proposed a textual conjecture that corresponds to the reading of the Nepalese version.³²

The second case study by Klebanov focussed on the variation in the list of bodily winds (प्राण) in SS 3.4.³³ 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, Jejjaṭa (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 Dalhaṇa's version of the text also included extremely early readings and variants, suggesting that some of the readings accepted by Dalhaṇa were ancient, if not original. Each case has to be weighed, and we are not yet in a position to make definitive judgements about the early divergence of textual recensions.

The detailed comparison that follows of 1.16 of the Nepalese ver-

³¹ *Suśrutasamhitā* 2.6 (*Su* 1938: 289–294) and 4.12 (*Su* 1938: 454–455) respectively.

³² 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.

³³ Klebanov 2021a.

sion 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.

Transpositions

Figure 2.3 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.³⁴ Be this as it may, this large block of verses is not present in the Nepalese version.

One can also see in Figure 2.3 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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.

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.³⁵

³⁴ 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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā* in other parts of India. For example, they are present in MS Hyderabad Osmania 137-3(b).

³⁵ 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

Nepalese version	Dalhana'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 2.3: A Comparison of verses in 1.16 of the Nepalese and Dalhana's versions.

Changing Spelling, Sandhi and Syntax

Later commentators like Dalhana often made efforts to standardise, simplify or improve the language of the Nepalese version. Such changes include the standardising of spelling,³⁶ sandhi,³⁷ and verbal forms,³⁸ as well as interventions to simplify and clarify syntax.³⁹ These efforts often involved splitting compounds.⁴⁰ In some instances, these changes improved the grammar,⁴¹ or

other early commentaries. See the discussion below, p. 33.

36 For example, पत्ताङ्ग (SS 1.16.21) → पतङ्ग (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81). For more information on this, see footnote 37 to the translation.

37 For example, ऋस्तेन ऋजु (SS 1.16.2) → ऋस्तेन र्जु (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

38 For example, उन्नामयिता (SS 1.16.21) → प्रान्मय (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81); अवचूर्णयीत (SS 1.16.21) → उपरहरेत् (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81).

39 For example, शोणितवहुत्विवेदनायां चान्यदेशविद्धमिति जानीयात्। निरुपद्रवता तदेशविद्धिलिङ्गम्। (SS 1.16.3) → शोणितवहुत्वेन वेदनया चान्यदेशविद्धमिति जानीयात्। निरुपद्रवतया तदेशविद्धम् इति। (1.16.4, Su 1938: 76); आमतैलपरिषेकोपचरेत् (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); अनन् (SS 1.16.15) → स्नेहनैतेन (1.16.20, Su 1938: 79).

40 For example, यदच्छाविद्धायां सिरायाम् (SS 1.16.4) → यदच्छ्या विद्धासु सिरासु (1.16.5, Su 1938: 76); धान्यास्त्रकपालचूर्णं (SS 1.16.10) → धान्यास्त्रं कपालचूर्णं (1.16.20, Su 1938: 78).

41 For example, सुरामण्डक्षीरम् (SS 1.16.10) → सुरामण्ड क्षीरम् (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78).

altered the meaning.⁴² However, some prefixes of verbal forms,⁴³ case endings,⁴⁴ and indeclinables were changed for less apparent reasons.⁴⁵ There is also a tendency to replace uncommon words with generic ones,⁴⁶ add indeclinables,⁴⁷ omit the verb “to be” at the end of sentences,⁴⁸ and introduce verses after a prose passage with the phrase भवति चात्र.⁴⁹

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” (वट्र). 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.⁵⁰ 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.⁵¹

The Nepalese version contains the rather obscure term वट्र for the slice of flesh that a surgeon cuts from the cheek in order to construct

⁴² For example, क्षीणाल्पमांसः (SS 1.16.12) → क्षीणोऽल्पमांसः (1.16.17, Su 1938: 79).

⁴³ For example, सम्बद्धितः (SS 1.16.8) → विवर्द्धितः (1.16.9, Su 1938: 77); निवेश्य (SS 1.16.10) → सम्प्रवेश्य (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78); अवबध्य (SS 1.16.10) → च बद्धा (1.16.15, Su 1938: 78).

⁴⁴ For example, मासे (SS 1.16.2) → मासि (1.16.3, Su 1938: 76).

⁴⁵ 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).

⁴⁶ For example, ऋक्षयेत् (SS 1.16.15) → योजयेत् (1.16.20, Su 1938: 79); नद्येत् (SS 1.16.21) → बद्धा (1.16.29, Su 1938: 81).

⁴⁷ 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).

⁴⁸ The words भवति or भवन्ति are omitted four times in Dalhaṇa’s version (1.16.10 (twice), 1.16.17 and 1.16.18 (Su 1938: 77, 79)).

⁴⁹ For example, [absent] (SS 1.16.11) → भवति चात्र (1.16.16, Su 1938: 79).

⁵⁰ For example, पञ्चदशसन्धानाकृतयः (SS 1.16.9) → पञ्चदशबन्धाकृतयः (see 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77)); दशकर्णसन्धिविकल्पाः (SS 1.16.9) → कर्णबन्धविकल्पाः (see 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77))

⁵¹ These names are नेमीसन्धानक, कपाटसन्धिक, and अर्धकपाटसन्धिक in SS 1.16.9 (cf. 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 77)).

a new nose.⁵² Modern dictionaries define वंश as a leathern strap or a slice of bacon,⁵³ the latter of which is more indicative of its meaning in the Nepalese version. This word was written out of subsequent versions,⁵⁴ and it was not mentioned as an alternative reading by either Cakrapāṇidatta or Ḏalhaṇa, which suggests that its use and meaning may not have been known to them. However, वंश was used by the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā* in the context of rhinoplasty, so it likely to be the correct reading in the Nepalese version.⁵⁵

Augmenting the Text

Apart from adding whole passages and verses (as seen in Figure 2.3), 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,⁵⁶ and phrases added to elaborate on diseases and treatments.⁵⁷ 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 Ḏalhaṇa (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. Some of the split ear flaps in Ḏalhaṇa's version have additional characteristics,⁵⁸ and a list of

⁵² SS 1.16.20 and 23.

⁵³ Apte: 1385; MW: 917.

⁵⁴ वंशम् (SS 1.16.20) → वद्धम् (SS 1.16.28, Su 1938: 81) and तद्वर्षेषं (SS 1.16.23) → तद्वर्षेषं (SS 1.16.31, Su 1938: 81).

⁵⁵ 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 वंश is old, occurring, also in the form वंश, from the *Atharvaveda* onwards (Mayrhofer 1986–2001: v. 2, 521–522).

⁵⁶ 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) → आशु (1.16.5, Su 1938: 77).

⁵⁷ For example, धात्र्यङ्के (SS 1.16.2) → धात्र्यङ्के कुमारधरङ्के वा (1.16.3); [absent] (SS 1.16.2) → वालकीडनकैः प्रलोभ्य (1.16.3); [absent] (SS 1.16.3) → पिचुवर्ति प्रवशयेत् (1.16.5).

⁵⁸ For example, पीठोपमपालिनिर्विधिमः (1.16.9, Su 1938: 77) → पीठोपमपालिरुभयतः क्षीणपुनिकाश्रितो निर्विधिमः (1.16.10, Su 1938: 77); इतराल्पपालिः सांक्षिसः (SS 1.16.9) → उत्सन्नपालिरितराल्पपालिः सांक्षिसः (1.16.10); तनुविषमपालिः (SS 1.16.9) → तनुविषमाल्पपालिः (1.16.10).

four symptoms associated with incurable joins in the Nepalese version (SS 1.16.19) was increased to six in Ḏalhaṇā'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 Ḏalhana (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.⁵⁹

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.⁶⁰ 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 Ḏalhaṇā's. It seems that this transposition may have resulted from the insertion of new verses 1.16.23cd–24 and 1.16.26.1–19 in the latter.

Redacting Recipes and Elaborating on Treatments

Some of the additional text in subsequent versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā* introduces new ingredients in recipes and different procedures in treatments. In many instances, the new material merely clarifies or elaborates on the original but sometimes it changes the recipe or

59 In Ḏalhana'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 *Suśrutasamhitā* 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 Ḏalhana.

60 For example, अणुस्थूल० (SS 1.16.9) → स्थूलाणु० (1.16.10, [Su 1938: 77](#)); तत्रैते दशकर्ण० (SS 1.16.9) → तत्र दशैते कर्ण० (1.16.10, [Su 1938: 77](#)); नातिगाढज्ञातिशिथिलं सूत्रेणाववध्य (SS 1.16.9) → सूत्रेणानवगाढमनतिशिथिलं च वद्धा (1.16.10, [Su 1938: 77](#)); पूर्वदक्षिणं कुमारस्य वामङ्गन्यायाः | प्रतनुं सूच्या वहलमारया (SS 1.16.2) → प्रतनुं सूच्या वहलमारया। पूर्व दक्षिणं कुमारस्य वामङ्गन्यायाः (1.16.3, [Su 1938: 76](#)).

treatment significantly. An example of a suppletion that clarifies the text of the Nepalese version can be seen in 1.16.3 of Ḏalhaṇa's version ([Su 1938: 76](#)), which contains a statement that the physician should insert a wick of cotton after the ear has been pierced.⁶¹ This statement anticipates the instructions in the the Nepalese version (SS 1.16.5–6) on removing the wick because of aggravated humours and replacing the wick with a thicker one every three days. In this case, the additional statement of Ḏalhaṇa's version elucidates the role of the wick in the procedure of piercing the ear.

A similar clarification occurs in Ḏalhaṇa's version at 1.16.18 ([Su 1938: 70](#)),⁶² which reiterates the cure for an ear tainted by a humour that was described earlier in 1.16.7.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ 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 Ḏalhaṇa's version, the treatment is reiterated.

In Ḏalhaṇa'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 Ḏalhaṇa's version, the recipe was rewritten to include sesame seeds.⁶⁵ 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. Ḏalhaṇa's version of the admixture has five additional ingredients, namely, [prickly chaff-flower](#), [Withania](#), [milk-white](#), [sweet plants](#) and [Indian ipecac](#).⁶⁶ It also has [beggarweed](#) instead of [Indian kudzu](#).⁶⁷

The general tendency in re-formulating a recipe from the

⁶¹ For example, [absent] (SS 1.16.2) → पिञ्चुर्वर्ति प्रवेशयेत् (1.16.3, [Su 1938: 76](#)).

⁶² Corresponding to SS 1.16.13 in the Nepalese version, lines 60–62 of the edition.

⁶³ SS 1.16.6 in the Nepalese version, lines 16–17 of the edition.

⁶⁴ Ḏalhaṇa 1.16.17 ([Su 1938: 79](#)), corresponding to Nepalese SS 1.16.12, lines 56–59 of the edition.

⁶⁵ Nepalese version SS 1.16.5 (lines 13–15): यवमधुकमञ्जिष्ठागन्धर्वहस्तमूलैर्मधुघृतप्रगाढैरालेपयेत् which become, in Ḏalhaṇa 1.16.7 ([Su 1938: 77](#)): मधुकैरण्डमूलमञ्जिष्ठायवतिलकल्पैर्मधुघृतप्रगाढैरालेपयेत्.

⁶⁶ Ḏalhaṇa's version 1.16.7 ([Su 1938: 77](#)).

⁶⁷ Nepalese version SS 1.16.14 (lines 65–66): अर्कालर्कबलातिबलानन्ताविदारीमधुकजलशूक्रप्रतिवापन्तैलम्पाचयित्वा which become, in Ḏalhaṇa 1.16.19 ([Su 1938: 79](#)): अर्कालर्कबलातिबलानन्तापामार्गाश्वगन्धाविदारिगन्धाक्षीरशुक्राजलशूक्रमधुरवर्गपयस्याप्रतिवापं तैलम्प्वा पाचयित्वा.

Nepalese version in later versions of the *Suśrutasamhitā* 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*, *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha*, and *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā*. 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 Dalhaṇa, 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 “*karṇiarogapratīṣedha*,” and *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā*, *Uttarasthāna* 1 and 18 with the same chapter names.⁶⁸

First, let us return to the comments on the insertion of a wick that were mentioned above (p.23). The Nepalese version says nothing, while Dalhaṇa's version says “one should insert a cloth wick” (पि-चुवर्ति प्रवेशयेत्). A little later, both versions say, “one should remove the wick”.⁶⁹ It seems likely that the editor of Dalhaṇa'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 version of the text on the principle of *lectio difficilior potior*. Both the *Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha* and the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā* describe first inserting a thread in the pierced earlobe and subsequently replacing it every third day.⁷⁰ In this respect, they agree with Dalhaṇa's version.

Secondly, it is interesting to consider again the recipe prescribed to treat the vitiation of humours in the pierced ear, mentioned above.

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

69 तत्र वर्त्तिमपहृत्य in the Nepalese version (line 13), and the less clear तत्र वर्त्तिमुपहृत्य in Dalhaṇa's version (1.16.6 (Su 1938: 77)).

70 6.1.58 (As 1980: 626) and 6.1.36 (Ah 1939: 780) respectively.

A slightly modified recipe is found in the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* 6.1.63 ([As 1980: 626](#)), but the same is not present in *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā*. As pointed out above, Ḏalhana's version adds a paste of sesame seeds (तिलकल्क) 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 (आज्य) is found. However, when checking the manuscripts of the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha*, one of them reads आचैः instead of आज्यैः(यवैरण्डजटायष्टीमञ्जिष्ठाज्यैः प्रलेपयेत्).⁷¹ Interestingly, the paste of sesame seeds (तिलकल्क) of Ḏalhana's version is not present in the *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* and is replaced by जटा, which is most probably spikenard.

Since the paste of sesame seeds is the main differentiating factor between the recipe versions attested by the Nepalese version and Ḏalhana's version, a general review of the contexts of its use in the major texts may be enlightening. References for the paste of sesame seeds are found in the texts shown in Table 2.1. Among them, refer-

<i>Text</i>	<i>Instances of sesame seed paste</i>
<i>Carakasaṁhitā</i>	6
<i>Suśrutasaṁhitā</i>	11
<i>Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha</i>	16
<i>Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā</i>	4

Table 2.1: Sesame seed paste (तिलकल्क) in different texts.

ences with the combination of the paste of sesame seeds, ghee and honey are not rare either, with four instances each in *Suśrutasaṁhitā* and *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* and two instances in *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā*. A combination of the paste of sesame seeds, ghee and honey has also been specifically quoted as a general healing recipe.⁷²

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.⁷³

⁷¹ MS Mumbai, Asiatic Society 162, catalogue no. BD 263/1-6

⁷² E.g., *Suśrutasaṁhitā* 1.11.22ab ([Su 1938: 49](#)), *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* 1.38.21 ([As 1980: 249–250](#)) and *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā* 1.30.34 ([Ah 1939: 357](#)).

⁷³ E.g., *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* 1.37.30 ([As 1980: 246](#)) for क्षतकण्ठ and *Aṣṭāṅgasāṅgraha* 4.17.22 ([As 1980: 517](#)) for healing of the surgical wound in उदररोग.

This material evidence points to the general trend that medicines in the older Nepalese version of the *Suśrutasamhitā* present a central core recipe, consisting of a few drugs, that develops with ever-increasing complexity in the more recent version of Ḟalhaṇa and later authors.

3 The Printed Editions

The careful survey of printed editions of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* by Meulenbeld lists no fewer than 44 entries.¹ 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.²

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.³ 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.⁴ These sources were described by Ācārya as follows; we provide an overview in Table 3.1.

The sources of the 1915 edition

- 1 Calcutta, Royal Asiatic Society. Covers the *sūtra*, *nidāna*, *śārīra* and *kalpa sthānas*.

¹ [HML](#): IIB, 311–314.

² E.g., Zysk 1984; [HML](#): IIB, 314–315.

³ See also the studies of these editions by Klebanov ([2021a](#): §1.2) and Wujastyk ([2013b](#): 143–144).

⁴ The following account is paraphrased from Y. T. Ācārya and N. R. Ācārya's own account of their sources ([Su 1938](#): 22).

- 2 Jaipur, Pandit Gaṅgādharabhaṭṭaśarman, lecturer at the Royal Sanskrit University. Covers the *cikitsāsthāna* and the *uttaratatantra*.
- 3 Bundi, my great friend the royal physician Paṇ. Śrīprasādaśarman. Covers the *uttaratatantra*.

The sources of the 1931 edition

- 1 Vārāṇasī, professor of literature, the great Gaurīnāthapāṭhaka. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *nidānasthāna* and *uttaratatantra*.
- 2 Ahmedabad. My friend Sva. Vā. Vaidya Raṇachodālālā Motilālaśarman. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.
- 3 From the personal library of my great friend Sva. Vā. Vaidya Murārajīśarman. Extremely old. No commentary. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.
- 4 Puṇe, BORI library. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Covers the *śārīrasthāna*.⁵
- 5 Puṇe, BORI library. With the *Nibandhasaṅgraha*. Complete. With some damaged folia.
- 6 Bombay, Asiatic Society. Incomplete.⁶
- 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 *Suśrutasandīpanabhāṣya* by Professor Hārāṇacandra Cakravārtti. Complete work. This is the 1910 Calcutta edition numbered “t” by Meulenbeld.⁷
- 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.⁸

⁵ Not one of the three MSS of the *śārīrasthāna* described in H. D. Sharma 1939.

⁶ 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.”

⁷ HIML: IB, 312; Bhaṭṭācārya 1910–17.

⁸ HIML: IB, 311; Sena et al. 1886–93.

edition source	1915			1931						1938					
	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3
<i>sthāna</i>															
<i>sū.</i>	●						●	?		○	○	†	●	●	●
<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 3.1: The sources of Yādavaśarman T. Ācārya’s three editions: manuscript coverage (●) and print coverage (○).

The sources of the 1938 edition

- 1 Gwalior, from the library of my great friend Pām. Rāmeśvaraśāstrin Śukla. Covers the *sūtra*, *nidāna*, *śārīra*, *cikitsā* and *kalpasthāna*.
- 2 Bikaner, from the library of the Royal Palace, supplied by Pām. Candraśekharaśāstrin. Contains the commentary *Nyāyācandrikāpāñjikāvyākhyā* by Gayadāsa. Covers the *nidānasthāna*. This is almost certainly MS Bikaner Anup 4390.⁹
- 3 Kathmandu, located in the private library of the Royal Guru Hemarāja Śarman. An extremely old palm-leaf manuscript. Readings from this MS were compiled by Pām Nityānandaśārman Jośi and sent to Ācārya. Covers from the beginning of the work to the end of the ninth chapter of the *cikitsāsthāna*. The siglum for this manuscript in footnotes was ता for तालपत्रपुस्तके.

Evaluation

Estimates show that there are approximately 230 extant manuscript witnesses for the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*.¹⁰ Although most of these manu-

⁹ See Dominik Wujastyk, “MS Bikāner AnupLib 4390.” *Pandit.* <<http://panditproject.org/entity/108068/manuscript>>.

¹⁰ 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.

scripts 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 3.1 reveals the underlying paucity of textual sources for these editions. At first, it appears that fifteen manuscripts were consulted. However, we quickly see that two of the sources were other people's printed editions, and one of those covered less than a quarter of the work (no. 9 of 1931). That reduces the manuscript base to 13 witnesses. Ācārya does not appear to have seen two of the manuscripts at all, having been sent collations prepared for him by others (7 of 1931 and 3 of 1938). Thus, Ācārya's final edition was based on the personal consultation of eleven partial manuscripts. One of them remains unidentified (6 of 1931). Only a single manuscript covers the whole of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, no. 5 of the 1931 edition. Manuscript 1 of 1938 is the next most complete, but it omits the *uttaratantra*, which comprises a third of the work. Manuscript 1 of the 1915 edition is third in size, but it still omits both of the longest chapters, and thus offers less than half the work. For the rest, the evidence is spotty, with each part of the work being supported by only between four and eight manuscripts, excluding the printed editions.

Two sources stand out for their historical importance. The first is no. 3 of 1931, which Ācārya calls "extremely old." It covered the *śārīrasthāna* only, and unfortunately we know nothing of the later history of this manuscript. The second is no. 3 of 1938, which is one of the important Nepalese manuscripts being considered in the present project. Ācārya's remarks and references to Hemarājaśarman's introduction to the *Kāśyapasaṃhitā* allow us to identify this manuscript as MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333.¹¹ 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.¹² 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.

¹¹ Su 1938: 22; Hemarāja Śarman 1938: 56–57. Discussed by Klebanov (2021a: §1.1, 2.3). See also HIML: IIB, 25–41; Wujastyk 2003b: 161–169.

¹² Su 1938: 22.

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. 3.1).¹³ The text was edited on the basis of the following sources.

For the Bhānumatī

1. A printed edition. Covered the *Bhānumatī* up to chapter Su.sū.40. The siglum was मु for मुद्रित.¹⁴
2. A manuscript in the India Office Library library provided through the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Pune.¹⁵ This manuscript covered the *Bhānumatī* up to the end of the *sūtrasthāna*. The siglum was ह for हस्तलिखित.¹⁶

For the Suśrutasamhitā

1. A palm leaf manuscript from Hemarājaśarman's personal library.¹⁷ The siglum was ता for ताडपत्र.
2. His own published edition. The siglum was ड for डल्हणसंमतः पाठः.¹⁸
3. Hārāṇacandra Cakravarti's published edition with his own commentary.¹⁹ The siglum was हा.

¹³ [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

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ At this time, manuscripts from Britain were routinely lent to scholars in India and vice versa.

¹⁶ Wujastyk [2021b](#): MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908 (PanditProject #109978, consulted on July 03, 2021).

¹⁷ I.e., MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333.

¹⁸ [Su 1938](#). It is noteworthy that Ācārya refers to his 1938 edition as representing “the Dalhaṇa version.”

¹⁹ Bhaṭṭācārya [1910–17](#).

१ अध्यायः]

सुश्रुतसंहिता

११

चरके—“लभोपायो हि चास्तानां रसावीनां रसायनम्” (च. चि. अ. १ पा. १) । पारिशेष्याद्वाजीकरणतत्त्वम् । अवाजिनं वाजीकुर्वन्ति येन तद्वाजीकरणम् । ‘अन्येषामपि दृश्यते’ (पा. अ. ६।३।१३७) इति वीर्धव्याप्तम् । येन वाऽत्यर्थं स्त्रीषु व्यज्यते तद्वाजी-करणम् । तदुक्तं चरके—“येन नारीषु सामर्थ्यं वाजिवलभते नरः । व्रजेष्वाप्यघिकं येन वाजीकरणमेव तत्” (च. चि. अ. २, पा. ४) इति ॥ ५ ॥

अथास्य प्रत्येकाङ्गलक्षणसमासः—तत्र, शल्यं नाम विविधतृणकाषु-पाषाणपांशुलोहलोहप्रास्त्रिवालनखपूयास्त्रावदुष्ट्रवणान्तर्गम्भेशलयोद्धरणा-र्थं षष्ठ्या विधानैः, यच्चशस्त्रक्षाराग्निप्रणिधानवणविनिश्चयार्थं च; शा-लाक्यं नामोर्ध्वंजन्त्रगतानां श्रवणनयनवद्वन्द्राणादिसंश्रितानां व्याधी-नामुपशमनार्थं; कायचिकित्सा नाम संवाङ्गसंश्रितानां व्याधीनां ज्वर-रक्तपित्तशोषोन्मादापसारकुष्ठमेहातिसारादीनामुपशमनार्थं; भूत-विद्या नाम देवैसुरगन्धवैयक्षरक्षःपितृप्रिशाचनैग्रहाद्युपस्तुप्तचेतसां शान्तिकर्मवलिहरणादिग्रहोपशमनार्थं; कौमारभूत्यं नाम कुमारभर-णधात्रीक्षीरदोपसंशोधनार्थं दुष्टस्तन्यग्रहसमुत्थिनां च व्याधीनामुप-शमनार्थम्; अगदतचं नाम सर्पकीटल्लतामूषकादिदृष्टविषव्यक्षनार्थं विविधविर्पसंस्योगोपशमनार्थं च; रसायनतचं नाम बयःस्थापनमायुर्म-धावलकरणं रोगापहरणसमर्थं च; वाजीकरणतत्त्वं नामावपदुष्टीणशु-रक्तरेतसामाप्यायायेनप्रसादोपचयजनननिमित्तं प्रहृष्टप्रणजननार्थं च ॥ ६ ॥

शस्त्राङ्गविशेषान् ज्ञातुं प्रतिलक्षणं संक्षेपेणाह—अथायेत्यादि । एकमेकमहं प्रति लक्ष-णानां समासः संक्षेपः प्रत्येकाङ्गलक्षणसमासः । तृण्यादीनां, तथा दुष्ट्रवणस्य, तथाऽन्तर्गत(र्भशाल्य)स्य उद्धरणार्थमिति प्रत्येकमुद्धरणशब्दः संबध्यते । दुष्टवणस्यान्तस्तुत्याद्याहरणार्थमित्यन्ये । षष्ठ्या विधानैरिति दिवणीयोक्तरपत्तर्पणादौ रक्षाविधानान्तैः; इत्थंभूतलक्षणे चृतीया । जनु श्रीवामूलं, जनुण ऊर्ध्वमूर्धजनु । प्राणादीत्यादिग्रहणच्छिरःकपालादिग्रह-णम् । उत्तरतत्त्वे प्रतिपादितक्रमप्राप्या ज्वरानन्तरमतीसारः पठितः, तस्यान्ते पाठोऽतिसा-रस्य सर्वाङ्गीणदोपारब्धलात्, औन्येषामपि तन्मध्यपाठेन सर्वाङ्गीणदोपारब्धलप्रतिपादना-व्यतिक्रमं वदन्ति । शान्तिकर्मवलिहरणादिना ग्रहणां देवावीनामुपशमो यस्तदर्थः; यदि वा श्रीर्हणं ग्रहो देवानामावेशस्तुपशमार्थम् । दुष्टस्तन्यग्रहसमुत्थितानामिति दुष्टस्तन्ये

१ ‘सर्वशरीरावस्थितानां व्याधीनामुपशमकरणार्थं उवरक्षोफगुरुरक्तपित्तोन्मादापसार-प्रमेहातीसारादीनां च’ इति ता । २ ‘देवदानव०’ इति ता । ३ ‘०विनायकनागग्रहोप-सुष्टुप्तेतसा०’ इति ता । ४ ‘०विपवेगोपशमनार्थं’ इति ता । ५ ‘शुक्राप्यायन०’ इति ता । ६ ‘तुणादीनां शस्त्रान्तानां’ इति सु । ७ ‘अन्ये तु तस्यान्ते पाठेन’ इति पा० । ८ ‘ग्रहणाद०’ इति सु ।

Figure 3.1: A page of the 1939 *Bhānumatī* edition, showing the variant readings in the footnotes.

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*.²⁰ A secondary purpose was to present the text of the *sūtrasthāna* as read in MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333, that had recently been brought to the editors' attention. In their judgement, the Kathmandu manuscript presented a text that was closer to what Cakrapāṇidatta had before him than the text according to Ḏalhaṇa. In spite of this, the editors largely reproduced the root text of Ḏalhaṇa's version. 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 his readings at the level of individual words and sentences (see Figure 3.1).

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.²¹

There is compelling evidence that Cakrapāṇidatta's *Bhānumatī* commentary once covered the whole text of the *Suśrutasamhitā*.²² 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.²³

²⁰ HIML: IA, 374–375 and IB, 495–496.

²¹ Su 1939: 3–4. See discussion by Klebanov (2021b: 7).

²² HIML: IA, 375.

²³ Cordier 1903: 332.

4 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.¹ That is why we will present only the key data essential for the study of our edition in the present book. In referring to the manuscripts, we use the sigla K, N and H, which correspond to the initial letters in the names of the libraries or owners, and have become canonical.

K MS Kathmandu KL 699 (fig. 4.1) is preserved at the Kaiser Shamsher (KL) library in Kathmandu.² It was microfilmed and catalogued by the NGMPP/ NGMCP as C 80-7.³ The MS comprises 152 palm-leaf folios that originally belonged to several different codicological units written by different scribes.⁴ 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.⁵ The MS is incomplete and contains a large part of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* as well as the *Sauśrutanighaṇṭu*.⁶ The date stated in the colophon at the end of the compendium is verified for Sunday, April 13, 878 ce. However, physical damage to the manuscript folio containing the colophon means that it is no longer possible to interpret it definitively. In particular, two persons are

¹ See also Harimoto 2010; 2011; 2014.

² See also the description by Klebanov (2021a: §2.1).

³ See the description in the online NGMCP catalogue, Harimoto 2013.

⁴ Bhattacharai (2020: 46) and Klebanov (2021a: 11) agree that four to five scribes were involved in the manuscript's production.

⁵ Codicological features of the manuscript, including the layout, peculiarities of the script, and various ornamental and text-dividing symbols were studied in Bhattacharai (2020).

⁶ Klebanov (2021a: 11) provided a detailed description of the content.




Figure 4.1: Folios 17r and 17v of MS Kathmandu NAK 1/1079 (K).

mentioned in the concluding remarks, someone called Śrī Harśacandra and Vaidya Vasuvarman, but their roles are not perfectly clear. Klebanov (2021a: 16) thinks that the former,

...either sponsored the copying enterprise or wrote the manuscript himself, [and that he subsequently] donated it to Vaidya Vasuvarman on the condition that he (Vasuvarman) would study the text and explain it to others. The second condition was that the manuscript should remain in the family and not be given away either for sale or as a pawn. If the manuscript sat unused, it should be returned to Śrī Harśacandra.⁷

N MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1079 (fig. 4.2) is kept at the National Archives Kathmandu (NAK), under accession number 1/1079 क०.⁸ It was microfilmed twice by the NGMPP as A 45-5(1) and A 1267-11(2).⁹ In 2023 the project was able to purchase higher-quality colour digital images of the manuscript from the NAK. The manuscript 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 scripts, with seven lines per folio on average. Although the text contained in the manuscript does not cover the entire *Suśrutasaṅhitā* and breaks off abruptly in the second chapter of the *sārīrasthāna*, 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 manuscript can be dated tentatively to the twelfth or thirteenth century.

H MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333 (fig. 4.3) formerly belonged to the historical collection of Hemarāja Śarman (fl. 1878–1953).¹⁰ It is now held by the National Archives Kathmandu and was microfilmed twice by the NGMPP as B 29-19 and B 30-15, but the latter microfilm is incomplete.¹¹ The manuscript comprises 435 palm-leaf folios, 34 × 5 cm in size, with one string-hole left of

⁷ Klebanov (2021a: 13–17) provided a translation and study of the colophon, as well as an exposition of different positions related to its interpretation.

⁸ See also the description by Klebanov (2021a: §2.2).

⁹ See the description in the NGMCP database by Acharya (2012).

¹⁰ See also the description by Klebanov (2021a: §2.3).

¹¹ See the NGMCP description by Klebanov (2012).




Figure 4.3: Folios 22v and 23r of MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333 (H).

centre. It is written in a type of Newari script that is more recent than that of N, with approximately six lines per folio. The manuscript is exceptionally well preserved. Of vital value for the present project, the manuscript supports the complete *Suśrutasan̄hitā* and the *Sauśrutanighaṇṭu*. The final colophon identifies the scribe of the manuscript as Vaidya Amarasiṁhaka, son of Kamaladatta, and states the date on which he concluded the copying of the text. Both reading the colophon, that is, deciphering the actual characters, and the 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) gave an analytical account of the views expressed in literature, considered further options, and proposed that the MS was completed on Sunday, July 29, 1543.

Editorial Principles

Method

The data for the critical edition comes from the witnesses of the Nepalese version, described above. 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 and tailored for the Saktumiva platform.¹² MS Kathmandu NAK 5-333 was transcribed first because its script is relatively easy to read, the scans are clear, it is the most complete of the manuscript witnesses, and its text is extremely close to that of MS Kathmandu KL 699. Following that, MS Kathmandu KL 699 and MS Kathmandu NAK 1-1079 were transcribed.

The diplomatic transcriptions were uploaded to Li's manuscript collation platform called Saktumiva, chapter by chapter as they were completed.¹³ An electronic edition of the vulgate of the *Suśrutasan̄hitā*, 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 on the Saktumiva platform and is available for collation.¹⁴

¹² See Wujastyk 2021–, TEI Consortium 2010 and Li 2017–: “TEI Tagging”.

¹³ See the Saktumiva interface Li 2017–.

¹⁴ This electronic edition is also available on the SARIT website (Wujastyk, Pollock, et al. 2008–: sub “*Suśrutasan̄hitā*”). The version at Saktumiva has received several corrections and the intention is to merge these back into the

Saktumiva's collation function standardises punctuation and orthographic variants according to filters which can be turned off or on.¹⁵ These filters enable the editors to ignore *dandas*, numbers and floral punctuation marks (*puṣpikā*) in the transcripts, as well as orthographic variants, such as ङ and ङ, certain germinated consonants, and *visarga* variants. On the basis of the automatic collation, Jason Birch created a provisional edition of SS.1.16, which the project's researchers read together at weekly seminars. Manuscript images were routinely checked to verify the transcripts, particularly when a reading was uncertain; the commentaries of Cakrapāṇidatta and Dalhana were read, and variant readings reported by these commentators were included in notes to the edition. Also, various reference books were consulted, to elucidate the meaning of technical terms and identify relevant information in other medical works.¹⁶

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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸

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.¹⁹ The resulting NEXUS file can be read by phylogenetic software to build a stemmatic tree.²⁰ This procedure was done with transcripts of several chapters of the Nepalese witnesses, and the results confirmed the editors' preliminary stemmatic hypothesis that K and H are more closely related to one another

SARIT edition eventually.

- ¹⁵ On the rationale for implementing text-critical principles as algorithms, see Li 2017 and Li 2018: §4.4.
- ¹⁶ Particularly valuable reference resources included V. Jośī and N. H. Jośī (1968), Meulenbeld (HIML), and the literature on *materia medica* cited on pp. 93 ff. below.

¹⁷ Wujastyk 2021–.

¹⁸ Wujastyk et al. 2021–: "The toolbox".

¹⁹ Li 2022a.

²⁰ This process is discussed in greater detail by Li (2022b).

than K and N.²¹ 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 Kathmandu KL 699 because the editors have endeavoured to present to the reader a hyparchetype of the text that was transmitted by this ninth-century manuscript. Therefore, the Sanskrit has been standardised as little 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.²² Therefore, the editors of SS.1.16 have opted to retain some perhaps unfamiliar features of the Sanskrit in MS Kathmandu 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, ०वाचनन्यात्य०), although the *anusvāra* is sometimes used (1.16.15, उदकं धान्यास्त०). In most cases,

²¹ See chapter 2 above for further discussion.

²² On the contrary, the text of the *Suśrutasamhitā* sometimes retains legitimate Pāṇinian forms that are rare or unknown elsewhere in Sanskrit literature. For example, the term *kārmuka* “effective,” formed by P.5.1.103, is virtually unknown in classical Sanskrit, and is said even by the authors of the *Kāśikāvṛtti* to occur uniquely as an adjective describing a bow. Yet it occurs in both the *Suśrutasamhitā* (1.41.5 (*Su* 1938: 182)) and the *Carakasamhitā* (1.26.13 (*Ca*. 1941: 138)), describing “effective” drug substances. Cf. the observation by M. Deshpande (1988: 118) that other rare Pāṇinian usages in the early Sanskrit medical texts provide evidence that, “... in all likelihood there was a dialect of Sanskrit closer to Pāṇini’s time and region in which [such peculiar Pāṇinian usage existed]. This peculiarity did not exist in most other dialects of Sanskrit.”

the consonant following a रेफ is doubled, but this is not always the case.²³ 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 *dāṇḍa* 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 formal Pāṇinian concept of 'end-of-sentence' and his rules on *sandhi* are contingent on the close contact of sounds (*saṃhitā*).²⁴ 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 *dāṇḍas* and changing *anusvāras* to म् before them are subjective decisions by the editors. The scribal use of *dāṇḍas* and *anusvāras* in the Nepalese manuscripts can be seen in the digital edition if one switches off the filters for ignoring *dāṇḍas* and final *anusvāra* variants.

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 *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. Since the print and digital environments

²³ Examples of the germination of consonants are कर्ण (1.16.1 ff), मुहूर्त (1.16.2), पूच्छ (1.16.2), गन्धवं (1.16.5), ॐलैः ममयुः (1.16.5), वर्ति (1.16.6) and पुनर्विच्छेत (1.16.6). Examples where it does not occur in 1.16 are ॐआर्थम् (1.16.8,19), कुर्यात् (1.16.16, 32), ०पालिर्वद्धूर० (1.16.10); ०पालिर्वायोजिमः (1.16.10) and दीर्घैक० (1.16.10).

²⁴ Pāṇini 1.4.109 परः सञ्चिकषः सहिता, *et passim*.

d NE, K m kumārasya vāmañi kanyāy
 pratanum sūcyā bahalam ārayā ||2||

[A: tataḥ N, H: pratanū]
 A: [ADD] picuvartim A: [OM]
 A: praveśayet ||

Figure 4.4: The digital edition of SS.1.16.3

differ markedly, each edition has its own format.

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 4.4, 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 *picuvartim* after *tataḥ*, omitted *sūcyā bahalam*,²⁵ 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 4.4, displays the manuscript sigla for the witnesses that support the selected reading, which is labelled “NE” (“New Edition”). As seen in Figure 4.5, 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.

²⁵ 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]	pravesayet
K: pratanum	sūcyā bahalam ārayā
N: pratanū	sūcyā bahalam ārayā
H: pratanū	sūcyā bahalam ārayā

Figure 4.5: The witnesses to a selected passage of SS.1.16.3

The digital form of the edition is “soft,” in the sense that editorial work on the files that generate the critical text is potentially continuous, adding ever greater refinement and precision. And, especially, as more manuscript witnesses come to light and are transcribed, the edition is open to continuous enrichment.

Printed Edition

The printed edition of SS.1.16 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 on p. 47:

१–९ 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 9 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, on p. 47:

६ प्रतनुं] प्रतनू N H

This entry means that on line six 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 indicates 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. Text deleted by a scribe is shown underscored by double lines, and the scribe's substitution is appended in quotation marks.

There are minor 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 in the digital edition as,

N: aneX]

and in print as

१ अनेन] अने अ N.

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 Ḏalhaṇa. 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.

5 Critical edition of Sūtrasthāna

16

अथातः कर्णव्यधिधिं व्याख्यास्यामः ॥ १ ॥

1.16.1

रक्षाभूषणनिमित्तम्बालस्य कर्णां व्यधयेत्। तौ षष्ठे मासे
सप्तमे वा शुक्लपक्षे प्रशस्तेषु तिथिकरणमुहूर्तनक्षत्रेषु कृतम-
ङ्गलस्वस्तिवाचनं^१ धात्र्यङ्के कुमारमुपवेश्याभिसान्त्वयमानो^२
भिषग्वामहस्तेनाकृष्य कर्णन्दैवकृते छिद्रे दक्षिणहस्तेन ऋजु
विध्येत्। दक्षिणं कुमारस्य वामङ्गल्यायाः। प्रतनुं सूच्या बह-
लमारया ॥ २ ॥

1.16.3

Witnesses

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

MS variants

१ व्याख्यास्यामः] व्या K. ३ सप्तमे] *om.* N. ३--४ ०मङ्गलस्वस्तिवाचनं] A; ०मङ्गलं
स्वस्तिवाचनं K, H, N. ४ धात्र्यङ्के] धात्र्यङ्के K. ४ कुमार] कुमारकम् N. ५ ऋजु] जुं
र्जम् N H. ६ प्रतनु] प्रतनू N H.

Variants from Su 1938

१ कर्णव्यधिधिं] कर्णव्यधवन्यविधिमध्यायं A. १ व्याख्यास्यामः] *add.* यथोवाच भग-
वान्यन्वन्तरिः॥ A. २ व्यधयेत्] विध्येते A. २ मासे] मासि A. ४ धात्र्यङ्के] *add.*
कुमारधराङ्के वा A. ४ मुपवेश्याभिसान्त्वयमानो] उपवेश्य वालक्रीडनकैः प्रलोभ्याभिसान्त्व-
यन् A. ५ कर्णन्] कर्ण A. ५ छिद्रे] छिद्रे A. ५ छिद्रे] *add.* आदित्यकरावभासिते
शनैः शनैर् A. ५ ऋजु] जुं A. ६ विध्येत्] *add.* प्रतनुकं सूच्या बहलमारया A. ६
कन्यायाः] कुमार्याः A. ७ आरया] *add.* ततः पिचुवर्तिं प्रवेशयेत्॥ 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 भक्ष्यविशेषैर्वा before वालक्रीडनकैः प्रलोभ्य in the vulgate.

- शोणितबहुत्वेऽतिवेदनायां चान्यदेशविद्धमिति जानी-
यात्। निरुपद्रवता तदेशविद्धलिङ्गम् ॥३॥
- 1.16.4
- १० तत्र यद्यच्छाविद्धायां सिरायामज्ञेन ज्वरदाहश्यथुवे-
दनाग्रन्थिमन्यास्तम्भापतानकशिरोग्रहकर्णशूलानि
भवन्ति ॥४॥
- 1.16.5
- १५ दोषसमुदयादप्रशस्तव्यधाद्वा तत्र वर्त्तिमपहृत्य यवमधुक-
मञ्जिष्ठागन्धवृहस्तमूलैर्मधुघृतप्रगाढैरालेपयेत्। सुरूढच्छैन-
म्पुनर्विद्येत् ॥५॥
- 1.16.6
- १६ सम्यग्विद्धमामतैलपरिषेकेणोपचरेत् । अत्यहात्यहाद्वर्ति
स्थूलतरीङ्^४ कुर्वीत परिषेकश्च तमेव ॥६॥
- 1.16.7
-
- Witnesses
-
- १० तत्र] MSS H and N. From here to the end of 1.16, MS K is missing
a folio.
-
- MS variants
-
- १० ०श्यथु०] em.; ०श्यथु० N; ०श्यथु० H. १३--१४ ०गन्धवृहस्तमूलैर्] ०गन्धवृह-
स्तमूलै N. १६ ०परिषेकेणोप०] ०परिषेकणोप० H. १७ ०तरीङ्] ०तरी० N
-
- Variants from Su 1938
-
- ८ बहुत्वे] बहुत्वेन A. ८ ऽतिवेदनायां] वेदनया A. ९ ०द्रवतया A. ९ ०वि-
द्धलिङ्गम्] ०विद्धमिति A. १० तत्र] तत्राज्ञेन A. १० यद्यच्छाविद्धायां] यद्यच्छासु
A. १० सिरायाम्] सिरासु A. १० सिरायाम्] add. कालिकामर्मरिकालोहितिकासूपद्रवा
भवन्ति। तत्र कालिकायां A. १० ज्वर०] ज्वरो १० ०दाह०] दाहः १० ०श्यथु०]
श्यथु० A. १०--११ ०वेदना०] add. च भवति मर्मरिकायां वेदना ज्वरो A. ११ ०ग्रन्थि०]
ग्रन्थयश् A. ११ ०ग्रन्थि०] add. च लोहितिकायां A. १२ भवन्ति] add. तेषु यथा-
स्वं प्रतिकुर्वीत ॥ क्षिणिजिहाप्रशस्तसूचीव्यादादृतवर्तित्वाद् A. १३ वा] add. यत्र संरभो
वेदना वा भवति A. १३ अपहृत्य] उपहृत्याश्च A. १३--१४ यवमधुक०] मधुकैरण्ड-
मूल० A. १३--१४ ०मञ्जिष्ठागन्धवृहस्तमूलैर्] ०मञ्जिष्ठायवतिलक्लैर् A. १४ आलेप-
येत्] add. तावद्यावत्सुरूढ इति ॥ A. १५ विद्येत्] add. विद्धानं तु पूर्वोक्तमेव ॥ A. १६
सम्यग्०] तत्र सम्यग्० A. १६ आमतैलपरिषेकणोपचरेत्] आमतैलेन परिषेचयेत् A. १६
अत्यहाद्] add. च A. १७ ०तरीङ्] ०तरी० A. १७ कुर्वीत] दद्यात् A.
-
- Notes
-
- ^३Dalhana, on 1.16.6 (Su 1938: 77), stated that some do not read सुरूढ-
च्छैनम्पुनर्विद्येत्.
- ^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.

अथ व्यपगतदोषोपद्रवे कर्णेऽलंप्रवर्द्धनार्थं लघुप्रवर्द्धनकमामुच्चेत् ॥७॥

1.16.8

२०

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

1.16.9

२५

तत्र समासेन पञ्चदशसन्धानाकृतयो भवन्ति ।^५ तद्यथा।
नेमीसन्धानकः। उत्पलभेद्यकः। वल्लूरकः। आसङ्गिमः। ग-
ण्डकर्णः। आहार्यः। निर्वेधिमः। व्यायोजिमः। कपाटस-
न्धिकः। अर्द्धकपाटसन्धिकः। सङ्ग्लिसः। हीनकर्णः। वल्ली-
कर्णः। यष्टीकर्णः। काकौषः। इति। तेषु तत्र पृथुलायतस-
मोभयपालिनेमीसन्धानकः। वृत्तायतसमोभयपालिरुत्पलभे-
द्यकः। हस्त्ववृत्तसमोभयपालिर्वल्लूरकर्णकः। अभ्यन्तरदी-
र्घैकपालिरासङ्गिमः। बाह्यदीर्घैकपालिर्गण्डकर्णकः। अपा-
लिरुभयतोऽप्याहार्यः। पीठोपमपालिर्निर्वेधिमः। अणुस्थूल-
समविषमपालिर्व्यायोजिमः। अभ्यन्तरदीर्घैकपालिरितराल्प-
पालिः कपाटसन्धिकः। बाह्यदीर्घैकपालिरितराल्पपालिश्चार्द्ध-

३०

MS variants

१८--१९ लघुप्रवर्द्धनकम्] लु प्रवर्धनकामो N; प्रवर्धनकामा “मै” H. १९ आमुच्चेत्] em.;
मुच्चेत् N H. २० नृणाम्] नृणा N. २१] A; दोषटो N H. २३ वसन्धाना०] वसन्धा०
N. २६ अर्द्धकपाटसन्धिकः] om. N. २७ काकौषः] काकौषमः H. २७ इति] ति H.
२७--२८ वृत्तसमो०] A; वृत्तसमो H; वृत्तसमो N. २९ भेद्यकः] भेद्यः N; भेदकः
H. २९ वल्लूर०] वल्लूर० N. ३० वाह्य] A; वाह्यैक N H. ३१--३२ अणुस्थूल०] अशुस्थूल० H
अशुस्थूल० H ३३ कपाट०] कवाटा० H.

Variants from Su 1938

१८ लंप्रवर्द्धनार्थ] om. A. १८--१९ लघुप्रवर्द्धनकम्] लघुव० A १९ आमुच्चेत्]
कुर्यात्॥ A २० सम्वर्द्धितः] विवर्धितः A. २१ सन्धानान्] सन्धानं A. २३ वदश-
सन्धानाकृतयो] वदशकर्णवन्ध्याकृतयः A. २३ भवन्ति] om. A. २४ नेमी०] नेमि० A.
२६ वसन्धिकः] अर्द्ध०] वसन्धिको अर्द्ध० A २७ यष्टी०] यष्टि�० A. २७ काकौषः] काकौ-
षक A. २७ तत्र] om. A. २८ नेमी०] नेमि० A. २९ वल्लूर०] वल्लूरकः A. ३१
पीठोपमपालिर्] add. उभयतः क्षीणपुत्रिकाश्रितो A. ३१--३२ अणुस्थूल०] स्थूलाणु० A.

Notes

^५Cakrapānidatta, on 1.16.9–13 (Su 1939: 128), and Daṭhaṇa, on 1.16.10 (Su 1938: 78), pointed out that others read पञ्चदशकर्णकृतयः (instead of पञ्चदशसन्धानाकृतयः). At the same place, Daṭhaṇa also mentioned that some read समुच्चतसमोभयपालिः (instead of वृत्तायतसमोभयपालिः) and others do not read संक्षिप्तादयः पञ्चासाध्याः.

कपाटसन्धिकः। तत्रैते दशकर्णसन्धिविकल्पा बन्ध्या भव-
 ३५ न्ति। तेषान्नामभिरेवाकृतयः प्रायेण व्याख्याताः। संक्षिप्ताद्यः
 पञ्चासाध्याः। तत्र शुष्कशङ्कुलिरितरात्पपालिः संक्षिप्तः।
 अनधिष्ठानपालिः पर्यन्तयोश्च क्षीणमांसो हीनकर्णः। तनु-
 विषमपालिर्वल्लीकर्णः। ग्रन्थितमांसः स्तब्धसिराततसूक्ष्म-
 पालिर्यष्टीकर्णः। निर्माससंक्षिप्ताग्रात्पशोणितपालिः का-
 ४० कौष्ठ इति। बद्धेष्वपि दाहपाकस्नावशोफयुक्ता न सिद्धिमुपया-
 न्ति ॥९॥^६

1.16.10

MS variants

३४ चार्द्धकपाट०] em.; वार्द्धकवाट० H; चार्द्धकवाप० N. ३७ पर्यन्तयोश्च] om. N. ३८
 ग्रन्थितमांसः] ०ग्रन्थितमान्सः N H. ३९ निर्मास०] A; निर्मान्स० N ; निर्मान्स० H. ४०
 ०स्नाव०] ०श्राव० H. ४० ०शोफ०] ०सोफ० N.

Variants from Su 1938

३४ चार्द्ध०] अर्ध० A. ३४ तत्रैते] तत्र A. ३४ दशकर्णसन्धिविकल्पा] दशैते कर्णव-
 न्ध्यविकल्पा: A. ३५ बन्ध्या भवन्ति] साध्याः A. ३५ तेषान्] तेषां A. ३५ नामभिर्]
 स्वनामभिर् A. ३६ शुष्कशङ्कुलिर्] add. उत्सन्धपालिर् A. ३७ च] om. A. ३७-३८
 ०षमपालिर्] ०षमात्पपालिर् A. ३८ ग्रन्थितमांसः] ग्रथितमांस० A. ३८-३९ ०सिरा-
 ततसूक्ष्म०] ०सिरासंततसूक्ष्म० A. ३९-४० काकौष्ठ] काकौष्ठक A. ४० अपि] add.
 तु शोफ A. ४० ०दाह०] add. ०राग० A. ४० ०पाक०] add. ०पिडका० A. ४०
 ०शोफ०] om. A.

Notes

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

अतोऽन्यतमस्य बन्धुश्चिकीर्षः अय्ग्रोपहरणीयोक्तोपस-
 मृतसम्भारः विशेषतश्चात्रोपहरेत्^९ सुरामण्डक्षीरमुदकं धा-
 ४५ न्यामूकपालचूर्णं च्छेति। ततोऽङ्गनां पुरुषम्वा ग्रथितकेशान्तं
 लघुभुक्तवन्तमासैः सुपरिगृहीतं च कृत्वा बन्धानुपधार्य छेद्य-
 भेद्यलेख्यव्यधनैरुपपाद्य कर्णणशोणितमवेक्ष्यैतदुष्टमदुष्टम्वेति
 ततो वातदुष्टे धान्यामूदकाभ्यां पित्तदुष्टे शीतोदकपयोभ्यां श्ले-
 ष्मदुष्टे सुरामण्डोदकाभ्यां प्रक्षाल्य कर्णणम्पुनरवलिखेत्। अ-
 ५० नुन्नतमहीनमविषमञ्च कर्णणसन्धिनिवेश्य स्थितरक्तं सन्दर्श्य
 मधुघृतेनाभ्यज्य पिचुप्लोतयोरन्यतरेणावगुण्ठ्य नातिगाढन्ना-
 तिशिथिलं सूत्रेणाववध्य कपालचूर्णेनावकीर्याचारिकमुपदि-
 शेत्। द्विग्रणीयोक्तेन चान्नेनोपचरेत् ॥ १० ॥

1.16.15

MS variants

४२] ततो N. ४२-४४ ०पहरणीयो०] ०पसंहरणीयो० N. ४४ चात्रोपहरेत्] A; चात्रोपहरणीयात् N H. ४५ पुरुषम् पुरुषः N. ४६ च कृत्वा] A; om. N H. ४६ उपधार्य] उपपाद्य H. ४७ ०शोणितमवेक्ष्यैतद्] ०शोणित अवेक्ष्येतद् N. ४७ अदुष्टम्] अदुष्टश N. ४७ वेति] A; चेति N H. ४८ धान्यामूदो०] धान्यामूदो० N ४८ शीतोदक०] शीतोदको० N. ४९-५० ०अवलिखेत्] अवलिखेत N. ५० ०सन्धिन्] ०सन्धिं N ५१ ०गुण्ठ्य] ०गुण्ठ्यो H. ५१ ०गाढन्] गाढं N. ५२ ०वध्य] ०वद्ध N. ५३ चान्नेनोपचरेत्] उपांचरेत् N. ५३ ॥ १० ॥] add. भ N.

Variants from Su 1938

४२ inserted passage] भवन्ति चात्र। यस्य पालिद्वयमपि कर्णस्य न भवेदिह। कर्णपीठ समे
 मध्ये तस्य विद्धि विवर्धयेत्॥ बाद्यायामिह दीर्घायां सन्धिराम्यन्तरो भवेत्। आभ्यन्तरायां दीर्घायां
 बाद्यसन्धिरुदाहतः॥ एकैव तु भवेत्यालिः स्थूला पृथ्वी स्थिरा च या। तां द्विधा पाटयित्वा तु छित्त्वा
 चोपरि सन्धयेत्॥ गण्डादुत्पाट्य मांसेन सानुबन्धनं जीवता। कर्णपालीमापालेस्तु कुर्यान्निर्लिख्य
 शास्त्रवित्॥ A. ४३ अतोऽन्यतमस्य] ०सन्धिन्] ०सम्भारः] ०सम्भारं A.
 ४४ सुरामण्डक्षीरम्] सुरामण्ड क्षीरम् A. ४४-४९ धान्यामूकपाल०] धान्यामूक पाल० A.
 ४६ बन्धान्] बन्धम् A. ४६-४७ ०व्यधनैर्] add. उपपन्नैर् A. ४७ अवेक्ष्यैतद्] अवेक्ष्य
 A. ४८ ततो] तत्र A. ४८ धान्यामूदकाऽ०] धान्यामूद्योदकाऽ० A. ४९ ०मण्डो-
 दकाऽ०] ०मण्डोद्योदकाऽ० A. ४९ कर्णणम्] कर्णौ A. ४९-५० ०अवलिखेत्] अनुन्नतम्]
 अवलिख्यानुन्नतम् A. ५० ०सन्धिन्] ०सन्धिं A ५० निवेश्य] सन्धिवेश्य A. ५० स-
 न्दर्श्य] सन्दर्श्यात् A. ५० सन्दर्श्य] add. ततो A. ५१ नातिगाढन्] सूत्रेणानवगाढमन्
 A. ५१-५२ नातिं] अतिं A. ५२ सूत्रेणाववध्य] च वद्धा A. ५३ चान्नेनोपचरेत्]
 च विधानेनोपचरेत् A. ५३ ॥ १० ॥] add. भवति चात्रा A.

Notes

^९विशेषतश्चात्रोपहरणीयात् 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 अय्ग्रोपहरणीयात् in the Nepalese version suggests that its second occurrence, which does not make good sense here, is a dittographic error.

विघट्टनन्दिवास्वप्नं व्यायाममतिभोजनम् ।

व्यायामग्रिसन्तापम्वाकश्च विवर्जयेत् ॥ ११ ॥

1.16.16

नातिशुद्धरक्तमतिप्रवृत्तरक्तं क्षीणरक्तं वा सन्दध्यात् । स हि वातदुष्टे रक्तबद्धोऽरुदो परिपुटनवान्भवति । पित्तदुष्टे गाढ-पाकरागवान् । श्लेषमदुष्टे स्तब्धकर्णः कण्ठूमानतिप्रवृत्तस्त्रावः शोफवान्धीणाल्पमांसो न वृद्धिमुपैति ॥ १२ ॥

1.16.17

स यदा रुदो निरुपद्रवः कर्णो भवति तदैनं शनैः शनैर-भिवर्जयेत् । अन्यथा संरम्भदाहपाकवेदनावान्भवति । पुनरपि छिद्येत् ॥ १३ ॥

1.16.18

MS variants

५४ विघट्टनन्] विघट्टनं N. ५५ अग्रिसन्तापम्] आग्रिसन्ताप N. ५५ विवर्जयेत्] वर्जयेत् N. ५६ ०शुद्ध०] ०सुद्ध० N. ५६ ०वृत्तरक्तं] ०वृत्तं रक्तं N. ५७ रक्तबद्धोऽरुदो] em.; रक्तबद्धो रुदो N; रक्तबद्धो रुदो H. ५७ ०पुटनवान्] ०पुटवाम N; ०पुटनवाम H. ५७ ०दुष्टे] दुष्टे N. ५८ श्लेष०] श्लेष० N. ५८ ०कर्णः] ०वर्णः N. ५८ ०स्त्रावः] ०श्रावः H. ५९ क्षीणाल्प०] क्षीणो ल्प० N. ६० रुदो] रुदो N. ६१ ०पाकवेदनावान्] ०पाकरागवेदनावान् N; ०पाकवेदनावाम H.

Variants from Su 1938

५४ विघट्टनन्] विघट्टनं A. ५६ नाति०] न चाशु० A. ५७ रक्तबद्धोऽरुदो] रक्ते रुदोऽपि A. ५७ भवति] om. A. ५८ गाढपाकरागवान्] दाहपाकरागवेदनावान् A. ५८ स्तब्ध०] स्तब्धः A. ५८-५९ ०वृत्तस्त्रावः शोफवान्] ०वृत्तरक्ते श्यावशोफवान् A. ५९ क्षीणाल्प०] क्षीणोऽल्प० A. ६० inserted passage] आमतैलेन त्रिरात्रं परिषेचयेत्त्रिरात्राच्च पिचुं परिवर्तयेत्। A. ६० रुदो] सुरुदो A. ६० कर्णो] सवर्णो A. ६१ अन्यथा] अतोऽन्यथा A. ६१ ०पाकवेदनावान्] ०पाकरागवेदनावान् A. ६१ भवति] om. A. ६१ अपि] om. A. ६२ छिद्यते] छिद्यते वा A.

	अथाप्रदुषस्याभिवर्द्धनार्थमभ्यङ्गः । गोधाप्रतुदविष्कि- रानूपौदकवसामजापयस्तैलं गौरसर्षपजञ्च यथालाभं संभृत्याकार्लक्बलातिबलानन्ताविदारीमधुकजलशूकप्रति- वापन्तैलम्पाचयित्वा स्वनुगुप्तन्निदध्यात् ॥ १४ ॥ ^c	1.16.19
६५	स्वेदितो मर्दितङ्कण्ठमनेन ग्रक्षयेद्वृघः । ततोऽनुपद्रवः सम्यग्बलवांश्च विवर्द्धते ॥ १५ ॥ ^d	1.16.20
७०	ये तु कण्णा न वर्द्धन्ते स्वेदोपपादिताः । तेषामपाङ्गे त्वबहिः कुर्यात्प्रछानमेव च ॥ १६ ॥ ^e	1.16.22cd -23ab

MS variants

६३ अथाप्र०] अथास्याः प्र० H. ६३ ०दुषस्याभिवर्द्धनार्थम्] ०दुषस्याभिवर्द्धनार्थम् N. ६५--
६६ ०आर्कार्लक्बलातिऽ] ०आर्कार्लक्बलातिऽ N. ६५--६६ ०प्रतिवापन्] ०प्रतिवापं N.
६६ ०गुप्तन्] ०गुप्तं N. ६६ निदध्यात्] निदध्यात् N. ६७ स्वेदितो] स्वेदितो N. ६७
अनेन] अनेन X N. ६८ ततोऽनुपद्रवः] ततो नुपद्रवः H; ततो नुपद्रवम् N. ७० अबहिः] अवर्हिं N.
७० कुर्यात्] कुर्यात् N. ७० प्रछानम्] प्रछन्नम् H.

Variants from Su 1938

६३ अथाप्र०] अथास्याप्र० A. ६३ अभ्यङ्गः] add. तद्यथा A. ६३--६४ ०मजापाप-
स्तैलं] ०मजानौ पयः सार्पस्तैलं A. ६५--६६ ०बलानन्ताऽ] ०बलानन्तापामार्गश्चगन्धा A.
६५--६६ ०विदारीमधुकजलशूक०] ०विदारिगन्धाक्षीरशुक्राजलशूकमधुरवर्गपयस्या० ६५--
६६ ०प्रतिवापन्] ०प्रतिवापं A. ६६ तैलम्] add. वा A. ६६ ०गुप्तन्] ०गुप्तं A. ६७
स्वेदितो मर्दितङ्क] स्वेदितोमर्दितं A. ६७ अनेन ग्रक्षयेद्वृघः] स्वेदनैतेन योजयेत् A. ६९
inserted passage] यवाश्चगन्धायष्टाहैस्तिलैश्चोद्वर्तनं हितम्। शतावर्यश्चगन्धाभ्यां पयस्ते-
ण्डजीवनैः॥ तैलं विपकं सक्षीरमभ्यङ्गात्पालिवर्धनम्। A. ६९ स्वेदस्वेदोप०] स्वेदस्वेदोप० A.
७० अपाङ्गे त्वबहिः] अपाङ्गदेशे तु A. ७० च] तु A.

Notes

^cDalhaṇa, on 1.16.19 (Su 1938:79), noted that some read राजसर्षपजं in the place of गौरसर्षपं. 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 अर्कपुष्पी.

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

^eDalhaṇa, on 1.16.23 (Su 1938: 80), noted that some read तेषामपाङ्गच्छेयं हि कार्यमाभ्यन्तरं भवेत्.

अमिताः कर्णवन्धास्तु विज्ञेयाः कुशलैरिह ।
 यो यथा सुनिविष्टः स्यात्तथा यो-
 जयेद्धिष्कृ ॥ १७ ॥ ^{११}

1.16.26.1

७५

जातरोमा सुवत्मा च श्लिष्टसन्धिः समः स्थिरः ।
 सुरुद्धोऽवेदनो यस्तु तं कर्णं वर्द्धयेच्छनैः ॥ १८ ॥

1.16.25

MS variants

^{७१} वन्धास्] ०वन्धो H. ^{७१} तु] स्तु H. ^{७२-७३} योजयेद्] योजये N. ^{७५} सुवत्मा]
 सुवर्मा N; सुवर्मा H. ^{७५} ०सन्धिः] ०सन्धिम् N. ^{७६} तु] em.; तत् N H.

Variants from Su 1938

^{७१} inserted passage] बाह्यच्छेदं न कुर्वत व्यापदः स्युस्ततो ध्रुवाः ॥ बद्धमात्रं तु यः कर्णं स-
 हसैवाभिवर्धयेत्। आमकोशी समाधातः क्षिप्रमेव विमुच्यते ॥ A. ^{७२} सुनिविष्टः] सुविशिष्टः
 A. ^{७२} स्यात्] तं A. ^{७२-७३} योजयेद्धिष्कृ] विनियोजयेत् A. ^{७३} inserted passage] (कर्णपाल्यामायान्नां पुनर्वक्षयमि सुश्रुत !॥ कर्णपाल्यां प्रकृष्टिप्राप्तावातपित्तकफास्यः ॥
 १॥ द्विधा वाऽप्यथ संसृष्टा: कुर्वन्ति विविधा रुजः। विस्फोटः स्तव्यता शोफः पाल्यां दोषे तु वा-
 तिके दाहविस्फोटजननं शोफः पाकश्च पैतिके। कण्डूः स्थविष्युः स्तम्भो गुरुत्वं च कफात्मक ॥
 ३॥ यथादोषं च संशोध्य कुर्यात्तेषां चिकित्सितम्। स्वेदाभ्यङ्करीयेषैः प्रलेपासुग्विमोक्षणैः ॥ ४॥
 मृद्धीं कियां वृहणीर्यथास्वं भोजनस्तथा। य एवं वेत्ति दोषाणां चिकित्सां कर्तुमर्हति ॥ ५॥ अत
 ऊर्ध्वं नामलिङ्गेवक्ष्ये पाल्यामुपद्रवान्॥ अत्याटकश्चोत्पुटकः श्यावः कण्डूयुतो भुशम्॥ ६॥ अ-
 वमन्थः सकण्डूको ग्रन्थिको जम्बुलस्तथा॥ स्वाच्ची च दाहवांशैव शृण्वेषां क्रमशः क्रियाम्॥ ७॥
 अपामार्गः सजर्जरः पाटलालकुचत्वयौ॥ उत्पाटके प्रलेपः स्यात्तैलमेभिश्च पाचयेत्॥ ८॥ शम्पा-
 कशिष्युपूतीकान्नोदामेदोऽथ तद्वासाम्॥ वाराहं गव्यमैयेण पित्तं सर्पिशं संसृजेत्॥ ९॥ लेपमुत्पुटके
 दद्यात्तैलमेभिश्च साधितम्॥ गौरीं सुगन्धां सश्यामामनन्तां तण्डुलीयकम्॥ १०॥ श्यावे प्रलेपनं
 दद्यात्तैलम् एभिश्च साधितम्॥ पाठां रसाञ्जनं क्षोद्रं तथा स्यातुष्णाकाञ्जिकम्॥ ११॥ दद्यात्तैलम् स-
 कण्डूके तैलमेभिश्च साधितम्॥ ब्रणीभूतस्य देवं स्यादिदं तैलं विजानता ॥ १२॥ मधुकक्षीराकाको-
 लीजीवकाद्यैर्विपाचितम्॥ गोधावराहसर्पाणां वसाः स्युः कृतवृद्धेण ॥ १३॥ प्रलेपनमिदं दद्यादव-
 सिच्यावमन्थके॥ प्रपौण्डरीकं मधुकं समझां धवमेव च ॥ १४॥ तैलमेभिश्च संपकं शृणु कण्डूमतः
 क्रियाम्॥ सहदेवा विश्वदेवा अजाक्षीरं ससैन्यवमेतेरालेपनं दद्यात्तैलम् एभिश्च साधितम्॥ १५॥
 ग्रन्थिके गुटिकां पूर्वं स्नावयेदवपात्य तु ॥ ततः सैन्यवच्छृणु तु शृद्धा लेपं प्रदापयेत्॥ १६॥ लिखित्वा
 तत्त्वात् घृष्णा चूर्णलोध्रस्य जम्बुले॥ क्षीरेण प्रतिसार्येनं शुद्धं संरोपयेत्तः ॥ १७॥ मधुपर्णीं मधूकं
 च म मधुकं मधुना सह ॥ लेपः स्नाविणि दातव्यस्तैलमेभिश्च साधितम्॥ १८॥ पञ्चवल्कैः समधुकैः
 पिष्टैस्तैश्च धृतान्वितैः॥ जीवकाद्यैः ससर्पिकैदद्यामानं प्रलेपयेत्॥ १९॥) A. ^{७६} यस्तु] च A.

Notes

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

- विशेषितायामथ नासिकायां
वक्ष्यामि सन्धानविधिं यथावत् ।
नासाप्रमाणं पृथिवीरुहाणां
पत्रं गृहीत्वा त्ववलम्बि तस्य ॥ १९ ॥ १२
- 1.16.27
- तेन प्रमाणेन हि गण्डपार्श्वाद्
उत्कृत्य वद्रं त्वथ नासिकाग्रम् ।
विलिख्य चाशु प्रतिसन्दधीत
तं साधुबद्धमिषगप्रमत्तः ॥ २० ॥
- 1.16.28
- ८५ सुसीवितं सम्यगतो यथावन्
नाडीद्वयेनाभिसमीक्ष्य नह्येत् ।
उन्नामयित्वा त्वचूर्ण्यीत
पत्ताङ्ग्यष्टीमधुकाङ्गनैश्च ॥ २१ ॥
- 1.16.29
- ९० संछाद्य सम्यक्षिपचुना ब्रणन्तु
तैलेन सिञ्चेदसकृत्तिलानाम् ।
घृतञ्च पात्यः स नरः सुजीर्णे
स्तिग्धो विरेच्यः स्वयथोपदेशम् ॥ २२ ॥
- 1.16.30

MS variants

७७ नासिकायां] नासिकाया N. ७९ प्रमाणं] प्रमाण० N. ७९ वीरुहाणां] वीरुहाणम् N. ८० पत्रं] पत्र N. ८२ वद्रं] वन्ध H. ८४ बद्धम्] बद्ध० N. ८५ सुसीवितं] em.; सुसीवित N; सुशीवितं H. ८८ पत्ताङ्ग०] em.; पत्ताङ्ग० H; पत्तङ्ग० N. ८९ ब्रणन्तु] ब्रण तुन् N. ९२ विरेच्यः] A; विरेच्य N H. ९२ देशम्] देशः N.

Variants from Su 1938

७७ विशेषितायाम्] विशेषितायास्त्व A. ७७ नासिकायां] नासिकाया A. ८२ वद्रं] वद्धं A. ८४ तं] तत् A. ८४ बद्धम्] बद्धैर् A. ८५ सुसीवितं] सुसीवितं A. ८६ नह्येत्] वद्धा A. ८७ उन्नामयित्वा] प्रोन्नम्य चैनाम् A. ८७ अवचूर्ण्यीत] अवचूर्ण्येत् ८८ पत्ताङ्ग०] पत्तङ्ग० A. ८९ ब्रणन्तु] सितेन A. ९२ स्वयथो०] स यथो० A.

Notes

^{१२} Cakrapāṇidatta, on 1.16.26 ([Su 1939](#): 133), said that others read नासासन्धानविधिम् here. Dalhana, on 1.16.27–31 ([Su 1938](#): 81), stated that some read, छिन्नां तु नासिकां दद्धा वयःस्थस्य शरीरिणः। नासानुरूपं संच्छिद्य पत्रं गण्डे निवेशयेत्॥

रुद्धञ्च सन्धानमुपागतं वै
 तद्धग्रहेषं तु पुनर्निकृन्तेत्।
 हीनम्पुनर्वद्धयितुं यतेत
 समञ्च कुर्यादतिवद्धमांसम् ॥ २३ ॥
 इति ओम्॥

1.16.31

MS variants

९३ सन्धानम्] सन्धाम् N. ९३ उपागतं] उपागतश् H. ९३ वै] चै H. ९४ ऋषेषं]
 ०सेषन् N. ९५ यतेत्] यतेतः N. ९६ ०मांसम्] ०मान्सम् N. ९७ ओम्] om. N.

Variants from Su 1938

९३ वै] स्यात् A. ९४ तद्धग्र०] तदर्थ० A ९५ हीनम्] हीनां A. ९६ समज्] समां A.
 ९६ ०मांसम्] ०मांसाम् A. ९७ ओम्] om. A. ९८ inserted passage] नाडीयोगं
 विनोष्टस्य नासासन्धानवद्विधिम्। य एवमेव जानीयात्स राज्ञः कर्तुमहंति॥ A.

6 Translation of Sūtrasthāna 16

- 1 Now we shall expound the method for piercing the ear.¹
- 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,² on the lap of a wet-nurse.³ Then, he should pull the ear with

¹ The topic of piercing the ear (कर्णनव्यप) 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 *Kaśāpyasamhitā* (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 Dalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) and Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 125), the heading of this chapter is “the method of piercing and joining the ear” (कर्णव्यधवन्यविधि), instead of the Nepalese version’s “the method of piercing the ear” (कर्णव्यधविधि). The topic of joining the ear (कर्णव्य) 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. When commenting on this statement, Dalhaṇa (Su 1938: 76) and Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 125) observed that only the ears of healthy people should be pierced, and they quoted 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” (1.16.1 (Su 1938: 76)).

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

- 2 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.
- 3 The versions of 1.16.3 known to Cakrapāṇidatta (Su 1939: 126) and Dalhaṇa (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 Dalhaṇa’s gloss “a man who holds the child.” Also, both versions add बालकीडिनकैः प्रलोभ्य (“having enticed with children’s toys”) to indicate that the child should

his left hand and pierce straight through with his right hand at a naturally-occurring cleft.⁴ 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.⁵

- 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.⁶
- 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.⁷
- 5 Having removed the wick (वर्ति) because of the accumulation

be tempted with toys to stay on the assistant's lap. According to Dalhaṇa on 1.16.3 ([Su 1938:76](#)), the toys include replica elephants, horses, bulls and parrots. Dalhaṇa further mentions that others read भृशविशेषैर्वा ("or by special treats") before बालक्रीडनकैः; but we see no trace of these small kindnesses in our witnesses.

- 4 The versions of 1.16.3 of Cakrapāṇidatta ([Su 1939:126](#)) and Dalhaṇa ([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 because of 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 absolutives.

- 5 Dalhaṇa 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" (*Lakṣmaṇatippaṇaka*) 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 Dalhaṇa in twelfth-century Bengal. See Meulenbeld ([HML:IA](#), 386).
- 6 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.

- 7 This passage is significantly augmented in Cakrapāṇidatta's and Dalhaṇa'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.'

of humours or an unsatisfactory piercing at that location,⁸ he should smear 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.⁹

- 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.¹⁰
- 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.¹¹
- 8 A person's ear enlarged in this way can split in two, either as a result of the humours¹² 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.¹³ They are as follows: Rim-join (नेमीसन्धानक), Lotus-splittable (उत्पलभेदक), Dried Flesh (वृक्षरुक), Fastening (आसङ्गिम), Cheek-ear (गण्डकर्ण), Take away (आहार्य), Ready-Split (निर्वेधिम), Multi-joins
-
- 8 In addition to these reasons, Dalhana at 1.16.6 (*Su 1938*:77) added "because of piercing with a painful, crooked and unsatisfactory needle" (क्लिष्टजिह्वाप्रशस्त्सूची-व्याधात) and "because of a wick that is too thick" (गाढतरवर्तित्वात). Dalhaṇa was aware of the reading in the Nepalese version because in his commentary on 1.16.6 (*Su 1938*:77) he noted that some read "because of the accumulation of humours" rather than "because of piercing with a painful, crooked and unsatisfactory needle or because of a wick that is too thick." On the concept of humoral accumulation (समुदाय), see the important analysis by Meulenbeld (1992).
 - 9 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.
 - 10 Describing ear and nose operations similar to those here, Celsus described the use of a quill (Latin *pinna*) where the Sanskrit authors use a cotton wick (*De Medicina* VII ¶10–11, Spencer 1935–38: v. 3, 366–367).
 - 11 Cakrapāṇidatta on 1.16.6 (*Su 1939*:127) and Dalhaṇa 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 tree cotton. Dalhaṇa added that it can also be made of lead and should have the shape of the *datura* flower. The manuscripts have variant readings for लघुप्रवर्धनकमामुच्चेत 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.
 - 12 Dalhaṇa 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.
 - 13 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 Dalhaṇa'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.

(व्यायोजिम), Door-hinge (कपाटसन्धिक), Half door-hinge (अर्धकपाटसन्धिक), Compressed (संक्षिप्त), Reduced-ear (हीनकर्ण), Creeper-ear (वल्लीकर्ण), Stick-ear (यदीकर्ण), and Crow's lip (काकौष्ठ).¹⁴

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.¹⁵
- 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.¹⁶ The five from compressed (संक्षिप्त) on are incurable.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸

¹⁴ 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 2003b: 154).

¹⁵ For an artist's impression of this join, see Majno 1975: 291 (reproduced as Figure 3.3 in Wujastyk 2003b: 155).

¹⁶ Cakrapāṇidatta on 1.16.9–13 (Su 1939: 128–129) and Ḏalhaṇa 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 (नेमीसन्ध्यानक) is similar to the join of the rim of a wheel (चक्रधारा).

¹⁷ Ḏalhaṇa 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.

¹⁸ The version of 1.16.11–13 known to Ḏalhaṇa (Su 1938: 78) has four verses (श्लोक)

- 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.¹⁹ And in this regard, he should particularly gather²⁰ **decanted liquor**, milk, water, **fermented rice-water**, and powdered earthenware crockery (**कपालचूर्ण**).²¹

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.²² 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 **tree cotton** and gauze (**स्नोत**), 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

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 Cakrapāṇidatta. He cites the verses separately in his commentary, the *Bhānumati* (Su 1939: 128–129), introducing each one as ‘some people read’ (के चित्पठन्ति). However, in Trikamajī Ācārya’s edition of the *Sūtrasthāna* of the *Bhānumati*, the root text is largely identical to the one commented on by Dalhaṇa (Su 1938), even in instances like this where Cakrapāṇidatta’s commentary indicates that he was reading a different version of the *Suśrutasamhitā*. See further the discussion on p. 6 above.

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

20 The reading in the Nepalese manuscripts of विशेषतश्चात्रोपहरणीयात् 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.

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

22 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.

(आचारिक). And he should supplement with food as taught in the “Two Wound” chapter.²³

- 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.²⁴ 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.²⁵
- 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,²⁶ fat, marrow, milk, and sesame oil, and white mustard oil.²⁷ 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.²⁸ This should then be deposited in a

²³ *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 4.1 (*Su* 1938: 396–408).

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

²⁵ In his edition of *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, 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 पिचुं परिवर्तयेत्).

²⁶ For such classifications, see the analyses by Zimmermann (1999) and Smith (1994).

²⁷ Ḑalhaṇa’s version of 1.16.19 (*Su* 1938: 79) includes ghee. However, Ḑalhaṇa’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. Ḑalhaṇa 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.

²⁸ The version of this verse known to Ḑalhaṇa (vulgate (*Su* 1938: 79)) adds several ingredients to this admixture, including prickly chaff-flower, *Withania*,

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.*²⁹
- 16 *Ears which do not enlarge even when sweated and oiled, should be scarified at the edge of the hole, but not outside it.*³⁰
- 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.*³¹
- 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.*³²
- 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 (वट्ठ),³³ with the same measurements, off*

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 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.

- 29 For these aims (i.e., healing and enlarging the ear), the text known to Dalhaṇa (*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 *Suśrutasamhitā* known to him may not have included them.
- 30 Dalhaṇa'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.
- 31 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 Dalhaṇa (*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 (मिश्रकच्चिकित्स) (SS 5.25), which does indeed begin with a discussion of the disease परिपोट. Dalhaṇa went on to say that some believe that these verses were not composed by sages and, therefore, do not read them.
- 32 The order of verses 17 and 18 is reversed in Dalhaṇa's version (*Su 1938*: 80).
- 33 The version of 1.16.28b known to Dalhaṇa (*Su 1938*: 81) reads "bound, connected (वद्धम्)" instead of "slice of flesh (वट्ठ)." 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 2003b: 67–70).

the cheek, the end of the nose is then scarified.³⁴ 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.³⁵ Having caused it to be raised,³⁶ the powder of sappanwood,³⁷ liquorice and Indian barberry should be sprinkled on it.³⁸*
- 22 *The wound should be covered properly with tree 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.³⁹*
- 23 *And once healed and really come together, what is left of that slice of flesh (वध) should then be trimmed.⁴⁰ If it is reduced, however, one should make an effort to stretch it, and one should make its overgrown flesh smooth.⁴¹*

34 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, Dalhana (*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.

35 Dalhana noted that the two tubes should be made of reed or the stalk of the leaf of the *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.

36 The Sanskrit term उत्त्रामित्या in 1.16.21 is non-Pāṇinian.

37 For पत्ताङ्ग (sappanwood), 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 Dalhana has पतङ्ग (1.16.29 (*Su 1938*: 81)) and this term is propagated in modern dictionaries.

38 Dalhana glossed अङ्गन as रसाङ्गन, *elixir salve* (*Su 1938*: 81).

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

40 The vulgate transmission has lost the word वध and replaced it with अर्ध "half," which makes little sense in this surgical context.

41 Dalhana 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 Jejjīṭa, Gayadāsa and others, although they did not comment on it because it was easy to understand. Cakrapāṇidatta also did not comment on this additional verse (*Su 1939*: 133).

Abbreviations

- Ah 1939 Kumṭe, Aṇṇā Moreśvara, Navare, Krṣṇaśāstrī, and Parādkar, Hariśāstrī (1939) (eds.), श्रीमद्भाग्भविरचितम् अष्टाङ्गहृदयम्, श्रीमद्रुणदत्तविरचितया सर्वाङ्गसुन्दराख्यया व्याख्यया, हेमाद्रिप्रणीतया आयुर्वेदरसायनाह्या टीकया च समुल्लसितम् = *The Astāṅgahṛidaya* (6th edn., Mumbayyām: Nirṇaya-sāgara Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3tt6967d>.
- Anup Anup Sanskrit Library.
- Apte Apte, Vaman Shivaram (1992), *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Company), ISBN: 4-653-00038-7; Reprinted from Gode and Karve 1957–59.
- AS Asiatic Society.
- As 1980 Āṭhavale, Anamita Dāmodara (1980) (ed.), अष्टाङ्गस-ञ्जः श्रीमद्भूद्ध्वाग्भविरचितः इन्दुव्याख्यासहितः [= *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha with Indu's Commentary*] (Pune: M. A. Āṭhavale, Śrīmad Ātreya Prakāśanam), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s25bwqsd0n7>.
- Bhela 1921 Mookerjee, Ashutosh, and Ananta Krishna Shastri, Vedantabisharad (1921) (eds.), *The Bhela Samhita. Sanskrit Text* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta), <https://n2t.net/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.*
- Ca. 1941 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1941) (ed.), महार्षिणा पुनर्वसुनोपदिष्टा, तच्छिष्येणाग्निवेशेन प्रणीता, चरकहृष्टबलाभ्यां प्रति-संस्कृता चरकसंहिता, श्रीचकपाणिदत्तविरचितया आयुर्वेदीपिकाव्या-ख्या संवलिता (3rd edn., Mumbayyāṁ: Nirnaya Sagara Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t48q2f20n>.
- 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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s2kbk5zcrg9>.
- KL *Kaiser Library.*
- MN₁ Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1920) (ed.), महामतिश्रीमाधवकरप्रणीतं माधवनिदानम् श्रीविजयरक्षित-श्रीकण्ठदत्ताभ्यां विरचितया मधुकोशाख्यव्याख्यया, श्रीवाचस्पतिवैद्यविरचितया आतङ्कदर्पणव्याख्याया विशिष्टांशेन च समुल्लसितम् = *Mādhavanidāna by Mādhavakara with the Two Commentaries, Madhukosha by Vijayarakhshita & Shrikanthadatta and Ātankadarpaṇa by Vāchaspati Vaidya* (1st edn., Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t9z08jn5j>.
- MN₃ Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1932) (ed.), महामतिश्रीमाधवकरप्रणीतं माधवनिदानम् श्रीविजयरक्षित-श्रीकण्ठदत्ताभ्यां विरचितया मधुकोशाख्यव्याख्यया, श्रीवाचस्पतिवैद्यविरचितया आतङ्कदर्पणव्याख्याया विशिष्टांशेन च समुल्लसितम् = *Mādhavanidāna by Mādhavakara with the Two Commentaries, Madhukosha by Vijayarakhshita & Shrikanthadatta and Ātankadarpaṇa by Vāchaspati Vaidya* (3rd edn., Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press), <https://n2t.net/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.*

- 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. Searchable at <https://vmlt.in/ncc/>.
- NGMCP NGMCP (2014), “Nepal-german Manuscript Cataloguing Project. Online Title List and Descriptive Catalogue,” Universität Hamburg and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, <http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/>.
- RORI *Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute.*
- Su 1889 Bhaṭṭācāryya, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara (1889) (ed.), *सुश्रुतः सूत्र-निदान-शारीर-चिकित्सा-कल्पोत्तर-तत्त्व-कथित आयुर्वेद-भगवता धन्वन्तरिणोपदिष्टः सुश्रुतनामधेयेन तच्छिष्येण विरचितः* (3rd edn., Calcutta: Saratī Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t1nh6j09c>; **HIML**: IB, 311, edition b.
- Su 1915 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1915) (ed.), *सुश्रुतसंहिता, सुश्रुतेन विरचिता, वैद्यवरश्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाव्याख्याया समुल्लसिता, आचार्योपाहेन त्रिविक्रमात्मजेन यादवशर्मणा संशोधिता = The Sushrutasamhita of Sushruta, the Nibandhasangraha Commentary of Shri Dalhaṇāchārya* (Mumbayyāṁ: Nirṇayasāgaramudrāyantrālaye), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3sv0mt50>, accessed 29/07/2020; **HIML**: IB, 312 edition *v.
- Su 1931 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1931) (ed.), *सुश्रुतसंहिता, वैद्यवरश्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाव्याख्याया समुल्लसिता, महर्षिण सुश्रुतेन विरचिता, सूत्र-निदान-शारीर-चिकित्सा-कल्पस्थानोत्तरतत्त्वात्मकः आचार्योपाहेन त्रिविक्रमात्मजेन यादवशर्मणा संशोधिता = The Sushrutasamhitā of Sushruta with the Nibandhasangraha Commentary of Shree Dalhaṇāchārya* (2nd edn., Mumbayyāṁ: Pāṇḍurāṅga Jāvajī at the Nirṇayasāgaramudrāyantrālaye), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t9j41sg94>, accessed 09/06/2020; **HIML**: IB, 312 edition *v.
- Su 1938 Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama, and Ācārya, Nārāyaṇa Rāma (1938) (eds.), *श्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहाव्याख्याया निदानस्थानस्य श्रीगयदासाचार्यविरचितया*

न्यायचन्द्रिकारब्यपञ्जिकाव्यारब्यया च समुद्धसिता महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता (3rd edn., Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t09x0sk1h>; [HTML](#): IB, 313, edition cc ('the vulgate').

Su 1938²

Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama, and Ācārya, Nārāyaṇa Rāma (2004) (eds.), महर्षिणा सुश्रुतेन विरचिता सुश्रुतसंहिता, श्रीडल्हणाचार्यविरचितया निबन्धसंग्रहारब्यव्याख्यया निदानस्थानस्य श्रीगयदासाचार्यविरचितया न्यायचन्द्रिकारब्यपञ्जिकाव्यारब्यया च समुद्धसिता (Vārāṇasī: Caukhambhā Krṣṇadāsa Akādamī); Reprint of the third, 1938 edition ([Su 1938](#)).

Su 1939

Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama, and Śarman, Nandakiśora (1939) (eds.), सुश्रुतसंहितायाः सूत्रस्थानम् श्रीचक्रपाणिदत्तविरचितया भानुमतीव्याख्याया समेतम् = *Sushruta-saṅhitā* (*sūtra Sthān*) with *Bhānumatī* Commentary by Chakrapāṇi Datta with Introduction by Gaṇanāth Sen (Śrīsvāmi Lakṣmīrāma Nidhi Granthamālā = Shrī Swāmī Lakshmī Rām Trust Series, 1; [Jaipur]: Śyāmasundara Śarman), <https://n2t.net/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: Nirṇay-asāgarākhyamudraṇālaye), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t8kd4jh7n>.

TMSSML

Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji Saraswati Mahal Library.

Viṣṇudh.

Śarman, Madhusūdana, and Śarman, Mādhavaprasāda (1912) (eds.), विष्णुधर्मोत्तरपुराणम् = [Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa] (Mumbai: Khemarāja Śrīkrṣṇadāsa at the Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press), <https://n2t.net/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 colon refer to pages in the present book.)

Bikaner Anup 4390: 29

Hyderabad Osmania 137-3(b): 18, 63

Kathmandu KL 699: vii, viii, 1, 17, 35f, 39, 41, 58, 64

Kathmandu NAK 1-1079: 2, 37, 39, 58, 64

Kathmandu NAK 1-1146: 10

Kathmandu NAK 1/1079: 36

Kathmandu NAK 5-333: 2, 30f, 33, 37ff, 58, 64

London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908: 14, 31

London Wellcome 3007: 4

Mumbai AS B.D.109: 28

Mumbai AS B.I.3: 28

Mumbai, Asiatic Society 162: 25

Thanjavur TMSSML 10773: 65

Bibliography

Ācārya, Yādavaśarma Trivikrama (1941) (ed.), महर्षिणा पुनर्वसुनोपदिष्टा, तच्छ्येणाग्निवेशेन प्रणीता, चरकटटबलाभ्यां प्रतिसंस्कृता चरकसंहिता, श्रीचक्रपाणि-दत्तविरचितया आयुर्वेददीपिकाव्याख्यया संवलिता (3rd edn., Mumbaiyām: Nirnaya Sagara Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t48q2f20n>.

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: Nirṇay-asāgarākhyamudraṇālaye), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t8kd4jh7n>.

Acharya, Diwakar (2012), “Description of Microfilm A 45/5,” NGMCP, <https://tinyurl.com/NGMCP-A45-5>, accessed 27/02/2023.

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. Kāśīnātha Śāstrī, and Āpaṭe, Hari Nārāyaṇa (1904) (eds.), वाचस्पतिमिश्रविरचितटीकासंवलितव्यासभाष्यसमेतानि पातञ्जल्योगसूत्राणि तथा भोजदेवविरचितराजमार्तण्डाभिधवृत्तिसमेतानि पातञ्जल्योगसूत्राणि (Ānandāśramasamksṛtagranthāvalih, 47; Punyākhya-pattana:

- Ānandāśramamudraṇālaya), <https://n2t.net/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).
- Āṭhavale, Anamta Dāmodara (1980) (ed.), अष्टाङ्गसङ्क्लिप्तः श्रीमद्बृद्धवा-ग्मटविरचितः इन्दुव्याख्यासहितः [= *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgasaṅgraha with Indu's Commentary*] (Puṇe: M. A. Āṭhavale, Śrīmad Ātreya Prakāśanam), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s25bwqsd0n7>.
- Azeez Pasha, M. (1971), "English Translation of Madan-ul-Shifa, Tibbe Sikandar Shahi (Sikandar Shah's Mine of Medicine)," *Bulletin of the Department of History of Medicine (Osmania University, Hyderabad)*, 2/4: 227–2324; continued in BDHM 3(1) 29–38; BIHM 1(3/4) 127–134; & BIHM 2(1), 17–22.
- 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. https://doi.org/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), ISBN: 047172761X.
- Bausi, Alessandro, et al. (2015), *Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies. An Introduction* (Hamburg: Tredition). <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.46784>.
- Bedekar, V. M. (1967), "The Legend of the Churning of the Ocean in the Epics and the Purāṇas: A Comparative Study," *Purāṇa*, 9/1: 7–61, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t57d2r97r>.
- 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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t03x8vz7b>.

- Bhaṭṭācārya, Candrakānta (1910–17) (ed.), सुश्रुतसंहिता प्रथमखण्डम् सूत्रस्थानात्मकम् हाराणचन्द्रचक्रवर्तिकविराजविरचितसुश्रुतार्थसन्दीपनभाष्य-समेतम्... चन्द्रकान्त भट्टाचार्य-प्रमुखैः संशोधितम् = [The Suśrutasaṃhitā with the Commentary Suśrutārthaśandīpanabhāṣya by Hārāṇacandra Cakravarti] (Kalikātā: Satya Press); Edition "t" in [HIML](#): IB, 312.
- Bhattarai, Bidur (2020), *Dividing Texts. Conventions of Visual Text-Organisation in Nepalese and North Indian Manuscripts* (Studies in Manuscript Cultures; Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter), 388.
- Birch, Jason, Wujastyk, Dominik, Klebanov, Andrey, Parameswaran, Madhu K., et al. (2021), "Further Insight into the Role of Dhanvantari, the Physician to the Gods, in the Suśrutasaṃhitā," *Academia Letters*. <https://doi.org/10.20935/AL2992>.
- Birch, Jason, Wujastyk, Dominik, Klebanov, Andrey, Rimal, Madhusudan, et al. (2021), "Ḍalhaṇa and the Early 'Nepalese' Version of the Suśrutasaṃhitā." <https://doi.org/10.20935/al3733>.
- Bollée, Willem (2010), "Remarks on the Cultural History of the Ear in India," in Nalini Balbir (ed.), *Svasti: Essays in Honour of Professor Hampa Nagarajaiah for His 75th Birthday* (Bangalore: K. S. Mudappa Smaraka Trust), 141–67, <https://jainelibrary.org/book-detail/?srno=007006>, 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, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3dz8nn5t>, <https://archive.org/details/s8id13658440/page/338/mode/2up>, accessed 02/06/2021.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2016), *How the Brahmins Won: From Alexander to the Guptas* (Leiden: Brill). <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004315518>.
- (2021), "Patañjali's Āryāvarta = Śuṅga realm?," *Academia Letters*. <https://doi.org/10.20935/al291>; Article 291.
- Bronner, Yigal (2021) (ed.), "The Pandit Project" (30 Sept.), <https://panditproject.org>.
- Brooks, Lisa Allette (2018), "Epistemology and Embodiment: Diagnosis and the Senses in Classical Ayurvedic Medicine," *Asian Review of World Histories*, 6: 98–135. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22879811-12340027>.

- Brooks, Lisa Allette (2020a), "A Surgeon's Hand: Reflections on Surgical Tactility in Early Ayurveda," *Asian Medicine*, 15/1: 30–62. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/15734218-12341460>, https://brill.com/view/journals/asme/15/1/article-p30_4.xml.
- (2020b), "The Vascularity of Ayurvedic Leech Therapy: Sensory Translations and Emergent Agencies in Interspecies Medicine," *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 35/1: 82–101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12595>.
- (2020c), "Whose Life is Water, Whose Food is Blood: Fluid Bodies in Ayurvedic Leech Therapy," in Natalie Köhle and Shigehisa Kuriyama (eds.), *Fluid Matter(s): Flow and Transformation in the History of the Body* (Asian Studies Monograph Series, 14; Canberra: ANU Press). <https://doi.org/10.22459/fm.2020>.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.4000/jtei.1520>.
- (2017), "Textual Variants," in Marjorie Burghart, James Cummings, and Elena Pierazzo (eds.), *Digital Editing of Medieval Texts: A Textbook* (DEMM), <https://www.digitalmanuscripts.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/04-Textual-variants-MB.pdf>, accessed 04/07/2021.
- Burnell, Arthur Coke (1880), *A Classified Index to the Sanskrit MSS. in the Palace at Tanjore* (London: Trübner), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t4xh86j61>; Bheṭasamhitā 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.), <https://n2t.net/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). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003298908>.
- 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, <https://n2t.net/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 Banarsi das), ISBN: 0-89581-676-8, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t2c94cv80>.
- Deshpande, Madhav (1988), "Pāṇini and the Northwestern Dialect: Some Suggestions on Sūtra 3.3.10," in Mohammad Ali Jazayery and Werner Winter (eds.), *Languages and Cultures: Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*, xxxvi (Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs; Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter), 111–23.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. (2010), "Pañca Gauḍa and Pañca Drāviḍa: Contested Borders of a Traditional 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. <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. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0041977x00008454>.
- Deshpande, Vijaya Jayant (2019), "An Investigation into Ancient Greco-Indian Medical Exchanges: Sostratus vs Suśruta," *Indian Journal of History of Science*, 54/2: 144–61. <https://doi.org/10.16943/ijhs/2019/v54i2/49659>.
- 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, <http://www.uni-hamburg.de/ngmcp/newsletter.html>.

- Eaton, Richard M. (1993), *The Rise of Islam and the Bengal Frontier, 1204–1760* (Berkeley: University of California Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13030/ft067n99v9/>.
- Edgerton, Franklin (1939), “The Epic Triṣṭubh and Its Hypermetric Varieties,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 59/2: 159–74. <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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s2kbk5zcr9>.
- Elliot, Robert Henry (1918), *The Indian Operation of Couching for Cataract: Incorporating the Hunterian Lectures Delivered before the Royal College of Surgeons of England on February 19 and 21, 1917* (London: H. K. Lewis).
- Emeneau, M. B. (1969), “Sanskrit Syntactic Particles – “kila, khalu, nūnam”,” *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 11/4: 241–68.
- Falk, Harry (1991), “Silver, Lead and Zinc in Early Indian Literature,” *South Asian Studies*, 7/1: 111–7. <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. <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 Muney Tokunaga (eds.), *Epic Undertakings* (Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference; Delhi: Motilal Banarsi Dass Publishe), 95–117.
- Froese, R., and Pauly, D. (2022) (eds.), “Fishbase: The Global Encyclopedia about Fish,” <https://www.fishbase.org.au/v4>.
- Gaṇapatiśāstrī, T. (1920–25), Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpaḥ (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 70; Anantaśayane: Rājakīyamudraṇayantrālaye), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t4pk5sj0j>.

- Gode, P. K., and Karve, C. G. (1957–59) (eds.), *Revised and Enlarged Edition of Prin. V. S. Apte's the Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Poona: Prasad Prakashan), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3gx47212>, accessed 20/10/2017.
- Gombrich, Richard (1979), “‘He Cooks Softly’: Adverbs in Sanskrit Grammar,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 42/2: 244–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0041977x0014580x>.
- Gupta, Sri Madhusudana (1835–36) (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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t6841qw6x>.
- Haas, E. (1876), “Über die Ursprünge der Indischen Medizin, mit besonderem Bezug auf Suśruta,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 30/4: 617–70, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43360939>.
- Harimoto, Kengo (2010), “[Preliminary Edition of the Nepalese MSS of the Suśrutasaṃhitā, adhyāyas 1.1–3, 6.4]” (prepublished).
- (2011), “In Search of the Oldest Nepalese Manuscript,” *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 84/1–4: 85–106, ISSN: 0392-4866, <https://www.academia.edu/4128593/>, accessed 08/09/2019.
- (2013), “Description of microfilm C 80/7,” NGMCP, <https://tinyurl.com/NGMCP-C80-7>, accessed 27/02/2023.
- (2014), “Nepalese Manuscripts of the Suśrutasaṃhitā,” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (Indogaku Bukkyogaku Kenkyū)*, 62/3: 23–29 (1087–1093). https://doi.org/10.4259/ibk.62.3_1087, <https://www.academia.edu/6695321/>, accessed 08/09/2019.
- Hayashi, Takao (2017), “The Units of Time in Ancient and Medieval India,” *History of Science in South Asia*, 5/1: 1–116. <https://doi.org/10.18732/h2ht0h>.
- Hemarāja Sarman (1938) (ed.), काश्यपसंहिता (वृद्धजीवकीयं तत्रं वा) महार्षिणा मारीचकश्यपेनोपदिष्टा ... हेमराजशर्मणा लिखितेन विस्तृतेन उपोद्घातेन संहिता ... सत्यपाल भिषगा कृतया विद्योतिनी हिन्दीव्याख्या ... समुद्धरिता (1st edn., Mumba: Nirṇayasāgara Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3mw5gb9p>.

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 Dhanvantare Demonstratum a Susruta Discipulo Compositum; Nunc Primum Ex Sanskrita in Latinum Sermonem Vertit, Introductionem, Annotationes Et Rerum Indice Franciscus Hessler* (Erlangen: Ferdinandum Enke), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t17m45r97>.

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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t05z1bg4q>.

— (1897), सुश्रुतसंहिता = *The Suśruta-Saṃhitā or the Hindū System of Medicine According to Suśruta Translated from the Original Sanskrit* (Bibliotheca Indica, 911; Calcutta: Asiatic Society), <https://n2t.net/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, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25210249>, 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, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25210334>, 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, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25210361>, accessed 25/06/2019.

— (1907b), *Studies in the Medicine of Ancient India: Osteology or the Bones of the Human Body* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t1pg9cq8b>.

- Hofer, Theresia (2007), "Swami Laxmi Ram's Ayurvedic Pharmacy in Jaipur, India," *Wellcome History*, 34: 2–3, <https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/64252/>, accessed 16/03/2022.
- 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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3ws9h63c>.
- Jack, David Morton (1884), "A Thesis on Cataract in India: Its Pathology and Treatment," Wellcome Library, London, MS 3007, <https://catalogue.wellcomelibrary.org/record=b1842019~S8>, accessed 02/06/2021.
- Jamison, Stephanie W., and Brereton, Joel P. (2014), *The Rigveda* (South Asia Research; New York: Oxford University Press), ISBN: 9780199370184; With commentary at <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/>.
- Jośī, Veṇīmādhavaśāstri, and Jośī, Nārāyaṇa Harī (1968), आयुर्वेदीय महाकोशः अर्थात् आयुर्वेदीय शब्दकोशः संस्कृत–संस्कृत (Muṇḍbaī: Mahārāṣṭra Rājya Sāhityta āṇi Saṃskṛti Maṇḍala), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t22c41g8t>.
- Kangle, R. P. (1969), *The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra* (2nd edn., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), ISBN: 81-208-0042-7, <https://n2t.net/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, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25210361>, accessed 25/06/2019, in *Zeitschrift Der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 1/62: 134–9, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43367361>, 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.), <https://www.academia.edu/12177425/>, accessed 08/09/2019.
- (2012), "Description of microfilm B 29/19," NGMCP, <https://tinyurl.com/NGMCP-B29-19>, accessed 27/02/2023.

- Klebanov, Andrey (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. <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. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004438224_008.
- Kuist, James M. (1982), *The Nichols File of The Gentleman's Magazine* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press), ISBN: 0-299-08480-9, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t53g2ct2z>.
- Kulikov, Leonid (2006), "The Sanskrit -yet- Optative: A Formation Not Yet Recorded in Sanskrit Grammars," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 50: 27–68. <https://doi.org/10.1553/wzksls27>, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24007742>.
- Kumṭe, Aṇṇā Moreśvara, Navare, Kṛṣṇaśāstrī, and Parādkar, Hariśāstrī (1939) (eds.), *श्रीमद्वाघटविरचितम् अष्टाङ्गहृदयम्, श्रीमदरुणदत्तविरचित्या सर्वाङ्गसुन्दराख्या व्याख्यया, हेमाद्रिप्रणीतया आयुर्वेदरसायनाह्या टीकया च समुद्धसितम् = The Astāṅgahṛidaya* (6th edn., Mum̄bayyām: Nirṇaya-sagara Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3tt6967d>.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.21037/atm-2019-rcs-04>, <http://atm.amegroups.com/article/view/54993>, accessed 02/11/2020.
- Li, Charles (2017), "Critical Diplomatic Editing: Applying Text-critical Principles As Algorithms," in Peter Boot et al. (eds.), *Advances in Digital Scholarly Editing. Papers Presented at the Dixit Conferences in the Hague, Cologne, and Antwerp* (Leiden: Sidestone Press), 305–10, ISBN: 978-90-8890-485-1, <https://www.sidestone.com/bookviewer/9789088904837>, accessed 10/11/2020.

- (2017–), “Saktumiva,” <https://saktumiva.org>, accessed 21/01/2023.
- (2018), “Limits of the Real: A Hypertext Critical Edition of Bharṭṛhari’s Dravyasamuddeśa, with the Commentary of Helārāja,” en, PhD thesis (Cambridge: University of Cambridge). <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.31454>.
- (2022a), “Helayo: Reconstructing Sanskrit Texts from Manuscript Witnesses,” *Journal of Open Source Software*, 7/71: 4022. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.04022>.
- (2022b), “Reconstructing a Sanskrit Text” (19 Nov.), <https://chchch.github.io/sanskrit-alignment/docs/index.html>, accessed 20/01/2023.
- Lienhard, Siegfried (1978), “On the Meaning and Use of the Word Indragopa,” *Indologica taurinensis*, 6: 177–88, <https://tinyurl.com/Lienhard1978>, 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, <http://www.academia.edu/3520571/>, accessed 27/05/2016.
- Majno, Guido (1975), *The Healing Hand. Man and Wound in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t4hm7xf2c>.
- 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.
- Mānasa-taraṅgiṇī (2019), “Kaitabha, Poison and Death: Meanderings through Tradition,” mAnasa-taraMgiNI Blog (1 Sept.), <https://tinyurl.com/kaitabha>, accessed 31/01/2023.

- Manucci, Niccolò (1907–08), *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), <https://tinyurl.com/manucci1907>, accessed 04/10/2021.
- Masai, François (1950), “Principes et conventions de l’édition diplomatique,” *Scriptorium*, 4: 177–93. <https://doi.org/10.3406/scrip.1950.2294>.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred (1953–72), *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen; a Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, Universitätsverlag).
- (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.
- Meulenbeld, Gerrit Jan (1974b), *The Mādhanavidāna and Its Chief Commentary: Chapters 1–10. Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Leiden: Brill), ISBN: 978-90-04-03892-9, <https://n2t.net/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.
- (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, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t8hf69z8j>.
- (1999–2002), *A History of Indian Medical Literature*, 5 vols. (Groningen: E. Forsten), ISBN: 9069801248.
- (2008), *The Mādhanavidāna 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-/mürch,” *eJournal of Indian Medicine*, 4/2: 35–135, <http://ugp.rug.nl/eJIM/article/view/24740>, accessed 13/10/2017.

- Miles, M. (1999), "Personal Communication," Mar.; Letter of 4 March.
- 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.
- 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, <http://hdl.handle.net/2078.1/155652>, 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), <https://n2t.net/ark:13960/t1zd2pq29>, accessed 29/01/2018; Vol.2: ark:/13960/t9r25qd8m. Reprinted as a single volume, New Delhi, 1987.
- Narayana, Ala, and Thrigulla, Saketh Ram (2011), "Tangible Evidences of Surgical Practice in Ancient India," *Journal of Indian Medical Heritage*, 16: 1–18, <https://ayushportal.nic.in/pdf/108234.pdf>, accessed 02/06/2021.
- NGMCP (2014), "Nepal-german Manuscript Cataloguing Project. Online Title List and Descriptive Catalogue," Universität Hamburg and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, <http://catalogue.ngmcp.uni-hamburg.de/>.
- Oberlies, Thomas (2003), *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit* (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, 5; Berlin: De Gruyter), ISBN: 9783110144482. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110899344>.
- Olivelle, Patrick (2005), *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Manava-dharmasutra*, 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: Kautilya's Arthaśāstra. a New Annotated Translation* (New York: Oxford University Press), ISBN: 9780199891825. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199891825.003.0001>.

- Osbaldeston, Tess Anne, and Wood, R. P. A. (2000), *Dioscorides. De Materia Medica. Being an Herbal with Many Other Medicinal Materials Written in Greek in the First Century of the Common Era. a New Indexed Version in Modern English [Introductory Notes by R. P. Wood]* (Johannesburg: IBIDIS Press), ISBN: 0-620-23435-0, <http://panaceavera.com/demateriaindex.html>.
- Pandey, Anshuman (2012), "Proposal to Encode the Newar Script in ISO/IEC 10646," <https://www.unicode.org/L2/L2012/12003r-newar.pdf>.
- Pass, Gregory (2003), *Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts* (Chicago: American Library Association), ISBN: 0-8389-8218-2, <https://tinyurl.com/pass2003>.
- PBS (2020), "Modern Day Blood-letting in North Africa," PBS (11 Dec.), <https://youtu.be/5YV-GyoLGfg>; Filmed in Farchana, Chad, amongst Sudanese refugees from Darfur, for the series *Our Human Planet*.
- Pillay, V. V. (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. <https://doi.org/10.5005/jp-journals-10071-23302>.
- Preisendanz, Karin (2007), "The Initiation of the Medical Student in Early Classical Āyurveda: Caraka's Treatment in Context," in Birgit Kellner et al. (eds.), *Pramāṇakīrtih. 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, https://www.istb.univie.ac.at/caraka/file_download/36.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405177504.ch24>, <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/companionDLS/>, accessed 04/07/2021.

- Rādhākāntā Deva, Rājā (1876), शब्दकल्पद्रुमः = *Shabda Kalpadrumah, Or, the Tree Bearing All the Words That May Be Wished For* (Calcutta: Baradākānta Mitra & Co. at the New Bengal Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t9x10x61b>.
- 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. Searchable at <https://vmlt.in/ncc/>.
- Rai, Saurav Kumar (2019), “Invoking ‘Hindu’ Ayurveda: Communalisation of the Late Colonial Ayurvedic Discourse,” *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, 56/4: 411–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0019464619873820>; Online first.
- Rama Rao, B., et al. (2005), *Sanskrit Medical Manuscripts in India* (New Delhi: Central Council for Research in Ayurveda & Siddha), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t88h7763b>.
- Rama Sastri and Krishnamurthi Sastri, S. R. (1952) (eds.), पातञ्जलीयोगसूत्रभाष्यविवरणम्। (शङ्करभगवत्पादप्रणीतम्) = *Pātñjala[sic]-yogasūtra-bhāṣya Vivaraṇam of Śaṅkara-Bhagavatpāda. Critically Edited with Introduction* (Madras Government Oriental Series, 94; Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t7jq3m14w>, accessed 20/10/2017.
- Râẏ, Priyadarjan, Gupta, Harendra Nath, and Roy, Mira (1980), *Suśruta Saṃhitā (a Scientific Synopsis)* (New Delhi: Indian National Science Academy), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t64511t6v>, accessed 13/09/2019.
- Renou, Louis (1940), “Sur certaines anomalies de l’optatif Sanskrit,” *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 41: 5–17, <https://n2t.net/ark:/12148/bpt6k121049>.
- Rhys Davids, Thomas William, and Stede, William (1921–25), *The Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary* (London: The Pali Text Society), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t4nk3nc12>.
- Rimal, Madhusudana, and Wujastyk, Dominik (2022), “MS Kathmandu NAK 1/1146,” Pandit Project (18 May), <https://www.panditproject.org/entity/104942/manuscript>.
- Roelli, Philipp (2020) (ed.), *Handbook of Stemmatology* (Berlin: De Gruyter). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110684384>.

- Roelli, Philipp, and Macé, Caroline (2015), "Parvum Lexicon Stemmatologicum. A Brief Lexicon of Stemmatology." <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-121539>.
- Roșu, Arion (1989), *Un demi-siècle de recherches āyurvédiques. Gustave Liétard et Palmyr Cordier: Travaux sur l'histoire de la médecine indienne* (Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne).
- Saha, Mridula (2015), *The History of Indian Medicine Based on the Vedic Literature Satapatha Brahmana* (Kolkata: The Asiatic Society), ISBN: 978-9381574294.
- 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. 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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t3nw8bc12>.
- Śāstri, 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 Govīmdajī Rāvajī Dośī), <https://n2t.net/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, <https://n2t.net/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. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110823134-009>; The contents of this volume were published simultaneously in *Semiotica* (1/3) 1979.
- Sena, Gaṅgāprasād, et al. (1886–93) (eds.), *सुश्रूतसंहिता...दल्हनाचार्य-कृत-निवन्ध-संग्रह*, चक्रपाणिदत्त-कृत-भानुमती-टीका...वङ्गानुवाद...इरेजि प्रतिशब्द (Calcutta: Maṇirāma Press); Edition "g" in [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), <https://n2t.net/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).
- (1999–2001), *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.), *बोधायनगृहस्त्रम् The Bodhāyana Grihyasutra* (Mysore: University of Mysore), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t2t492622>.
- Shiffman, Melvin A. (2013), "History of Otoplasty: Review of Literature," in id. (ed.), *Advanced Cosmetic Otoplasty: Art, Science, and New Clinical Techniques* (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer), chap. 5, 43–64. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-35431-1_5.
- Siddiqi, Muhammad Zubayr (1959), *Studies in Arabic and Persian Medical Literature*, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s25bxqt84xm>.
- Singhal, G. D., et al. (1972–82), *Diagnostic [and Other] Considerations in Ancient Indian Surgery* (Varanasi: Singhal Publications); A translation of the *Suśutasaṃhitā* in 10v.
- Sircar, Dinesh Chandra (1987), "6. Rākshaskhāli (Sundarban) Plate; Śaka 1118," *Epigraphia Indica* (1953–54), 30: 42–3, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t80m25q3w>.

- Sleeman, W. H. (1893), *Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official* (London: Constable), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t22c4bx7w>; 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.
- Spencer, Walter George (1935–38), *Celsus: De Medicina. with an English Translation by W. G. Spencer*, 3 vols. (Loeb Classical Library, 292, 304, 336; Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press; William Heinemann), <https://tinyurl.com/loebcelsus>, accessed 02/06/2021.
- Speziale, Fabrizio (2019), "Rasāyana and Rasaśāstra in the Persian Medical Culture of South Asia," *History of Science in South Asia*, 7: 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.18732/hssa.v7i0.40>.
- 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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t95823n1k>.
- Srikantha Murthy, K. R. (2000–02), *Illustrated Suśruta Saṃhitā: Text, English Translation, Notes, Appendices and Index* (Jaikrishnadas Ayurveda Series, 102; 1st edn., Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia).
- Steingass, F. (1930), *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary Including the Arabic Words and Phrases to Be Met with in Persian Literature* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s25bwz0337d>; Reprint, Delhi: Oriental Reprint, 1973.
- Storey, C. A. (1971), *Persian Literature, a Bio-bibliographical Survey*. Vol. II.2: Medicine (London: Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t9v18bf68>.
- Strauss, Bettina (1934), "Das Giftbuch des Šānāq: eine Literaturgeschichtliche Untersuchung," *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Medizin*, 4/2: [89]–[152] followed by Arabic text, <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s2hb5j66s95>.

- Suvedī, K. S., and Tīvārī, N. (2000) (eds.), *सौश्रुतनिघण्टुः: ग्रन्थादैविस्तृतेन ग्रन्थवैशिष्ट्यप्रकाशकेनोपोद्धतेन अवसाने च द्रव्याणामनेकभाषानामावली-पर्यायसङ्ख्याभ्यां समलङ्घतः सुश्रुतसंहितायां प्रयुक्तानामौषधद्रव्याणां पर्याय-गुणकर्मवर्णात्मको उपर्यन्थः* (Belajhundī, Dānī: Mahendrasaṃskṛtavivāśavidyālayah).
- Talwar, P. K., and Kacker, R. K. (1984), *Commercial Sea Fishes of India* (Calcutta: Zoological Survey of India), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t5s841v5m>.
- Tavernier, Jean-Baptiste (1684), *Collections of Travels through Turkey (sic), into Persia, and the East-Indies* (London: M. Pitt), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t9g45vn74>.
- TEI Consortium (2010), *TEI P5: Guidelines for Electronic Text Encoding and Interchange*, ed. C. M. Sperberg-McQueen et al. (Oxford, Providence, Charlottesville, Nancy: TEI Consortium), <http://www.tei-c.org/Guidelines/P5/>.
- Thorburn, S. S. (1876), *Bannu; or Our Afghan Frontier* (London: Trübner & Co.), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t39z96g7m>; Reprinted Lahore: Niaz Ahmad, 1978.
- UNESCO (2013), “International Memory of the World Register Suśruta Samhita (Nepal),” UNESCO, <http://tinyurl.com/susruta>, accessed 11/09/2019.
- Unicode Consortium (1991), “The Unicode Standard 15.0, Newa Range,” <https://unicode.org/charts/PDF/U11400.pdf>.
- Unschuld, Paul Ulrich (1984), *Medicine in China: A History of Ideas* (Berkeley: University of California Press), ISBN: 0520050231.
- Valiathan, M. S. (2007), *The Legacy of Suśruta* (Hyderabad, Chennai, etc.: Orient Longman).
- Velankar, H. D (1925–30), *Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrita and Prākṛta Manuscripts in the Library of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Bombay: Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t53g00h0n>; Biswas #0115.
- Watt, George (1889–96), *A Dictionary of the Economic Products of India* (Calcutta: Dept. Revenue and Agriculture, Government of India), <http://tinyurl.com/watt1889>, 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), <https://n2t.net/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), <https://n2t.net/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, <https://books.google.ca/books?id=ohkoAAAAYAAJ>.
- Wujastyk, Dagmar (2012), *Well-mannered Medicine: Medical Ethics and Etiquette in Classical Ayurveda* (New York: Oxford University Press). <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. <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. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7746874>.
- 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, <https://academia.edu/492290>.
- (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, <https://www.academia.edu/188844/>, accessed 27/05/2019.
- (2003a), "Black Plum Island," in *2nd International Conference on Indian Studies. Proceedings* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University, Institute of Oriental Philology and Księgarnia Akademicka), 637–49.
- (2003b), *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. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7742068>.
- (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, <https://www.academia.edu/4125988/>.
- Wujastyk, Dominik, et al. (2020), “Suśrutasamhitā,” PanditProject (6 Oct.), <https://panditproject.org/entity/42004/work>, accessed 14/09/2022.
- Wujastyk, Dominik (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. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004438224_007.
- (2021b), “MS London BL H. T. Colebrooke 908,” <https://panditproject.org/entity/109978/manuscript>, accessed 03/07/2021.
- (2021–), “Sushrutaproject: Version Control for Suśruta Text TEI Transcriptions: Suśruta Project Manuscript Transcriptions,” University of Alberta, <https://wujastyk.github.io/sushrutaproject/>, accessed 21/01/2023; archived at doi: [10.5281/zenodo.6471655](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6471655).
- Wujastyk, Dominik, et al. (2021–), “The Suśruta Project: The Textual and Cultural History of Medicine in South Asia Based on Newly-Discovered Manuscript Evidenc,” ed. Dominik Wujastyk, Jason Birch, Andrey Klebanov, et al., <https://sushrutaproject.org>, accessed 21/01/2023.
- Wujastyk, Dominik, Birch, Jason, Klebanov, Andrey, et al. (2021–) (eds.), “New Digital Edition of the Suśrutasamhitā: The Suśruta Project at Saktumiva,” University of Alberta, <https://saktumiva.org/wiki/wujastyk/susrutasamhita/start>.
- Wujastyk, Dominik, Pollock, Sheldon, et al. (2008–), “SARIT: Search and Retrieval of Indic Texts,” <http://sarit.indology.info>, accessed 21/01/2023.

- Yagi, Toru (1994), "A Note on bhojya- and bhakṣya-," in Yasuke Ikari (ed.), *A Study of the Nīlamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir* (Kyoto: Kyoto Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University).
- 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, Francis (1983), "Suśrutasamhitā," review of G. D. Singhal et al. (1972–82), *Diagnostic [and Other] Considerations in Ancient Indian Surgery* (Varanasi: Singhal Publications); A translation of the *Suśrutasamhitā* in 10v. In *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 57/2: 291–3, ISSN: 00075140, eprint: 44441590, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44441590>.
- (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. <https://doi.org/10.2307/603532>.
- (2000), *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery* (Indian Medical Tradition; 2nd edn., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass); First published 1991. Reprint of 1998 edition.

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. (1994–96) (eds.), *Indian Medicinal Plants: A Compendium of 500 Species. Vaidyaratnam P. S. Varier's Arya Vaidya Sala, Kottakal* (Madras: Orient Longman).
- BIA Prater, S. H. (1993), *The Book of Indian Animals* (3rd edn., Bombay, Delhi, etc.: Oxford University Press); 4th impression of 3rd corrected 1980 edition.
- Chopra 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_{sup}*).
- Chopra IDG Chopra, R. N., Chopra, I. C., Handa, K. L., et al. (1958), *Chopra's Indigenous Drugs of India* (2nd edn., Calcutta: Dhur & Sons), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t9673t140>.
- Chopra_{sup} 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.
- 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. <https://doi.org/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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t59c7tg9z>; 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), <https://tinyurl.com/dymock1890>, accessed 16/03/2023.
- 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, <https://n2t.net/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), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/s2cvp72x58j>.
- IGP Griffiths, Mark (1994), *The New Horticultural Society Index of Garden Plants* (London: Macmillan).
- Issar Issar, T. P. (1994), *Blossoms of Bangalore* (Bangalore: T. P. Issar).
- IW Israel, Samuel, et al. (1988), *Indian Wildlife: Sri Lanka Nepal* (Insight Guides; Singapore etc.: APA Publications), ISBN: 9780245545238.

- K&B Kirtikar, K. R., Basu, B. D., and an I.C.S (1987), *Indian Medicinal Plants*, ed. E. Blatter, J. F. Caius, and K. S. Mhaskar, 8 vols. (2nd edn., Dehradun: International Book Distributors); First published in Allahabad, 1918.
- NK Nadkarni, K. M. (1982), *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, <https://tinyurl.com/Nadkarni1982>; First published in 1954.
- Potter Wren, R. C. (1956), *Potter's New Cyclopaedia of Botanical Drugs and Preparations*, ed. R. W. Wren (7th edn., Rustington, Sussex: Health Science Press), <https://n2t.net/ark:/13960/t14n65c9g>.
- Potter_{rev} 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.
- Reptiles Daniel, J. C. (1983), *The Book of Indian Reptiles* (Bombay: Oxford University Press).
- 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. **NK**: v. 1, #1192; **ADPS**: 382,
414 and **AVS**: v. 2, 319, 4.366
are confusing, **23**, **62**
- castor oil tree (*gandharvahasta*)
→ *eranda*. **GVDB**: 135,
K&B: v. 3, 2277, **59**
- castor-oil (*eranda*) Ricinus
communis, L. See **NK**: v. 1,
#2145, **Chopra**: 214, **64**
- country mallow (*atibalā*)
Abutilon indicum, (L.)
Sweet, but may be other
kinds of mallow, e.g., Sida
rhombifolia, L.. See **NK**: v. 1,
#11, **IGP**: 1080, **NK**: v. 1,
#2300, **ADPS**: 71, 77, **62**
- country sarsaparilla (*amantā*)
Hemidesmus indicus, (L.) R.
Br. See **ADPS**: 434,
AVS: v. 3, 141–5, **NK**: v. 1,
#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
fruitescens R. Rr.
(**GVDB**: 429-431), **62**
- datura (*dhattūra*) Datura metel,
L. See **AVS**: v. 2, 305 (cf.
Abhidhānamañjarī), **NK**: v. 1,
#796 ff. **Potter_{rev}**: 292 f,
ADPS: 132, **59**
- decanted liquor (*surāmaṇḍa*)
K&B: v. 2, 502, **NK**: v. 2,
appendix VI, #49, **61**
- elixir salve (*rasāñjana*) → *añjana*.
See **Indian barberry**, **64**
- fermented rice-water
(*dhānyāmla*) → *kāñjī*, *kāñjikā*,
sauvīra. **GVDB**: 458, **NK**: v. 2,
appendix VI, #18, **61**
- giant potato (*kṣīravidārī*)
possibly → *kṣīraśukla*.
Ipomoea mauritiana, Jacq. See
ADPS: 510, **AVS**: v. 3, 222,
AVS: v. 3, 1717 ff, **100**, **101**
- heart-leaf sida (*balā*) *Sida*
cordifolia, Linn. See
ADPS: 71, **NK**: v. 1, #2297, **62**
- Holostemma creeper (*jīvantī*)
→ *sūryavallī*? Holostemma

- ada-kodien, Schultes. See **ADPS**: 195, **AVS**: v. 3, 167, **NK**: v. 1, #1242, **AVS**: v. 3, 1619, 100
- hornwort (*jalaśuka*) ← *jalanīlikā*. Ceratophyllum demersum, L. See **AVS**: v. 2, 56, **IGP**: 232. Singh and Chunekar (**GVDB**: 166) suggest pondweed. Dalhaṇa noted on 1.16.19 (*Su* 1938: 79) that some people interpret it as a poisonous, hairy, air-breathing, underwater creature, 62
- Indian barberry (*añjana*) → *rasāñjana, dāruharidrā*. Berberis aristata, DC. **Dymock**: v. 1, 65, **NK**: v. 1, #335, **GJM1**: 562, **IGP**: 141, 64, 99
- Indian ipecac (*payasyā*) Uncertain. Possibly *Tylophora indica* (Burm.f.) Merr. Perhaps a synonym of *panacea twiner*, *giant potato*, *purple roscoea*, and plants like asthma plant and Gulf sandmat (**GVDB**: 237–238). Also “curds” when not a plant, 23, 62, 63, 100
- 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 **GJM2**: 444, 451, **AVS**: v. 1, 187, but **AVS**: v. 3, 1719 = *Ipmoea mauritiana*, Jacq, 23, 62, 63
- Indian madder (*mañjiṣṭhā*) Rubia cordifolia, L. See **IGP**, **Chopra**: 215, **GVDB**: 289, 59
- liquorice (*madhuka*) see *yaśṭimadhuka*, 62
- liquorice (*yaśṭimadhuka*) *Glycyrrhiza glabra*, L. **AVS**: v. 3, 84, **NK**: v. 1, #1136, **GVDB**: 329 f., 64
- milk-white (*kṣīraśuklā*) An unidentified plant. **GVDB**: 126: see *purple roscoea* and *giant potato*, 23, 62, 101
- monitor lizard (*godhā*) *Varanus bengalensis*, Schneider. See **Reptiles**: 58, 62
- neem tree (*nimba*) *Azadirachta indica* A. Juss. **GVDB**: 226, 59
- panacea twiner (*arkapuṣpī*) → *arkaparṇī*, *Tylophora indica* (Burm. f.) Merr. **GVDB**: 23–24. 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, 100
- plants like asthma plant and Gulf sandmat (*kṣīriṇī*) various milky plants, perhaps including *Euphorbia hirta* Linn. (asthma plant) and *E. microphylla* Heyne (Gulf

- sandmat) (GVDB: 127), 100
- pondweed (*śaivāla*)
Zannichellia palustris L.
Sometimes identified with ??
(*dūrvā*). GVDB: 409, 100
- 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, 23, 59, 62
- purple calotropis (*arka*)
Calotropis gigantea, (L.) R.
Br. See ADPS: 52,
AVS: v. 1, 341, NK: v. 1, #427,
Potter_{rev}: 57, Chopra
IDG: 305–308, 62
- purple roscoea (*kṣīrakākoli*)
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., 100
- sappanwood (*pattāṅga*) Also *pattāṅga*. Caesalpinia sappan, L. AVS: v. 1, 323, K&B: v. 2, 847 f, GVDB: 234, 64
- sesame oil (*taila*) Sesamum indicum L. GVDB: 183, 63
- spikenard (*jatāmāṇsi*)
Nardostachys jatamansi DC
GVDB: 163, etc, 25
- sweet plants (*madhuravarga*)
The sweet plants are enumerated at *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 1.42.11. See also GVDB: 127, 23, 62, 63
- tree cotton (*kārpāsa*) G.
arboreum L. ADPS: 231. Pace the identifications of Singh and Chunekar (GVDB: 92, 247), since G. barbadense L. is native to South America and G. herbaceum L. which is native to Africa, 59
- tree cotton (*picu*) See *kārpāsa*, 61, 64
- white calotropis (*alarka*)
Calotropis procera, (Ait.) R.
Br. See NK: v. 1, #428,
Chopra: 46b, Chopra
IDG: 305–308, 62
- Withania (*aśvagandhā*) Withania somnifera (L.) Dunal. See AVS: v. 5, 409 f, Dymock: v. 2, 566 f., Chevallier 150, 23, 62