

DALHAṆA'S VERSION OF THE SUŚRUTA SAMHITĀ

P. V. SHARMA*

It appears from Dalhaṇa's commentary that there were different versions of the text of the Suśruta Samhita prevalent in different traditions. Commentators belonging to different traditions have held up their respective traditional version and have presented their commentary on that basis. Jejjaṭa, Gayadāsa, Kārttikakuṇḍa etc., had their own traditional versions. Sometimes Dalhaṇa has mentioned a number of versions¹ of the single text.

Apart from the academic traditions, there may be regional basis also as we see Kāśmīra recension of the Caraka Samhita. Similarly the Suśruta Samhita might also have recensions according to regional factor.

While presenting his interpretation, Dalhaṇa has discussed there various textual versions exposing their traditional controversy. For doing so, he had to go through all these texts and study the textual versions critically. The great labour involved in such a gigantic work can be well imagined.

Moreover, Dalhaṇa, too, had his own version which he did not mention explicitly but going through his commentary minutely and comparing it with the text, this can be detected. Some of the samples have been given here (Table I).

In deciding the version, Dalhaṇa has not followed blindly any previous commentator, but has always used his discretion. Sometimes, he follows Gayadāsa or Jejjaṭa or rejects both but sometimes he takes decision based on the views of majority of commentators or old tradition. Applied utility was always in his mind.²

* Deptt. of Dravyaguna, Faculty of Indian Medicine, Banaras Hindu University Varanasi.

Looking to this situation, the reader has to be very cautious in going through the present text and has to use his critical acumen in deciding the version as Dalhaṇa has done. Even then, it would be difficult for any body to claim that his version represents sincerely the original version of Suśruta. Dalhaṇa mentions Gayadāsa as having special position among the scholars presenting correct versions of the text ³ which shows that regarding textual version he had particular leaning towards Gayadāsa.

He has also mentioned of a South Indian tradition which was not popular in north. ⁴

Regarding Suśruta, it seems that there were two distinct traditions, one the followers of Vṛddha Suśruta and the other those following Suśruta. ⁵

Dalhaṇa has bitterly criticised some of the versions as 'pramāda pāṭha' ⁶

Some of the textual versions accepted and commented upon by Dalhaṇa do not seem to be correct. For example tinisaindhavam ⁷ would be more acceptable and intelligible in the form of tiniśam dhavam which is perhaps the original and correct text.

Some of the versions seem to be doubtful at first instance though it is not possible to propose alternative versions. The following may be seen :

1. Yāvakāmstāvakan (S. Ci. 28. 19). Here Dalhaṇa interprets tāvakān as tavakabhavān which is not at all intelligible.

2. Sajīrakāṇyārdrakāśīṅgabera sauvarcalāni (S. U. 47. 80). This being in the form of bahuvrīhi compound is adjective of madyāni but ārdraśīṅgaberasauvarcalāni does not fit here. To solve this anomaly, Dalhaṇa has proposed that 'saha' may be understood before ārdra. (ārdrakasyadau sahaśabdo boddhavyaḥ). But this is stretching too far. In fact, the reading seems to be wrong; it may be sajīrakāmārdrakāśīṅgabera sauvarcalāni.

3. Kriyā vā mānuṣī yasmin sagrahaḥ parikīrtyate (S. U. 60. 40.). Correctly the reading should be sa grahī parikīrtyate.

4. Kulīrakṣaudramaṇḍūkīśiddham tailam ca pūjitam. (S. U. 21. 45).

The first and the last words have been interpreted as karkaṭaśṛṅgi and brāhmībheda respectively but the word kṣaudra has been left uninterpreted. Evidently honey is not used in the preparation of tailas and as such the reading seems to be incorrect.

5. Svarasairbhṛṅga vṛkṣānām (S. U. 35. 4.). The word bhṛṅga has been interpreted as paṭrabhaṅga which as prefix does not fit with the word vṛkṣa; this anomaly is perhaps due to faulty version.

6. Pibedyūsam saḥārjakam (S. U. 42. 111). Here the word arjaka has been interpreted but saha is left out in the commentary. It may be saha meaning mudgaparṇi or meaning with. In the later case, the better reading would be pibedyūsañca sārjakam.

Śivadāsa Sena, the last classical commentator of the later medieval period, has also referred to Dalhana's version in his commentary⁸ and more than once has also criticised it as it did not tally with the ancient tradition or the majority view.⁹

TABLE I

Existing version	Dalhana's version
भूमौ पतति स्रस्तमुष्कः	भूमौ पतति, स्रस्तमुष्कः (सू. 32.4).
सौम्या आग्नेयाश्च	सौम्याश्च आग्नेयाश्च (सू. 47.7)
गुटिकाः प्रयोज्याः	वटकाः प्रयोज्याः (सू. 44.11)
मोदकाः	गुटिकाः (सू. 44.23).
सन्तर्पणं क्षौद्रं	सतर्पणं क्षौद्रं (सू. 44. 51)

गुडेनोत्कारिका	गुडे चोत्कारिका (सू. 44.82)
यथादितस्ते गुणतः प्रधानाः	यथादितस्ते तु गुणैः प्रधानाः (सू. 46.48).
अम्लोष्णं लघु संग्राहि स्निग्धं पित्ताग्निवर्धनम्	} अम्लोष्णं लघु संग्राहि स्निग्धं शीतफलं मतम् (सू. 46.167)
दोषनाशनः	दोषशमनः (सू. 46.361)
संयुक्तं शोधनैर्गणैः	युक्तं संशोधनैर्गणैः (चि. 38.118)
तथाम्बुजम्	तथाम्बुजः (क. 4 26)
कुसुमं तृणमूल्याश्च	कुसुमं तृणशून्यायाः (क. 6.21)
परिषेकान् प्रदेहांश्च	परिषेकावगाहांश्च (उ. 39.158)
सुवर्णमणिसंयुतम्	सुवर्णमणिभिर्युतम् (उ. 39.234)
सुमनाश्चम्पकाशोक	सुमनाश्चम्पकाशोक (उ. 39.236)
प्रलिम्पेच्चन्दनादिभिः	प्रलिम्पेच्चन्दनादिना (उ. 39.290)
लोध्राम्बुष्ठा	रोध्राम्बुष्ठा (उ. 40.72)
पाठानिकुम्भ	पाठा निकुम्भा (उ. 42.49)
मधुरैः सघृतैः	मधुरैः संस्कृतैः (उ. 43.16)
हरीतकीचूर्णयुतैः प्रयोगैः	हरीतकीतूर्णमयःप्रयोगैः (उ. 44.14)
शालादिकं चाप्यथ	शालादिकस्याप्यथ (उ. 44.27)
कण्टकपञ्चमूली	कण्टकपञ्चमूली (उ. 48.21).
पद्मोच	पद्मोचा (उ. 48.23)
गजाह्वपिप्पलीमूल	गजाह्वा पिप्पलीमूल (उ. 60.40)
शिशुकट्वंगकिण्वाहि	शिशुकट्वंगकिणिही (उ. 61.23)

NOTES

1. S. 11.39-42

2. अयं प्रयोगो न सौश्रुत इति जेज्जटः, गयदासेन व्याख्यातत्त्वान्मयापि व्याख्यातः ।

S. C. 9.69.

- अमुं पाठं पञ्जिकाकारो न पठति, जेज्जटपठितत्त्वादस्माभिरपि पठितः । S. 11.2.24.
 अस्माभिस्तु सर्वमतानुसारिभिः जेज्जटाभिप्रायेण पठितः । S. 91.42-76
 बहुभिस्तु जेज्जटादिभिः परिहृत एव । S. Su. 13.4.
 इदं चकेचित् पठन्ति, नतु निबन्धकारा इति सुपयोगित्वान्मयापि लिखितम् ।
 S. Su. 12-28.
3. पञ्जिकाकारगयदासेन तु विशिष्ट पाठशुद्धिकारेण S. Su. 29-44.
 निर्णीतपाठ व्याख्यातृभिः श्रीगयदासप्रभृतिभिः S. Su. 17-37
4. दाक्षिणात्यास्तुपठन्ति । सोऽप्यत्राप्रसिद्धेरनार्षः । S. Su. 16.32
5. वृद्धसुश्रुताध्यायिनः । S. C. 1.37-7; 38, 93. also Ci. 31-8.
 सुश्रुताध्यायिनः । S. Su. 15-28, 30, U, 25-4
6. स तु प्रमादपाठः । S. Su. 25-30, 27-9,
 तच्च प्रमादव्याख्यानम् । S. U. 89-217.
 तच्च प्रमादजत्वान्नादेयम् । S. Su. 46-69.
7. S. Ci. 16-43.

Śivadāsaena gives this version as *tinisatvacam*. Further he comments that Candaraṭa had read it as *tinīśam dhavam*. He also mentions the version *tinisaindhavam* which is evidently Dalhana's (See Carakadatta, *vidradhicikitsa* 20).

8. डल्लनस्तु 'तथैव युक्तान्' इत्यत्र 'यथेरितेन'
 इति पठित्वा.....व्याचष्टे । क्षीरजलमित्यत्र
 क्षीरघृतम् इति डल्लनः पठति । Cakradatta, *tr̥ṣṇācikitsā* 7-19. also. 2,3.
9. डल्लनस्तु मधूकमित्यत्र 'मधुकोदकं वा' इति पठित्वा व्याचष्टे यष्टिमधुजलमिति ।
 तन्न युक्तं चरकसंवादात् । 'मधुरो गणः' इत्यत्र 'प्रथमो गणः' इति डल्लनः पठित्वा
 विदारिगन्धादिगण इति व्याचष्टे, तन्न प्रामाणिकं बहुभिः व्याख्यातत्वात् । *ibid.*

SUMMARY

The commentary of Dalhaṇa suggests that there were different versions of the text of Suśruta Saṁhitā. Dalhaṇa had his own version, and he used his discretion to decide the correct text. Sometimes he follows Gayadāsa or Jejjāta or sometimes rejects both. Applied utility was always in his mind. He mentioned a South Indian tradition also. The article also gives a table of some samples which on minute comparison show that Dalhaṇa had his own version of Suśruta Saṁhitā.

सारांश

सुश्रुतसंहिता पव डल्हण का पाठ

ले० प्रियव्रतशर्मा

डल्हण की व्याख्या से यह सङ्केत प्राप्त होता है कि मूल सुश्रुतसंहिता के अनेक पाठ उपलब्ध थे। डल्हण का अपना पाठ था और उन्होंने ने सही पाठ का निर्णय करने के लिये स्वयं की बुद्धिमत्ता से काम लिया। कहीं पर वो जेज्जट तो कहीं गयदास का अनुमोदन करते हैं किन्तु कुछ स्थानों पर दोनों उनके लिये अस्वीकार्य हो जाते हैं। व्यावहारिक उपयोगिता उनके लक्ष्यमें सर्वोपरि थी। उन्होंने एक दक्षिण भारतीय परम्परा का उल्लेख भी किया है। लेख में कुछ उदाहरण सारणी के रूप में दिये गये हैं जिनका सूक्ष्म अध्ययन इस तथ्य को प्रतिपादित करता है कि सुश्रुतसंहिता का डल्हणचार्य के पास अपना ही पाठ था।