but not without adding that regarding these ‘conditions [of the buddhi]’ there is a ‘difference of opinion among the teachers [of Sāṅkhya]’ (tattvārthṣāraṇāṃ vipratipatiḥ). The subsequent part of the ‘avatāraṇa’ is then, as expected, devoted to outlining the various opinions of Pañāhindikaraṇa, Vindhyavāsin and finallyĪśvara-kṣaṇa himself. According to the opinion of the latter the bhāvas are threefold, [viz.] sāṃśiddhi, prakṛti and vaikṛti, i.e. ‘are seen’ to occur in three different forms, ‘one innate, one caused by [an inflow of] primary matter and one caused by a (transformation-product)’. Kārikā 43, however, in addition introduces the dichotomy of karanaśrayaṇ, ‘based on’ the instrument (i.e. the internal organ together with the five senses of perception and the five organs of action), and kāryāśrayaṇ, ‘based on the effect (i.e.

5 E. Frauwaller (Geschichte der indischen Philosophie I, Salzburg 1953, pp.30ff, 37ff) renders bhāva by ‘Zustände des Erkenntnis’ (buddhi) and ‘psychische Zustände’. G. J. Larson (Classical Sāṅkhya, Delhi/Varanasi/Patna 1979, e.g. pp.192f) proposes ‘conditions’ or ‘dispositions’ as English equivalents, but as far as I can see he does not clarify in which of its several senses he uses the latter expression. According to SK 23 (advayavāstya buddhir dharmo jñānaṁ virāga avārayam 1 satvikam etad nāpam tāmatam asmat viparayam 1) they are the ‘sātvita’ or ‘tāmasa’ form of the buddhi. Though the term bhāva is not semantically explained in the YD, what is said in this commentary on SK 23, not to mention the Sanskrit lexicon as such, clearly supports FRAUWALLER.

6 Note that this ‘difference of opinion’ does not refer to the distinction between ‘three’ and ‘eight’ and ‘filthy’ bhāva (on which latter see LARSON, op.cit. in fa.5, p.193).

7 One cannot but suspect that the text of the YD contains a lacuna here, as Patañjali’s opinion is not reported in course of the explanation of the introductory statement tattvārthṣāraṇāṃ vipratipatiḥ, whereas it is referred to at the end of the exposition of Īśvara-kṣaṇa’s own position (124.15f.: evam trivibhāga-pargrahāda tv dvāraya na svaryo svahat patañjaliḥ ...); cf. also 120.3ff. (Pañāhindikaraṇa, Patañjali and, finally, Vindhyavāsin).

8 According to the YD his teaching is identical in substance with that of the much earlier Vārasāgarnya.

9 Note that the expressions prakṛta and vaikṛta are also used side by side with prakṛti and vaikṛti.

10 Cf. YD 124.8f.: anyeṣṭaṁ tu satvasyāptavat kālōtvareṇa prakṛtyahsvyandād dhīg iti bhūvai keśasvaparaśvanāvat 1 tat prakṛtaṁ 1.

11 Cf. SK 25.

12 Literally ‘characterized by an effect as [its] locus/substratum’.
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the gross body). On closer inspection, however, it becomes clear that what śāraṅkṣa means to say is that not only the eight 'conditions' have these three forms just mentioned, but also the various stages of the development of living beings, starting from the earliest phase of the growth of an embryo, the difference being that the former refer to (literally: have as their abode or substratum) that complex entity which is technically called līṅga, which moves from one 'incarnation' to the next until the end of a kālpa, while the latter refer to the bodies made out of the five gross elements. In the course of explaining and illustrating the three kinds of "physical/somatic conditions" the author of the YD clarifies that the 'embryos immediately after conception' (kaḷala), etc., are vaikṛta, and then adds the remark (124.27):
yathā bhiṣagveda bhūhītam — kṣiraṇa pīṭā garbhīṇa gaurāṃ putrāṃ janayattī.

'As it has been set forth in the "Veda of the Physicians":
"Upon drinking milk a pregnant [woman] delivers a white son (i.e. a son of fair complexion)."

The expression bhiṣagveda — which is not listed in our dictionaries and about which I hence do not know whether it also occurs elsewhere could, no doubt, refer to the 'science of medicine', but if it did, one would have to wonder why a second term besides the well-known Āyur-

---

13 FRAWALTNER (op.cit. in fn.5, p.365) renders kaḷala by 'Flockchen' ('small flock' or 'pat'). Other, different explanations by various scholars have been collected by DAS (op.cit. in fn.38), fn. to §13.21. — Note the marked anthropocentrism of Śāṅkya in this regard, which is somewhat irritating as the YD mentions (124.23) the 'bodies of planets, asterisms and stars'. In this connection attention may also be drawn to W. SLADE'S study of Bhāskara-kāṇṭha's Cintāmānbodhāstra in this volume of the JES.

14 Note that in SK 40 the expression adhitvāsam is used instead.

15 Nobly so far seems to have wondered whether they are also subsumed under the notion of bīhavas. The phrase yathā caite tathā, inserted by the author of the YD between pāda c and pāda d of SK 43, could be taken to support this assumption, together with what he adds immediately after the kārśa, supplementing the predicate, viz. caitvā evem 1. However, the explanation (YD 124.22) kātalādīghrāvena śāntāvay āha 1 seems to contradict it; but this explanation is problematic anyway insofar as it would be nonsensical to speak of 'a body which has the body as its locus/substratum'.

16 The dictionaries do not list bhiṣagveda, but the upapada compound bhiṣagvād. Hence one will have to at least consider the possibility that bhiṣagveda means 'knowledge of remedies'.

veda is used by the author here, and one which is extremely rare, if not even unique, at that.

2. Now R.C. PANDEY, the editor of the YD, refers in a footnote at this point to Bṛhadāranyakopanisāda (= BĀU) 6.4.14, and indeed it is this part of the famous Upanisāda which anyone who has read it and remembers it cannot but recall here. When one looks up the passage mentioned by PANDEY, it becomes however immediately evident that it is not really quoted in the YD, but, if a relation does exist, rather hinted at, for BĀU 6.4.14 (in the Kāṇva recension) reads as follows:

sa ya icchē — putro me śuklo jāyeta, vedam anubruta, sarvaṁ āyur iyād iti, kṣīraudanaṁ pācayita sarpiṣṣantam aśnīyām | līvurau janayitvāvai 11.

If he (i.e. the husband) then wishes, "May a son of fair complexion be born to me, may he learn [and recite] the Veda, may he live the (full) span of life", [then] both (i.e. he together with his wife) should have rice boiled in milk prepared and eat it together with ghee. [The two] are [then] in a position to beget [such a son].

If it is now taken into account that the Madhyandina recension reads gaurō instead of śuklo, the doubts one might still have regarding the relation of the YD passage to BĀU 6.4.14 disappear entirely: essential elements of the Upanisādaic statement are retained by the author of the YD — who evidently does not intend a quotation in this case —, and correctly at that, for what he says does not necessarily imply that the woman is already pregnant when she begins to drink milk. As for the question one cannot help asking oneself next, namely why the author of the YD thought it at all necessary to report the gist of BĀU 6.4.14 at this particular point of his explanation, the easiest and most plausible reply for the time being seems to be this: because what first came to his mind in connection with the notion of 'various stages of the embryo' was the

---

17 E.g. in 12.10 (cf. my JES article cited in fn.*, p.132). — There is very little likelihood that bhiṣagveda refers to a particular part of (a) medical work(s) only.

18 That a conditional clause is at least intended is confirmed by the fact that the subsequent passages are invariably introduced by āha.

19 That is to say, I assume that kṣīraudana denotes the same dish as Nepali khir, one of the NIA successors of kīra.
idea of begetting, and this in its turn provoked a literary, nay even a Vedic reminiscence.

3. Returning to BĀU 6.4.14, what has to be noted is that it forms part of a section (6.4.1-28) which for many reasons deserves an examination closer than I am able to carry out in the present article, vistarabhāvyāt (if I may be permitted to briefly switch over to Sanskrit). 20 Earlier generations of Indologists found this section somewhat embarrassing — as is clear from the fact that they felt prompted to justify, at least indirectly, their decision to translate it too, and not into Latin at that, the language commonly used until the first half of this century when a European author could not avoid touching upon things sexual 21. But the secondary apologetic aim apart, P. DEUSSEN is perfectly right in stating by way of introduction: 22 "In view of the importance which the begetting of a son — as one who carries on his father’s sacrificial duties — has according to Indian religious ideas, it is but little wonder that when bidding him farewell on the occasion of his passage to secular life,

20 I plan to deal with at least another part of BĀU 6.4 separately, in an article entitled ‘Śaṅkaras “Ding”.
21 F.M. MöLLER simply remarks (The Upaniṣads, PL II < Sacred Books of the East XV >, repr. New York 1962, p.215): 'I have given those portions of the text which do not admit of translation into English, in Sanskrit. As for DEUSSEN, see fa.24 below.
22 In contradistinction to e.g. O. BÖHTLINGK (cf. his Brhadāraṇyakopanisadād in der Mādhajinda Recension, St. Petersburg 1889).
23 This European custom has — not unexpectedly — also found its obsequious prudish Indian imitators, among whom I should like to mention just one, namely M.V. PĀṬAVIDHĀN (Jayavallabha’s Vaijñāna ... < Prakrit Text Society Series No.14>, Ahmedabad 1969), who shows a predilection for Latin terms like semen virile, pudendum muliebre etc. beside Sanskrit expressions.
24 Sechzig Upaniṣads des Veda ..., Leipzig 1897, p.513: ‘Bei der Wichtigkeit, welche nach indischer Religionsanschauung die Zeugung eines Sohnes, als Fortsetzern der Opferpflichten des Vaters, hat, ist es nicht weiter befremdlich, wenn der Lehrer seinem Schüler, beim Übergang ins bürgerliche Leben und zur Gründung einer Familie, zum Abschiede auch über diesen Punkt die nötigen Aufschlüsse gibt, an welchen, bei dem religiösen Ernsten von dem sie getragen werden, kein Anstoß zu nehmen ist.' I think I should not withhold from my readers a particularly nice, and telling, 'trouvaille' of my friend R. KOWPER, who recently drew my attention to the fact that DEUSSEN, op. cit., p.325, renders nṛthvāraṇaṣah of Maitreyaupaniṣad 4.1 by 'die Zeugungsherbenen' (= 'those who are above procreation').

25 The division of 6.4 into subsections goes back to DEUSSEN.
26 Cf. BĀU 6.4.17.
27 According to Śābara's definition (in the Bhāṣya on Māminśāstrop 3.1.3), viz. sāṃskāra nāma sa bhavati yamātītād padārtho bhavati yogāh kasyatrītvaḥ, as quoted by P.K. KANE, History of Dharmaśāstra II, Poona 1974, p.190 and referred to by J. GONDA, Vedic Ritual. The Non-Solemn Rites, Leiden/Köl 1980, p.364 — where in fn.1 also relevant secondary literature is listed. GONDA declares sāṃskāra to be an 'untranslatable term', but I for one think Śābara's attempt at defining at least part of its semantic area is not bad at all. But GONDA is, no doubt, right as regards finding a single equivalent which could cover the various non-technical and technical-terminological meanings of this Sanskrit word. As for the latter see now L. KAPANI, La notion de Sāṃskāra I, Paris 1992.
eyes\(^{28}\)), for what primarily matters is the fact as such that fathers in Ancient India did entertain wishes of this kind and, in particular, that they knew, or were given instruction about, certain means to be applied for their fulfillment. Yet the contents of these wishes are such that one cannot but arrive at the conclusion that it is (the) Brahmans, brahmanical brahmaraśrins, for whom this subsection of the BĀU is meant — or perhaps I should rather say: people who are strongly interested in the Vedas.\(^{29}\) Thus the question arises whether the wish to determine one's children's qualities before conception, or perhaps also after it, and the knowledge about the proper means to this effect, were confined to the group of Brahmins, or, more generally, people 'knowing the Veda', or whether, on the contrary, they were common features of Ancient Indian society, including lower, perhaps even non-Aryan, strata.

4. Neither the BĀU subsection under discussion nor its "echo" in the YD permits us to answer this question, and there is also no additional material found in Vedic texts, as far as I know.\(^{30}\) But what suggests itself in any case — i.e. also with regard to another question, viz. that of a possible survival of these peculiar practices in post-Vedic India — is to look into Ayurvedic literature,\(^{31}\) i.e. first of all, into the earliest works of this highly important śāstra, about which we now know so much more thanks to the many unique contributions of Gerrit Jan MEULENBELD.

Not relevant for the problem at issue are, of course, passages like Āṣṭāṅgahṛdayasāmaññhī (≈ AII), Śārīrakāhāna 1.17, where, and according to the commentator Aruṇadatta too, a correspondence is stated to obtain between the particular colour of the sperm and the (skin?) colour of an embryo.\(^{32}\) The situation, however, changes for the better when we read on and thus arrive at verses 25cd-26ab\(^{33}\), in which a wife who 'wants a son similar to her husband' is advised 'to look at the husband in front [of her]', which according to Aruṇadatta's convincing explanation means that 'she should think of no other man'\(^{34}\) at that time, i.e. after her menses when preparing herself for intercourse. Aruṇadatta adds by way of adducing reasons: 'For what kind of [a man] she sees or thinks of at that moment, precisely (eva) such [a man] does she beget'.\(^{35}\) The relevancy for our context is given by the fact that, apart from the palpable significance of this passage as, so to say, "counterpositive" — be this real or fictitious in terms of an History of Indian Ideas — and as a "logical" antecedent of the conception that what one thinks of in the hour of death\(^{36}\) determines one's future destiny, i.e. rebirth

\(^{28}\) Ṛṣhṭikāra (BĀU 6.4.16).

\(^{29}\) After all the BĀU among other Upāniṣads contains evidence for Kaśātrīyas possessing special spiritual knowledge and even excelling Brahmins in this regard, and this knowledge is, to say the least, connected with Vedic texts and rituals and could hence hardly have been acquired without a solid grounding in the latter.

\(^{30}\) What I have in mind here is, of course, the idea of a 'preconceptional or prenatatal determination of one's children's qualities'. The translators of the BĀU also do not mention any parallels. Kaśīṭakasūpaśyad 2.10, however, teaches a prayer by which a father, when about to lie down with his wife, can prevent the death of her children. Passages like Taittirīyasāmaññhī 2.5.1.48 and 2.6.5.4 (kindly pointed out to me by Dr. C. KIEHNEL) — which speak about undesired qualities of children ("accursed, thief, 'fated to drown', 'has a skin disease' etc.), born because of intercourse with women who should be avoided ("with stained garments", 'a woman who turns away', 'a woman bathing' etc.) — or Kaṭha-arāṇyaka 2.39 (cf. M. WITZEL, Das Kaṭha Arāṇyaka, textkritische Edition mit Übersetzung und Kommentar (Teilrück), Kathmandu 1974, pp.244f.) rather seem to mark the starting point, which triggered off the search for means to determine one's children's qualities, for their common feature is the possibility of begetting (without being aware of it) children with undesirable qualities.

\(^{31}\) Note that I do not take into account other and later sources which most probably contain much relevant material, such as e.g. the ŚīvasvarOdaya, kindly pointed out to me by Dr. C. KIEHNEL (cf. ŚīvasvarOdaya. Text and Translation by E.K. RAJ, Varanasi 1980, pp.51ff. as well as R.K. RAJ, Encyclopedia of Yoga, Varanasi 1982, pp.396ff.).

\(^{32}\) śukraṁ śuklam guru sniḍhān madhuram bahalam bahu ī ghranāukālaśitaṁ bhūlam saṁbhūtaṁ punaṁ 11

\(^{33}\) it is possible, albeit not likely, that the comparison with various liquid substances extends to qualities other than their colours, too. The edition used by me is that of the Nirnaya Sāgara Press: The Āṣṭāṅgahṛdaya. A Compendium of the Ayurvedic System ... collated by the Late D. Anna Mosteswar Kunte ... and Krīṣṇa Rāmchandra Śāstrī Narve, ... Bombay 1939. — In the case of the Cararakaśāmaññhī (= CS) and the Sutasvasāmaññhī (= SS) of the NSP editions have been used; in the case of the Āṣṭāṅgaśāraha (= AS), however, the reference is to A.D. ĀTHAVALE's edition, Poona 1980.

\(^{34}\) catuṁ hi tathā snīṭā śuklākuśāyāṁbaru sūcīḥ 11

\(^{35}\) icchānti bharatśadaṁ putram paśyey puruḥ putram 1.

\(^{36}\) bhārātraṇ paśyey ānyamanābhī. — I can't help adding, though only for the fun of it: now we know why so many sons don't resemble their fathers!

\(^{37}\) tada hi yādṛṣṭaṁ paśyati cintayati vā ātyaṁ eva pratiṣṭha iti 1.

\(^{38}\) Cf. pp.219ff., 223ff. of F. EDGERTON's article 'The hour of death', Annals of the
these verses and Aruṇādaṭṭa’s commentary on them are evidence at least of the possibility of deliberately exercising influence on qualities of the male issue, still to be conceived, although perhaps on qualities of his external appearance only. Yet the passage differs from the subsection of the BAAV referred to in the preceding paragraph in that it is only the wife who is said to determine these qualities, and only by her behaviour.

The next pādās, however, bring us much closer to the Upāṇīṣad, for according to them an upādhyāya, explained by the commentator as puruṣaḥ ‘hāravatvā,’ ‘is to perform in the proper (i.e. prescribed) way a putriya vidhi, albeit for a śādīra woman without [Vedic] mantraḥ.’37 But the designation of the ritual does not by itself give a clue as to whether its final aim is just the conception of a son38 or in addition to it also the conception of a particular son, i.e. a son endowed with special qualities equally brought about by magico-religious means. Śārīra. 1.28c itself could be taken to support the second alternative in that it reads:

avatasya evam samyoṣah śyād apataya ca kāṁtaḥ 11,

since ‘offspring according to [the couple’s] wishes’ might well refer both to qualities of appearance and of character of the child; yet one notices with some irritation, at least at first sight, that Aruṇādaṭṭa interprets the expression differently, namely by yathābhīṣmatām pūnpārbaṁśaḥ sūrgandhavāpam vā, but it seems that he has let himself be too much impressed by the change of words, i.e. the fact that here — just as at


37 1.27c-1.28b:

upādhyāya vha putriya kūrvi vidhiyavādavidhi 11
namaskārabhyāyāś tu śūkārya mantavyaśīt 1.

38 I am not able to address the question of the relation in which this passage, and similar ones, stand to the sanskāra of pūmsavāna; the — anyway surprisingly simple — article of F. BRUCKER in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 136.1966: 478-481 (‘Das Pumsavāna-Ritual aus der Sicht der heutigen Medizin’) does not contain anything on this question; for a critique of BRUCKER see R.P. DAS, The Origin of the Life of a Human Being. Conception and the Female according to Ancient Indian Medical and Sexological Literature, Delhi 1994, fn. to 1.5. Material relevant for the pūmsavāna is found at CN, śārīra. 8.19, SS, śārīra. 2.32, AH, śārīra. 1.37ff. and AS, śārīra. 1.60ff. (according to information kindly given me by Dr. DAS).

1.29ab39 — instead of putra the more general expression apataya is used, and this in spite of his rightly paraphrasing evam of the verse by yathoktavādhanavāṭhāne and his equally correct explanation of the secondary noun putriya in his commentary on 1.27cd-28ab40. On the other hand, one cannot help asking oneself why the author of the AH should not also have taken into account the possibility of a couple wanting a daughter if the much younger Aruṇādaṭṭa does not hesitate at all to make this assumption — which after all is but a natural one even in the context of Indian culture with its tendency of being hostile to or attach little value to female issue.41 Therefore it is necessary to at least mention that putriya qualifying vidhi could after all be derived from putra ‘child’.42

But what about the immediately following verse 1.30? Is not the idea of the “preconceptional determination” attested in it, for it reads thus:

icchetaṁ yūḍṛṣaṁ putram tadārpańcaratiṁ ca tān 11
cintayetām janapadāṁ tadāräparicchadā 11.

‘And the two (i.e. the couple), themselves showing the like conduct and possessing the like properties, should think of/have in mind [those] people who have that external ap-

39 apatayaṁ kulāṁgūro gote jaṁī saha apī.

40 ... putriyaḥ hitam 1 ... putriyaṁ iti ‘putrāc cha ca’ (Pāṇini 5.1.40) iti cchahi 1.

41 But perhaps our, i.e. the Indologists’, picture is onesided in assuming this, also insofar as it does not take into account possible, and highly probable, historical differences, i.e. development in the Indian value system in this regard.

42 Cf. Aruṇādaṭṭa’s remark in his commentary on 1.30: ... putrafalo ‘putramākopapalaṁcāntvāḥ ‘brah vā taṁ hi dhawan apī kaścit icchatya eva 1.

43 Aruṇādaṭṭa explains: ‘ācāraṁ ācāraṁ, kulāṁgūraṁ deṣāñcāpaṁ ca iṣkāraṁvādhaṁyāpanaṁ karmo ‘nāmaḥ 1; note that the implicit concept of dharma is — rather in accordance with reality than with śāstra theory — qualified as ‘corresponding to the family and region/place’.

44 Aruṇādaṭṭa’s explanation of paricchadā is: manuyagavāā padanadāhanāpyaṇasāvātrāntaṁ kāraṇaṁ yādahṣaṅgadhodāhyavāṇaṁ upāsrayātyātanāya 1.

45 The conclusion arrived at by H. SCHARFE (Untersuchungen zur Staatsrechtshistorie des Kauṭayā, Wiesbaden 1968, p.139) that janapada refers, also in the Arthaśāstra, ‘to the tribe’, holds good for the AH, too; but in its case clearly the people (living in a janapada) are meant.
able to perceive more clearly how far the continuity really extends — and will consequently wonder whether it is at all justified to speak of a ‘break’ between the Vedic and the post-Vedic period.

That this general assumption is also confirmed by Ayurvedic literature, has been pointed out to me in a recently published article."^^^69 In the present essay I should like to draw attention to, and briefly discuss, some other pieces of evidence. Already when I glanced through a part of one of the medical Samhitas for the first time, what struck me among other things was the practice of referring to a particular chapter by a designation which is in fact nothing but a secondary noun derived by adding the suffix -ink- to — often — "irregular" compounds formed out of the first words at the very beginning of the chapter concerned. For this, of course, reminds one of a similar practice used in certain Vedic texts, viz. Brāhmaṇa, etc.

I need hardly state explicitly that I do not have in view (the) commentators of the Ayurvedic Samhitas, as their testimony would be of no importance for the question at issue here, unless they did not simply carry on, or copy, a corresponding practice of the authors' of the mūla texts themselves. Thanks to the help kindly rendered me by Dr. R.P. Das — and thus ultimately to the well-known project of my colleague R.E. Emmerick, the publication of the results of which many people are eagerly looking forward to — I am able to give in an ‘Appendix’ a complete list of all the occurrences of designations (ending in -yā) found in the four works on which Emmerick's project is based, as well as the identification of the chapter/passage referred to. For the point I want to make it is sufficient to give here just a few examples.

At AS, kalpasthāna 7.40, the expression mātrāṅgīya(st-ukto vidhiḥ) is used, and what is referred to is the 11th adhyāya of sūrasthāna, the first sentence of which reads as follows: athātāḥ mātrāṅgīyam nāmādhyāyam vyākhyāyām ahauḥ ‘now in the following sentence we shall henceforth' after the preceding chapter] explain the chapter that is called ‘that dealing with him who takes a [particular, i.e. limited] quantity of food [only, as one ought to do]’. Or at CS sūtra. 17.121 it is stated that a number of classes of diseases (120) are taught kiyantahsārasatyeśu smīn adhyāya, in this adhyāya which contains (i.e. begins with the words) "how many [diseases have been taught] in (i.e. of) the head", the reference being to the 17th chapter, i.e. that at the very end of the expression quoted is found and which begins thus:

\[
\text{atyāhātāḥ kiyantahsārasatye adhyāyaṃ vyākhyāyām} \text{ṣaṃbhāvaḥ} \text{ātreyah} \\
\text{kiyantah sārasā prasthāṃ rogā ṛṣidi ca dehitām} \text{ī etc.}
\]

This second example is particularly instructive in that it clearly shows that the secondary noun formed by adding the suffix -yā- has to be rendered by ‘containing [the words] ”...”’; and this evidently holds good for the first example, too, the correct rendering of which would be ‘the chapter containing (i.e. starting with) [the word] mātrāṅgī’, which forms in fact the beginning proper of this chapter, i.e. is found in the first sentence of AS, sūtra. 11.2.

Or that what is referred to by saying at SS, uttaratantra 47.74 of a particular vidhi, and of its lakṣaṇa, that they are sadyovranīyokta, is SS, cikitsasthāna 2, although in this case we do not find the words sadyo vrāṇam as the beginning of the first sentence of this adhyāya, but only as prior member of compounds that denote its contents. Thus already at the very end of the immediately preceding chapter cikitsita. 1.139, the author announces, ‘In what follows I am going to say even more with regard to the treatment of suddenly [caused] wounds’ (bhūtyo āpy upari vākyāyam sadyovanacikitsīte śāsana; and accordingly the first sentence of the 2nd adhyāya reads thus: athātāḥ sadyovanacikitsītam vyākhyāyām.)

But in the SS there are also designations of the type known to us from the AS and CS. E.g. dvivranīyokta vidiśāna at sūtra. 16.15 refers to the adhyāya cikitsita, 1, the beginning of which (after the usual introductory formula) reads as follows: dvau vrāṇau bhavatah (śārīra ānantukāś ceti), so that the correct rendering of the designation dvivranīya again cannot but be ‘[the chapter] which contains (i.e. begins with) [the words], “there are two [types of] wounds”.

---

69 Über Form und Charakter der sogenannten "Polemiken im Staatslehrbuch des Kauṭāya" (Untersuchungen zum "Kauṭāya" Arthaśāstra II), Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 143,1993: 106-134. Cf. also my article ‘A Note on Sanskrit hrī̄rīna, and hrī̄rīnāhāna’, to be published in one of the next issues of the Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik.

70 That is to say I am not convinced that the explanation of atāḥ as it is usually given by commentators is correct, viz. that, as part of this stereotypical introduction, it means ‘therefore’.

71 Cf. also SS, cikitsita, 2.59.
It is most important to note this because among the various functions of the suffix cha (= yā) which Pāṇini distinguishes\footnote{Cf. also J. WACKERNAGEL, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Sanskrit Sprache*, 1895, pp. 436 (§168b) and 438 (§168c), respectively.} there are two which have to be considered with regard to these designations, viz. firstly, in accordance with sūtra 5.2.59, that of the suffix *mat* — which in 5.2.94 is taught to be *rād asāṣṭy asminn īti* — or, secondly, in accordance with 4.3.87, that of *grantha* that has been made having [X] as its subject\footnote{O. BÖTTINGK’S (Pāṇini’s Grammar, repr. Hildesheim 1964) *Litterarisches Er- zeugnis* seems too narrow an equivalent; *grantha* can denote any fixed formulation from a single sentence up to a whole text. Of course, in view of *adhiyāya*, it is not probable at all that simple sentences are meant in this sūtra, but the attribute *litterarisches* as well as the concept *Erzeugnis* may easily lead to a misunderstanding.}, examples being, according to 4.3.88, *stūkramṇya, *a grantha* dealing with the crying of a child*, yamabaddha, *a grantha* composed on Yama’s assembly/hall*. Although these *granhas* are known only from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and it is therefore not even possible to exactly determine the meaning of *grantha*\footnote{In the first vārtika on Pāṇ. 5.5.59 (Mahābhāṣya II 385.22) in explaining which *Patañjali* gives the famous *asyananyam* (cf. *Rgvedasamhitā* < RV> 1.164) as an example.} as used in 4.3.87, the function as such of the suffix is clear and evidently different from that which it has when added in accordance with Pāṇini 5.2.59, and, as Kātyāyana adds,\footnote{Is what is referred to RV Khilārī 5.7.5? K. Mylius’ article ‘achāvāka, achāvāka. Skizze eines vedischen Opferpreisertamtes’, *Golden Jubilee Volume, Vadika Sam- sodhana Mandal*, Poona 1981. pp. 177-184 does not throw light on this particular question.} not only to nominal stems, i.e. in order to form designations of *sūktas* and *sāmanas* like e.g. *acchāvākhyam, *the sūkta* which contains [the words] *acchāvāka*\footnote{For the names like *āyārya* etc., however, see J. WACKERNAGEL, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Sanskrit Sprache*, 1895, pp.325f. (§123a).} or *yājñayājñiyam, *the sāman* which contains (i.e. begins with the) [the words] *yājñā yājñī* (RV 1.168.1).\footnote{For are not the designations attested in medical texts, at least the majority of them, names of *adhiyāya*, and should they not hence rather lack the secondary suffix -yā? Has therefore the conclusion to be drawn that these designations cannot be regarded as derivationally identical with those taught by Pāṇini in his sūtra 5.2.59?} The situation becomes even more complicated insofar as according to Pāṇ. 5.2.60 *luk* is substituted instead of *cha*, i.e. -yā becomes invisible, ‘when names of an *adhiyāya* or an *anuvāka* are formed’.\footnote{Cf. also the article of L. RENO ‘Les divisions dans les textes Sanskritis’, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1.1952: 1-32.} For are not the designations attested in medical texts, at least the majority of them, names of *adhiyāya*, and should they not hence rather lack the secondary suffix -yā? Has therefore the conclusion to be drawn that these designations cannot be regarded as derivationally identical with those taught by Pāṇini in his sūtra 5.2.59?}

Certainly not, because already the juxtaposition of the expressions *adhiyāya* and *anuvāka* in Pāṇ. 5.2.60 suggests that what Pāṇini had in view was not a ‘lesson’ in just any kind of text,\footnote{Namely in the only vārtika on Pāṇ. 5.2.60 (Mahābhāṣya II 386.16).} but *adhiyāya* as used to denote sections/chapters in Vedic, or perhaps even particular Vedic texts. In addition, the relative chronology — of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Āyurvedic Sanshātā* — has, of course, also to be taken into account in this connection, i.e. the fact that the latter are — not only in their present form — undoubtedly later than the former. And in view of both these reasons the most plausible explanation suggesting itself with regard to the discrepancy between Pāṇini and the evidence as found in the medical texts is that it is simply due to historical development: starting from secondary nouns like those referred to by Pāṇini, this way of forming designations of sections of texts was extended to other cases, too — just like that taught in Pāṇ. 4.3.87f. —, and this process, by no means without its parallels in the history of Old Indian, is perhaps even reflected in the *Mahābhāṣya*, i.e. by the fact that already Kātyāyana thought it necessary to teach\footnote{In fact, I do not find a single exception in the material listed in the ‘Appendix’.} that the replacement of *cha* (= yā) by *luk*, according to Pāṇ. 5.2.60, is only optional.

But it would still be possible to argue against the assumption that the use of such designations in Āyurvedic texts is but a continuation of a corresponding usage in Vedic, or late Vedic, Sanskrit by referring to the circumstance that these medical texts are most probably made up of various strata of different origin and age. There is indeed a great general likelihood that this is true, although unfortunately nobody has succeeded until now in demonstrating, not even with regard to just one of these texts, what are the strata that have in fact to be distinguished, and that the model of a compilation cannot also be applied. Nevertheless, the number of relevant secondary nouns is so large, and — what is even more important — their distribution so wide, that the possibility that all
of them occur in younger strata can be excluded with a very high degree of probability.

There is hence a great likelihood indeed that the names of adhya- yas formed by the secondary suffix -arya- and meaning 'containing [the words XV]'. i.e., in most cases, 'beginning' with these words, testify to the survival of a device developed in the Brāhmaṇas and used in still later Vedic literature by priest-scholars for the purpose of easy and at the same time clear reference to certain parts of the texts — and a device at that which, at least originally, presupposed an oral transmission, and a corresponding knowledge, of the texts referred to, and which has nothing to do with the division of the medical texts into sthānas, etc., not to speak of the counting of the adhyāyas within one and the same sthāna or of the verses/prose sections of which an adhyāya happens to consist. And, to be sure, it is legitimate to draw such a historical line "between the Veda and the Āyurveda" even though the texts of each group that happen to have been preserved do not necessarily follow one upon the other in close sequence as regards their relative chronology.

Appendix

ASI:1(6h): āyuṣ-kāmpya-siṣyārtha- - AS1
AS78(15h): tātrastśri-nilānm āyuṣ-kāmpya nirōṭiṇi - AS1
AS27(200b): doṣa-bhediyākāś ca śrēṣṭa-vādīkayo viśēṣena - AS20
AS27(202a): doṣa-bhediyākāś ca pīta-vādīkayo - AS20
AS28(213b): doṣa-bhediyākāś ca vātā-vādīkayo - AS20

ASI:13(31b): teṣām duṣṭaṁ sarvanā mātrāśīlīyaktaṁ avaccheta - AS11
ASI:6(336a): dōsopakramaniyoktaṁ ca vātāṁ sādhunana - AS21
ASI:8(347a): dōsopakramaniyoktaṁ tāṁ upācāreta - AS21
ASI:9(353b): tathā prakrāti-bhediyākāśam - AS8
AN14(72b) HM14: doṣa bhēdiya-vihiṁita - AS20 HS12
AN15(73b) HM15: doṣa bhēdiya nāma đhāma ca - AS20 HS12
AC10(189b): āvāvidhāpakaśājyoḍiṇiīānā nāma-śāṣṭra-pāγān - AS24
AC12(199b): a-jīrṇaśūraṇa mātrāśīlīyaktaṁ vādāhaneopakrameta - AS11
AC14(218b): āvāvidhāpakaśājyoḍiṇiīānā śāṣṭra-vśāṣṭra-gāda-yogāntī - AS24
AC23(290a) AU2(19a): dōsopakramaniyam cekṣeta - AS21
AK7(363a): tata mātrāśīlīyakta - AS11
AU2(19a): see AC23(290a) - AS2
AU29(215a): śīpocov̄anīyam cekṣeta - AS2
CS3(30): ārvāvadhīyate jagata hārāhān - AS3
CS5(111): guṇā mātrāśīlīyam 'smin - AS5
CS6(18): avidhāśīta-pāṭīye 'ādyāvye vṛjñānīyam ukāni - AS28
CS6(51): tāvāśīlīyam nirāśām - AS6
CS11(64): tāvāśīlīyam mārgām ca - AS11
CS14(15): ukta tāvāśīlīyam yo - AS16
CS17(121): kiyānāśīlīyaṁ 'smin - AS17
CS18(56): vāyākhyāyaṁ vāmā trī-loṭhīya - AS18
CS20(10): tata sthānaṁ-jāh pūrvaṁ aṣṭomaṁyāvāh - AS19
CS26(113): āvāruya-bhadrākāśyā - AS26
CS28(29): tri-māṇya pravāyakā - CC26/C39
CS28(48) CV5(27): avidhāśīta-pāṭīye - AS28
CS29(7): vaṅkāpyaṁ arthe daṁ-mālaṁ-mālīye triṁśat-arīrāhīye - AS30
CS30(37): mārī-tāvāśīlīyam ca - CC26/C56
CS30(40): kiyānāśīlīyaṁ trāyād ca - AS17
CS30(42): avidhāśīta-pāṭīye - AS28
CS30(53): vānra-svarāyaṁ prākāṅkṣayā - CC11.1
CS30(56) CS30(149): abhāyākāśakṣayā - CC1.1
CS30(56): pāṇā-kāmpyam eva ca - CC1.2
CS30(57): samyoja-sāra-māyām - CC21.4
CS30(57): māṇapāma-bhāyaṁ ca - CC23.5
CS30(61): dvi-vātāyaṁ māṇiṇyam ca - CC25 CC26
CS30(149): see CS30.56
CV3(52): desfōddvamsa-nimittīya - CV3.1
CV5(8): viṣṇānāṁ ukāni avidhāśīta-pāṭīye - CS28
CV5(27): see CS28.48
CV6(3): tatra sākhkyaṁ āvād yahoktam aṣṭomaṁyāvāh - CS19
CV7(32): uktā vāyāsīrā-pīyeh - CV7
CV8(32): bhiṣag-pīyeh vṛjñām - CV8
CI12(29): uktām go-maya-cīmīyē - CI2
CI11.81: abhāyākāśakṣayē 'smin - CC1.1
CI12.23: nārīśāh prāṇa-kāmpyam - CC1.2

I need hardly draw attention to the fact that in other cases, too, Indologists reckon with the possibility of "underground" traditions, that is, a continuity which is not directly attested as such in the available sources, i.e. not attested uninterrupted.

Abbreviations: First place: A = Asīṅgīnasāgra, C = Carakasaṃhitā, H = Astāngahṛdaya, S = Sūtrasaṃhitā, R = Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya. Second place: C = cikitsāsthāna/cikitsāsthāna, I = indicāsthāna, K = kalpa/sādhana, L = lādāsthāna, N = nādaśūna, S = śūnāsthāna, S = śāśta, S = śāśta, V = vīmaṇāsthāna, U = uttarāsthāna/uttarātanāra. An asterisk (*) shows that the reference and what is referred to are not exactly identical. — The editions used are: for A that of Ti. Rudrapārāśa, Trichur 1913-1926 (with the page number and column given in brackets), for C that of Jādavaji Trikāmji Āchārya, Bombay 1941, for H that of Annā Moreśwar Kunte, Kṛṣṇa Rāmchandra Śāstri Nāve and Hari- Śāstri Parādkar Vaidya, Bombay 61499, and for S that of Jādavji Trikāmji Āchārya and Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya, Bombay 1938.