

SUKĪRA - SUDHĪRA

AYODHYA PANDEY* and K. RAGHUNATHAN**

Introduction :

The names of SUKĪRA-SUDHĪRA appear as a dual compound word in the works of Vijayarakṣita and Dalhaṇa (Mā. ni. 1, 1, 2; Su. u. 58-64). Dalhaṇa indicates that they followed Kārtikakuṇḍa. However, Sudhīra seems to hold individual views in the works of Dalhaṇa (Su. Ci. 1, 27; Ci. i, 74-75), as well as in commentary on the work of Tisaṭācārya by his son Candraṭa. Candraṭa even went to the extent of saying that it would be an uncalled for effort on the part of any one to attempt to comment particularly when the works of Bhaṭṭāra, Jejṭa and Sudhīra on Caraka samhitā are extant.¹ Candraṭa's statement proves that Sudhīra was commentator of Carakasamhitā. Citings of Dalhaṇa lend support to believe that Suśruta Samhitā also might have been commented upon by Sudhīra. Nothing is particularly known of Sukīra except that he was a follower of Kārtikakuṇḍa along with Sudhīra. The study of their works reflects the contemporary view points and the correlations of ideas with that of Kārtikakuṇḍa and other commentators. Dalhaṇa's remarks on Suśruta-Cikitsā Sthāna 1, 27, provide a glimpse of the independent view of Sudhīra on the dietetics particularly with reference to compatibility or otherwise, which is different from that of Gayadāsa and Jejṭa for ulcers. This will be helpful guideline to the study on Gayadāsa, a commentator of the late medieval period, contemporary to Kārtikakuṇḍa, Iśvarasena, Vakulakara, Sukīra, Sudhīra etc.

It is disappointing that none of the work accounts of these two commentators from which biographical details could be built up are available, and the meagre conclusions drawn are only based on the fragmentary evidences of the later authorities.

Sukira

The epithet 'Vaidya' appears in Vijayarakṣita's work with the name of Sukīra; Dalhaṇa mentions Sukīra and Sudhīra simply in the form of a compound word. This is reminiscent of the usage of names of Vakula and Iśvarasena as a dual

* Research Assistant, Indian Institute of History of Medicine, Hyderabad.

** Director, Indian Institute of History of Medicine, Hyderabad.

1. Vyākhyātari Haiichandre Jejjatanāmnī sati suhīre ca, anyasyāyurvede vyākhyā dhārṣṭyaṃ samāvahati - Candraṭa's commentary on Cikitsā Kalikā of Tisaṭācārya.

compound word Vakuleśvarasena who also held ideas and views that synchronise with Kārtikakuṇḍa as observable in the works of Vijayarakṣita and Dalhaṇa. Sukīra's work perhaps must be extant at that time.

Sudhira

Sudhira was also mentioned 'Vaidya' by Vijayarakṣita; Dalhaṇa and Candraṭa refer to Sudhīra in their works with a tone of appreciation. Candraṭa in the beginning of his commentary on Cikitsā Kalikā states that the work of Sudhīra is acclamable as parallel to that of Bhaṭṭāra and Jejjaṭa on Caraka Samhitā and any attempt by any one else to comment on this work is uncalled for. This is a compliment to the proficiency attributed to his capacity.

It can be understood from Dalhaṇa's remarks that Sudhīra was a commentator of Suśruta Samhitā also. It is seen through the commentary of Dalhaṇa on Suśruta (Cikitsā Sthāna 1, 27) that Sudhīra held an independent view on dietary regimen in case of ulcers which is different from Gayadāsa and Jejjaṭa. In a passage from Dalhaṇa's work on Suśruta (Cikitsā Sthāna, 1, 74-75) an evidence of similarity of views held by Sudhīra and Gayadāsa are described and one might say that Gayadāsa consulted the work of Sudhīra while writing his work.² From Dalhaṇa's remarks on Suśruta (Uttaratantra 56, 58-64), it is clear that both Sukīra and Sudhīra followed the views of Kārtikakuṇḍa and his views were considered as a pronouncement from a seer (ārṣa).³ These remarks of Sukīra - Sudhīra solve controversy relating to the originality of this section of Suśruta Samhitā which was held by some as an interpolation.⁴

The Date of Sudhira:

The references of Dalhaṇa (Suśruta Cikitsā Sthāna 1, 27 and Suśruta Uttaratantra 58, 58-64) may be considered as evidences to fix the period of Sudhira; Candraṭa's reference to Sudhira in the beginning of his commentary on his father's work-Cikitsā Kalikā-is another additional evidence. From these it can be deduced that Sudhira lived earlier to Dalhaṇa and Candraṭa and his must have been a popular famous work of the time. Candraṭa, son of Tiśata wrote a commentary on the work of his father who was identified to be the son of Vāgbhata.⁵ This

2. "Atra Sudhira - eṣa sarvavraṇnām śārirāgantūnām sāmānyenokto vidhih Kasmāt, Doṣaviśeṣāt; aviśiṣṭāhi vātapitta śleṣmāṇo duṣakāh śārirānāmāgantūnām ca vṛṇānām; uktamca, 'kālāntarāṇa-doṣoraplavaviśeṣacchāriravat praktikārah^{oo} iti;.....etc. Gayatusarva vṛānānām vidradhyādyāṣeṣa vṛānānam ayameva vidhiruktha; doṣa viśeṣamape kṣya kārya iti.'

3. Kārtikakuṇḍastvamum yogam anyathāpathathi vyākhyānayaticakecidenam anāṛṣam vadanti; tanna, sukira sudhiradibhiṣṭikarabhi rāṛṣatvena varṇitatvāt'.

4. T. traiva Suśrutena Paucaṣṭhānātmakam Prasthānānāntaram kṛtam.

5. "Iti Vāgbha, a Sūnūnā Tiśataadevena racitam Cikitsā śāstram" - Colophon of Cikitsā Kalikā, B.O.R.I. 2, 14/1883-83.

leads to the view that Sudhira was a contemporary to Tīsatācārya whose date might not be beyond 9th Century A. D. or the date of Kārtikakuṇḍa whose ideas had been followed by Sudhira as well as Sukira who perhaps might be colleagues. Therefore, this date may be the upper limit of Sudhira and incidentally of Sukira too. Gayadāsa cited by Dalhaṇa (Suśruta Cikitsā Sthāna, 1, 27) differs from Sudhira's view though there are instances of his following him (Su. ci. 1, 74-75) faithfully at some places. The lower limit of Sudhira's date, therefore, is the date of Gayadāsa which must not be later to 10th Century A. D., as he was mentioned by Cakrapāṇidatta, (Bhatt. IHQ. 23, 1947, P. 154) which helps to conclude that Gayadāsa lived prior to 10th Century A. D.

In the light of these the date of Sudhira may be fixed in the range between 9th and 10th Century A. D., incidentally, Sukirā's date may be considered to be within that range.

Sudhira's Ability

It is clear from the remarks of Candraṭa that Sudhira was an erudite commentator of Caraka Samhitā who equals Bhaṭṭāra and Jejjaṭa. The passages of Sudhira's work on Suśruta Samhitā quoted by Dalhaṇa (Suśruta Cikitsā Sthāna 1, 27 and 1, 74-75) strengthen this observation; Sudhira appears to be an expert surgeon of his time with thorough knowledge on the basic principles of medical science.

The dietetic regimen prescribed by him in cases of ulcers and the independent views expressed in the interpretations accepted by his followers establish his ability in the profession. From Suśruta Uttarasthāna 58-64, it can be inferred that he maintained the tradition of Tantrayukti. Sudhira maintained this traditional approach in interpretation with extra-ordinary ability, characteristic of the period to which he belonged, and proved a genius as a commentator.

SUMMARY

Sukira-Sudhira mentioned by a dual compound by Vijayarakṣita and Dalhaṇa were commentators of Vṛddhatrayi who lived between 9th and 10th Century A.D. The lack of the extant works calls for search for evidence from later authorities and sources to fix their date as well as to know the ability in their profession. Works of Candraṭa, Dalhaṇa and Vijayarakṣita occupy an important place in this respect.

REFERENCES

1. Acharya, Yadavaji Trikamji.: The Susrutasamhita of Susruta, with the Nibandhasangraha Commentary of Sri Dalhanacharya, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1938.
2. Acharya, Yadavaji Trikamji.; Charaka Samhita, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1941.
3. Acharya, Yadavaji Trikamji.: Madhavanidana by Madhavakara, with the Madhukosa by Vijayaraksita and Srikanthadatta and with extracts from Atankadarpana by Vacaspati Misra; Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1965.
4. Meulenbeld, G. J. : Madhavanidana (and its Chief Commentary) E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1974.
5. Bhattacharya, D. C.: New Light on Vaidyaka Literature, IHQ., June, 1974.

सारांश

सुकीर - सुधीर

ले० अयोध्यापण्डेय

तथा के० रघुनाथम्

बृद्धत्रयी के टीकाकार "सुकीर-सुधीर" जिनका सामासिक (द्वन्द्वसमास) प्रयोग विजयगक्षित और डल्हणके ग्रन्थों में हुआ है ९ वीं और १० वीं शताब्दी के हैं। इनकी टीकाओं की अनुपलब्धि के कारण इनके काल निर्णय एवं योग्यताओं के विषय में जानने के लिये परवर्ती टीकाकारों के संदर्भों में एतद्विषयक गवेषणा अपेक्षित है। चन्द्रट, डल्हण तथा विजयगक्षित की कृतियाँ इस दिशा में उपयुक्त स्थान रखती हैं।