

ARCHIV FÜR INDISCHE PHILOSOPHIE

Philipp A. Maas

The Concepts of the Human Body and Disease in Classical Yoga and Āyurveda*

0. Introductory remarks
1. The role of the therapeutic paradigm in classical Yoga
2. Medical knowledge reflected in the Pātañjalayogaśāstra
3. A critical edition of Patañjali's list of bodily constituents
4. A brief glance at lists of bodily constituents in classical Āyurveda
5. A glimpse at lists of bodily constituents in Epic, Purāṇic and Buddhist literature
6. The definition of disease in Pātañjalayogaśāstra I.30
7. The theory of tastes as a source for a textual corruption
8. Conclusions

* Work on this paper has been generously supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in the context of FWF projects P17300-G03 ("Philosophy and Medicine in Early Classical India I) and P19866-G15 ("Philosophy and Medicine in Early Classical India II"). The present paper was originally read at the workshop cum symposium "Classical Indian Medicine: Text and Meaning", at the Wellcome Institute, London, on November 6, 2004. I would like to thank the participants for their valuable comments. I am grateful to Dr. Cristina Pecchia, Vienna, who read a draft of this paper painstakingly and made some valuable suggestions; moreover, Susanne Kammüller was so kind to check the English of the draft. I am also very thankful to Dr. Dominik Wujastyk for his valuable comments on an earlier version of the present paper. Last not least I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Dr. Karin Preisendanz for having drawn my attention to a number of relevant passages from Āyurvedic and philosophical literature, and for a detailed, thorough and constantly pleasant discussion. I am deeply indebted to the following institutions for having liberally provided me with copies of their manuscripts of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra: Adyar Library (Chennai), École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Centre de Pondichéry (Pondicherry), Central Library (Baroda), Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (Chennai), Jaykar Library University of Poona (Pune), Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (Kathmandu and Berlin), Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library (Thiruvananthapuram), Oriental Research Institute (Mysore), Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library (Thanjavur), and University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia). Dr. Kengo Harimoto, Hamburg, was kind enough to provide me with copies of relevant folios of manuscripts containing the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa, one (formerly?) kept at the Punjab University Library (Lahore) and the other one from the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library (Thiruvananthapuram).

0. This paper originates from a text-critical note in my edition of the first chapter of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra (PYŚ),¹ i.e. the Yogasūtra (YS) together with the so-called Yogabhāṣya.² The purpose of this note was merely to justify my decision in favour of the reading *dhāturasakarāṇavaiśamyam* against *dhātuvaiśamyam*, which occurs as the definition of disease (*vyādhi*) in PYŚ I.30. *dhāturasakarāṇavaiśamyam* is the version transmitted by nearly all textual witnesses I had access to for my edition (i.e. twenty-four manuscripts, twenty-one printed editions, and three commentaries on the PYŚ); this version is also attested by the secondary evidence of the commentaries. The reading *dhātuvaiśamyam* is transmitted by only one quite ancient palm-leaf manuscript from Nepal written in Old Bengali script (siglum *K^b*). As happens now and then when one deals with questions of textual criticism, things became less clear the longer I thought about them. When I submitted my edition as a Ph.D. thesis at the University of Bonn in 2004, I kept to the reading transmitted by the vast majority of textual witnesses, which in my opinion was most probably the *lectio difficilior*. Nevertheless, I was unable to exclude the possibility that this was the more unlikely or even a nonsensical reading.

In preparing the edition for publication, I changed my mind but retained a feeling of uncertainty, as there are good reasons for a decision in favour of the single reading *dhātuvaiśamyam* against the reading transmitted even by all three commentaries. These well-known commentaries are (1) the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa (YVi)³ written by a certain Śaṅkara who may or may not be identical with the author of the Brahmasūtrabhāṣya (cf. Halbfass 1991: 207), (2) the Tattvavaiśārādī (TVai), also called Yogasūtrabhāṣyavyākhyā, by Vācaspatimiśra I, who most probably “flourished between A.D. 950 and 1000” (Diwakar 2006: xxviii), and (3) the Yogavārttika (YVā) by Vijñānabhikṣu, who presumably lived in the latter half of the sixteenth century (Larson – Bhattacharya 1987: 376). If my new verdict should be right, the corruption of the original PYŚ appeared possibly as early as the eighth century; in any case it must have crept into the transmission by the year 1000. The occurrence of mistakes at a comparatively early stage like this would, of course, not

¹ Maas 2006: 105, n. 30.6.

² I have argued that probably one single author, Patañjali, collected the PYŚ’s *sūtra*-passages from different sources and added his own commentary, which became known as the Yogabhāṣya; cf. Maas 2006: xii–xviii, following Bronkhorst 1985.

³ References to the first chapter (Samādhipāda) are to the critical edition by Harimoto (1999). References to chapters 2–4 are to the Madras edition of 1952 if not stated otherwise.

be surprising at all in face of the considerable time span between the production of the commentaries and the PYŚ itself, which most probably was composed at some time between A.D. 325 and 425 (Maas 2006: xix).

1. In order to establish the historical relationship between different versions of text dealing with a definition of “disease” it is, of course, necessary to take the author’s background knowledge of medicine into consideration. Already Wezler, in his well-known article “On the Quadruple Division of the Yogaśāstra, the Caturvyūhatva of the Cikitsāśāstra and the ‘Four Noble Truths’ of the Buddha” (Wezler 1984),⁴ furnished proof which demonstrated that Patañjali not only knew – at least from a systematic perspective – a medical system which he calls *cikitsāśāstra*, but that he expected his readers (or listeners) to share this knowledge (PYŚ II.15, p. 78,1-3):

yathā cikitsāśāstram caturvyūham – rogo rogahetur ārogyam bhaiṣajyam iti, evam idam api śāstram caturvyūham eva. tad yathā – saṃsārah saṃsārahetur mokṣo mokṣopāya iti.

In the same way that medical science has four divisions – i.e. disease, the cause of disease, health, and medicine – so also this science [of Yoga] has four divisions, namely, the circle of rebirths, the cause of the circle of rebirths, deliverance, and the method [leading] to deliverance.

In a statement immediately following this passage, Patañjali establishes a relationship between this fourfold division and four *sūtra*-passages. A comparison of the *bhāṣya*-passage with the *sūtra* clearly shows that the latter contains a fourfold systematic division, although the *sūtra* does not explicitly mention it (cf. Wezler 1984: 295f.). Moreover, the *sūtra*-text does not compare the science of Yoga with the science of medicine.

1.1 Although Wezler (1984: 304f.) clearly acknowledges that the comparison is suitable, he feels a “palpable” difference between the medical concept of health and the philosophical concept of liberation. To heal physically and mentally means to restore health, a state which existed prior to disease. The various soteriological concepts do not refer to “an analogous previous state of freedom from Suffering; on the contrary, Suffering is recognized as the fundamental constituent element of existence” (Wezler 1984: 304).

⁴ See also Halbfass 1991: 245ff.

1.2 According to Halbfass, however, the analogy reveals “perhaps the most significant denominator between the medical concept of health and the goal of philosophical soteriology”. Even if soteriology does not try to restore a state that was lost, it aims at “a rediscovery (...) of an (...) underlying perfection which has always been there”. The regaining of a natural state of “health, balance and harmony (...) offered itself as a bridge between the therapeutic paradigm and the other two important paradigms (...) of awakening and final liberation” (Halbfass 1991: 250).

1.3 Although the notion of health as the pristine or original state of the human body is without doubt generally accepted in classical India, it is, nevertheless, a matter of question of exactly which analogy between medicine and soteriology Patañjali had in mind. We find, in fact, partly contradictory conceptions of health and disease in the oldest classical treatise on Āyurveda, the Carakasamhitā (CS).⁵ These conceptions are closely related to the theory of the three “humours” (*doṣa*) wind (*vāta*), bile (*pitta*) and phlegm (*śleṣman*), which are said to exist in equal proportion in a healthy body (cf. Jolly 1901: 39-41). Both conceptions agree in the basic notion that the body suffers from disease when the normal ratio of the three “humours” is disturbed, which then turn from being mere elements of the body into pathogenetic substances, and that it is the physician’s task to establish their normal state. The conceptions differ, however, in their perception of the original state of the body. According to one view, it is simply health; according to the opposite view, one of the three substances wind (*vāta*), bile (*pitta*) or phlegm (*śleṣman*) dominates the constitution of each human body.⁶ The similar-

⁵ According to Meulenbeld (*HIML* IA/114), the Carakasamhitā must have been composed between about 100 B.C. and A.D. 200.

⁶ *tatra kecid āhuḥ – na samavātapittaśleṣmāṇo jantavaḥ santi, viśamāhāropayogitvān manuṣyāṇām; tasmāc ca vātaprakṛtayaḥ kecit, kecit pittaprakṛtayaḥ, kecit punaḥ śleṣmaprakṛtayo bhavanti. tac cānupapannam. kasmāt kāraṇāt? samavātapittaśleṣmāṇaṃ hy arogam icchanti bhiṣajāḥ, yataḥ prakṛtiś cārogyam ...* (CS Vi 6.13). “In this regard some say that no living beings with [the] suitable [ratio of] wind, bile and phlegm exist, because [all] men consume unsuitable food (i.e. food leading to an unsuitable ratio of the bodily elements), and therefore some [people] have wind as their basic constitution, some have bile as their basic constitution, and some have phlegm as their basic constitution. This, however, is not correct. For which reason? Because physicians hold (*icchanti*) that a healthy [man] has [a] suitable [ratio of] wind, bile and phlegm, and because the basic constitution [of man] is health” A reconciliation of both views is found in CS Vi 8.95, where human beings are said to either have one or several *doṣas* as their nature, or to naturally possess equal shares of all of them. For a similar view see CS Sū 7.39-41 (cf. Scharfe 1999: 618b).

ity of this latter conception of disease and health to the conception of suffering and release in philosophy is even closer than the one seen by Wezler and Halbfass. Both medicine and soteriology remove disorders and aim at the realization of perfections: medicine leads to flawlessness of body and mind, whereas yogic soteriology culminates in spiritual perfection.⁷ A major difference between the respective aims is, however, that health is a temporal state that is always threatened by disease, while release is final and unconditioned.⁸

1.4 In my interpretation, the objective of the comparison of yoga and medicine in the PYŚ is therefore twofold. On the one hand, it stresses the negative world-view of Sāṅkhya–Yoga by equating the circle of rebirths with disease and deliverance with healing. On the other hand, the comparison shows the high importance and meaningfulness of the *yogaśāstra*, which implicitly surpasses the importance of medicine. Medicine, to be sure, does not do more than temporarily remove a temporal form of suffering, i.e. disease. Yoga, on the other hand, claims to bring about complete and ultimate well-being. If therefore every man is in need of medical care, he much more urgently needs the practice of yoga.

This suggestive exemplification (*dṛṣṭānta*) works best, of course, if the reader or listener is familiar with the notion of a medicinal science that has four divisions. Therefore, the almost complete absence of any reference to a division like this in the texts of Āyurveda is quite remarkable. Wezler (1984: 309) cites only one passage from the CS, which clearly – although using a different terminology – refers to a fourfold division of medical knowledge (CS Sū 9.19, p. 64,4f.):

hetau liṅge praśamane rogāṅām apunarbhave |
jñānaṃ caturvidhaṃ yasya sa rājārho bhiṣaktamaḥ ||

⁷ This analogy is also reflected in a stanza found at the beginning of manuscript B of Patañjali's MBhāṣya (I, p. 505), in Śivarāma's commentary (eighteenth century) on Subandhu's Vāsavadatta, at the end of the YVi, and at the end of the PYŚ manuscript *My*¹, which ascribes the authorship of works on Yoga, grammar and medicine to Patañjali: *yogena cittasya padena vācāṃ malaṃ śarīrasya ca vaidyakena | yo 'pākarot taṃ pravaraṃ munīnāṃ patañjalim prāñjalir ānato 'smi ||* (cf. Woods 1914: xivf. and Endo 1993: 22). On the (lack of) historicity of this ascription cf. *HIML* 1A/141-144.

⁸ Patañjali does not say explicitly that he holds health to be merely a conditional and temporal state. This attitude is, however, voiced in Sāṅkhyakārikā (SK) 1bc: *dṛṣṭe sāvāpārthā cen naikāntātyantato 'bhāvāt* "If [one argues that] this [desire to know the means to ward off suffering] is meaningless, since a perceptible [means is available], [we answer] "No!", because a [perceptible means that wards off suffering] invariably and permanently does not exist." Āyurveda is, according to the commentaries, one of the "perceptible" means for warding off suffering (cf. Steiner 2007: 508 and n. 5).

He who possesses the fourfold knowledge of the cause, the symptom, curing and not coming into existence again of diseases is an excellent physician, worthy for a king.

This almost complete absence of a fourfold division of medicine in Āyurveda literature is one of several points in support of Wezler's conclusion that the ultimate origin of the fourfold division of medicine, as well as that of the same division in Yoga and in Nyāya literature, is the Buddha's analysis of human existence in his "Four Noble Truths". In order to solve the above text-critical problem it is, however, sufficient to keep a much more modest conclusion in mind: Patañjali knew a science of medicine, and he assumed that his readers would share this knowledge.

2. But what kind of medicine did Patañjali know? Did its basic theoretical assumptions agree with classical Āyurveda, or was it a different system, maybe one that is lost today? I would like to discuss these questions in the context of PYŚ III.29. This passage deals with a result the yogi gains from complete concentration (or – as Woods would have it – "constraint") (*saṃyama*) on the *cakra* of the navel (PYŚ III.29, p. 153,7-10, as translated in Woods 1914: 260):

nābhicakre kāyavyūhajñānam (YS III.29). *nābhicakre saṃyamaṃ kṛtvā kāyavyūhaṃ vijānīyāt. vātapittaśleṣmāṇas trayo doṣāḥ. dhātavaḥ sapta tvag-lohita-māṃsa-snāyṁ-asthi-majjā-śukrāṇi. pūrvam pūrvam eṣāṃ bāhyam ity eṣa vinyāsaḥ.*

[As a result of constraint] upon the wheel of the navel [there arises the intuitive] knowledge of the arrangement of the body (YS III.29). By performing constraint upon the wheel of the navel he would discern the arrangement of the body. The humours are three, wind, bile and phlegm. The [corporeal] elements are seven, skin and blood and flesh and sinew and bone and marrow and semen. Here (*eṣa*) the mention is such that the preceding element is in each case exterior to that next preceding.

This passage, in connection with the one discussed above, shows that Patañjali was acquainted with a medical science that shared its theoretical framework with classical Āyurveda, as he explicitly mentions the three well-known humours (*doṣa*) and seven bodily constituents (*dhātu*).⁹ In consequence, it is quite tempting to try to identify the specific text that served as a source or as a model for the exposition of the "arrangement of the body" (*kāyavyūha*) in the PYŚ. This, of course, would

⁹ According to Zysk (1986: 689), lists of bodily constituents are a part of ancient Indian anatomical knowledge that was gained from the observation of ritually butchered horse bodies in Vedic sacrifice.

involve a comparison of Patañjali's enumeration of bodily constituents with the relevant parallel passages in early classical Āyurvedic works, which should be based as far as possible on critically edited texts. Things being as they are, we face the unsatisfactory situation that critical editions of relevant works on Āyurveda simply do not exist.¹⁰ With regard to the PYŚ the situation is much better, as I am in a position to present an edition of the relevant passage on the basis of twenty manuscripts from different parts of the Indian subcontinent and on the basis of information provided by the commentaries.

3. The value of the commentaries as secondary evidence for the transmission of the passage under discussion varies considerably. Vācaspati omits the whole passage from his TVai, and Viññānabhikṣu only attests that in his version of the PYŚ the enumeration of the seven bodily constituents ends with *majjāśukr[āṇi]* (YVā 347,23f.). Only the YVi allows for a reconstruction of the reading its author very probably knew or had at hand:

*tathā [Tm 98v] dhātavaḥ sapta bāhyābhyantarabhāvenāvasthitāḥ. raso bāhyaḥ sarveṣāṃ. tato 'bhyantaram lohitam tato māmsam tato 'sthi tato medas tato majjā tataḥ śuklam sarvābhyantaram ity evaṃ pūrvam pūrvam eṣāṃ bāhyam ity eṣa vinyāsaḥ*¹¹

So also *the body elements are seven*, standing in the relation of being external and internal [to each other]. *Food essence* is the most external of all [*dhātus*]. Blood is more internal than [food essence], more internal than [blood] is *muscle flesh*, more internal than [muscle flesh] is *bone*, more internal than [bone] is *fat*, more internal than [fat] is *marrow*, more internal than [marrow] is *semen*, the most internal of all. Thus *the order of*

¹⁰ The two research projects under the direction of Karin Preisendanz, University of Vienna, mentioned in note *, are devoted to filling this gap for the Vimānasthāna of the Carakaśaṃhitā.

¹¹ The following symbols are used: Σ all witnesses, except the one(s) mentioned — *abc* text doubtful — (two) *akṣaras* marked as illegible by the scribe — ++ (two) illegible *akṣaras* due to physical damage of the leaf — † text not transmitted by the mentioned witness(es). — Beginning of text: *L* 109v5f., *M^E* 288,16, *Tm* 98r9. *v.l.*: 1 bāhyābhyantara...śuklam] *L M^E*; after bāhyā-, *Tm* has a lacuna due to damage of the folio. raso] *L*; (rasaḥ)tvak *M^E*; † *Tm*. 2 bāhyaḥ] *L*; bāhyā *M^E*; † *Tm*. 3 sarvābhyantaram] *L M^E*; +++pratiṣṭhā *Tm*. 4 bāhyam] *M^E*; bāhya *L Tm*. ity] *L M^E*; ityāṃ ity *Tm*. — The editors of the Madras edition (siglum *M^E*) use round brackets in order to show that they regard a reading as wrong: “The wrong readings are given in round brackets and correct readings have been suggested in square brackets. When different readings are found, they have been given in the footnotes except in the case of a few books in which the correct readings have been given in the footnote or incorporated in the text itself” (p. vi). The Madras edition is virtually based on a single manuscript, i.e. a transcript of *L*. *L* and *Tm* are copies of the same manuscript (see Harimoto 1999: 28).

succession here is such that of these each preceding is external to the [following] one.

A reconstruction of the complete list in the version of the PYŚ which served as the basic text of the YVi thus runs *rasa-lohita-māṃsāsthimedo-majjā-śuklāṇi*. This version differs from the printed edition of the PYŚ in having *rasa* instead of *tvag* as the first member of the compound. Moreover, instead of *snāyvasthi* “sinew and bone” we find *asthimedo* “bone and marrow”, and finally, the YVi’s basic text has *śuklāṇi* instead of *śukrāṇi* at the end of the compound.

3.1 A closer look at the manuscripts of the PYŚ reveals that these and additional variants are characteristic for large parts of the transmission.

The relevant passage¹² in PYŚ III.29 in its critically edited version reads *dhātavaḥ sapta rasa-lohita-māṃsa-snāyuvasthi-majjā-śukrāṇi*.¹³ In discussing this reconstruction of the archetypal version, i.e. the earliest reconstructable text which most probably was the common ancestor of all other extant versions, we should keep in mind the transmission history of the PYŚ, as far as it is known from previous work on its first chapter.¹⁴ Already at an early date the transmission split into two branches, a northern and a southern branch. Accordingly, most of the manuscripts clearly transmit either of two versions, the northern or the southern version. The northern version may be called the “vulgate”, since it seems to have gained the status of a normative recension, which exerted a heavy contaminating influence on certain sub-branches of the southern transmission. The latter is almost exclusively¹⁵ represented by

¹² Beginning of text: B^{n1} 25a3, B^{n2} 30a10, B^s 19b15, K^{n1} 16b8, K^{n2} 49b10, K^{n3} 36b4, M^{2g} 32a6, M^{1g} 89a6, M^{1g} 42b7, M^{1g} 40a4, M^{1g} 18b9, P^n 51a1, P^{c^g} 32b6, $P^{v^{n1}}$ 48a6, $P^{v^{n2}}$ 43b6, $P^{v^{n4}}$ 13b20, T^n 61a2, $T^{j^{g1}}$ 48a6, $T^{j^{g2}}$ 28a3f., T^{v^g} 85b1.

¹³ *v.l.* (exclusive of minor scribal errors; for editorial symbols cf. note 11): *dhātavaḥ sapta* Σ ($-K^{n3}$ M^{1g}); *sapta* K^{n3} ; *teṣu dhātuṣu* M^{1g} ; *rasa-* B^{n1} K^{n3} M^{2g} M^{1g} M^{1g} M^{1g} P^{c^g} $T^{j^{g1}}$ $T^{j^{g2}}$ T^{v^g} YVi ; *tvag* K^{n1} M^{1g} P^n $P^{v^{n2}}$ $P^{v^{n4}}$ T^n ; *tvagvasā* B^{n2} K^{n2} ; *vasātvag* B^s ; $-P^{v^{n1}}$. *-snāyuvasthi-* B^{n2} K^{n1} K^{n2} M^{1g} $P^{v^{n1}}$; *snāyuv* | *stha* K^{n2} ; *snāyuv* B^s ; *snāyuvasthi* M^{1g} P^n P^{c^g} $P^{v^{n2}}$ $P^{v^{n4}}$ T^n T^{v^g} ; *medo'sthi* B^{n1} K^{n3} M^{2g} M^{1g} M^{1g} $T^{j^{g1}}$ $T^{j^{g2}}$; *asthimedo* YVi . *-śukrāṇi* B^{n1} B^{n2} B^s K^{n1} K^{n2} K^{n3} M^{1g} M^{1g} P^n $P^{v^{n1}}$ $P^{v^{n2}}$ $P^{v^{n4}}$ T^n ; *śuklāṇi* M^{2g} M^{1g} M^{1g} P^{c^g} $T^{j^{g1}}$ $T^{j^{g2}}$ T^{v^g} YVi .

¹⁴ Cf. Maas 2006: lxviii-lxxiv and 165-170, Maas 2008: 100-105, as well as Maas forthcoming.

¹⁵ Two ancient palm-leaf manuscripts from Western India in Devanāgarī script (manuscript no. 395/2 in the collection referred to as *Jinabhadrasūri tāḍapatrīya graṃth bhaṃḍār-jaisalmer durg* in Jambuvijaya 2000 and manuscript no. 344 in the Lālhbhai Dalpatbhai Saṃskṛtī Vidyā Mandir, Ahmedabad), which recently became available to me through the good offices of Dr. Yasutaka Muroya, Vienna, also seem to belong to this branch of the transmission.

manuscripts from South India. These witnesses – although all of them presumably are contaminated by the northern version – have preserved the remainder of what once may have been the “southern version”, a version which distinguished itself from the vulgate by a number of peculiar errors as well as by a considerable number of original readings. Moreover, the southern version has apparently not been used as a source of contamination in North India.

3.2. The passage under consideration consists of the nominal phrase *dhātavaḥ sapta* “the bodily elements are seven” and a *dvandva*-compound listing a group of terms. All witnesses read the nominal phrase without major deviations,¹⁶ whereas there are quite a number of variants with regard to the *dvandva*. We find *rasa* – the reading attested by the YVi – instead of *tvag*, *tvagvasā* or even *vasātvag* at the beginning of the compound. Instead of *snāyu*, some witnesses have *snāyv* and eliminate the hiatus of final *u* and the following initial *a*-vowel of *asthi*, whereas other witnesses transmit *medo'sthi*, or – a variant peculiar to the YVi's basic text – *asthimedo*;¹⁷ finally, all southern witnesses read *śukla* instead of *śukra* – which does not affect the meaning of the word in question at all.¹⁸

3.2.1 With the exception of the last-mentioned variant it is possible to reconstruct the archetypal version of the compound with a reasonable amount of certainty. Stemmatological considerations lead to the conclusion that the archetype most likely contained *rasa* as the first member of the compound, as we find exactly this word in all southern and in some northern witnesses. Moreover, three manuscripts from outside the southern group (*Bⁿ²* *Kⁿ²* and *B^s*) have a combination of *tvag* and *vasā*. It is highly probable that *vasā* “fat” is a corruption of *rasa* “food essence”. This change could easily happen in a script like Old Bengali, in which

¹⁶ In *My³* (or in one of its exemplars) the partitive locative *teṣu dhātuṣu* was probably introduced to establish a connection between this sentence and the following one, maybe because the original *dhātavaḥ sapta* was illegible.

¹⁷ The reading of the YVi seems to be of secondary origin as it violates the structure of the compound. In its first six members the list is made up of three pairs of terms, namely two fluids (chyle and blood), two kinds of more solid body tissue (muscle flesh and fat) plus bone and marrow. The sequence bone – fat also disturbs the pattern of external – internal.

¹⁸ According to *MW* (1080b, s.v.) *śukla* is a “later form of *śukra*, for which it is sometimes [the] w[rong] r[eading]”. The evidence of the PYŚ, the BhelaS (see note 54) and the MBh (see MBh 12.290.33 in Appendix) suggest, however, that *śukla* is not a historical but rather a regional, i.e. southern variant of *śukra*.

the *akṣaras ra* and *va* are semi-homographs (cf. Dimitrov 2002: 59) – all the more if a scribe was not familiar with the technical meaning of the word *rasa* – and subsequently affect the transmission.

3.2.1.1 The possibility that contamination made *tvag* part of the text in B^{n2} and K^{n2} becomes as good as certain if we consider that both witnesses transmit the compound with eight members instead of seven, which, of course, contradicts the words of the author himself. A similar process may safely be assumed to have shaped the version of B^s , which reads *vasātvag* at the beginning of the compound and omits *asthi*. If the omission was not accidental, a scribe may have tried to restore the required number of items by omitting *asthi* voluntarily.

3.2.1.2 Considerations of higher textual criticism support the findings of stemmatics, as it is easy to view *tvac* “skin” as the most “exterior” (*bāhya*) of all bodily constituents, and it is exactly this assumption that throws the suspicion of being secondary on *tvag*. Is it not more likely in our present context that a scribe changed *rasa* to *tvag*, simply because he could not imagine how *rasa*, which may also mean “chyle”, could be viewed as external in comparison to the constituent blood? However, Patañjali’s statement that the *dhātus* are listed in a descending order with each preceding item being “external” to the following does not necessarily refer to the physical, spatial arrangement of constituents, but to the degree of their transformation from food, which is foreign to the body, to semen, which is intimately related to the body, i.e. its essence. Why, if *tvag* was the primary reading, should a scribe intentionally change it to *rasa*? Perhaps because he was too familiar with a group of terms starting with *rasa*? The problem is complicated by the fact that in Āyurvedic as well as in non-medical literature different lists and enumerations of (and references to) *dhātus* are current.¹⁹ As Das points out, some commentators of medical works even take *tvac* and *rasa* to be synonyms (2003: 276f.), presumably in order to solve the problem that both items may head enumerations of *dhātus*.

3.2.2 For the time being, I would like to postpone the final judgement of this variant in PYŚ III.29 and first discuss the reading *snāyuvasthi* versus *snāyvasthi*, *medo'sthi*, and *asthimedo*. As the variants are dispersed across the two main groups of textual witnesses, it is impossible to draw

¹⁹ Das (2003: 273 with n. 930) refers to a list of bodily constituents in Kāśyapaśaṃhitā Sū 28 that actually starts with *tvac*. Cf. also his discussion of several similar lists and concepts in Āyurvedic and non-Āyurvedic literature in §§ 10.7ff. (p. 273-284).

upon stemmatic arguments in order to determine the archetypal reading; it is not even possible to detect which variant was read by the two hyparchetypes.

It is, nevertheless, highly probable that the archetypal reading is *snāy-uasthi*, even though (or rather since) this reading violates the rule for intervocalic *sandhi* in classical Sanskrit (cf. Allen 1962: 35). In the non-classical languages we find “very often ... unchanged, with hiatus, two adjoining vowels in the seam of compounds” (*BHSG* 35a, § 4.51). Deviations from the rules of classical *sandhi* are not only common in Buddhist and Epic Sanskrit (cf. Oberlies 2003: 15), they are also met with in the first chapter of the PYŚ.²⁰ Scribes evidently have the tendency to change unusual readings according to their own phonetic and grammatical standards (Srinivasan 1967: 35, § 1.4.5.7), and there is no reason why a scribe should change a completely unobjectionable *snāy-vasthi-* to *snāy-uasthi*; this could not even happen by chance, since the inherent vowel *a* can only deliberately be transformed into its initial form. Therefore there is little doubt that *snāy-uasthi* was changed in course of the transmission to *snāy-vasthi*.

4. But what is the genetic relationship between the variants *snāy-uasthi* and *medo'sthi*? Before trying to answer this question, it seems advisable to take a look at the concept of bodily constituents throughout a number of classical Āyurveda works.

4.1 In the CS (Sū 28.4) we find the view that bodily constituents (*dhātu*) are of two kinds, viz. pure [body tissues] (*prasāda*) and impure [waste products] (*mala*) (cf. *HIPh* II/325f.). Both are products of food digestion. Those parts of the food which can be assimilated to the body generate the pure elements, and the remaining parts of food, which defy assimilation, turn into impure bodily constituents.

*tatrāhārah prasādākhyo rasaḥ kiṭṭam ca malākhyam abhinirvartate. kiṭṭāt sveda-mūtra-purīṣa-vāta-pitta-śleṣmāṇaḥ karṇākṣi-nāsikāśya-lomakūpa-prajananamalāḥ keśa-śmaśru-loma-nakhādayaś cāvayavāḥ puṣyanti. puṣyanti tv āhārarasād rasa-rudhira-māṃsa-medo'sthi-majja-śukrāujāṃsi te sarva eva dhātavo malākhyāḥ prasādākhyāś ca rasamalābhyāṃ puṣyantah svam mānam anuvartante yathāvayahśarīram. evaṃ rasamalau svapramāṇāvasthitāv āśrayasya samadhātor dhātusāmyam anuvartayataḥ.*²¹

²⁰ Cf. PYŚ I.8, line 6 and I.47, line 6 along with the respective text-critical notes in Maas 2006: 96 and 109.

²¹ I follow the variant reading given in Trikamji's note 5 for *āhāra-*, but reject the reading *prasādākhyam rasam* for *prasādākhyah rasaḥ* adduced in the same note.

In this regard food becomes an essence, called “pure matter”, as well as waste, called “impure matter”. Sweat, urine, feces, wind, bile and phlegm, impure matter arising from the ears, eyes, nose, mouth and the pores of the skin and parts such as the hair of one’s head, the beard, the hair of one’s body, the nails, etc., thrive from waste, whereas (*tu*) chyle, blood, muscle flesh, fat, bone, marrow, semen and strength (*ojas*) develop from the food essence When they are thriving from the [food] essence and from impure matter, all of these bodily constituents – called “impure matter” and “pure matter” – conform to their individual measure in accordance with age and body. Thus, when [food] essence and impure matter keep their individual measure, they maintain the suitable ratio (*sāmya*) of constituents belonging to a body [which can thus be regarded as] having constituents in a suitable ratio (i.e. to be healthy).

From a medical point of view, the three elements wind, phlegm and bile are most important among the listed bodily constituents, since their ratio is stressed as the decisive factor for health and disease. In the context of their potential to cause disease, these elements are frequently²² termed “corruption” (*doṣa*), i.e. pathogenetic substances.

4.1.1 Caraka’s²³ notion of the constitution of the human body differs considerably from the one found in PYŚ III.29. The PYŚ separates the concept of three *doṣas* from the concept of *dhātus*, while the CS passage reflects the integration of both concepts into one single theory, which takes wind, bile and phlegm to be impure bodily constituents. Moreover, the CS knows more than twenty-three bodily constituents, in contrast to the PYŚ, which mentions their number to be exactly seven.²⁴

Passage	Items	No.
Sū 28.4 ²⁴	<i>sveda, mūtra, purīṣa, vāta, pitta, śleṣman, karṇa-, akṣi-, nāsikā-, āśya-, lomakūpaprajananamala, keśa, śmaśru, loma, nakhādi, rasa, rudhira, māmśa, medas, aṣṭhan, majjan, śukra, ojas</i>	23+

²² “[T]he older parts of the Caraka-Saṃhitā consider wind, bile, and phlegm in their natural state as elements (*dhātu*) and only in their riled condition as faults (*doṣa*)” (Scharfe 1999: 624bf.). Although this statement may be true for the bulk of the CS, we find at least one exception in Vi 1.5: *doṣāḥ punas trayo vātāpittaśleṣmāṇaḥ. te prakṛtibhūtāḥ śarīropakāraḥ bhavanti, vikṛtīm āpannās tu khalu nānāvīdhair vikāraiḥ śarīram upatāpayanti* “There are three pathogenetic substances: wind, bile, and phlegm. When they are in their original state, they are favourable to the body. If, however, they get into a modified state, they torment the body with various diseases.” Here wind, bile and phlegm are said to be *doṣas*, even in their original condition.

²³ I use the name “Caraka” as a convenient designation for the several authors and redactors who were involved in the composition of the CS in its present form.

²⁴ Cf. above, 4.1.

Passage	Items	No.
Ci 15.15 and 17-19 ²⁵	<i>rasa (anna), rakta (asrj), mām̄sa, medas, asthan, majjan, tvac</i>	7
Śā 6.10 ²⁶	<i>mām̄sa, lohita, medas, vasā, asthan, majjan, śukra, garbha (?)</i>	7/8
Vi 5.8 ²⁷	<i>rasa, śoṇita, mām̄sa, medas, asthan, majjan, śukra</i>	7
Ni 5.3 ²⁸	<i>vāta, pitta, śleśman, tvac, mām̄sa, śoṇita, lasīkā</i>	(3+4) = 7
Ci 21.15 ²⁹	<i>rakta, lasīkā, tvac, mām̄sa, doṣās trayah</i>	7
Sū 27.337ab ³⁰	<i>śoṇita etc.</i>	1+
Ci 15.219 ³¹	<i>śoṇita etc.</i>	1+
Ci 19.9 ³²	<i>śoṇita etc.</i>	1+
Sū 11.47 ³³	<i>rakta etc.</i>	1+
Sū 21.4 ³⁴	<i>medas etc.</i>	1+

Table 1: Bodily constituents expressively labelled as *dhātu* in the CS

²⁵ *saptabhir dehadhātāro dhātavo dvividhaṃ punaḥ | yathāsvam agnibhiḥ pākam yānti kiṭṭaprasādavat || (15) rasāt stanyaṃ tato raktam asrjāḥ kaṇḍarāḥ sirāḥ | mām̄sād vasā tvacaḥ ṣaṭ ca medasaḥ snāyusandhayaḥ [v.l.] || (17) kiṭṭam annasya viṇmūtraṃ rasasya tu kapḥo 'srjāḥ | pittam, mām̄sasya khamalāḥ, malaḥ svedas tu medasaḥ || (18) syāt kiṭṭam keśalomāsthno* majjñāḥ sneho 'kṣivīḥ tvacām | prasādakīṭṭe dhātūnām pākād evaṃ dvi-dharechataḥ [v.l. according to Cakrapāṇi's commentary] || (19); for stanza no. 16, cf. Table 2 below. * The context requires *asthnaḥ* to be a singular ablative. A possible metric reconstruction of the first *pāda* of 19, with a *ra-vipulā*, is *kiṭṭam keśalomam asthno*.*

²⁶ *evam eva sarvadhātugūṇānām sāmānyayogād vṛddhiḥ, viparyayād dhrāsaḥ. tasmān mām̄sam āpyāyate mām̄sena bhūyastaram anyebhyaḥ śarīradhātubhyaḥ, tathā lohitaṃ lohiteṇa, medo medasā, vasā vasayā, asthi taruṇāsthā, majjā majjñā, śukraṃ śukreṇa, garbhas tv āmagarbhena*. This passage does not record “the seven elements listed in the classical medical texts ... chyle, blood, flesh, fat, bone, marrow, and semen” (Scharfe 1999: 610b, repeated in 618b).

²⁷ *rasavahānām srotasām hṛdayaṃ mūlaṃ daśa ca dhamanyaḥ. śoṇitavahānām srotasām yakṛn mūlaṃ plihā ca. mām̄savahānām ca srotasām snāyur mūlaṃ tvak ca. medovahānām srotasām vṛkkau mūlaṃ vapāvahanaṃ ca. asthivahānām srotasām medo mūlaṃ jaghanaṃ ca. majjavahānām srotasām asthīni mūlaṃ sandhayaḥ ca. śukravahānām srotasām vṛṣanau mūlaṃ śephaś ca. ... yāny eva hi dhātūnām pradoṣavijñānāni tāny eva yathāsvam pradūṣṭānām dhātusrotasām*.

²⁸ *trayo doṣā vātapittaśleśmānaḥ prakopaṇavikṛtāḥ, dūṣyās ca śarīradhātavas tvan-mām̄saṇītalasīkāś caturdhā doṣopaghātavikṛtā iti. etat saptānām saptadhātukam evaṃ-gatam ājānanaṃ kuṣṭhānām, atahprabhavāny abhinīrvartamānāni kevalaṃ śarīram upa-tapanti*.

²⁹ *raktaṃ lasīkā tvan mām̄sam dūṣyam, doṣās trayo malāḥ | visarpñāṃ samutpattau vijñeyāḥ sapta dhātavaḥ ||*

³⁰ *dhātūnām śoṇitādīnām gurum vidyād yathottaram |*

³¹ *paribhūya pacaty annaṃ taikṣṇyād āśu muhur muhuḥ | paktvānnaṃ sa tato dhātūn choṇitādīn pacaty api ||*

³² *api ca śoṇitādīn dhātūn atiprakṛṣṭam dūṣayanto dhātudoṣasvabhāvaktān atīsāvaranān upadarśayanī.*

³³ *tatra śākhā raktādayo dhātavas tvak ca, sa bāhyo rogamārgaḥ ...*

³⁴ *tasya hy atimātramedasvino meda evopacīyate na tathetare dhātavaḥ*

Passage	Items	No.
Sū 26.43.1 ³⁵	<i>rasa, rudhira, māṃsa, medas, asthan, majjan, ojas, śukra</i>	8
Sū 26.43.5 ³⁶	<i>rasa, rudhira, māṃsa, medas, asthan, majjan, śukra</i>	7
Ci 15.16 ³⁷	<i>rasa, rakta, māṃsa, medas, asthan, majjan, śukra, garbha (?)</i>	7/8
Vi 8.102 ³⁸	<i>tvac, rakta, māṃsa, medas, asthan, majjan, śukra, sattva³⁹</i>	8
Vi 5.7 ⁴⁰	<i>prāṇa, udaka, anna, rasa, rudhira, māṃsa, medas, asthi, majjan, śukra, mūtra, puriṣa, sveda</i>	13
Ci 6.8 ⁴¹	<i>kapha, pitta, pavana, medas, asra, śukra, ambu, vasā, lasikā, majjā, rasa, ojas, piśita</i>	13
Śā 3.6 ⁴²	<i>tvac, lohita, māṃsa, medas, nābhi, hṛdaya, kloma, yakṛt, plīhan, vṛkka, basti, puriṣādhāna, cāmāśaya, pakvāśaya, uttaraguda, adharaguda, kṣudrāntṛa, sthūlāntṛa, vapā, vapāvahana</i>	20

Table 2: Similar passages in the CS

4.1.2 In spite of these clear differences, the list of pure bodily constituents, i.e. *rasa-rudhira-māṃsa-medo-’sthi-majja-śukrāujāṃsi*, offers itself for a comparison with PYS III.29. Leaving out of consideration a number of minor deviations,⁴³ the first seven items match the PYS’s list of *dhātus* in the version of three Grantha manuscripts *M2^g*, *Tj^{g1}* and *Tj^{g2}* and in the basic text of the YVi.

³⁵ *tatra madhuro rasah ... rasa-rudhira-māṃsa-medo-’sthi-majjāujāḥ-śukrābhivardhanah ...*

³⁶ *sa (i.e. tikto rasah) evaṃguṇah ... rasa-rudhira-māṃsa-medo-’sthi-majja-śukrāny ucchoṣayati*

³⁷ *rasād raktaṃ tato māṃsaṃ māṃsān medas tato ’sthi ca | asthno majjā tataḥ śukraṃ śukrād garbhah prasādayah ||*. This stanza, which presumably occurred in an embryological context of the Punarvasu tradition (cf. CS Sū 1.30-31), is probably an interpolation; cf. BhelaS Sū 11.3 and SS Sū 14.10 cited below in notes 52 and 58.

³⁸ *tvag-rakta-māṃsa-medo-’sthi-majja-śukra-sattvānti*.

³⁹ These items are labelled as “supreme parts” of the body (*sāra*).

⁴⁰ *prāṇōdakāṇna-rasa-rudhira-māṃsa-medo-’sthi-majja-śukra-mūtra-puriṣa-sveda-vahānti*.

⁴¹ *kaphah sapittah pavanas ca doṣā medo-’sra-śukrāmbu-vasā-lasikāḥ | majjā rasāujāḥ piśitam ca dūṣyāḥ pramehiṇām, viṃṣatir eva mehāḥ ||*

⁴² *yāni cāsya (i.e. garbhasya) mātṛtaḥ saṃbhavataḥ saṃbhavanti, tāny anuvyākhyāsyāmaḥ; tad yathā – tvac ca lohitaṃ ca māṃsaṃ ca medas ca nābhiḥ ca hṛdayaṃ ca kloma ca yakṛc ca plīhā ca vṛkkau ca bastiḥ ca puriṣādhānaṃ cāmāśayaḥ ca pakvāśayaḥ cottaragudaṃ cādharaḡudaṃ ca kṣudrāntṛaṃ ca sthūlāntṛaṃ ca vapā ca vapāvahanaṃ ceti*.

⁴³ The CS reads *rudhira* instead of the synonym *lohita*, *majja* (stem form *majjan*) instead of *majjā*, and *śukra* instead of *śukla*. The YVi lists the items *medas* and *asthan* in inverse order.

4.1.3 The treatment of the bodily constituents in the bulk of the CS is quite elusive. In contrast to what might be expected, I did not find a passage which states the number of *dhātus* to be exactly seven. In four passages Caraka refers to a list starting with blood (*śoṇita*, *rakta*)⁴⁴ whereas in Śā 6.10 *māṃsa* is the first of the *dhātus* referred to. In Vi 5.8 Caraka mentions seven *dhātus* starting with *rasa*. The relevant items are virtually identical with those holding positions 16-22 of the list Sū 28.4 (cf. above 4.1). A close approximation to the position that seven *dhātus* form a complete set is found in Ci 15.16, where the series beginning with *rasa*, although concluded with the additional item *garbha*, is presented:

rasād raktaṃ tato māṃsaṃ māṃsān medas tato 'sthi ca |
asthno majjā tataḥ śukraṃ śukrād garbhāḥ prasādayaḥ ||

Ci 15.15 states that the *dhātus* are transformed by their respective fires, which are said to be seven. This process is twofold, leading to impure and pure matter.⁴⁵ In Ci 15.17-19ab Caraka enumerates the pure and impure items originating from several body tissues, presumably the *dhātus* mentioned in 15.15.⁴⁶ The resulting inventory of seven *dhātus* (*rasa*, *rakta*, *māṃsa*, *medas*, *asthan*, *majjan* and *tvac*) differs from the series in Ci 15.15 in two respects: it has *tvac* instead of *śukra*, and *garbha* is not mentioned. Besides these references to sets of *dhātus*, which are quite similar to the standard list of seven *dhātus* in classical Āyurvedic literature, a different set of seven items occurs in Ni 5.3 and Ci 21.15. As Das states, there

we find, in a list of seven *dhātu*-s of which three are the morbid entities [i.e. the “humours”], a series consisting of skin, flesh, blood and serous fluid (*lasīkā*-); this series is also found in Aḥ,Ni 14,2 and As,Ni 14,p.70a, where the word *dhātu*- is absent.⁴⁷

Moreover, the CS has three similar but slightly differing lists in *dvandva*-compounds (Sū 26.43.1, Sū 26.43.5 and Vi 5.7; cf. Table 2),⁴⁸ and a list of body tissues that are spoilt in the bodies of diabetics (Ci 6.8).⁴⁹ The

⁴⁴ *śoṇita* is used in Sū 27.337ab, Ci 15.219 and Ci 19.9, and *rakta* in Sū 11.47 (cf. Table 1).

⁴⁵ A number of items designated as impure matter in Ci 15.17-19ab are identical with some of the impure bodily constituents mentioned in Sū 28.4.

⁴⁶ Cf. the conclusion in Ci 15.19cd.

⁴⁷ Das 2003: 274f.

⁴⁸ The first two lists appear in the context of the influence of the six tastes (*rasa*) on the human body, the third is connected with the discussion of channels of nutriment in the body (*śrotas*).

⁴⁹ Water (*ambu*), lymph (*lasīkā*) and fat (*vasā*) are not found in any other Āyurvedic list.

first list enumerates the same eight items as those appearing at the end of the list in Sū 28.4, but the two final items *śukra* and *ojas* are inverted. The second list does not contain *ojas* at all; accordingly it lists only seven bodily constituents. The third list concurs with the preceding one in not including *ojas* as well as in listing seven items in identical succession; by the inclusion of *prāṇodaka* at the beginning of the list and *mūtrapurīṣa-sveda* at the end, however, the total number of items is increased to twelve. Finally, there is an unlabelled group of bodily constituents in Śā 3.6, made up of twenty body parts, which an embryo is said to receive from the mother. The first four items *tvac*, *lohita*, *māṃsa*, and *medas* correspond exactly to the first four items of the enumeration of *dhātus* in PYS III.29 according to manuscripts K^{n1} , Mj^n , P^n , Pv^{n2} , Pv^{n4} and T^n .

4.1.4 Another list of eight terms, occurring in Vi 8.102, does not at all deal with body tissues but with potential “supreme parts” of the body (*sāra*): *tvag-rakta-māṃsa-medo'sthi-majja-śukra-sattvānīti*.⁵⁰ Notably, this group – like the list of *dhātus* in the printed edition of the PYS – starts with *tvac*.

4.1.5 How is this variety of notions concerning the bodily constituents to be explained? In a synchronic perspective on Āyurveda, the diversity of medical contexts accounts for such a broad range. In a diachronic perspective, however, one may safely assume that quite a number of different body concepts were current at the time of the CS's composition. Some of these concepts are presumably reflected in collocations of terms similar to – and some even identical with – the set of seven *dhātus* well-known from the classical sources, i.e. *rasa*, *rakta*, *māṃsa*, *medas*, *asthan*, *majjan* and *śukra*. In Sū 28.4 Caraka may have integrated a great number of bodily constituents into a single comprehensive *dhātu*-concept. Out of the resulting inventory of *dhātus* the pure bodily constituents (i.e. the seven “classical” *dhātus* plus *ojas*) as well as the three “humours” are the most important bodily constituents in medical theory and practice. Therefore these two sets occur in the bulk of the CS quite independently of the comprehensive list of bodily constituents in Sū 28.4.

⁵⁰ The wording of this passage is well established. The collation of forty-six manuscripts that I prepared in course of the research projects mentioned above (cf. note *), does not show a single substantial variant. For a parallel passage, cf. AS Śā 8.32. Each of the eight parts of the body may be the most excellent. However, there are bodies in which none or all excel. The close conceptual connection between *sāras* and *dhātus* is highlighted in Das 2003: 273 with additional reference to AH Śā 3.117.

4.2 The *Bhelasamhitā* (BhelaS), today an extremely rare medical text that has come down to us in one single, incomplete manuscript and one additional folio (cf. Yamashita 1997: 19f.), seems to be closely related to the CS.⁵¹ In a passage very similar to CS Ci 15.16, Bhela refers to a list of seven *dhātus* (Sū 11.3-4ab):⁵²

*rasād raktaṃ tato māṃsaṃ māṃsān medas tato 'sthi ca |
asthno majjā tataḥ śuklaṃ śuklād garbhasya sambhavaḥ ||
evaṃ pūrvāt paraṃ yāti dhātuṃ dhātūr yathākramam |*

The list corresponds neatly to the already mentioned Grantha version of the PYS (and it is similar to the basic text of the YVi) as well as to the already discussed inventory in CS Sū 26.43.5.

Moreover, in Śā 5.1 the BhelaS reads a list of twelve items, labelled as locations (*sthāna*) of bodily strength (*ojas*) and energy (*tejas*): *tvak-śoṇita-māṃsa-medo-'sthi-majjā-śukla-sveda-pitta-śleṣma-mūtra-purīṣāṇīti*.⁵³ This list in its first seven items corresponds almost completely to the list of “supreme parts” of the body (*sāra*) found in CS Vi 8.102; the only difference is that Bhela reads *śoṇita* instead of *rakta*, *majjā* in contrast to *majjan*, and *śukla* for *śukra*.⁵⁴ That these items are closely related to a theory of bodily constituents is not only obvious from the recorded items, but also from the author’s own words, according to which “these (i.e. the listed bodily constituents), when unimpaired (that is, their being unimpaired), are called ‘well-being’”.⁵⁵ The complete list reflects a *dhātu*-theory closely related to the one described in CS Sū 28.4, a theory which takes *dhātu* as a collective term for body tissues, waste products and *doṣas*.

4.3 The *Suśrutasamhitā* (SS), a medical work which has become famous for its treatment of surgery,⁵⁶ does not seem to know one common category for pathogenetic substances (*doṣa*), body tissues (*dhātu*), and waste products (*mala*).⁵⁷ According to Suśruta, the term *dhātu* exclusively de-

⁵¹ Cf. Preisendanz 2007: 630, and *HIML* IIA/14-16.

⁵² The same items – but without a common title – appear in BhelaS Ci 4.20-21.

⁵³ *īha khalv ojas tejah śarīre nitye ca bhavataḥ. tayoh sthānāni dvādaśa bhavanti. tad yathā – tvak-śoṇita-māṃsa-medo-'sthi-majjā-śukla-sveda-pitta-śleṣma-mūtra-purīṣāṇīti. tāny avyāpannāni sukham ity ucyā<n>te* (BhelaS Śā 5.1).

⁵⁴ The last mentioned variant indicates the southern provenance of the BhelaS manuscript (cf. note 18).

⁵⁵ Cf. CS Sū 9.4: *vikāro dhātuvaiśamyam sāmyam prakṛtir ucyate | sukhasamjñakam ārogyam vikāro duḥkham eva ca ||*.

⁵⁶ Cf. *HIML* IA/344.

⁵⁷ Suśruta uses the compound *doṣa-dhātu-mala* – which figures neither in Caraka’s nor in Bhela’s compendium – quite frequently; cf. Sū 3.6a, 4.5, 14.3, 15.1, 15.3, 15.15, etc.

signates the set of seven bodily constituents that in the process of digestion develop in succession from food and drink (SS Sū 14.10-11):⁵⁸

*rasād raktaṃ tato māṃsaṃ māṃsān medaḥ prajāyate |
medaso 'sthi tato majjā majjāṇaḥ śukraṃ tu jāyate || (10)
tatraiteṣāṃ dhātūnām annapānaraśaḥ prīṇayitā. (11) [prose passage]*

In SS Śā 5.6 Suśruta explicitly states that the bodily constituents are seven (*dhātavaḥ sapta*); thus the above inventory (*rasa, rakta, māṃsa, medas, asthi, majjan, and śukra*) can be taken to be complete. The same number as well as the same items are also recorded at the beginning of both the AH and the AS (AH Sū 1.13 = AS Sū 1.18, translated in Vogel 1965: 57):

*rasāsṛṇ-māṃsa-medo-'sthi-majja-śukrāṇi dhātavaḥ |
sapta dūṣyāḥ (...) ||*

Chyle, blood, flesh, fat, bones, marrow, and sperm (are) the seven elements; (they are liable) to be spoiled (by the humours).

It seems that after Vāgbhaṭa had composed his influential work(s), this group of terms became the normative version of the *dhātu*-list⁵⁹ that found its way into modern secondary literature⁶⁰ and it would therefore not be surprising at all if knowledge of this version made the scribe of the common ancestor of the three Grantha manuscripts of the PYS change his exemplar from *snāyuaṣṭhi* to *medo'sthi*.

4.3.1 The SS, however, does not transmit this standard version throughout. In describing the effects of sweet taste (*madhura rasa*) it records a list of bodily constituents which comprise the same eight items as the previously discussed list in the parallel passage CS Sū 26.43.1 (cf. n. 48 above) – i.e. the seven body tissues plus *ojas* in penultimate position – with *stanya* “breast milk” added as the final element.⁶¹

4.3.2 The term *snāyu*, which figures in the PYS's list of *dhātus*, is attested neither by Caraka nor by Bhela. It occurs, however, in the context of Suśruta's *marman*-theory.⁶² In SS Sū 22.3 there is a list of eight

⁵⁸ Note the similarity of the wording of stanza 10 to CS Ci 15.15 and BhelaS Sū 11.3 cited above. For further references, see Das 2003: 128, n. 408.

⁵⁹ Cf., however, Indu's comment on *ca* in ASSū 1.19: *caśabdān malānām dhātusamjñāpi dehadhāvakatvāt*, which reflects a concept of *dhātus* similar to the one in CS Sū 28.4.

⁶⁰ See for example Jolly 1901: 41f. and Wujastyk 2003: xviiiif.

⁶¹ SS Sū 42.10.1: *rasaguṇān ata ūrdhvaṃ vakṣyāmaḥ — tatra madhuro raso rasa-rakta-māṃsa-medo-'sthi-majjāvjaḥ-śukra-stanya-varadhanah ...*

⁶² Fedorova (1990: 250ff.) takes Suśruta's *marman*-theory to be a synthesis of different and partly overlapping systematic anatomical concepts, among which the theory of bodily constituents as the most comprehensive one served as the model for the speci-

vulnerable spots: *tvāṅ-māṃsa-sirā-snāyuv-asthi-sandhi-koṣṭha-marmāṅṅity aṣṭau vranavastūni*. This list resembles the archetypal version of the PYS's *dhātu*-list in recording *snāyuvasthi* directly after the item *māṃsa*. Moreover, the passage is quite remarkable in containing the elements *māṃsa*, *sirā*, *snāyu*, *asthi* and *sandhi* "muscle flesh, tubes, sinews, bones and joints" as well as the item *marman*. The *marmans*, according to Suśruta, are exclusively located at the same five bodily constituents which hold positions two to five in the list of vulnerable spots, from which they cannot be separated.⁶³ The item *marman* therefore includes at least parts of the first-listed items muscle flesh, tubes, etc., and is therefore not on par with the beginning of the list.

4.4 The comparison of different lists of bodily constituents throughout the early literature of Āyurveda confirms Zimmermann's claim (1983: 10) that no single, common and uniform body concept exists.⁶⁴ According to Caraka the human body consists of two classes of constituents, viz. pure and impure ones. The class of impure constituents contains *inter alia* the three pathogenetic substances wind, bile and phlegm, but Caraka does not indicate the exact number of impure constituents. The number of pure bodily constituents in the CS is generally eight, but lists with seven items are also met with. Similar but still slightly different lists occur in the discussion of the "supreme parts" of the body (*sāra*) and in Caraka's embryology. The findings in Bhela's compendium are also ambiguous. On the one hand Bhela lists seven items called *dhātu*, and on the other hand he relies on a concept of health and disease which draws upon a set of twelve bodily constituents, including some waste products as well as bile (*pitta*) and phlegm (*śleṣman*). As far as I can see, Suśruta conceptually separates the three *doṣas* from the *dhātus*. This separation was adopted by Vāgbhaṭa, whose oeuvre is the first to reflect a standardization of the Āyurvedic body concept, as seen in the statement that the number of *dhātus* is exactly seven at the beginning of AH and AS.⁶⁵ The

fic arrangement of bodily constituents in the *marman*-theory ("Suśruta versucht in der Marmantheorie, die genannten Einzelansätze nach Art der dhātu-Theorie zusammenzufassen" [*ibid.*, p. 252]).

⁶³ Cf. SS Śā 6.3: *saptottaraṃ marmaśatam. tāni marmāṅṅi pañcātmakāni bhavanti, tad yathā — māṃsamarmāṅṅi sirāmarmāṅṅi snāyumarmāṅṅy asthimarmāṅṅi sandhimarmāṅṅi celi. na khalu māṃsa-sirā-snāyuv-asthi-sandhi-vyatirekenāṅṅāni marmāṅṅi bhavanti, yasmān nopalabhyante.*

⁶⁴ Cf. also the rich material presented in the discussion of the term *dhātu* in Das 2003: 553-558.

⁶⁵ A passage in Śā 6 reflects a *dhātu* concept quite similar to CS Sū 28 and Cī 15.17ff.; cf. Das 2003: 554.

body concept of the PYŚ is similar to this standard concept, since both concepts take the existence of three *doṣas* and seven *dhātus* for granted. The body concept in the oldest reconstructable version of the PYŚ differs, however, from the whole range of concepts in classical Indian medicine, as it includes *snāyu* “sinew” instead of *medas* “fat”. One of the very rare instances⁶⁶ where comparable notions can be found is Suśruta’s record of *marmans* and his list of vulnerable spots.

4.5 An exact parallel to the list of bodily constituents in PYŚ III.29 occurs in the Yuktidīpikā (YD) on Sāṅkhyakārikā 38: *tathā bāhyāntara-pariṇāmo rasa-lohita-māmsa-snāyv-asthi-majjā-śukrāṇām* (227,3f.).⁶⁷ The Sāṅkhya and the Yoga list agree in having the same word for “blood” (*lohita*), and in using the feminine *majjā* (instead of *majjan*) for “marrow”. In contrast to the various Āyurvedic body concepts discussed above, they include *snāyu* “sinew” instead of *medas* “fat”. Since the author of the YD was well acquainted with the PYŚ,⁶⁸ he may have borrowed his *dhātu*-list from Patañjali’s work.

5. Outside the medical literature – in the Mahābhārata (MBh) as well as in a number of Purāṇas and less frequently in Buddhist literature⁶⁹ – *snāyu* is part of quite a number of comparable inventories.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ An additional reference – but one being too short for the purpose of a proper comparison – is the group of terms in the compound *tvāṇmāmsasnāyu* in CS Ci 21.70 and AH Ci 18.8.

⁶⁷ Cited in Preisendanz 1994: II/433f. with additional reference to Vedic and late Vedic lists discussed in Müller 1934 and 1935.

⁶⁸ The “Index of prose passages referred to in the Yuktidīpikā ...” (in Wezler and Motegi 1998: 346) lists no less than eleven citations from the PYŚ.

⁶⁹ Cf. *BHSD* 283a, s.v. *dhātu* (2). The only references to similar lists of bodily constituents I could find are three passages, two from the Lalitavistara (LV), and one from the Mahāvastu (MV): LV 13,30f.: *yat tasya pitta-śleṣma-snāyv-asthi-māmsa-rudhiraṃ cā-sīt ...*, LV 14,5: *yat teṣāṃ pitta-śleṣma-māmsāsthi-snāyu-rudhiraṃ cābhūt ...*, and MV I, p. 19,12-20,2: *... so dhūmo kaṭuko bhayānako chaviṃ bhittvā carma bhittvā mānsaṃ bhittvā snāyuyṃ bhittvā asthiṃ bhittvā asthimarjaṃ mānsādy atiniryāti*. The Satipaṭṭhānasutta of the Majjhimanikāya I, p. 57f. teaches the human body to consist of the four gross elements (*dhātu*) earth, water, fire and wind. The Theravāda Tipiṭaka also has a quite comprehensive list of body parts consisting of thirty-one items in Dīghanikāya II, p. 293f., Majjhimanikāya I, p. 57 and III, p. 90f., Aṅguttaranikāya III, p. 323f., Khuddakanikāya I, p. 2 and Suttanipāta I, p. 195-201 (cf. Scharfe 1999: 614b). Items 6-10 are skin (*taco*), flesh (*mamsaṃ*), sinew (*n[a]hāru*), bones (*aṭṭhi*), and bone marrow (*aṭṭhimīṇjaṃ*).

⁷⁰ The following references were located with the help of a digital version of the MBh and of the Purāṇas in the “Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages” which was searched for lists of bodily constituents that include the word *snāyu*. (Search http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm; link checked on November 13, 2008).

Works	Items ⁷¹										No.	
	sinew	marrow	blood	muscle	bones	skin	fat	semen	tubes	“humours”		
MBh 12.177.19-20ab ≈ NārP 1.42.74-75ab	⁵ snāyū	⁴ mājjan		² māṃsa	³ aśhan	¹ tvac						5
MBh 12.180.13 = NārP 1.43.32	⁴ snāyū		² soṇḍa	¹ māṃsa	⁵ aśhan		³ medas					5
MBh 12.290.33	⁴ snāyū	³ mājḡā	² soṇḍa					¹ śukra	⁵ śirā			5
MBh 12.293.16cd-17ab ≈ BrahmaP 243.5cd-6ab	² snāyū	³ mājjan	⁶ soṇḍa	⁵ māṃsa	¹ aśhan	⁴ tvac						6
NārP 1.55.101ab	¹ snāyū	⁷ mājḡā	³ rakta		² aśhan	⁴ tvac	⁶ vasā	⁵ śukra				7
AgnP 292.39cd-40ab	⁴ snāyū	⁶ mājḡā	² asṛj	³ māṃsaka		¹ tvac	⁵ medas	⁷ śukra				7
BhāḡP 11.26.21ab	⁴ snāyū	⁶ mājḡā	³ rudhira	² māṃsa	⁷ aśhan	¹ tvac	⁵ medas					7
MBh 12.293.31 ≈ BrahmaP 243.21	⁸ snāyū	⁶ mājjan	³ rudhira	² māṃsa	⁷ aśhan	¹ tvac	⁴ medas				⁵ pitta	8
GarudaP 2.3.98	⁸ snāyū	³ mājjan		⁴ māṃsa	⁶ aśhan		⁵ medas	⁷ śukra			¹ pitta, ² śleṣman	8
MBh 12.293.35 ≈ BrahmaP 243.25	⁸ snāyū	⁶ mājjan	³ rudhira	² māṃsa	⁷ aśhan	¹ tvac	⁴ medas	⁹ śukra			⁵ pitta	9
MBh 12.207.16	⁷ snāyū	⁹ mājḡā	⁴ rakta	⁶ māṃsa	⁸ aśhan	⁵ tvac			¹⁰ śirā		¹ ṛāta, ² pitta, ³ kapha	10
Percentage	100%	91%	82%	82%	82%	73%	64%	44%	18%		bile 36% phlegm 18% wind 9%	

Table 3: Epic and Purāṇic body concepts comprising *snāyū*.

⁷¹ Superscript numbers refer to the sequence of terms. For full citations of the text passages referred to as well as for variant readings, cf. Appendix.

5.1 The preceding table shows that there are as many body concepts as there are text passages under investigation. None of the eleven passages reflects an underlying body concept which is strictly identical with one of the other passages. The concepts differ from each other in three respects: the number of bodily constituents – ranging from five to ten –, the listed items, and the sequence of listing, which is – at least in part – determined by metrical constraints. Although the total number of passages is too small for a reliable statistic, some general observations may not be out of place: Almost all lists connect *snāyu* with marrow, and, a little less frequently, with bones, blood and muscle flesh. Skin is found in nearly three fourths, fat in two thirds, and semen in less than half of the lists. Food essence (or chyle), which – as we have seen above – figures so prominently in Āyurveda, does not occur at all. This is also true for the lists of, and references to, bodily constituents in Vedic and late Vedic literature discussed by Jamison (1986: 172-177), some of which do include *snāvan*, the Vedic equivalent of *snāyu*.

5.2 These results increase the probability that the reconstruction of the archetypal version of the PYŚ is correct in reading *rasa* instead of *tvag* at the beginning of the *dhātu*-list in III.29, as it is very unlikely that a scribe who would change *tvag* to *rasa* due to his background knowledge of Āyurveda would leave *snāyu* unchanged, which from this perspective is simply not a bodily constituent in the technical sense. The opposite seems to be true: a scribe with background knowledge of a Vedic, late Vedic, Epic or Purāṇic list changed the unusual *rasa* to *tvag*.

6.1 Although the present state of research does not allow the identification of a strict parallel to the PYŚ's list of bodily constituents *rasa-lohita-māṃsa-snāyu-asthi-majjā-śukrāṇi* in Āyurvedic works, we have seen that Patañjali held a body concept that is strikingly similar to the Āyurvedic concept that does not take the *doṣas* to be bodily constituents in a technical sense (cf. above 4.4). Moreover, the occurrence of *rasa* at the beginning of the PYŚ's list indicates that the author was familiar with a theory of food transformation. Taking these similarities into consideration, it comes as a surprise when the author of the PYŚ in dealing with disease (*vyādhi*) in I.30 gives explanations that deviate considerably from what I could find in the works of classical Indian medicine.

6.2 YS I.30 contains a list of nine kinds of mental distractions which are “hindrances” to concentration (*samādhi*):

vyādhi-styāna-saṃśaya-pramādālasyāvīrati-bhrāntidarśanālabdhabhūmi-katvānavasthitatvāni cittavikṣepā antarāyāḥ.

The distractions of the mental capacity, the hindrances [to concentration] are: disease, languor, doubt, indolence, weakness, incontinence, erroneous views, not reaching a stage [of concentration], and instability [when having reached it].

After a short introductory remark Patañjali comments upon the individual items of this nine-fold series of expressions. He starts, of course, with *vyādhi*, “disease”. Nearly all witnesses give *dhāturasakaraṇavaiṣamyam* as an explanation or definition of *vyādhi*. *Tv^a*, a quite old palm-leaf manuscript in Malayālam script, has *dhāturasakāraṇavaiṣamyam* instead, and *K^b*, the palm-leaf manuscript in Old Bengali script mentioned at the beginning of this paper, reads *vyādhīr dhātuvaiṣamyam*. This reading fits perfectly with the well-known definition of disease in early Āyurveda: *vikāro dhātuvaiṣamyam* “Modification (i.e. disease) is the unsuitable ratio of bodily constituents” (CS Sū 9.4a).⁷² This is obviously a definition of disease by way of its cause,⁷³ and not a characterisation of its nature by means of an enumeration of synonyms, as in CS 9.4d⁷⁴ and CS Ni 1.5:

*tatra vyādhīr āmayo gada ātan̄ko yakṣmā jvaro vikāro roga ity anarthāntaram.*⁷⁵

Work	<i>dhātuvaiṣamyam</i>	<i>rasavaiṣamyam</i>	<i>karaṇavaiṣamyam</i>
YVi 282,3-8 ⁷⁶	<i>vātapittaśleṣmānām viśamabhāvaḥ</i>	<i>upayuktāhārapariṇāmaviśeṣasya vṛddhikṣayaḥ</i>	<i>andhabadhīratvādi</i>

⁷² The similar definition *rogas tu doṣavaiṣamyam* (AH Sū 1.20a) apparently reflects the terminological separation of *doṣa* and *dhātu* which characterizes Āyurveda from Sūśruta onwards; cf. Scharfe 1999: 625ff.

⁷³ Cf. SS Sū 1.38: *vyādhigrahaṇād vātapittakaphaṣoṇitasannipātavaiṣamyanimittāḥ sarva eva vyādhayo vyākhyātāḥ*.

⁷⁴ The whole stanza CS Sū 9.4 reads: *vikāro dhātuvaiṣamyam sāmyaṃ prakṛtir ucyate | sukhasaṃjñakam ārogyam vikāro duḥkham eva ca ||*.

⁷⁵ A comprehensive discussion of the different and partly conflicting concepts of disease in the classical works of Āyurveda is beyond the scope of the present paper.

⁷⁶ *vyādhīr dhāturasakaraṇavaiṣamyam. dhātavo vātapittaśleṣmānāḥ, teṣāṃ viśamabhāvo vaiṣamyam. tac ca vātapittaśleṣmabhūyīṣṭhadravayopayogādibhyo jāyate ... rasa upayuktasyāhārasya pariṇāmaviśeṣaḥ. sa ca saptadhā. rasakāryatvād rasa ity ucyate. rasa-lohita-medomāṃsāsthi-majjā-śuklākhyāḥ. tasya vaiṣamyam vṛddhikṣayaḥ. karaṇavaiṣamyam andhabadhīratvādi.* “Disease is the unsuitable state of bodily constituents, ‘essences’ and instruments. Wind, bile and phlegm are the bodily constituents. Their being unsuitable is [their] unsuitable ratio; and this [unsuitable ratio] arises from, for example, employing substances having wind, bile and/or phlegm as the chief component ‘Essence’ is a special transformation of the consumed food, and it is sevenfold. It is called ‘essence’ (*rasa*) because it is an effect of [food] essence (*rasa*). [The sevenfold ‘essence’ comprises] chyle, blood, fat, muscle flesh, bone, marrow, and semen. Its unsuitable state is increase or decrease. The unsuitable state of the instruments is blindness, deafness and so on.”

Work	<i>dhātuvaiśamyam</i>	<i>rasavaiśamyam</i>	<i>karaṇavaiśamyam</i>
TVai 34.25ff. ⁷⁷	<i>vātapittaśleṣmānām nyūnādhikabhāvaḥ</i>	<i>aśitapītāhārapari- ṇāmaviśeṣasya nyū- nādhikabhāvaḥ</i>	<i>indriyānām nyūna- bhāvaḥ (?)</i>
YVā 174.17f. ⁷⁸	<i>vātakaphapittānām visadṛśabhāvaḥ</i>	<i>āhārapariṇāmānām visadṛśabhāvaḥ</i>	<i>cakṣurādīmanaādī- nām visadṛśabhāvaḥ</i>

Table 4: The definitions of disease in PYŚ I.30 as explained by the commentators

6.3 What would *dhāturasakaraṇavaiśamyam* mean? To answer this question, the commentators of the PYŚ have the first word.

Although the commentators are historically separated by several hundred years, they all take *dhāturasakaraṇavaiśamyam* as a *tatpuruṣa*-compound with *dhāturasakaraṇa* as a *dvandva* in initial position. As shown in Table 4 above, they also agree that *dhātu* as a collective term designates the three “humours” wind, bile and phlegm.⁷⁹ With regard to the second item – *rasa* – the three interpretations differ only slightly. Śāṅkara understands “food essence” in a secondary meaning to designate the complete set of seven bodily constituents.⁸⁰ It may not pass without notice that the YVi’s enumeration of the seven bodily constituents here is at variance with PYŚ III.29. In the passage presently under discussion the constituents are *rasa-lohita-medo-māṃsāsthimajjā-śukla*, while the YVi on III.29 attests *rasa-lohita-māṃsāsthī-medo-majjā-śukla* to be the wording of the basic text. The difference in the

⁷⁷ *dhātavo vātapittaśleṣmāṇaḥ śarīradhāraṇāt. aśitapītāhārapariṇāmaviśeṣo rasāḥ. karaṇānīndriyāni. teṣāṃ vaiśamyam nyūnādhikabhāva itī.* “The bodily constituents wind, bile and phlegm [are called ‘constituents’] because they sustain the body. The [food] essence is a special transformation of food that has been eaten or drunk. Instruments are capacities. Their unsuitable state is the state of deficiency or of surplus.”

⁷⁸ *śarīradhāraṇakāṇḍ dhātūnām vātakaphapittānām, rasānām āhārapariṇāmānām, karaṇānām cakṣurādīmanaādīnām ca vaiśamyam visadṛśabhāvo vyādhiḥ.* “Disease is unsuitability – [i.e.] the being inappropriate – of the bodily constituents wind, phlegm, and bile which are [called bodily constituents] because they sustain the body (*dhāra*), of the bodily constituents (*rasa*) which are transformations of food, and of the instruments sight, etc., and mind, etc.”

⁷⁹ Vācaspati and Viṅṇābhikṣu derive the word *dhātu* from the root *dhṛ* “to sustain”. This traditional etymology apparently can be traced back to MBh 12.330.21f.: *trayo hi dhātavaḥ khyātāḥ karmajā itī ca smṛtāḥ | pittaṃ śleśmā ca vāyuḥ ca eṣa saṃghāta ucyate || etaiḥ ca dhāryate jantur etaiḥ kṣṛṇaiḥ ca kṣṛyate | āyurvedavidas tasmāt tridhātuṃ māṃ pracakṣate ||*. From a linguistic point of view, the word *dhātu* has to be derived from the (first) root *dhā*, “to put”.

⁸⁰ This secondary meaning is not recorded in the dictionaries (*BHSD*, *Apte*, *pw* and *MW*).

position of *medas* is difficult to explain but it may presumably be put down to a slip of memory.

In contrast to Śaṅkara, who speaks of a sevenfold *rasa*, Vijñānabhikṣu takes the word *rasa* as a plural noun. Although he does not say explicitly which entities he has in mind, the explanation *āhārapariṇāma* “transformation of food” indicates that – similar to Śaṅkara – he uses the word *rasa* metonymically, i.e. the word referring to the cause is used for the effect, to designate the complete set of bodily constituents. Finally, according to Vācaspati, the word *rasa* means “food essence”, presumably as a single item.

The three interpretations of the term *karāṇa*, i.e. “instrument(s)”, are a little more at variance. Śaṅkara, on the one hand, explains it to refer to the sense capacities (*buddhīndriya*). Vācaspati, on the other hand, does not specify whether he considers *karāṇa* to refer to the capacities leading to cognitive or to physical acts (*buddhīndriya*, *karmendriya*). Vijñānabhikṣu’s gloss (*cakṣurādīmanāādīnām*) clearly shows that he associates *karāṇa* with the sense capacities as well as the three mental capacities of classical Sāṅkhya, i.e. *manas*, *buddhi* and *ahaṅkāra*. This interpretation has to be rejected because it presupposes the well-known Sāṅkhyistic tripartite division of the mental capacity, which classical Yoga does not accept (cf. *GiPh* I/403-405 and 418). Since the two further occurrences of the word *karāṇa* in the bulk of the PYŚ⁸¹ clearly suggest a reference to the sense capacities as “instruments” of perception, it seems reasonable to accept the YVi’s interpretation “sense capacities” in the present case.

One may ask, however, why Patañjali chose the – at least in the PYŚ – rare word *karāṇa*, instead of using the word *indriya* as elsewhere.⁸² Did he cite a well-known definition? If so, this would be, to my knowledge, without a parallel in Āyurvedic literature.

6.4 There are, however, two arguments against the acceptance of *dhātu-rasakaraṇavaiśamyam* as the definition of disease intended by the author. First, if we take the compound *karāṇavaiśamyā* “unsuitability of the senses” to refer to a state of impairment of the senses as suggested by the explanation in the YVi (“blindness, deafness, etc.”), we face the undesirable consequence that this definition of disease draws upon two

⁸¹ PYŚ I.35, line 8-11: *yāvad ekadeśo ’pi kaścit svakarāṇasaṃvedyo na bhavati, tāvat sarvaṃ parokṣam iva ... tasmāt ... kaścīd viśeṣaḥ pratyakṣīkartavyaḥ*; PYŚ IV.14, p. 188,3f.: *prakhyākriyāsthītīśīlānāṃ guṇānāṃ grahaṇātmakānāṃ karaṇabhāvenaikāḥ pariṇāmah śrotam indriyam ...*

⁸² The text of the PYŚ has about fifty occurrences of the word *indriya* “sense(s)”.

logically different categories, i.e. on the causes of disease (*dhātu-* and *rasavaiṣamya*) and on its symptom (*karaṇavaiṣamya*). Furthermore, if we follow Suśruta's statement that unsettled senses are a decisive symptom of the "unsuitable ratio of 'humours' etc.", *karaṇavaiṣamya* would not only be a symptom of disease, but also a logical indicator of the two causes of disease (SS Sū 15.9):

*doṣādīnām tv asamatām anumānena lakṣayet |
aprasannendriyaṃ vīkṣya puruṣaṃ kuśalo bhiṣak ||*

A skilled physician would detect the unsuitable ratio of the "humours", etc. (i.e. pure and impure products of the food essence [?]⁸³) by means of inference after having observed that the patient's senses are unsettled.

In the final analysis this means that the definition of disease would have two parts, i.e. it would comprise two causes of disease as well as a symptom of disease, which is simultaneously an inferential sign (maybe even due to the relation of cause and effect) for these very causes.

If one adopts a different interpretation of *karaṇavaiṣamya* – one not shared by the commentators – the definition would comprise three aetiologies. In CS Sū 11.37-43⁸⁴ we find an exposition of the "three causes of disease" (*trīṇy āyatanāni*), one of which is the unwholesome connection of sense and object (*asātmendriyārthasamyoga*), i.e. overuse, underuse and wrong use of sense objects. Could not Patañjali's *karaṇavaiṣamya* refer to this "basic disease aetiolog[y] in ayurvedic medicine" (Wujastyk 2003: 10)? The expression "unsuitability of the senses" would then have to be taken as an ellipsis for "the unsuitability of the connection between senses and their object". Or is such an interpretation too far fetched?

6.5 The second argument against the acceptance of *dhāturasakaraṇavaiṣamya* as the original definition of disease in the PYŚ is that in this case there would be a terminological difference between PYŚ I.30 and PYŚ III.29. The bodily constituents – at least according to Śaṅkara and Vijñānabhikṣu – are labelled *rasa* in I.30, and *dhātu* in III.29. This terminological difference is difficult to explain, because the word *rasa* is to my knowledge not used to label the complete set of bodily constituents in Āyurveda. Furthermore, the "humours" are called *dhātu* in I.30, while in III.29 they are designated as *doṣa*. These two different terms could be a trace of a comprehensive *dhātu* concept similar to the one found in CS Sū 28.4. Nevertheless, Patañjali clearly separates *doṣas* from *dhātus* in III.29.

⁸³ Cf. CS Sū 28.4, adduced above, 4.1 (p. 12).

⁸⁴ Translated into English in Wujastyk 2003: 28-31.

6.6 In view of the difficulties discussed above, one may feel tempted to regard *dhāturasakaraṇavaiṣamyam* as secondary and to accept *dhātu-vaiṣamyam* instead. There is but one problem. Would not this procedure simply eliminate a complication of the text? In other words, why should a scribe have extended the meaningful *dhātu-vaiṣamyam* to *dhāturasakaraṇavaiṣamyam*?

7.1 A tentative answer occurred to me when I read the following passage of the CS (CS Vi 1.4):

rasās tāvat śatī – madhurāmlalavanakatutiktakaṣāyāḥ. te samyag upayujyamānāḥ śarīraṃ yāpayanti, mithyopayujyamānās tu khalu doṣaprapakalpante.

To start with, there are six tastes: sweet, sour, salty, pungent, bitter, and astringent. If these [tastes] are properly used, they support the body, but if they are used in a wrong way, they certainly lead to an enagement of the humours.

This excerpt clearly states that tastes (*rasa*), if employed the wrong way, lead to an agitation of the *doṣas*. *doṣaprapakopa* expresses the same idea as *doṣavaiṣamyam*. Could not the knowledge of a passage like this⁸⁵ have led a scribe or a reader of PYŚ I.30 to comment upon *dhātu-vaiṣamyam* with the marginal gloss *rasakāraṇam* “caused by tastes”? This would have been an ellipsis of *rasamithyopayogakāraṇam* “caused by the wrong use of tastes”. In a next step, an inattentive scribe would have inserted the marginal note (of which the final *anusvāra* would have been lost) right into the text to which it referred because he took the gloss for the correction of an omission. This way *dhāturasakāraṇavaiṣamyam* would have become part of the transmission of the PYŚ. This reading is actually found in *Tv*. The scribe of an early exemplar of all other textual witnesses would have emended the quite senseless *kāraṇa* to *kaṛaṇa*.

7.2 What does this hypothetical outline of the transmission mean for the stemmatical hypothesis on the transmission of the PYŚ as outlined above on p. 8f.? Is it in need of modification, or is it simply wrong? Which reading should be assumed for the oldest reconstructable witness, and what was the reading of the two hyparchetypes, the original southern version, and the original vulgate? Although it may be impossible to answer these question conclusively, since we are dealing with an open

⁸⁵ See, for example, AH Sū 11.35cd: *doṣā duṣṭā rasair dhātūn dūṣayanty ubhaye malān* “The ‘humours’, when spoilt by the tastes, spoil the constituents, both spoil the waste products.” For a different translation cf. Scharfe 1999: 629.

recension, the most probable scenario is that neither the northern manuscript K^b nor the southern Tv^y transmit the reading of a hyparchetype. K^b would have a shorter version than its exemplar, either because the scribe emended the text or simply because he was inattentive. The best explanation for the reading *kāraṇa* in Tv^y is in any case a simple scribal mistake. Therefore, the above reconstruction of the transmission of Patañjali's definition of disease is not actually based on manuscript evidence. It is just a possible and to a certain degree probable course of events.

8.1 To sum up: Patañjali knew a medical system which he calls *ci-kitsāsāstra*. This system shared its basic theoretical assumptions with classical Āyurveda, although at the present state of research it is impossible to identify a specific school or work. In commenting on the word *vyādhi*, the PYŚ in all known versions of the text but one presents a unique definition of disease that apparently is without a parallel in classical Āyurveda. The version transmitted by a single textual witness (albeit as an emendation or a scribal mistake), however, agrees with an Āyurvedic definition of disease and its medical terminology is not necessarily in conflict with Patañjali's terminology in PYŚ III.29.⁸⁶ Moreover, there is a hypothesis which – with reference to another Āyurvedic concept – can explain how the original reading was corrupted into the version we find in almost all textual witnesses. In view of this, *dhātuvaiṣamyam* is presumably the original reading.

It is, however, not inconceivable, even though less probable, that with *dhāturasakaraṇavaiṣamyam* PYŚ I.30 (a) preserves a definition of disease that is, to my knowledge, without a parallel in Āyurvedic literature and (b) employs a terminology that is completely different from the one in PYŚ III.29. Strictly speaking, the text critical problem I have set out to solve in the present paper is insoluble at the present time.

8.2 The above findings taken collectively provide a sketch of the theoretical foundations of medical science as known to Patañjali, which, in turn, enables us to attempt a rough and tentative determination of the position of this medical system within the history of Āyurveda. The PYŚ conceptually separates bodily constituents (*dhātu*) from *doṣas*. This differentiation becomes increasingly characteristic for classical Āyurve-

⁸⁶ The term *dhātuvaiṣamya* could reflect Patañjali's acquaintance with a medical concept according to which the "humours" are considered to be *dhātus*. This concept is actually met with in the Buddhist *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*sūtra, where "phlegm, bile, and wind are referred to as the 'triad of elements' (*dhātu-tritaya*)" (Scharfe 1999: 617).

da only from Suśruta onwards. Patañjali's presumable definition of disease as *dhātuvaiṣamyam*, on the other hand, does not draw upon this distinction; it is identical with one of Caraka's definitions.⁸⁷ Patañjali's list of bodily constituents differs from all Āyurvedic *dhātu*-lists, and other enumerations and references to *dhātus*, in having *snāyu* instead of *medas*. Similar lists can be found in the context of Suśruta's *marman*-theory, in Vedic and late Vedic literature, as well as in the MBh and in a number of Purāṇas. None of these lists starts, however, with *rasa*. The enumeration of "food essence" as the initial item – as well as Patañjali's statement that the bodily constituents in YS III.29 are listed in a descending order of being foreign to the body – may be taken to indicate Patañjali's familiarity with a theory of food transformation. On the whole, the system of medical knowledge with which Patañjali was acquainted is clearly Āyurvedic, and of an early classical style. Presumably it reflects the author's familiarity with one of the many corpora of medical knowledge⁸⁸ that have not been preserved, simply because they were long ago superseded by other, more authoritative writings.

Appendix

TEXTUAL PASSAGES REFERRED TO IN TABLE 3: EPIC AND PURĀNIC BODY CONCEPTS COMPRISING *SNĀYU*

MBh 12.177.19-20ab and NārP 1.42.74-75ab:

jan̄gamānām ca sarveṣām śarīre pañca dhātavaḥ |
pratyekaśaḥ prabhidante yaīḥ śarīraṃ viceṣṭate ||
tvak ca māṃsaṃ tathāsthīni majjā snāyu ca pañcamam |

v.l. in NārP 1.42.75b: *snāyuś ca pañcamah* for *snāyu ca pañcamam*.

MBh 12.180.13 and NārP 1.43.32:

māṃsa-śoṇita-saṃghāte medaḥ-snāyv-asthi-saṃcaye |
bhidyamāne śarīre tu jīvo naivopalabhyate ||

⁸⁷ If one took *dhāturasakaraṇavaiṣamyam* to be the original reading, the concept of disease known to Patañjali would be even less similar to this concept as found in classical Āyurveda.

⁸⁸ The statement *vividhāni hi śāstrāṇi bhīṣajām pracaranti loke* (CS Vi 8.3) clearly attests to the fact that at Caraka's time quite a number of different medical corpora were current.

MBh 12.290.33:

*śukra-śoṇita-saṃghāte majjā-snāyu-parigrahe |
sirā-śatasamākṛṇe navadvāre pure 'śucāu ||*

v.l. *pāda* a: *śleşma* D4.9; *śukla* T, G1-3.6, M7 for *śukra*..

MBh 12.293.16cd-17ab and BrahmaP 243.5cd-6ab:

*asthi snāyu ca majjā ca jānīmah pitṛto dvija ||
tvañ māṃsam śoṇitam caiva mātṛjāny api śuśrūma |*

v.l. in BrahmaP 243.6a: *tvañmāṃsaśoṇitam ceti*, in *pāda* b: *anuşuśrūma* for *api śuśrūma*.

NārP 1.55.101ab:

snāyu-asthi-rakta-tvak-śukra-vasā-majjās tu dhātavaḥ |

AgniP 292.39cd-40ab:

*yādīṃś (i.e. the akṣaras ya, etc.) ca hṛdaye nyasyed
eṣāṃ syuḥ sapta dhātavaḥ ||
tvag-asṛñ-māṃsaka-snāyu-medo-majjā-śukrāṇi dhātavaḥ |*

40ab has a surplus of two syllables.

BhāgP 11.26.21ab:

tvañ-māṃsa-rudhira-snāyu-medo-majjāsthi-saṃhatau |

MBh 12.293.31 and BrahmaP 243.21:

*tvañ māṃsam rudhiram medaḥ pittaṃ majjāsthi snāyu ca |
etad aindriyakam tāta yad bhavān idam āha vai ||*

v.l. in BrahmaP 243.21d: *ittham āttha mām* for *idam āha vai*.

GaruḍaP 2.3.98:

*pittaṃ śleşmā tathā majjā māṃsam vai meda eva ca |
asthi śukraṃ tathā snāyur dehena saha dahyati ||*

MBh 12.293.35 and BrahmaP 243.25:

*tvañ māṃsam rudhiram medaḥ pittaṃ majjāsthi snāyu ca |
aṣṭau tāny atha śukreṇa jānīhi prākṛtāni vai ||*

v.l. in BrahmaP 243.25d: *prākṛtena* for *prākṛtāni*.

MBh 12.207.16:

*vāta-pitta-kaphān raktaṃ tvañmāṃsam snāyūm asthi ca |
majjāṃ caiva sirājālais tarpayanti rasā nṛṇām ||*

1. Sigla

- Bⁿ¹* Microfilm images of the PYŚ in Devanāgarī script on paper. Central Library, Baroda. Acc. No. 11088, Serial No. 64 (in Nambiyar 1942).
- Bⁿ²* Microfilm images of the PYŚ in Devanāgarī script on paper. Central Library, Baroda. Acc. No. 341, Serial No. 61 (in Nambiyar 1942).
- B^s* Microfilm images of the PYŚ in Śāradā script on paper. Central Library, Baroda. Acc. No. 1831, Serial No. 62 (in Nambiyar 1942).
- K^b* N-GMPP microfilm images of the PYŚ in Old Bengali script on palm leaf. National Archives, Kathmandu. MS No. 5-2672, Reel No. B 40/2.
- Kⁿ¹* N-GMPP microfilm images of the PYŚ in Devanāgarī script on paper. National Archives, Kathmandu. MS No. 61, Reel No. A 61/11.
- Kⁿ²* N-GMPP microfilm images of the PYŚ in Devanāgarī script on paper. National Archives, Kathmandu. MS No. 1-1337, Reel No. A 62-32.
- Kⁿ³* N-GMPP microfilm images of the PYŚ in Devanāgarī script on paper. National Archives, Kathmandu. MS No. 5-2669, Reel No. A 62/27.
- L* Digital images of folio 109r and 109v of a palm-leaf manuscript of the YVi in Malayālam script. Panjab University Library, Lahore. Serial No. 428 (in Sarup – Sahai Shastri 1941).
- M^E* Madras edition of the YVi.
- M2^g* Digital images of the PYŚ in Grantha script on palm leaf. Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Chennai. Shelf No. R 1508, Serial No. 11606 (in Kuppuswami Sastri 1938).
- My^x* Digital images of the TVai, including the PYŚ written in the center of the folios, in Nandināgarī script on paper. Oriental Research Institute, Mysore. Shelf No. C 1981/b, Serial No. 35070 (in Marulasiddaiah 1984).
- My¹* Digital images of the PYŚ in Telugu script on paper. Oriental Research Institute, Mysore. Shelf No. C 204/2, Serial No. 35071 (in Marulasiddaiah 1984).
- My²* Digital images of the Yogabhāṣya, including the YS written in the center of the folios, in Telugu script on paper. Oriental Research Institute, Mysore. Shelf No. C 3214/2, Serial No. 35072 (in Marulasiddaiah 1984).
- My³* Digital images of the PYŚ in Telugu script on palm leaf. Oriental Research Institute, Mysore. Shelf No. P 1560/5, Serial No. 35065 (in Marulasiddaiah 1984).
- Pⁿ* Digital images of the PYŚ in Devanāgarī script on paper. Jaykar Library, University of Poona. Shelf No. 2742, Serial No. 1480 (in Mahajan 1986).
- Pc^g* Digital images of the PYŚ in Grantha script on palm leaf. École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Centre de Pondichéry, Pondicherry. Shelf No. 287.
- Pv^{m1}* Digital images of the PYŚ in Devanāgarī script on paper. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. No. of receipt 1926.
- Pv^{m2}* Digital images of the TVai, including the PYŚ written in the center of the folios, in Devanāgarī script on paper. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. No. of receipt 1923.

<i>Pvnd</i>	Digital images of the PYŚ, with citations from the TVai included in the running text, in Devanāgarī script on paper. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. No. of receipt 1930.
<i>Tm</i>	N-GMPP microfilm images of the TVai, including the PYŚ written in the center of the folios, in Devanāgarī on paper. Trivipustakālaya, Kathmandu. MS No. T.81, Reel No. T 6/5.
<i>Tj^{gd}</i>	Microfilm images of the PYŚ in Grantha script on palm leaf. Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library, Thanjavur. Serial No. 9904 (in Burnell 1880) and 6703 (in Subrahmanya Sastri 1931).
<i>Tj^{gd}</i>	Microfilm images of the PYŚ in Grantha script on palm leaf. Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library, Thanjavur. Serial No. 9903 (in Burnell 1880) and 6702 (in Subrahmanya Sastri 1931).
<i>Tm</i>	Digital image of folio 98 of the YVi in Malayālam script on palm leaf. Oriental Research Institute, Thiruvananthapuram (Trivandrum). Shelf No. L662, Serial No. 14385 (in Bhaskaran 1984).
<i>Tv^o</i>	Digital images of the PYŚ on palm leaf in Malayālam script. Oriental Research Institute, Thiruvananthapuram (Trivandrum). Shelf No. 622, Serial No. 14371 (in Bhaskaran 1984).
<i>YVi</i>	Reconstruction of the basic text of the Pātanjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa (YVi)

2. Abbreviations

AgniP	Agnipurāṇa: <i>Agni Purāṇa</i> . A Collection of Hindu Mythology and Traditions. 3 vols. Ed. by Rājendralāla Mitra. [<i>Bibliotheca Indica</i> 65,1-3]. Calcutta: The Ganes'a Press, 1873-1879. Vol. 1: Chapters 1-114, 1873. Vol. 2: Chapters 115-208, 1876. Vol. 3: Chapters 269-382, 1879.
AH	Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā: <i>Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā</i> . The Romanised Text Accompanied by Line and Word Indexes. Compiled and ed. by Rahul Peter Das and Ronald E. Emmerick. [<i>Groningen Oriental Studies</i> 13]. Groningen: Forsten, 1998.
Apte	Vaman Shivaram Apte, <i>Revised and Enlarged Edition of V.S. Apte's The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary</i> . Ed. by P.K. Gode ... and C.G. Karve ... [et al.]. 3 vols. Poona: Prasad Prakashan 1957-1959.
AS	<i>Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha of Vāhaṭa or Vṛddha Vāgbhaṭa. With the Śāṣilekhā Sanskrit Commentary of Indu</i> . Prologue in Sanskrit and English by Jyotir Mitra. Ed. by Shivaprasad Sharma. [<i>Banaras Sanskrit Series</i> 19]. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 2006.
BhāgP	Bhāgavatapurāṇa: <i>Bhāgavata Purāṇa of Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa. With Sanskrit Commentary Bhāvārthabodhinī of Srīdhara Svāmin</i> . Containing Introduction in Sanskrit and English and an Alphabetical Index of Verses. Ed. by Jagdish Lal Shastri. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.
BhelaS	<i>Bhelasamhitā bhelēcāryeṇa praṇītā</i> . Ed. by V.S. Venkatasubramania Sastri and C. Raja Rajeswara Sarma. [<i>Central Council for Research in Indian Medicine and Homoeopathy Publication</i> 31]. New Delhi: Sāhitya Anusandhāna Ekaka et al., 1977.

- BHSG/D* Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953 [*William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series*]. Vol. 1: *Grammar*. Vol. 2: *Dictionary*.
- BrahmaP Brahma-purāṇa: *Sanskrit Indices and Text of the Brahma-purāṇa*. By Peter Schreiner and Renate Söhnen. [*Purāṇa Research Publications* 1]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987.
- Ci Cikitsāsthāna
- CS Carakasamhitā: *Caraka Samhitā by Agniveśa. Revised by Caraka and Dṛḍhabala. With the Āyurveda-Dīpikā Commentary of Cakrapānidatta*. Ed. by Jā-davji Trikamjī Ācārya. [*Krishnadas Ayurveda Series* 66]. Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy, 2000 (repr. of the ed. Bombay 1941).
- GaruḍaP *Garuḍapurāṇam kṛṣṇadvai-pāyana-maharṣi-śrīvedavyāsa-praṇītam*. ... Pañcānātarakarātmena saṁśodhitam. ... Virasimhaśāstrīṇā ... Dhīrānanda-kāyānidhinā ca pariśodhitam. Kālikātārājadhānyām śaka 1812 (= AD 1890).
- GiPh I* Erich Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*. Bd. 1: *Die Philosophie des Veda und des Epos. Der Buddha und der Jina. Das Samkhya und das klassische Yoga-System*. [Wort und Antwort 6]. Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1953.
- HIML* Gerit Jan Meulenbeld, *A History of Indian Medical Literature*. 3 vols (in 5 parts). [*Groningen Oriental Studies* 15]. Groningen: Forsten, 1999-2002.
- HIPh* Surendranath Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*. 5 vols. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991 (repr. of the first ed. Cambridge 1922-1955).
- LV Lalitavistara: *Lalita-Vistara*. Ed. by Parasurama Lakshmana Vaidya. [*Buddhist Sanskrit Texts* 1]. Darbhanga: Mithila Vidyapitha, 1958.
- MBh Mahābhārata: *The Mahābhārata*. For the First Time Critically ed. by V.S. Sukthankar, S.K. Belvalkar et al. 20 vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933(1927)-1966.
- MBhāṣya Mahābhāṣya: Franz Kielhorn (ed.), *The Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali*. 3rd Edition Revised and Furnished with Additional Readings, References, and Selected Critical Notes by K.V. Abhyankar. Vol. 1-3. Poona: M.G. Dhadphale at the Bhandarkar Institute, Poona, 1962-1972.
- MS manuscript
- MV I Mahāvastu: *Mahāvastu Avadānaṃ. Le Mahāvastu*. Texte Sanscrit publié pour le premier fois et accompagné d'introductions et d'un commentaire par Émile Senart. Vol. 1. Paris: Impr. nationale, 1882.
- MW* Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages. New Ed. Greatly Enlarged and Improved with the Collaboration of E. Leumann ... C. Cappeler ... [et. al.] Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899.
- NārP Nārādīya-purāṇa: *Atha nārādīyamahāpurāṇaṃ prārābhyaṭe*. Mumbāi: Śrī-veṅkateśvara Śṭīm-Yantrāgāra, 1923.
- Ni Nidānasthāna
- om.* omits

- pw* Otto Böhtlingk, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*, 7 vols. St. Petersburg: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1879-1889.
- PYŚ I Pātañjalayogaśāstra, first chapter, as edited in Maas 2006.
- PYŚ II-IV Pātañjalayogaśāstra, second to fourth chapter, as edited in *Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi vācaspatimiśraviracitaṭīkāsameta-śrī-vyāsabhāṣyasametāni*. āśramasya paṇḍitaiḥ saṃsodhitam [*Ānanda Āśrama Sanskrit Series* 47]. Puṇyapattana '1978.
- SK Sāṅkhyakārikā of Īsvaraḥṣṇa, see Wezler – Motegi 1998
- Śā Śārīrasthāna
- SS *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. ... with the *Nibandhasaṅgraha Commentary of Dalhanāchārya and the Nyāyacandrikā Pañjikā of Gayadāsāchārya on Nidānasthāna*. Ed. by Jādavjī Trikamjī Āchārya from the Beginning to the 9th Adhyāya of Cikitsāsthāna and the Rest by Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya. [*Chaukhamba Ayurvijnan Granthamala* 42]. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan, 2003 (Repr. of the ed. Bombay 1933).
- Sū Sūtrasthāna
- TVai Tattvavaiśārādī of Vācaspatimiśra, see PYŚ II-IV
- Vi Vimānasthāna
- v.l.* variant reading (*varia lectio*)
- YD Yuktidīpikā, see Wezler – Motegi 1998
- YS Yogasūtra, see PYŚ I-IV
- YVā Yogavārttika of Vijñānabhikṣu in *Pātañjalayogadarśanam vācaspatimiśraviracita-tattvavaiśārādī-vijñānabhikṣukṛta-yogavārttikavibhūṣita-vyāsa-bhāṣyasametam*. ... śrīnārāyaṇamīśreṇa ṭippanīparīśiṣṭādibhiḥ saha saṃpāditam. Vārāṇasī: Bhāratīya Vidyā Prakāśan, 1971.
- YVi Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa: *Pātañjala-Yogasūtra-Bhāṣya-Vivarāṇa of Śāṅkara-Bhagavatpāda*. Critically ed. with Introduction by ... Polakam Sri Rama Sastri ... and S.R. Krishnamurthi Sastri [*Madras Government Oriental Series* 94]. Madras: Government Oriental Manuscript Library, 1952. See also Harimoto 1999.

3. Literature

- Allen 1962 William Sidney Allen, *Sandhi*. The Theoretical, Phonetic, and Historical Bases of Word-Junction in Sanskrit. [*Janua Linguarum* 17]. 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1962.
- Bhaskaran 1984 T. Bhaskaran, *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscript Library, Trivandrum*. Vol. 3: *ya to ṣa*. [*Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* 254]. Trivandrum: Oriental Research Institute and Manuscript Library, University of Kerala, 1984.
- Bronkhorst 1985 Johannes Bronkhorst, Patañjali and the Yoga Sūtras. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985) 191-212.
- Burnell 1880 Arthur Coke Burnell, *A Classified Index to the Sanskrit Manu-*

- scripts in the Palace at Tanjore*. Prepared for the Madras Government. London: Trübner, 1880.
- Das 2003 Rahul Peter Das, *The Origin of the Life of a Human Being*. Conception and the Female According to Ancient Indian Medical and Sexological Literature. [*Indian Medical Tradition* 6]. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003.
- Dimitrov 2002 Dragomir Dimitrov, Tables of the Old Bengali Script (on the Basis of a Nepalese Manuscript of Daṇḍin's Kāvyaḍarśa). In: Dragomir Dimitrov – Ulrike Roessler – Roland Steiner (ed.), *Śikhisamuccayaḥ*. Indian and Tibetan Studies (Collectanea Marpurgensia Indologica et Tibetica). [*Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde* 53]. Wien 2002, p. 27-78.
- Diwakar 2006 Diwakar Acharya, *Vācaspatimiśra's Tatvasamīkṣā*. The Earliest Commentary on Maṇḍanamiśra's Brahmasiddhi. Critically Edited with an Introduction and Critical Notes. [*Nepal Research Centre Publications* 25]. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2006.
- Endo 1993 Ko Endo, Notes on the Trivandrum Manuscript of the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* | *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 41.2 (1993) 19-24 [= 1139-1144].
- Fedorova 1990 Mariana Fedorova, *Die Marmantheorie in der klassischen indischen Medizin*. Ph.D. thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 1990.
- Halbfass 1991 Wilhelm Halbfass, *Tradition and Reflection*. Explorations in Indian Thought. New York: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Harimoto 1999 Kengo Harimoto, *A Critical Edition of the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa*. First Part: *Samādhipāda with an Introduction*. Ph.D. thesis in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1999.
- Jambuvijaya 2000 Muni Jambuvijaya, Dharmacandravijaya et al., *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jaisalmer Jain Bhandaras*. | *Jaisalmer ke prācīn jain grāṁbhhaṇḍārom kī sūcī*. Delhi – Jaisalmer: Motilal Banarsidass – Parshvanath Jain Shwetambar Trust, 2000.
- Jamison 1986 Stephanie W. Jamison, Brāhmaṇa Syllable Counting, Vedic Trāc "Skin", and the Sanskrit Expression for the Canonical Creature. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 29 (1986) 161-181.
- Jolly 1901 Julius Jolly, *Medicin*. [*Grundriss der indoarischen Philologie und Altertumskunde* III/10]. Strassburg: Trübner, 1901.
- Kuppuswami Sastri 1938 S. Kuppuswami Sastri – P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri, *An Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*. Part 1 (a-ma). Madras: Superintendent Government Press, 1938.
- Larson – Bhattacharya 1987 Gerald James Larson – Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, *Sāṃkhya*. A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy. [*Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies* 4]. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass, 1987.

- Maas 2006 Philipp André Maas, *Samādhipāda*. Das erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch ediert / The First Chapter of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra for the First Time Critically Edited. [*Studia Indologica Universitatis Halensis – Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien* 9]. Aachen: Shaker, 2006.
- Maas 2008 Philipp André Maas, “Descent with Modification”: The Opening of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra. In: Walter Slaje (ed.), *Śāstrārambha*. Inquiries into the Preamble in Sanskrit. Preface by Edwin Gerow. [*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 62]. Wiesbaden 2008, p. 97-119.
- Maas forthcoming Philipp André Maas, On the Written Transmission of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra. In: Johannes Bronkhorst – Karin Preisendanz (ed.), *Philosophy*. [*Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference Helsinki, Finland, 2003* 10,1]. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass (in the press).
- Mahajan 1986 Shantaram G. Mahajan (chief ed.), *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts Available in the Jayakar Library, University of Poona*. Pune: Jayakar Library, University of Poona, 1986.
- Majjhimanikāya *The Majjhima-Nikāya*. Ed. by Vilhelm Trenckner and Robert Chalmers. London: The Pali Text Society et al., 1888-1889. Vol. 1, ed. by V. Trenckner 1888. Vol. 2-3, ed. by R. Chalmers 1889.
- Marulasiddaiah 1984 Gurusiddappa Marulasiddaiah, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts [in the Oriental Research Institute, Mysore]*. Vol. 10: *Vyākaraṇa, Śilpa, Ratnaśāstra, Kāmaśāstra, Arthaśāstra, Sāṅkhyā, Yoga, Pūrvamīmāṃsā, Nyāya*. [*Oriental Research Institute Series* 144]. Mysore: Oriental Research Institute, University of Mysore, 1984.
- Müller 1934 Reinhold F.G. Müller, Zur anatomischen Systematik im Yajus. *Archiv für Geschichte der indischen Medizin* 27 (1934) 20-31.
- Müller 1935 Id., Natur- und Medizingeschichtliches aus dem Mahābhārata. *Isis* 23,1 (1935), 25-53.
- Nambiyar 1942 Raghavan Nambiyar, *An Alphabetical List of Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute, Baroda*. Vol. 1. [*Gaekwad's Oriental Series* 97]. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1942.
- Oberlies 2003 Thomas Oberlies, *A Grammar of Epic Sanskrit*. [*Indian Philology and South Asian Studies* 5]. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter, 2003.
- Preisendanz 1994 Karin Preisendanz, *Studien zu Nyāyasūtra III.1 mit dem Nyāyatatvāloka Vācaspatimīśras II*. Teil 1-2. [*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 46]. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994.
- Preisendanz 2007 Karin Preisendanz, The Initiation of the Medical Student in Early Classical Āyurveda. Caraka's Treatment in Context. In: Birgit Kellner et al. (ed.), *Pramāṇakīrtih*. Papers Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of his 70th Birthday. Part 2. [*Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde*

- 70,2]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2007, p. 629-668.
- Sarup – Sahai
Shastri 1941 Lakshman Sarup – Bala Sahai Shastri, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Panjab University Library*. Vol. 2. Lahore: University of the Panjab, 1941.
- Satipaṭṭhānasutta see Majjhimanikāya
- Scharfe 1999 Hartmut Scharfe, The Doctrine of the Three Humours in Traditional Indian Medicine and the Alleged Antiquity of Tamil Siddha Medicine. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 119,4 (1999) 609-629.
- Srinivasan 1967 Srinivasa Ayya Srinivasan, *Vācaspatimiśras Tattvakaumudī*. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung [*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 12]. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co., 1967.
- Steiner 2007 Roland Steiner, Das “dreifache Leiden” in Sāṃkhyakārikā 1. In: Konrad Klaus – Jens-Uwe Hartmann (ed.), *Indica et Tibetica*. Festschrift für Michael Hahn. [*Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde* 66]. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien, 2007, p. 507-519.
- Subrahmanya Sastri
1931 Palamadai Pichumani S[ubrahmanya] Sastri, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahāl Library Tanjore*. Vol. 11: *Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, Sāṅkhya & Yoga*. Srirangam: Sri Vilas Press, 1931.
- Vogel 1965 Claus Vogel, *Vāgbhata's Aṣṭāṅghaydayasaṃhitā*. The First Seven Chapters of its Tibetan Version. Ed. and Rendered into English [*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 38,2]. Mainz: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft – Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1965.
- Wezler 1984 Albrecht Wezler, On the Quadruple Division of the Yogaśāstra, the Caturvyūhatva of the Cikitsāśāstra and the “Four Noble Truths” of the Buddha (Studies in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa 2). *Indologica Taurinensia* 12 (1984) 289-337.
- Wezler – Motegi 1998 Albrecht Wezler – Shujun Motegi, *Yuktidīpikā*. The Most Significant Commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā Critically Edited. Vol. 1. [*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 44]. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998.
- Woods 1914 James Haughton Woods, *The Yoga-System of Patañjali*. Or the Ancient Hindu Doctrine of Concentration of Mind, Embracing the Mnemonic Rules, Called Yoga-Sūtras, of Patañjali and the Comment, Called Yoga-Bhāshya, Attributed to Veda-Vyāsa, and the Explanation, Called Tattva-Vaiçāradī, of Vācaspati-Miçra. [*Harvard Oriental Series* 17]. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914 (repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992).
- Wujastyk 2003 Dominik Wujastyk, *The Roots of Ayurveda*. Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings. Translated with an Introduction and Notes. Revised Edition. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

- Yamashita 1997 Tsutomu Yamashita, Towards a Critical Edition of the Bhela-saṃhitā. *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society* 5 (1997) 19-27.
- Zimmermann 1983 Francis Zimmermann, Remarks on the Conception of the Body in Ayurvedic Medicine. In: Beatrix Pfeleiderer – Günther D. Sontheimer (ed.), *Sources of Illness and Healing in South Asian Regional Literatures*. [*South Asian Digest of Regional Writing* 8]. Heidelberg 1983, 10-26.
- Zysk 1986 Kenneth G. Zysk, The Evolution of Anatomical Knowledge in Ancient India, With Special Reference to Cross-Cultural Influences. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 106 (1986) 687-705.