

## On Two Medical Verses in the Yuktidipikā

ALBRECHT WEZLER

1. The Yuktidipikā (= YD), the most important commentary on Īśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāṃkhyakārikā extant and available,<sup>1</sup> contains — as Śāstra works generally do — not a few quotations, both in prose and verse. R.C. Pandeya's edition (pp. 177sqq.) includes among other things also an 'Index of Verses Quoted in YD' and an 'Index of Prose Passages Quoted in YD'. Already a cursory comparison between these two alphabetically arranged lists shows that the prose passages could be identified to a remarkably large extent, whereas for very few of the verses is their source mentioned. Now it is clear that in view of the paucity of suitable and reliable research tools an editor is to a considerable degree dependent on his own knowledge of texts and his own power of recollection, unless he is assisted by friends and colleagues or by a stroke of luck. It would hence not be fair to find faults with an editor for failing to identify each and every quotation found in his text, provided he has done what he ought to do, namely add a list of all the quotations.

The importance of such an index is too obvious to call for further comment. Indeed, a consolidated index of the indexes already available (as a rule attached to editions, e.g. of philosophical texts) should be compiled (with the help of a PC) and published. Among other things this would surely go far towards identifying many of the quotations that have so far resisted attempts at identification.

But even then there is very great likelihood indeed that in most cases it will be only a certain percentage of the quotations a particular text contains that can be traced back to their original source; the number of Sanskrit texts which have not come down to us is simply too large to warrant the hope that completeness, and perfection, can be achieved in this regard. On the other hand, it need hardly be stated that except for this untraceable rest all the other quotations in a given text should certainly be identified. One of the reasons is the important role which quotations play in discussions about the relative chronology of texts, i.e. in establishing a *terminus ad quem* and/or a *terminus post quem*, etc. Quite evidently, such arguments cannot be based on an accidental or arbitrary choice of quotations, but presuppose — ideally that all of them without exception have been identified, but as this is practically never possible — that at least all those which have been taken from extant texts<sup>2</sup> have actually been identified.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> I should like to add the remark that the critical edition of this text, the preparation of which I announced quite some time ago (see fn.47 on p.455 of my article 'Some Observations on the Yuktidipikā' in: *ZDMG, Supplement II*, Wiesbaden 1975, pp.439-455), will finally be completed in the course of the next year in cooperation with two Japanese colleagues, Prof. Shunjun Motegi and Mr. Hisayoshi Miyamoto. — In 1970 Dr. Ramāsaṅkar Tripathi published in Varanasi a book entitled *Īśvarakṛṣṇavacitā Sāṃkhyakārikā Da. Ramāsaṅkaratṛipāṭhivivacitayā Tattvaprabhākhyayā vyākhyayā ajñātakāṇṭhikayā Yuktidipikayā vivṛṇayā ca vibhūṣitā*, which gives the bare text of the YD following to all appearances Pandeya's edition. The recent publication mentioned below in fn.12 deserves still less to be called an edition.

<sup>2</sup> I hope that this kind of quotation is meant by the use of the word 'some' in the statement 'possibly, when a critical edition of the text has been completed and some of the many quotations identified, one will be able to determine a more precise date' [of the YD], found on p.228 of G.J. Larson's and

2.1. As for the YD, the result achieved by Pandeya can be improved upon. E.g. the hemistich

*grhasthah sadṛśim bhāryāṃ vindetānanyapūrvikām*  
found on p.15 l.30 and stated by the — anonymous<sup>4</sup> — author to stem from 'another śāstra' (śāstrāntara\*) is a quotation of GautDhS (1.4.1, which however reads *ananyapūrvām yaviyasim*.<sup>5</sup> The context, but more importantly the contents of the quotation itself, quite clearly point in the direction of the Dharmaśāstra, so that it is somewhat surprising that Pandeya failed to identify it and hence to recognize that its being part of a verse is highly questionable.

Or to give another example, the *āryā*

*vṛkṣāgrāc cyutapādo yadvad anicchan narah pataty eva*  
*tadvad gunapuruṣajño 'nicchann api kevali bhavati*  
quoted<sup>6</sup> on p.21 ll.28-29 is verse 83 of the Paramārthasāra of Ādiśeṣa, where however the reading (*narah*) *kṣitau patati* seems to be attested without variant(s). This identification was apparently made first by Danielson,<sup>7</sup> who also used it as (the only) argument for determining the *terminus ad quem* of the Paramārthasāra, in that he subscribed to Frauwallner's view that 'the YD existed in the year 550 A.D.' and hence drew the conclusion that 'the PS must be earlier than that'. This is, I think, a good example of the danger which one should try not to incur, viz. relying on the date of a text B, without carefully examining the evidence, or pseudo-evidence, on which it is based, in order to determine the relative chronology of another text A in which one is primarily interested. It is admittedly rather annoying to have to enter into a discussion of the date of a second text, or even many more texts, since quite often such problems

R.Sh. Bhattacharya's volume *Sāṃkhya. A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy*, (Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies), Princeton 1987.

<sup>3</sup> See also the remark on p.458 (together with fn.6) of my article 'Further References to the Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa (Studies on the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa III)' in *Amṛtadhārā, Prof. R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume*, ed. by S.D. Joshi, Delhi 1984, pp.457-472.

<sup>4</sup> The ascription of the YD to Vācaspatimiśra (I.) in the colophon of the Poona MS. is so evidently wrong that I do not deem it necessary explicitly to justify why the author has for the time being to be regarded as unknown. In passing I should, however, like to mention that this error, or the — partially unnecessary — discussion it has provoked, has in its turn had the consequence that MSS. of Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvakaumudī* which do not contain even a hint to this effect have wrongly been listed in the entry on the YD in the corresponding, not yet published volume of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*.

<sup>5</sup> See also VāsdhS 8.1 and the Bhaviṣyapurāṇa as quoted by F. László, *Die Parallelversion der Manusmṛiti im Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, (AKM XI,2), Wiesbaden 1971, p.166 (6.5c); cf. also M. Shee, *tapas und tapasvin in den erzählenden Partien des Mahābhārata*, Reinbek 1986, pp.63ff. — It seems that the characterization of Sudakṣiṇā as *ātmānūrūpā* (with reference to Dilīpa) in Raghuvamśa 1.33 has also to be seen in the light of this rule of the Dharmaśāstra.

<sup>6</sup> It is introduced by *uktam ca*, but not followed by an *iti*.

<sup>7</sup> H. Danielson, *Ādiśeṣa, The Essence of Supreme Truth (Paramārthasāra), Sanskrit Text with Translation and Notes*, Leiden 1980, pp.1f. and fn.268 (p.77); in the 'Introduction' it is convincingly shown that this work cannot be classified as belonging to the Sāṃkhya school of thought.

turn out to have a snowball effect, but there is no way by which this kind of ensuing complexity could legitimately be avoided.

2.2 Pandeya's 'Index of Verses Quoted in YD' includes a rather strange entry too, viz. 'sambandhiśabdah sāpekṣo 25', for as a rule verses, or parts of verses, quoted in the YD are quite clearly marked off in his edition, but one looks in vain for such a typographically distinct element on p.25. Only when reading the whole of this line by line does one finally chance upon the clause *sambandhiśabdah sāpekṣo nityam vṛttau samasyate* (l.19). Now this forms part of the counterargument — its prior part being *pūrva eva samāso 'stu* — of the defensor; he wants to invalidate an objection (of the opponent) by deciding in favour of the first interpretation of the compound *mūlaprakṛti* (according to which it is to be paraphrased by *mūlaṃ cāsau prakṛtiḥ*, and not *mūlaṃ prakṛtīnām*) and by (now directly) refuting the view that the *karmadhāraya* compound would not be correct (a view based on and explicitly justified by quoting Patañjali's famous dictum *saviśeṣānām vṛttir na [vṛttasya vā viśeṣanām na prayujyate]* (Mahābhāṣya I 361.5ff; cf. II 18.7ff), 'no word-composition (i.e. compounding) [is allowed] of [words] qualified [by an outside] word[, nor is a qualifying word [allowed] to be added to that part of speech]] which has [[already]] been made a compound')<sup>8</sup>, and this view seems to be refuted by the statement, just quoted, viz. *sambandhiśabdah sāpekṣo nityam vṛttau samasyate*, which is, however, found only in one of the two MSS. used by Pandeya for his edition of the YD, namely that of Ahmedabad.

Now the counterargument as a whole is introduced by an *ucyate* which is used in this function stereotypically in the YD — just like *āha* announcing an objection of the opponent. Therefore one cannot but wonder why the second part of this counterargument could be regarded by Pandeya as a quotation: in fact there is in the text no indication of a quotation. Most probably Pandeya thought of Vākyapadiya III 748 [= 14 (Vṛttisamuddeśa).48],<sup>9</sup> which reads thus:

*sambandhiśabdah sāpekṣo nityam sarvaḥ prayujyate*  
*[svārhavat sā vyapekṣāsyā vṛttāv api na hiyate]*,<sup>10</sup>

but Pandeya has failed to add this reference, either in a footnote on p.25 or in the 'Index ...', and has forgotten to mark off what he considered to be a quotation (if this idea did not come to his mind only later, i.e. at the time of compiling the indexes). In this connection it has to be noted that such confusion would by no means be surprising in an edition which abounds in (prose) quotations which are identified in footnotes given at the bottom of the page where they occur, but which are nevertheless (or for that very

<sup>8</sup> My translation is modelled on that of S.D. Joshi, *Patañjali's Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya Samantahūnīka (P. 2.1.1) ...*, (Publications of the Centre of Advanced Study in Sanskrit, Class C, No. 3), Poona 1968, p.40.

<sup>9</sup> According to the numbering of the critical edition by W. Rau, *Bharṇharis Vākyapadiya*, (AKM XLII,4), Wiesbaden 1977.

<sup>10</sup> This *kārikā* is also quoted by Kaiyata on Mahābhāṣya I 361.1f., viz. *Pradīpa* (NSP-Edition) II 319 b 25-26.

reason?) not included in the corresponding index,<sup>11</sup> so that everybody is free to guess what this index is meant to embrace!

What is then the meaning of this 'quotation'? Shiv Kumar and D.N. Bhargava, to whom we owe the first volume of an English translation of the YD,<sup>12</sup> have correctly recognized that *sāpekṣo* has the function of a predicate, but their rendering of the first clause by 'the related word is always needed' is quite evidently wrong, and nonsensical<sup>13</sup> (whereas 'and is also compounded in a complex formation'<sup>14</sup> as equivalent of the second clause is unobjectionable). Instead it should be translated as follows: 'A relational word is always dependant on/always shows a relation to [the correlated word].' Thus this sentence as a whole indeed expresses basically the same idea as Bhartḥhari's verse, although in a very abridged form, especially as regards pādas c and d which can be translated thus: 'This its interdependence [with the other word correlated with it] is [also] not abandoned even in a complex formation (i.e. in compounding) just as its own meaning [is not abandoned by a relational word].' As regards the relation in which the YD's sentence stands to the Vākyapadiya verse, it cannot simply be taken for granted that the former is a quotation of the latter. All that can be said with certitude is that this verse may have lurked in the mind of whoever uttered the sentence.<sup>15</sup> In cases like this it is evidently not at all easy clearly to distinguish between an intended quotation, i.e. an utterance made by someone in order to repeat another person's statement *verbatim*, but differing from it because of a slip of memory, on the one hand, and an original statement, on the other, the formulation of which is, consciously or unconsciously, influenced by what has been said by another person.<sup>16</sup> But it need hardly be added that in spite of the boundary being fluid this distinction as such is of no little importance.

However, it is not only highly questionable whether this sentence can in fact be regarded as a quotation, but it is also not clear at all that it forms a part of the text of

<sup>11</sup> Thus e.g. on p.23 quotations from the Chāndogya-Up., viz. 8.7.1 (rightly called *prajāpater vacanam*, but containing many variants) and 3.11.4-6 (with variants) and Muṇḍaka-Up. 1.1.4 (also with variants); two more sentences, viz. *vidvārṣaḥ prajāṃ nākamayanta, kiṃ prajāṃ karisyāmaḥ* and *putraisaṇḍyāt ca vittaissaṇḍyāt ca vyuthāya bhāikṣacaryāṃ caranti*, have not been recognized as quotations (from BĀU 4.4.22).

<sup>12</sup> *Yuktidīpikā Vol. I*, Delhi (Eastern Book Linkers) 1990. The text is also given, but without any variants or explanations.

<sup>13</sup> As for the quality of this translation in general, it is enough to note that *prākṛikā vikārapuruṣaḥ tathā* of Ārambhāśloka 6 is rendered by 'the materialists (i.e. the Cārvākas) and the perverted persons', and that such bowlers are a common feature of it. — The rendering (of the YD passage in question) in the volume on Sāṃkhya of the Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy (cf. fn.2 above), p.238 '(the word 'primordial') ... cannot be attached to another word ...' is likewise not acceptable.

<sup>14</sup> On the term *vytti* cf. P. Thieme's review of L. Renou, *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*, Paris 1957, in GGA 212, 1958, 23ff. (= *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1971, pp.731ff.).

<sup>15</sup> And perhaps he knew only the version of the verse which is attested e.g. in the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* (ed. by R.B.K.P. Trivedi, (BSS no. LXX), Bombay 1915), p.160, viz. with *samasyate* instead of *prayujyate*. — On the secondary reading *vākyavat* (for *svārthavat*) cf. S.D. Joshi, op. cit. (fn.8), pp.38f.

<sup>16</sup> A particularly noteworthy subvariety of the latter is the allusion to a famous statement, known to the educated, the deliberate use of a formulation, hallowed by time and tradition, in a modified form.

the YD. Doubts seem to be justified first of all because the sentence is attested to only in one of the MSS., but in this case observations about the dialectical structure and the 'formulae' used in the stylized discussion that very largely characterize the YD allow one to come to a decision which is well founded and hence convincing. For the taking up of an argument brought forward already earlier — and therefore explicitly characterized as *pūrva* —<sup>17</sup> is not something done only once by the author of the YD. On the contrary, there are some more instances (even though it does not seem to be a particularly common feature of this text), and in the other cases it is, significantly enough, also coupled with a subsequent recalling, i.e. quoting, of an objection, or objections, raised earlier against it, but now only in order to reject it or them definitively. At YD 38.23 we read: *ucyate ... athavā punar astu pūrvakam evodāharāṇam* (cf. 38.20) | *yat tūktam anekāntād iti* (cf. 38.20) *atra brūmah ...*; and at 3.23f.: *ucyate — pūrva eva parihāro 'stu* (cf. 3.16) *athavā punar astu tantrāntarokter ity ayam parihārah* (cf. 3.18) | *yat tūktam pramāṇānupadeśaprasaṅga ity atra brūmah ...*. In the second case, though, the clause containing the key word *pūrva* is not immediately followed by the *yat tūktam* phrase, but quite evidently only because a second alternative refutation is also taken into account, or rather preferred to the first one. The structure of the 'formula' as such, however, stands out distinctly in relief: it is of such a kind that the clause containing the key words *pūrva* and *astu* must be immediately followed by *yat tūktam ...*, except for the case — which is, however, perfectly understandable both in terms of logic as well as of syntax — when it is stated that a second alternative refutation (*parihāra*) holds good equally. And this observation is strikingly confirmed if one also looks into the Mahābhāṣya, which obviously served as a model for the author of the YD in this regard;<sup>18</sup> for it is this immediate sequence that is found also in Patañjali's work, e.g. at I 10.26 *athavā punar astu jñāna eva dharma iti* (cf. 10.5) | *nanu cokaṭṭam jñāne dhārma iti cet tathādharmā iti* (cf. 10.5ff.) ..., or 12.21: *athavā punar astu sūtram* (cf. 11.15) | *nanu cokaṭṭam sūtre vyākaraṇe śaṣṭhyartha nupapanna iti* (cf. 11.16ff.) | ... or 17.16: *athavā punar astu viśayeṇa tu nāndlingakaraṇāt siddham ity eva* (cf. 17.8, vārt. 9) | *nanu cokaṭṭam ityāṃjñāprakṛtyartham etat syād iti* (cf. 17.11), etc. etc. The philologically trained reader of the YD has therefore good reason for rejecting the sentence in question: most probably it is a marginal note that crept into the text in a direct predecessor of the Ahmedabad MS., whatever its relation to the Vākyapadiya verse may be.

23. Another type of quotation is equally deserving of attention. It is represented in the YD e.g. by the verse (22.12-13):

*akke cen madhu vindeta kimarthaṃ parvataṃ vrajet  
iṣṭasyārthasya saṃprāptau ko vidvān yatnam ācaret.*

This verse is also quoted in Vācaspatiśra's Tattvakaumudī, though already on the first kārikā and not, as in the YD, in the commentary on kārikā 2, i.e. in a different context.<sup>19</sup> But Vācaspatiśra's categorizing it as a *laukikānām ābhānakāḥ* is quite

<sup>17</sup> It should be noted that there are also other 'formulae' used for taking up a previous argument (etc.).

<sup>18</sup> With relationship of the YD to the Mahābhāṣya I shall deal elsewhere.

<sup>19</sup> On this verse, and other works in which it is quoted, cf. S.A. Srinivasan, *Vācaspatiśra's Tattvakaumudī ...*, Hamburg 1967, p.180. — On *arka* cf. my article 'A Note on Mahābhāṣya II 366.26: *gunasam-dravo dravyam* (Studies on Mallavādin's Dvādaśānanyacakra II)' in *Buddhism and Its Relation to Other Religions, Essays in Honour of Dr. Shōzen Kumoi on His Seventieth Birthday*, Kyoto 1985, fn.34.

evidently not provoked by the context, but merely by the contents of the verse itself and perhaps by his knowing it as a 'popular saying, a proverb'.

In a case like this it is, of course, not reasonable to search for the source of the quotation, even though it cannot but ultimately have been composed by an individual author. On the other hand, it cannot *a limine* be excluded that the label 'proverb' is wrong or that the verse, or prose passage, became a 'proverb' only secondarily; nor should it be forgotten that a list of occurrences of (genuine) proverbs is a natural tool of any philology.

3. But my main concern is with two medical verses which are quoted in the YD on Sāmkhyakārikā (12.12-15) and which read thus:

*sarveṣāṃ vyādhirūpāṇāṃ nidānaṃ trividhaṃ smṛtam  
āhāraś ca vihāraś ca karma pūrvakṛtaṃ tathā ||  
tatrāhāravihārotthān rogān dravyam apohati  
yas tu karmakṛto vyādhir maraṇāt sa nivartate.*

The quotation is introduced by *āha ca*, 'and [in accordance with that (i.e. what I stated just now)] it is said'; the particle *iti* is added only after a third verse which is also quoted,<sup>20</sup> though separated from the two earlier ones by an inserted *punar apy āha*. The pair of verses is adduced as a vindication of the defensor's proposition preceding the *āha ca*, viz. (YD 12.10f.): *pratyakṣa<sup>21</sup> evaitad upalabhyate yad āyurvedavihitasya kriyākramasyābhiyuktam ātmavantaṃ bheṣajabhiṣakparicārasaṃpannaṃ praty ānarta-kyam*, which in its turn is meant to answer the opponent's objections (clothed in a question and directed at the last part of the kārikā), viz. (12.9): *katham etad avagamyate || yad dṛṣṭasya hetor anaikāntikatvam anātyantikatvaṃ ca* 'how is it known (i.e. is there really a means-of-valid-cognition which proves) that the perceptible means [for removing the threefold suffering] are neither certain (i.e. by necessity efficacious) nor final (i.e. successful once and for ever)?' The answer given is this: 'It is in fact perceived directly that the course of actions (i.e. the medical treatment in its particular deliberate succession) prescribed by the Āyurveda is useless/does not achieve the desired object [even?] with regard to [a sick person] who is careful, possessed of self-restraint [and] has the [right] medicine, a physician and people to attend and nurse him'. And it is clear already at first sight why the two verses are quoted thereafter: not, of course, because the author of the YD wants to draw attention to an individual case or a particular kind of such a perception — which would result in an unnecessary redundancy or over-explicitness, since everybody knows from his own experience that what he has said about the failure of medical treatment is true —, but because he wants to make an additional point, viz. to point out that the science of medicine itself not only admits the unreliability of the remedies it provides, but in fact recognizes a particular class of diseases to be by its very nature incurable and hence absolutely fatal!

<sup>20</sup> Viz. 12.17-18:

*sopadravo sarvarūpo balamāṃsendriyāpahati  
sāriṣṭaś caiva yo vyādhis taṃ bhiṣak parivarjayet.*

This verse, too, still needs to be identified; see also below, fn.112.

<sup>21</sup> This reading found in the Ahmedabad MS. is unfortunately not even mentioned in Pandeya's edition. His reading *pratyakṣa* can hardly be correct as the locative is obviously, i.e. according to the dictionaries, used only as a quasi-preposition.

Hence there seems to be little doubt that the two verses are quoted from a text belonging to Āyurveda literature, even though the expression *āyurveda(vihitasya)* does not (directly) refer to them and they are also perfectly clear in this regard.

3.1 Two expressions used in these verses, however, seem to call for closer inspection, viz. *āhāra* and *vihāra*.

3.1.1 As for the former, there can hardly be any doubt that it is only the meaning 'taking food' or 'food' which can be countenanced here. Both meanings are well attested. Thus *āhāra* e.g. of Manu 5.105 is explained by Medhātithi by simply adding *pavitrāṇāṃ payomūlānām* 'taking [viz. food] which, prepared from<sup>22</sup> milk, serves as a means of purification', or (*grāmya*) *āhāra* of Manu 6.3 is taken to mean *vrihiyavamayam annam*<sup>23</sup> by Medhātithi and similarly *godhūmatilakādikam* by Rāmacandra while Rāghavānanda, explaining the attribute only, gives the explanation *kṛṣyādīyatnotpādyam* (scil. *bhakṣyam*). But it is not always possible to decide with certainty whether in a particular case the expression *āhāra* is used to denote the action or its object: e.g. in the Manu verses referred to just now the commentator Maṇirāma explains *āhāra* of 5.105 by *haviṣyārūpaḥ*, i.e. starts from the assumption that it means food or rather a particular kind of food, or Govindarāja in paraphrasing *grāmya āhāra* of M 6.3 'by *grāmodbhava*<sup>24</sup> nna-bhakṣaṇam' shows that he regards it as a *nomen actionis*! As justly pointed out already by the Larger Petersburg Dictionary,<sup>25</sup> indigenous Indian grammarians are of the opinion that the meaning 'food' does not derive from the fact that the suffix is added to denote the object of the action (*karmān*), but the *apādāna*, i.e. what normally is expressed by the ablative; for the author of the Kāśikā it even serves as the example for this function of the suffix *ghañ*, for in explaining Pāṇ. 3.3.19 he says: *āhuranti tasmād rasam ity āhārah* '*āhāra* is semantically equivalent to [the phrase] 'They (i.e. the living beings) take from it the *rasa* (the digestible part of food, i.e. that which the organism is able to utilize for itself)'. Now, this looks like a very medical, scientific conception of food, so that one even feels justified in doubting whether in this case the grammarians have really been led by their feeling for language and not rather by their knowledge of Āyurvedic theories, for there is little likelihood that this expression was coined to render the rather complicated notion of 'that from which a living being or an organism takes what it needs as nutriment'; and as far as I can see *ā/hṛ* itself is also not used, at least not idiomatically, in a manner which would lend credibility to the explanation given in the Kāśikā. It is much more probable that Lingayasūrin hits the target when he paraphrases<sup>26</sup> *āhāra* by *āhriyate*, *bhujyate*, p.587, i.e. that his explanation in fact agrees with

<sup>22</sup> Not 'with', as follows from Medhātithi's commentary on Manu 11.106, viz. his explanation of *haviṣyam* by *payomūlaghṛtādi*.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. also Kullūka (*vrihiyavādikaṃ bhakṣyam*) and Maṇirāma (*vrihiyavādibhakṣyam*).

<sup>24</sup> Rāghavānanda's explanation *kṛṣyādīyatnotpādyam* is less open to misconstruction than that given by Govindarāja which could be taken to refer to provisions obtained in a village.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. also V.S. Apte's dictionary (the reference to the Siddhānta Kaumudī I was, however, not able to verify) as well as Pt. S. Ramasubba Sastri et al., *Kṛdantariṣamālā*, Madras 1971, p.1419.

<sup>26</sup> *Amarakośa* [I.] with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries *Amarapadavṛtti* of Lingayasūrin and the *Amarapadapārijāta* of Mullinātha, critically ed. ... by A. A. Ramanathan, Adyar: Madras 1971, p.587.

the idea normally connected with the word when used in the meaning of 'food',<sup>27</sup> but on the other hand it cannot be disputed that the interpretation offered by Jayāditya is equally possible in terms of Sanskrit word formation.

The next question which arises is whether or not *āhāra* = *āhriyate* is semantically identical with 'food' as defined e.g. in *The New Penguin English Dictionary*:<sup>28</sup> '(minerals, vitamins, etc. together with) material consisting essentially of protein, carbo-hydrate, and fat taken into the body of a living organism and used to provide energy and sustain processes (e.g. growth and repair) essential for life'.<sup>29</sup> In this connection it is important to take note of a remark found in the *Śabdastomamahānidhi*,<sup>30</sup> viz. *nirāhārās ca ye jīvā iti smṛtau jalapāne 'py āhārasabdah*, according to which 'the word *āhāra* is also used with reference to<sup>31</sup> the drinking of water',<sup>32</sup> and the *śloka pāda* quoted as an example — albeit from a text which I was not able to identify — contains a compound which indeed bears witness to this assertion, for *nirāhāra*<sup>33</sup> can only mean 'one whose *āhāra* consists of water (only)' and thus quite clearly demonstrates that water and other liquids can be subsumed under *āhāra*.

This observation is confirmed e.g. by Sarvajñanārāyaṇa who in his commentary on the *Manu* verse referred to already above, viz. 5.105, explains *āhāra* by *brahmasuvarcalā pānādir duṣṭajalādīpāne*, or by Rāmacandra who (on the same verse) similarly equates *āhārah* to *jalapānādir*.<sup>34</sup> In the light of this evidence 'food' seems to be too narrow a concept, a more correct equivalent being 'what is taken, i.e. received into one's body through the mouth'.<sup>35</sup>

3.1.2. The second expression to be examined, viz. *vihāra*, is likewise used as an illustration in a grammatical work, or at least a grammatical context, viz. in a *kārikā* which

<sup>27</sup> See also the passage quoted below on p.136 from Śāṅkara's *Gitābhāṣya*.

<sup>28</sup> Harmondsworth 1986.

<sup>29</sup> Note that this definition is also primarily based on (the) science (of medicine) and not on common understanding of what food is.

<sup>30</sup> (A Sanskrit Dictionary) compiled by Śrī Tārānātha Bhaṭṭācārya, Varanasi 1967<sup>9</sup>. It is quite remarkable that Bhaṭṭācārya confines himself to adding *iti smṛtau* to this quotation although, according to Prafulla Mitra's 'Memoir' (p.XII) he e.g. 'had the entire Mahabharata committed to memory which was so extraordinarily retentive that he could tell anybody offhand the contents of any Sanskrit book and particular pages there of wherein the subjects occurred.'

<sup>31</sup> It should be noted that the locative can, in a case like the present one, not be rendered by 'in the meaning/sense of'.

<sup>32</sup> Or 'drink of water', since *jalapāna* need not be a *nomen actionis*.

<sup>33</sup> Not listed in the dictionaries (as far as I can see).

<sup>34</sup> See also fn.56 and fn.81 below.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. in this regard also the common translation 'eat' for verbs seeming rather to mean 'take in' in modern Indian languages; see e.g. R.P.Das, 'Dravidischer Einfluß bei der Bildung neuindoeuropäischer periphrastischer Passiv: ...', *Sill* 11/12, 1986, 15f.

Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa quotes in his *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇasāra* (on verse 46 of the *mūla*), qualifying it as a *vṛddhokti*,<sup>36</sup> and which reads thus:

*upasargena dhātvartho balād anyatra niyate*<sup>37</sup>  
*prahārāhārasaṃhāravihārāparihāravat*

The commentators obviously<sup>38</sup> deemed this so clear that they unfortunately thought they could do without an explanation, and Kauṇḍabhaṭṭa confines himself to demonstrating that this verse indeed supports the point he wants to make in discussing the various theories about *upasargas* and *nipātas*. But this does not really matter; for, what the primary nouns *prahāra*, *āhāra*, etc. are meant to illustrate is the *semantic difference* caused by the preverbs; therefore a commentator could only be expected to make clear this aspect, but not to discuss the various meanings each of these words has.

After all *vihāra*, in the verses from the YD, poses a problem in so far as none of the meanings listed in the dictionaries really seems to fit, except perhaps for that of 'walking for pleasure or amusement, wandering, roaming; sport, play, pastime, diversion, enjoyment, pleasure' (Monier-Williams). However, this clearly calls for a critical examination, and in this regard it is certainly useful to look for explanations of *vihāra* in commentaries of other works.

In as much as *vihāra*, too, can be used as a verbal noun, it is legitimate to take into account also another derivative, viz. *viharana*, which is attested in *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 28 in an enumeration of the functions (*vṛtti*) of the five *karmendriyas*, i.e. 'faculties which serve action'.<sup>39</sup> Since Īśvarakṛṣṇa also follows the *yathāsaṃkhyā*-principle,<sup>40</sup> there cannot be the least doubt that *viharana* (no. 3 in *kārikā* 28cd) refers to *pāda* (no. 3 in *kārikā* 26 cd), i.e. that it denotes the function of the feet. Now the author of the YD explains *viharana* as follows (p.1041.2): *viśiṣṭaṃ haraṇaṃ viharanam | ataś ca yad eva samavi-śamanimnonnatacarikramanaparivartananāṭyavyāyāmādih sa indriyārtho nānyah*. That is to say that the word denotes different kinds of what one does with one's feet, viz. walking, circumambulating (?), dancing, doing physical exercises, etc., on the various kinds of ground. Hence the aspect of pleasure is not totally absent, but is quite evidently not dominant, being merely one among many others. A semantic development e.g. from 'walking' to 'walking for pleasure',<sup>41</sup> and even to 'enjoyment, pleasure'<sup>42</sup> is therefore

<sup>36</sup> In the *Vaiyākaraṇabhūṣaṇa* the quotation is simply followed by *iti cānyah* in order to make clear that it is not also a verse of Kumārilabhaṭṭa's like the two quoted before it (which are taken from the *Tantravārttika* on MS 1.3.33, ASS-edition II 250).

<sup>37</sup> Note the variant *anyah pratiyate*.

<sup>38</sup> This remark holds good for the compilers of the *Kṛdantarūpamālā* (cf. fn.25 above) too, cf. *Upodghāta* p.IX.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *karmārthānindriyāni karmendriyāni* (YD 99.15) [in contradistinction to *buddher indriyāni bud-dhindriyāni*, 99.64].

<sup>40</sup> On which see H. Brinkhaus, 'Yathāsaṃkhyā und versus rapportati', *Sill* 7, 1981, 21-70.

<sup>41</sup> Unless this latter meaning is derived from the elliptic use of *vihāra* 'passing away [the time]'. In any case it is important to take into account the narrower or wider context; in the *Arthasāstra*, e.g., *vihāra* always means '(place of) recreation' (1.10.13; 1.19.14; 2.1.33; 2.2.3; 5.1.23 and 28; 7.15.22; 12.5.47; 13.2.45) or '(sportive) amusement, pleasure' (2.26.5; 3.3.21; 5.5.7; 13.5.8).

indeed possible. Hence it is not necessary to check the passages on which this entry is based; but it is imperative to recognize, and not to lose sight of, the fact that *viharana* and *vihāra* are not basically connected with the idea of pleasure, amusement, play etc.

On the other hand, it is also possible that Īśvarakṛṣṇa, and following him the author of the YD, deliberately restrict the meaning of *viharana* for obvious reasons. The criticism directed by Jayantabhaṭṭa against the Sāṃkhya conception of the *karmendriyas*, or to be more precise, against the feet as a *karmendriya*, is based on different considerations, for what he says is (II 379.8f.):<sup>43</sup> *api ca viharāṇam api na kevalaṃ caranayugala-kāryam, api tu jānūrujaṅghādisahitapādasampādyam api* 'and in addition walking is also not only to be performed by [just] the pair of feet, but on the contrary, also something that is brought about by the feet in cooperation with the knees, thighs, the shanks, etc.' At least it has to be noted that in the Mahābhāṣya the following sentence is found (I 363.25f.): *antareṇa khalv api śabdaprayogaṃ bahavo 'rñā gamyante 'kṣinikocaiḥ pāṇivihārāiś ca* (cf. also I 388.4f.), where the compound *pāṇivihāra* can only mean 'movement, gesture of the hand(s) (used as signal)' (*hastaceṣṭā*).<sup>44</sup> And it cannot simply be argued that the addition of the prior *pāṇi* is significant in that it shows that *vihāra* alone does not refer to a movement of the hands, for the qualification can likewise be accounted for by assuming that in the given context it was necessary to exclude movements of other parts of the body like the feet, etc. It is therefore at least probable that *vihāru* does not refer exclusively to 'functions' of the feet — as is in fact to be expected in view of the basic meaning of *vi/hṛ* 'to part asunder, keep apart, separate, to open'.<sup>45</sup>

However, it cannot be denied that the action primarily thought of in connection with the word *vihāra* and hence denoted by it is that of the feet, or rather legs,<sup>46</sup> although the movement of walking or marching etc. affects, of course, the body as a whole.

To adduce a few more pieces of evidence:  
Bhag.Gītā 11.42ab

*yac cāvahāsārtham asatkṛto 'si vihārasaṃyāsanaḥhojaneṣu*  
'and that you have not been shown due respect [by me] while walking, lying, sitting or eating [together with you] because I wanted to mock you', where Śaṅkara's explanation *viharāṇaṃ vihārah pādavyāyamaḥ* is indeed to the point since Arjuna clearly has in mind rules about giving precedence to another person, walking behind a person of higher rank and similar 'rules of etiquette'.

<sup>42</sup> That is to say *kṛiḍā* as it is then usually paraphrased by commentators (cf. e.g. Cakrapāṇidatta on Caraka, Cikitsāsth. 20.41 or Ādiyadarśana, Devapāla and Brāhmanabala on KāṭhGS 1.19 (C. Dreyer, *Das Kāṭhaka-Gṛhya-Sūtra* ..., Stuttgart 1986, p.20). By way of a specialization of meaning *vihāra* can even have the meaning of *śruti*; cf. e.g. the commentary called Lakṣmi on Sāhityadarpaṇa 3.110 (ed. by Āchārya Kṛṣṇamohan Śāstri, Varanasi 1967, p.149), Śukraniti 3.112 (*kuryād vihāraṃ dhāraṃ nirhāraṃ vijane sadā*).

<sup>43</sup> Reference is to Vol. II of the edition (MORIS 139) by K.S. Varadacharya, Mysore 1983.

<sup>44</sup> This is the explanation given by Cārudeva Śāstri in his *Upasargārthacandrikā*, Vol. 3, Delhi—Varanasi 1979, p.419; cf. Nāgojibhaṭṭa's *Uddyota* (NSP-edition), II 378 b 1.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. e.g. RV 10.162.4 and AiBr 2.35 (= *Adhyāya* 10.3). — Cf. also Pāṇini 1.3.41 (*veḥ pādaviharane*).

<sup>46</sup> As rightly pointed out by Jayanta!

Another very interesting passage is Matsyapurāṇa 184.21cd-23ab:<sup>47</sup>

*aṣṭau māsān vihārah syād yatināṃ saṃyutātmanām  
ekatra caturo māsān vārṣikān nivaset punaḥ ||  
avimukte<sup>48</sup> praviṣṭānāṃ vihāras tu na vidyate  
nā deho bhavitā tatra dṛṣṭaṃ śāstre purātane;*

for it testifies to the fact that *vihāra* is used — in stark contrast to its meaning 'monastery'<sup>49</sup> — to denote precisely the opposite, i.e. the specific activity of mendicant ascetics during the rest of the year, their homeless 'roaming about'.<sup>50</sup> It is noteworthy that more than just the constant movement on foot is here at least implied.

In a metaphorical and slightly extended meaning *vihāra* is used in the Yogabhāṣya (on YS 4.10), viz. the passage<sup>51</sup> *ye caite maitrīdayo dhyāyināṃ vihārās* ..., which should certainly not be rendered — as it was by Woods<sup>52</sup> — by 'as for friendliness and such [exalted states-of-mind], they are the diversions<sup>53</sup> of contemplative [yogins]', but rather by '... are the activities [of the mind-stuff] of [yogins] practising meditation', for the explanation given by the author of the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa (330.22f.), *vihārāḥ [= cittavyāpārāḥ, ceṣṭāni]* is highly convincing indeed.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>47</sup> In the edition by Pañcānana Tarkaratna, Calcutta 1891; it is 183.21ff. in *Matsyapurāṇa*, Text in Devanāgarī, Translation and Notes in English, Foreword [and Translation!] by H. H. Wilson. Arranged by N.S. Singh, Delhi 1983.

<sup>48</sup> On this place name see e.g. V.S. Apte's dictionary.

<sup>49</sup> I wonder how *vihāra* became to denote 'monastery'; I doubt whether this is a specialization of the meaning 'place of residence' because, at least originally, it served as a temporary abode only. Monier-Williams' explanation ('originally a hall where the monks met or walked about') is also not really convincing; and 'place of recreation, pleasure, amusement' can certainly also be excluded. I should like to propose that it is derived from (*kālam*) *vi/hṛ*, 'to pass away [the time]', i.e. that it originally denoted a place where monks, and nuns, spent the rainy season, i.e. the time during which they could not roam about; cf. the semantically closely related middle Indic expression *lena* (< Skt. *layana*), 'place where an animal cowers [for shelter]' = 'burrow hole, den' and 'place where monks take shelter [during the rainy season]' > 'monastery'. Sukumar Dutt's explanation of the term *lena* is, however, entirely different (*Buddhist Monks and Monasteries of India, their History and their Contribution to Indian Culture*, London 1962, p.93); on the other hand this book contains many pieces of information which seem to support at least my interpretation of *vihāra* (cf. pp.58f., 93 and particularly 94 ('The original purpose of a *vihāra* was apparently to provide shelter from inclemencies of weather and noxious things — they were no more than shelters for monks to dwell in for *vassāvāsas*')). Cf. also his book *Early Buddhist Monachism*, (2nd rev. ed.), London 1960, pp.99ff. and 150ff.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. the expression *nivaset* and *avimukte praviṣṭānāṃ* clearly in contrast to *vihāra*.

<sup>51</sup> According to Vācaspatimiśra this is a statement of the *ācāryaḥ* quoted in the Bhāṣya.

<sup>52</sup> *The Yoga-System of Patañjali* ..., (HOS 17), repr. Delhi—Varanasi—Patna 1966, p.309.

<sup>53</sup> The italics are mine.

<sup>54</sup> In this connection Arunadatta's characterization of *vihāra* as *vāgdehamanaśceṣṭālākṣaṇa* should be noted (*Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya*, Śārirasth. 3.44).

'Movement [of the body],<sup>55</sup> but first of all of the feet', is hence a meaning of *viḥāra* that is not only well-attested, but seems also quite suitable for the context of the two verses under discussion. 'Mode of life', an equivalent found e.g. among others in the Pali-English Dictionary of Rhys Davids und Stede, clearly suffers from being too broad, and inexact, a meaning. For, closely connected with the expression *āhāra* as *viḥāra* is in our verses, it cannot by any means denote a concept which already by itself quite naturally includes the manner of eating. The syntagma *āhāraś ca viḥāraś ca* of the second line of the two verses at issue<sup>56</sup> almost gives the impression of being the *vigraha*,<sup>57</sup> the separation of the corresponding *dvandva* compound *āhāravihārau*. In fact the compound *āhāravihāra* occurs quite frequently especially in Āyurvedic texts; both words are often mentioned together, either by themselves or as parts of a larger compound or series of expressions, so that one feels tempted to assume that the concepts denoted by them are in fact closely connected with or even supplementary to each other. But one should not count one's chickens before they are hatched, i.e. one should first take a closer look at some at least of the relevant passages<sup>58</sup> in order to find out in which of its numerous meanings the word *viḥāra* is in fact used in the Āyurveda, and whether the meaning is the same in all cases.

At Caraka,<sup>59</sup> Vimānasth. 8.92-93 it is said — in the context of dealing with 'certain topics (viz. ten factors) [to be examined] for the knowledge of physicians (i.e. by the physicians in order to know more about the patient)' (*kānicit prakaraṇāni bhiṣajām jñānāntam*: 68, cf. 84) among which figures also *deśa*: *deśas tu bhūmir āturas ca | tatra bhūmiparikṣā — āturajñānahetor vā syād auśadhaparijñānahetor vā | tatra tāvad iyam āturaparijñānahetoh | tad yathā — ayaṃ kasmin bhūmideśe jātaḥ saṃvṛddho vyādhitō vā; tasmimś ca bhūmideśe manasyānām idam āhārajātam, idam viḥārajātam, idam ācārajātam*,<sup>60</sup> it looks very much as though the various physical activities of people, as such activities are specific to a particular place or region, are here set off against cooking and drinking, on the one hand, and conduct and manners, on the other. A somewhat

<sup>55</sup> Cf. also the expression *niśāvihārāḥ*, referring to *grahānām paricārakāḥ*, at Suśruta, Uttarāt. 60.22, which is explained in the context itself, viz. by *niśācarānām* (*teṣāṃ hi ye ...*) in the subsequent verse. Dāhāṇa paraphrases the former by *rātrau bhramanaśilāḥ*; cf. also Cakrapāṇidatta's explanation of *viḥārantam* (at Caraka, Cikitsasth. 21.4) by *vicarantam*.

<sup>56</sup> It is attested to also elsewhere, e.g. at Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, Śārīrasth. 3.44. — In his commentary on this passage Arunadatta qualifies *āhāra* as *pānāśanādilakṣaṇa* (the 'ādi' perhaps referring to licking etc.).

<sup>57</sup> On this term see P. Thieme, 'Meaning and form of the "grammar" of Pāṇini', *Sill* 8/9, 1982/83, pp.29ff.

<sup>58</sup> Most of them were kindly pointed out to me a couple of years ago by Dr. R.P. Das.

<sup>59</sup> The edition used by me is that of Jāḍavajī Trikamjī Āchārya, NSP: Bombay 1941<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>60</sup> In *The Caraka Saṃhitā* ..., ed. and published in six volumes ... by Shree Gulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society, Jamnagar 1949, this is translated as follows (II 928): '... such and such are the articles of diet used by the people; and such their modes of exercise and customs'. Priyavrat Sharma, *Caraka-Saṃhitā, Aṅgīveśa's treatise refined and annotated by Caraka and redacted by Dṛḍhabala* ..., 2 vols., Varanasi—Delhi 1981, renders it thus: '... in that type of land the people mostly have such diet, behaviours, conduct ...'. A parallel is Aṣṭāṅgas., Sūtrasth. 23; cf. also the compound *āhāravihāropacāra* (*paricchadāḥ*) at Caraka, Śārīrasth. 8.14 and Aṣṭāṅgas., Śārīrasth. 1.

different picture presents itself if the initial part of the *kuṣṭhanidāna*<sup>61</sup> of the Suśruta is compared with its parallels in the Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, and Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha<sup>62</sup>, for what corresponds to Suśruta,<sup>63</sup> Nidānasth. 5.3 *mithyāhārācārasya* (,) *viśeṣād guruviruddhā-sātmyājirmāhitāśīnaḥ ... yo vā ... tasya pittaśleṣmāṇau prakupitau ...*<sup>64</sup> in the Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya<sup>65</sup> is Nidānasth. 14.1f.

*mithyāhāravihāreṇa viśeṣeṇa virodhinā*

*sādhunindādvadhānyasvahanādyaiś ca sevitaḥ ||*

*pāpmabhiḥ karmabhiḥ sadyaḥ prāktanaiḥ preritā malāḥ ...*<sup>66</sup>

and this would seem to indicate that *viḥāra* and *ācāra* are semantically so closely related (as regards a particular part of their respective semantic fields) that they can be interchanged (in this regard). Gayadāsa strikingly confirms this observation in that he explains in his commentary on the Suśruta passage: (*mithyāśabdāḥ āhārācārābhyāṃ saha pratyekam abhisambadhyate | tatra dvādaśāśanapravibhāgoktavividhiviparitavidhīr mithyāhārāḥ |*)<sup>67</sup> *ācārāḥ kāyavānmanobhedena trividho viḥārāḥ*<sup>68</sup> *| tasya svasthavṛttināgata-bādhavidhānād anyathākaraṇam mithyācārāḥ ...*. It should also be noted that Toḍara in his commentary<sup>69</sup> on the passage quoted just now from the Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya offers an explanation of *viḥāra* which is in remarkable agreement with that given by Gayadāsa for *ācāra*, viz. *mithyāvihāreṇa [=] himśastēyādikena kāyavānmanasena prānyupaghātapanuṣa-vacanāniṣṭavartinā*. According to both these commentators *viḥāra* means 'activity' of the (age-old) triad of 'body, speech and thought',<sup>70</sup> and this is a very interesting piece of information no matter whether the activity is considered to be wrong (*mithyā*) for ethical or for medical reasons, since it permits one to assign (tentatively) to *viḥāra* the meaning 'habitual or occasional behaviour' — and the lexical content is thus indeed in accordance

<sup>61</sup> Cf. on this also R.E. Emmerick, 'Some Remarks on the History of Leprosy in India', *Ind. Taur.* XII, 1984, 93-105 as well as 'Die Lepra in Indien' in *Aussatz. Lepra. Hansen-Krankheit, Ein Menschheitsproblem im Wandel, Teil II: Aufsätze*, hrsg. v. J.H. Wolf, Würzburg 1986, pp.185-199.

<sup>62</sup> Reference is to the edition by A.D. Āṭhvale, Poona 1986.

<sup>63</sup> Reference is to the edition by Jāḍavajī Trikamjī Āchārya, NSP: Bombay 1916.

<sup>64</sup> Dāhāṇa explains: *fāstroktavidhibhraṣṭāhārācārasya*.

<sup>65</sup> Reference is to the edition by Anṇā Moreśvar Kuṇṭe, NSP: Bombay 1925<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>66</sup> = Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha, Nidānasth. 14.2f.

<sup>67</sup> As kindly pointed out to me by Dr. R.P. Das, the implicit reference is to Suśruta, Uttarāt. 64.53 (or 56 in the edition used by G.J. Meulenbeld, *The Mādhavanidāna and its Chief Commentary* ..., Leiden 1974, p.344 fn.4, where the latter passage is translated).

<sup>68</sup> The bolding is mine.

<sup>69</sup> Quoted l.c. by the editor in the sixth edition of the work — NSP: Bombay 1939 — mentioned in fn.65; on the MS. used see no. 32 on p.15 of the Sūcipatra section of this edition.

<sup>70</sup> See fn.54 above; cf. also Arunadatta on Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, Nidānasth. 1.6 (quoted in Nilamegha's *Tantrayuktivivāra* on 2 (ed. N.E. Muthuswami, Trivandrum 1976, p.3): *viḥārāś ca tasminn eva kaphaje jvare dehananovyāpāroparamāḥ*.

with that of *ācāra* as the latter too seems to be explained within the context itself of the passage from the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, viz. by *snehapīṭasya vāntasya vā vyāyāmagrāmyadharmasavino* 'of one who performs physical exercises or has sexual intercourse [immediately] after partaking of an oleaginous substance or after vomiting', and by *yo vā majjaty apsūsmābhīṭapah sahasā chardir vā prāṭihanti* 'or who unwisely takes a bath in [cold] water after an exposure to heat or who forcibly suppresses [any nature urge] for vomiting'. Admittedly, sexual intercourse, a refreshing bath, and even killing of other living beings does in fact or can give pleasure, but clearly the aspect of amusing oneself, indulging in a particular action, is 'noematisch' not relevant<sup>71</sup> here; but it is not for that reason alone that Hilgenberg and Kirfel's rendering of *vihāra* in this *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya* passage<sup>72</sup> by 'Tätigkeit' is not entirely satisfactory.

Another of the ten topics of Caraka, *Vimānasth.* 8.68 and 84 already mentioned above, are 'the characteristics'<sup>73</sup> of (< consisting in) physiological parent state etc.' which the author explains in 8.95: (*tatra prakṛtyādin bhāvān anuvyākhyāsyāmaḥ* |) *tadyathā — śukraśonitaprakṛtiṃ, kālagarbhāśayaprakṛtiṃ, āturāhāravihāraprakṛtiṃ, mahābhūtavikāraprakṛtiṃ ca garbhāśarīram apekṣate*. One has, of course, to read 'prakṛtiṃ mātur āhāravihāraprakṛtiṃ',<sup>74</sup> which means '(the organism of the embryo depends, for its own development, on) ... the kind of food (or more precisely: what the mother takes into her body) and behaviour/activities of the mother ...'.

This passage it is that Cakrapāṇidatta may have had in mind when he explains *samyagupacāraiḥ* of Caraka, *Śārīrasth.* 3.3 (*yadā ... tadā garbho 'bhivariate, sa sāmīyārasopayogād arogo 'bhivardhate samyagupacāraiḥ copacaryamānaḥ* ...) quite convincingly by *garbhahūtair āhāravihāraiḥ*, and he need not add *mātur*, or a similar expression, in order to make clear what he wants to say, viz. that the growth of the embryo is not impaired when the mother takes proper care of it by eating and drinking only what is salutary to it and by avoiding all activities that might be detrimental to it.

In a similar way a dependence is — again in principle correctly — seen between the *āhāra* and *vihāra* of a wet-nurse, or more generally a breast-feeding woman, and the quality of her milk; cf. e.g. *Suśruta*, *Śārīrasth.* 10.32ff.:

*dhātṛyās tu gurubhir bhojyair viśamair doṣalais tathā  
doṣā dehe prakūpyanti tataḥ stanyam pradūṣyati. ||  
mithyāhāravihāriṇyā duṣṭā vātādayaḥ striyaḥ  
dūṣayanti payas tena śārīrā vyādhyayaḥ śiśoḥ ||  
bhavanti kuśalas tāmś ca bhiṣak samyag vibhāvayet.*

Here too *vihāra* is clearly not used in the meaning of 'pleasure' or 'amusement', and therefore one will accept K.K. Bhishagratna's<sup>75</sup> rendering as (basically) correct, viz. 'of

a woman, vitiated owing to injudicious and intemperate eating and living'.<sup>76</sup> His interpretation of *mithyā* is also quite convincing, and he, of course, starts from the assumption that this member of the compound has likewise to be construed with *vihāra* too — as explicitly stated by Gayadāsa on the passage from the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* just quoted.

At *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya*, *Uttarasth.* 1.17ab the following recommendation is met with:

*hihāhāravihāreṇa yatnād upacarec ca te*

(i.e. the two wet-nurses one should employ if the mother herself is not able to feed her baby). The translation proposed by Hilgenberg and Kirfel<sup>77</sup> 'diese pflege man sorgfältig mit zuträglicher Nahrung und Erholung' is somewhat problematic; apparently they did not recognize that *hihā*<sup>78</sup> qualifies 'vihāra' as well as *āhāra*<sup>79</sup> just as *mithyā*<sup>80</sup> does in the other cases; 'salubrious way of living' does not, however, mean here 'recreation' or 'rest', but 'keeping bodily activities within certain [limits in order to avoid any decrease of the 'milking capacity' or any deterioration of the quality of the milk'].

A further and particularly clear confirmation of the foregoing determination of one of the meanings of *vihāra* is provided by *Suśruta*, *Cikitsāsth.* 30.5 in so far as *somavad āhāravihārau vyākhyātau*, said in connection with prescriptions about the use of certain medicinal plants, must refer to the preceding *adhyāya* (29). And this latter contains a detailed description of the treatment, behaviour, diet etc. of a patient who has taken one of the *somarasāyanas* in the course of the many weeks of his developing a 'new body' (*navā tanuḥ*, 29.14). Therefore, K.K. Bhishagratna's<sup>78</sup> translation 'the regimen of diet and conduct is the same as in the case of Soma' is fully justified.

At Caraka, *Indriyasth.* 1.3 a number of factors are enumerated which a physician should examine if he wants to determine a patient's remaining span of life, and among them *āhāra* and *vihāra* are also mentioned. Although that latter topic does not seem to be dealt with in detail in the *Indriyasthāna*,<sup>79</sup> it is, I think, not unreasonable to assume that the expression *vihāra* is used in a meaning identical with that which it has in the *Āyurveda* passages discussed in the foregoing, and hence to accept Priyavrat Sharma's rendering ('diet, activities') as the one most probably correct and to reject that found in the edition and translation of the Shree Gulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society ('his diet, recreation').

For the same reason H.H.M. Schmidt's translation<sup>80</sup> of the compound *pānāhāravihārabhesajam*<sup>81</sup> occurring in verse 102(ff.) of the *Yogaśataka* ascribed to Nāgārjuna by

<sup>76</sup> The italics are mine.

<sup>77</sup> Op. cit. (cf. fn.72), p.518.

<sup>78</sup> Op. cit. (cf. fn.75), p.541.

<sup>79</sup> Oddly enough this idea is not even mentioned by Cakrapāṇidatta in his commentary on this passage and therefore no reference is given either.

<sup>80</sup> *Das Yogaśataka, Ein Zeugnis altindischer Medizin in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, hrsg. u. übersetzt ...*, Bonn 1978, p.213.

<sup>81</sup> Note that here *pāna* is mentioned separately, and not subsumed under *āhāra*.

<sup>71</sup> On this term and the semantic theory with which it is connected, cf. K. Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg 1967, pp.37ff.

<sup>72</sup> L. Hilgenberg and W. Kirfel, *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā ...*, Leiden 1941, p.270.

<sup>73</sup> According to Cakrapāṇidatta *prakṛti* is here equivalent to *svabhāva*.

<sup>74</sup> This is also evinced by Cakrapāṇidatta's explanation (... *evam garbhāśayasthaś ca doṣaḥ*); *mātur āhāra-vihārau taikālinau yaddoṣakaraṇasvabhāvau ...*

<sup>75</sup> *An English Translation of the Sushruta Samhita ...*, Varanasi 1963, vol. II, p.228.



'Trank-, Nahrungs- und Vergnügungsmedizin'<sup>82</sup> cannot be considered a successful attempt to render the original; no doubt J. Filliozat's<sup>83</sup> 'médication par boisson alimentation et manière de vivre' is decidedly much nearer the point. Obviously the remedies referred to here correlate to corresponding causes, or types of causes, of diseases; in this connection Siddhasāra<sup>84</sup> 5.2 and 9.1 should also be mentioned, since, respectively, particular *doṣas* are stated there to be 'mūhyāhāravihārotahā'<sup>85</sup>, and 'the wind etc.' to be excessively disturbed (*duṣṭa*) 'mūhyāhāravihārotahā'!

But there are passages where one cannot be as sure as in these last cases, or where *vihāra* is quite evidently used at least in the meaning 'pleasant, amusing activity' if not directly 'pleasure, amusement' etc.

An interesting paragraph (12) of Caraka, Śārīrāsth. 5 is devoted to an explication of 'the means of ascending of those desirous of liberation' (*mumukṣūṇām udayanāni*); the lengthy list that is given in this paragraph also comprises *suptasthiṭagataprekṣāhāra-vihārapratyaṅga-ceṣṭādikeṣv ārambheṣu smṛtipūrvikā*<sup>86</sup> *pravṛttiḥ*; in view of *gata* 'going, moving', one hesitates to assume that *vihāra* means 'bodily activity' here, but 'pleasure' etc. is evidently excluded. It would appear that two traditional 'prefabricated' chains have been strung together here, one made up of past participles used as verbal nouns and the other of primary nouns, and what is meant by *vihāra*, in contradistinction to 'food' and to the 'movement of minor limbs of the body', is most probably the remaining activities of the body, such as urinating, defecating etc.<sup>87</sup>

In the description of various types of *saṁtva* at Caraka, Śārīrāsth. 4.36ff., however, expressions like *ambhavihārarati* (37.5), *sukhavihāra* (37.6), *strīvihāra* (37.7), *vikṛtāhāravihāraśila* (38.3) or *āhāravihārapara* (35.6) are to be interpreted in the light of Cakrapāṇidatta's explanation *vihārah* [=] *kṛiḍā*. That is to say, it has to be admitted firstly that *vihāra* can be used even in Ayurvedic texts to denote ways and doings which are first of all thought of as giving pleasure, and, secondly, that this holds good of the word too when it forms a compound together with *āhāra*. This compound as such cannot hence be regarded as an absolutely reliable indication of *vihāra* meaning 'walking, bodily activity' etc.

<sup>82</sup> The fact that the Tibetan translator renders *vihāra* by *gnas* does not, as Schmidt thinks, warrant the conclusion that he took it to mean 'Aufenthaltort'; it is either the stereotypical equivalent of this word (if it does not mean 'monastery') or an abbreviation for *gnas lugs*, 'position' (etc.).

<sup>83</sup> J. Filliozat, *Yogaśataka, Text médical attribué à Nāgārjuna*, Pondichéry 1979, p.107.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. R.E. Emmerick, *The Siddhasāra of Ravigupta. Vol. I: The Sanskrit Text*, Wiesbaden 1980.

<sup>85</sup> The Tibetan translation (for which see R.E. Emmerick, *The Siddhasāra of Ravigupta, Vol. 2: The Tibetan Version with Facing English Translation*, Wiesbaden 1982, pp.84f. and 180f.) adds an explanation (in both cases), viz. 'wrong positions such as (wrong way of) sitting and lying down'.

<sup>86</sup> Is this due to Buddhist influence or do we have to do here with a common trait of the Indian ascetic-meditative tradition?

<sup>87</sup> Cf. the explanation of the commentator on verse 101 of the *Yogaśataka* (Filliozat, op. cit., p.150), *vi-hāro vimūḍhādhyuṣargah*. This meaning is alternatively taken into consideration also by Cāruḍeva Śāstri, *Upasargārthacandrikā* (cf. fn.44), p.418. Note, however, that at Caraka, *Siddhisth.* 11.30 (*akālanirhāravihāra-sevin*) the *malādinirgama* (Cakrapāṇidatta) is expressed by *nirhāra*; a parallel is found at Aṣṭāṅgas, *Sūtrasth.* 27.

Nevertheless there are passages in non-Ayurvedic texts too in which no other choice can reasonably be made. What I have in mind is e.g. Bhag.Gītā 6.17

*yuktāhāravihārasya yuktaceṣṭasya karmasu*

*yuktasvapnāvabodhasya yogo bhavati duḥkhaḥ,*

and the relevant part of Śaṅkara's commentary on this verse, viz. *āhṛiyata ity āhārah* [=] *annaṃ, viharanaṃ vihārah* [=] *pādakramah, tau yuktau niyutaparimāṇau yasya saḥ yuktāhāravihārah tasya, tathā yuktaceṣṭasya [anyā ca] yuktā niyatā ceṣṭā yasya karmasu tasya*. For, just as in the case of Caraka, Śārīrāsth. 5.12 the fact that the compound under discussion and a second compound containing the word *ceṣṭā* are juxtaposed does not by any means warrant the conclusion that it cannot therefore have the meaning 'walking', all that has to be assumed is that *ceṣṭā* refers to other activities of the body, and this is expressed in the Caraka passage by the prior member *pratyāṅga*<sup>88</sup>, and suggests itself quite naturally in the verse from the Bhagavadgītā too, as is also shown by the secondary explicatory addition of *anyā ca*.

Or consider Medhātithi's commentary on Manu 1.96, in which he takes *bhūta* to refer to plants like trees etc. and animals like worms, insects (?) (*kṛta*)<sup>89</sup> etc., but explains *prāṇin* — and the *prāṇinah* are said to be the relatively best among the *bhūtas* by Manu — by *āhāravihārādiceṣṭāsamarthāḥ* 'those [among them] who are able to eat food and to perform movements like walking etc.'.

Finally, the sentence *dṛśyante ca prāṇināṃ kālānūrūpāḥ svabhāvāhāravihāravayavasthāḥ*, found at YD 131.12, has undoubtedly to be classed with this group too.

By way of summary it has to be emphasized that none of the entries found in special dictionaries or glossaries of technical terms of the Ayurveda s.v. *vihāra* fulfils the requirement of being comprehensive (i.e. distinguishing the various meanings) as well as of being precise (i.e. specifying the individual meaning). Thus, the author of the *Vaidyaka-Śabdāsindhu*<sup>90</sup> confines himself to quoting the *Medinikośa* (*ceṣṭāyām, bhramane*); in the glossary attached to vol. VI of the edition and translation of Caraka by the Shree Gulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society<sup>91</sup> all that is given is the explanation *gamanabhramanādīśārtracēṣṭā*, and with reference to just one passage (Śārīrāsth. 2.29) at that; and the *Āyurvediya Mahākośa*<sup>92</sup> does not contain more than the remark *kāya-vihāraś caturvidhaḥ gamanacarikramanasthānāsanaśābhedena*, which is in fact merely a part of Ḍaḥaṇa's explanation of *vihaṛet* at the very end of *Suśruta, Cikitsāsth.* 29.10, although it has to be admitted that the remark is of no little significance: what Ḍaḥaṇa seems to have in mind when he states that the particular *vihāra* referred to in the text is a *kāyavihāra*, is the threefold division of body, speech and thought<sup>92</sup>, and his

<sup>88</sup> On *kṛta* cf. also R.P. Das, *Das Wissen von der Lebensspanne der Bäume, Surapālas Vṛkṣāyurveda*, Stuttgart 1988, p.265.

<sup>89</sup> Compiler Kavirāja Umeśachandra Gupta. Revised and enlarged 2nd ed. by Kavirāja Nagendra Nātha Sena, Varanasi—Delhi 1983<sup>3</sup>, p.990.

<sup>90</sup> See fn.60 above.

<sup>91</sup> *Āyurvediya Mahākośaḥ arthāt Āyurvediya Śabdakośa* ..., Sampāḍakau Venimādhavaśāstri Josi, Nārāyaṇa Hari Josi, Bombay 1968, p.779.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. p.139 and footnotes 54 and 70 above.

distinction of the four kinds of 'bodily activity', viz. 'going, marching,<sup>93</sup> standing and sitting (down)', is, of course, likewise worthy of note.

Only the lemma in the 'Index Sanskrit' added to J. Filliozat's edition and translation of the *Yogaśataka*<sup>94</sup> testifies to a capacity of making distinctions, for it reads thus: 'situation, conditions extérieures (de l'organisme), manière de vivre, hygiène générale ...'.

I on my part should like to propose, in view of the evidence discussed in the foregoing, to enlarge the entry on *vihāra* in our Skt. dictionaries by inserting: 'bodily movements, especially going and walking, but also other kinds; activity/activities not only of the body, but also of speech and mind > way of living, mode of life (excluding eating and drinking).'

3.2 Of course what I am aiming at is the argument that *vihāra* — in the two verses of the YD which have provoked the rather lengthy discussion making up paragraph 3.1. — is used in the meaning determined in the foregoing and just described by way of summary. Hence I should like to propose the following translation:

'All the various types of diseases have a threefold cause, as is known from trustworthy tradition, [viz.] 1) what is taken into the body through the mouth, and 2) the bodily activity/mode of life and 3) the deeds done previously/in a former birth. Among these the diseases arising from what is taken into the body and from bodily activity/mode of life are removed by a drug; but a disease which is caused by [former] deeds, comes to an end [only] because of the death [of the person suffering from it].'

Quite evidently the dichotomy of curable *versus* incurable diseases<sup>95</sup> underlies this threefold distinction. As regards the particularly interesting distinction of two different causes of — in principle — curable diseases, viz. *āhāra* and *vihāra*, attention may first be drawn to some of the passages mentioned in the preceding paragraph, viz. *Śūsruta*, *Śārīrasth.* 10.32ff. and *Siddhasāra* 5.2 as well as 9.1. In addition two verses quoted in the *Bhāṣya* on the *Rasavaīṣeṣikasūtra* should also be considered.

The first one reads thus (on 1.83):

*vihārāhārahetūnām ṛtukālopajanmanām  
doṣānāṃ śamanānṛthāya svasthakarma vidhiyate ||  
śayanasthānagamanasānāpānāśanādibhiḥ,*

while the second is the following *varṇasāstha* (on 1.2):

*vipakvabhōjī pratikāraṇe (ra)to hūṭāni cānnāni samācaran (mitam)  
asāhasaṃ karma samācaran sadā śataṃ samā jīvati mānavo sukhi.*

<sup>93</sup> It seems that the intensity expressed does not refer to the speed, but to the distance and the manner of walking.

<sup>94</sup> P. 150 (cf. fn.83 above)

<sup>95</sup> The dichotomy taught by Dārila in his commentary on *Kauśika-sūtra* 25.2, quoted by S. Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy II*, Cambridge 1965, p.275, viz. *dviprakāra vyādhyāh āhāranimittā asubhanimittā ceti | tatra āhārasamuthānāṃ vaiśamya āyurvedaṃ cakāra* (recte: *āyurvedaḥ carakādipranitāh śamanānṛthāh*) *adharmasamuthānāṃ tu śāstram idam* (viz. the *Atharvaveda*) *ucyate*, is basically not different, and cannot simply be put aside as a mere fabrication meant to explain the existence of both, the *Atharvaveda* and the *Āyurveda* (forming the *upaveda* of the former). (My attention was kindly drawn to this passage in Dasgupta's work, and to passages from the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* and the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* about a threefold division of diseases discussed below, by G.J. Meulenbeld in a letter dated 14 June 1987).

The first verse bears further witness to the idea that *vihāra* and *āhāra* have in fact been regarded, though among other factors, as causes of 'disturbances', and the second one, though the two expressions are not used in it, confirms the existence of the idea that by observing a proper diet and by not overstraining oneself one lives as long as what is believed to be the ideal span of life (a hundred years), i.e. that one does not fall ill and die an untimely death.<sup>96</sup>

The central importance which food has for the preservation of health is stressed also at Caraka, *Sūtrasth.* 25.31.: *hiitāhāropayoga eka eva punarvāyādhikaro bhavati, ahitāhāropayogaḥ punar vyādhinimittam*. And in the same text the idea is expressed that a *hiitabhojana* lives a hundred years (*Sūtrasth.* 27.348; cf. 342ff.); the opposite idea, i.e. that among other faults an *annadoṣa* leads to death (of Brahmins) is known to Manu (cf. 5.4 and 5ff.).

As for bodily activity, in the verse from the commentary on the *Rasavaīṣeṣikasūtra* one aspect only is emphasized; the other aspect, however, viz. that such activity, nay even exertion is — physiologically — necessary, is given its due in a verse occurring in the *Kāśikā* on Pāṇ. 6.1.63<sup>97</sup> viz:

*vyāyāmakṣuṇṇagātrasya padbhyām udvaritasya ca  
vyādhayo nopasarpanti vainateyam ivoragāh.*<sup>98</sup>

In a similar manner further evidence will now be presented for the third cause, i.e. the idea that *karman*, too, exercises influence on the physical condition of man, although in this case also I cannot offer more than some material I have come across by chance since I have not had the time necessary for systematic search or comprehensive reading.

To all appearances, the expression *kṣetriya*, taught by Pāṇini in a *nipātanasūtra* (5.2.92), and stated by him to be equivalent to the syntagma *parakṣetre cikitsyah* 'curable [only] in another dwelling/living-place [of the soul] (i.e. another body in the next birth)',<sup>99</sup> has to do with the idea that certain diseases are by necessity fatal and that they are caused by *karman*, for the conception of a disease, in the proper sense of the word, which can only be cured after death in the next life would in itself be very strange indeed.

In other sources *karman* is regarded as a cause of diseases, or particular diseases, but no specification is given as to their character, i.e. severeness. Thus at *Rasaratna-samuccaya* 1.25 the importance of *rasa* is highlighted by stating:

*hanti bhakṣaṇamātreṇa pūrvajanmāghasaṃbhavam  
rogasaṅgham aśeśānāṃ narārāṇāṃ nātra saṃśayaḥ;*

<sup>96</sup> Cf. also Caraka, *Śārīrasth.* 2.46: *naro hiitāhāravihārasevi ... bhavaty arogaḥ.*

<sup>97</sup> I am grateful to Mr. Mahes Raj Pant, Kathmandu, for drawing my attention to it.

<sup>98</sup> Note that the construction is anacoluthic.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. *Kāśikā* on P. 5.2.92: ... *kṣetriyaṃ kuṣṭham* (cf. fn.61 above) / *parakṣetram [=] janmāntaraśramam, tatra cikitsyah kṣetriyah / asādhyo 'pratyakhyeyo vyādhir ucyate | nāmyasya nivartata ity antah*. Note that this is merely one of four different explanations offered, all of which, however, are stated to be 'authoritatively valid' (*sarvaṃ caitat pramāṇam*).

it should be noted that it is the central aim of Indian alchemy to create a 'new body', i.e. ultimately to overcome death.<sup>100</sup>

The compound *pāparoga* (e.g. Manu 5.164) — its derivative *pāparogin* is also attested e.g. Manu 3.92 and 159 — is commonly taken to be a *karmadhāraya*, but as the diseases referred to (according e.g. to the commentators on Manu) are ultimately incurable ones like *kuṣṭha*<sup>101</sup> and *kṣaya* ('decline'), it is worth considering whether it should not perhaps be analyzed as a *taipuruṣa*, viz. *pāpād rogaḥ*. At least, Manu himself clearly distinguishes (11.48) between a *nūpaviparyaya* 'in consequence of crimes committed in this life' (*duṣcaritaiḥ*) and 'in consequence of those committed in a former [existence]' (*pūrvakṛtāiḥ*),<sup>102</sup> and it is most probable that this verse, and those following upon it, were regarded by Bühler<sup>103</sup> as justifying the translation of *pāparogin* (e.g. at 3.92) by 'those afflicted with diseases that are punishments of former sins'. That *adharmā* is the cause (*kāraṇa*, *nimitta*) of diseases is an idea with which also Medhātithi, Govindarāja and Kullūka were familiar (cf. e.g. their commentaries on Manu 1.83).<sup>104</sup>

Finally, the tripartition of the causes of diseases deserves consideration. Various threefold classifications of diseases (as such) are found in medical texts e.g. at Sūtrasth. 24.4 the division of *duḥkha* into *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhauṭika* and *ādhidāivika*, referred to in Sāṃkhyakarikā 1 and made explicit in the commentaries on it, is met with in connection with defining diseases to be *duḥkhasaṃyoga*.<sup>105</sup> According to Tīsaṭā-cārya<sup>106</sup> diseases are classified into three groups, viz. *karmaja*, *doṣaja* and *ubhayaja*, and Caraka (Śārīrasth. 1.86ff.) distinguishes between past, present, and future *vedanās*.

We also find threefold divisions of the causes of diseases. Thus e.g. Caraka, Sūtrasth. 1.54 reads thus:

*kālabuddhindriyārthānāṃ yogo mithyā na cāti ca  
dvyāśrayānāṃ vyādhināṃ trividho hetusaṃgrahaḥ,*

<sup>100</sup> Cf. also the prescription for the use of *soma* referred to above on p.141.

<sup>101</sup> On which see fn.61 above.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. also Śivatatvaratnākara 2.3.

<sup>103</sup> *The Laws of Manu*, (SBE XXV), reprint Delhi—Varanasi—Patna 1967.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. also A. Roṣu, 'Medicine and Psychology in Ancient India' in *Curare* 4, 1981, 205-210, in particular p.206, and last but not least M. G. Weiss, 'Caraka Saṃhitā on the Doctrine of Karma' in *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Tradition*, ed. by W.D. O'Flaherty, Berkeley—Los Angeles—London 1980, pp.90-105. Much interesting information is also contained in works such as Viśveśvara Bhaṭṭa's *Madanamahārṇava* (ed. by E. Krishnamacharya and M.R. Nambiyar, (GOS 117), Baroda 1953), which discusses the causes of and cures for diseases mainly in terms of what may be called *karma* and *adharmā*, and *pratyakṣa* respectively. The great Bengali author Baṅkim Candra Caṭṭopādhyāy's *Dharmmatatva* (first published in book form in 1888) also contains a very interesting discussion on diseases being caused by *adharmā* (in his own special neo-Hindu definition). This important work has unfortunately not yet been translated into any European language.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Sūtrasth. 1.22.

<sup>106</sup> *Cikitsākalikā*, verse 10f.

'wrong use, non-use and excessive use'<sup>107</sup> of time (i.e. seasons etc.), intelligence and sense objects is the threefold complex of causes of diseases which have two loci (viz. body and mind)<sup>108</sup>. Or in the Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha (Sūtrasth. 22.6) the *doṣas*, which are the only cause of all diseases (*sarvarogaikakāraṇam*: 22.5), are said to have in their turn a threefold *nimitta*, viz. *asātmayendriyārthasaṃyoga*, *prajāñāparādha* and *parināma*. On the other hand it has to be noted that Caraka (Sūtrasth. 1.23) teaches a quadruple division of *āgantū*, *śārīra*, *mānasa* and *svābhāvika* diseases.<sup>109</sup> It is hence as clear as one can wish that the threefold classification of the two verses quoted in the YD is merely one among many different attempts at systematically dividing the causes of diseases, and no clear parallel to it has so far been presented from a medical text. Hārītasamhitā 3.2.23 as quoted by Pandeya in a footnote on p.12 of his edition of the YD, viz.

*karmajā vyādhayaḥ kecid doṣajā santi cāpare  
sahajā kathitās cānye vyādhayas trividhā mataḥ,*

does not, of course, meet this requirement, but it has also not been possible to identify the source from which the author of the YD quotes here. It cannot even be regarded as certain that it is a medical work, for when making the corresponding assumption<sup>110</sup> I did not yet take into consideration the pronounced tendency of proper Āyurveda texts<sup>111</sup> to declare all diseases without exception, whatever their causes may be, to be curable. In fact it cannot at all be precluded that the source drawn upon in the YD belongs to quite a different branch of learning,<sup>112</sup> although the argument (that the quotation is meant to make) is, no doubt, strongest if it is the science of medicine itself which is called to witness.

Yet a definite answer to this question can only be given when a comprehensive investigation of all systematic divisions of the causes of diseases, found in medical texts, has been undertaken.<sup>113</sup> In view of the richness of the relevant material such a study would, however, clearly go beyond the scope not only of the present essay, but also of anything which could still be subsumed under the term 'article'. Nevertheless it is hoped that the above discussion has at least demonstrated: (a) that it is sometimes worthwhile to examine a quotation more closely even if it cannot be identified, (b) that semantic studies are very much needed in the field of Āyurvedic research, and above all (c) that 'cataloguing' of ideas, i.e. collecting, analysing and describing them with a view to

<sup>107</sup> Note how the author expresses himself, i.e. that *na* and *ati* correspond to the compounds *ayoga*/*yogābhāva* and *aiyoga*.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. the immediately following verse:  
*śārīraṃ satvasaṃjñāṃ ca vyādhinām āśraya mataḥ ...*

<sup>109</sup> At Aṣṭāṅgas, Sūtrasth. 22.1 a sevenfold division is taught.

<sup>110</sup> See above p.132.

<sup>111</sup> Cf. e.g. Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha 22.3.

<sup>112</sup> And this could likewise apply to the verse quoted in the YD after the two verses under discussion and mentioned already above (fn.20).

<sup>113</sup> A preliminary attempt to gather material relevant for such an investigation has been made by R.P. Das, op. cit. (in fn.88), pp.268 and 519.