

## TRANSMITTING THE *CARAKASAMHITĀ*. NOTES FOR A HISTORY OF THE TRADITION<sup>1</sup>

CRISTINA PECCHIA\*

The history of a textual tradition is mostly related to textual criticism, insofar as it helps to understand and assess the nature of the extant individual products or process of the textual transmission. The textual tradition belongs to the intellectual history of specific geographical areas, to the extent it helps to identify and relate groups of persons and characters within the particular historical and cultural context of a text. This paper takes up the case of the *Carakasamhitā* trying to construct a picture of the reasons and procedures of the reproduction of the text in handwritten form on the basis of the analysis of philological activities, seats of learning, patronage structures, etc. The question of research strategies will be also addressed, in order to point out problems and limits in the sources from which interpretations arise.

Key words: Carakasamhitā, Manuscript tradition, Places of deposit and transmission, Patrons, Copyists.

### INTRODUCTION

A theorist of textual criticism, Giorgio Pasquali, remarked that the best editor of an ancient work that is transmitted, for instance, in medieval manuscripts, will be the one who knows the work, its language, its time and the language of its times, and, at the same time, the time in which the manuscripts were produced.<sup>2</sup> This reflection is the reason why the history of the work's tradition is a subject of study for those who approach a work from the point of view of textual criticism. Both manuscript and printed books are one of the main subjects of study for the history of a work's tradition, and even more relevant in connection with the paucity of other primary sources, namely archive documents like private

---

\* University of Vienna, Department of South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, Spitalgasse 2, Hof 2.1, 1090 Vienna, Austria. E-mail: Cristina.Pecchia@univie.ac.at

papers, account books and business correspondence, as well as sources like histories of libraries and manuscripts collections. Raising the issue of the work's transmission is also, of necessity, an exploration in the history of education and scholarship, in the wider intellectual and cultural history of specific geographical areas, groups of persons and institutions<sup>3</sup> in South Asia.

The considerations that I shall present concern the history of the transmission of the *Carakasamhitā* (CaS), and more in particular the *Vimānasthāna*, which is the subject of a critical edition under preparation at the University of Vienna.<sup>4</sup> The object of analysis and interpretation will be limited to one type of production of the textual transmission, namely the manuscript books<sup>5</sup> (leaving aside the category of printed books, which also requires observations concerning the history of printing in India and therefore a partially different range of information and methods of analysis).<sup>6</sup> This will contribute to establish the spatio-temporal coordinates in which the data of the transmission of the work should be placed.

## 1. MANUSCRIPT BOOKS AS SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF A TEXTUAL TRADITION

Manuscript books bear information on different levels, according to “their bifunctional role, namely as both archeological object”, or ‘container’, and as intellectual message, or textual ‘content’.<sup>7</sup> When we consider a manuscript as a container, we examine it from a codicological<sup>8</sup> and paleographical point of view, that is to say, we examine the manuscript from the point of view of its materiality and graphical representation of the text, including scripts, signs, seals, and so on. When we investigate the content of a manuscript, we analyse the text that is contained in it, also including scribal colophons, which can be a particularly precious source.<sup>9</sup> In the case of the CaS, they are not always present. This fact is also a result of the fragmentation of the work in individual *sthānas*, which, especially if they originally belonged to the wider framework of the *Samhitā*, were not closed by the copyist by means of a colophon. The scanty number of scribal colophons is also the reason why the precise date and place of production of many manuscripts remain unknown.

Manuscript books, furthermore, have spatio-temporal coordinates, which reveal information about the time and contexts in which they were produced, acquired, used, exchanged, preserved, etc., and also allow some inferences regarding, for instance, how the work was perceived and circulated. The information that can be gathered from these investigations goes under four main categories: time, places, agents and modalities of the transmission.

Only some reflections deriving from this very wide spectrum of data and observations will be exposed in the following.

## 2. THE CARAKASAMHITĀ AS A COMPOSITE WORK<sup>10</sup>

At present, 236 manuscripts containing the CaS are known. Most of them are known through direct record in catalogues and handlists, and some through their being mentioned by editors of printed books of the CaS. Among them, forty-nine copies of manuscripts containing the *Vimānasthāna* (*Vim.*) are available for the critical edition under preparation. These copies are in different materials, namely paper copies, microfilms and digital copies; other five manuscripts kept in the Anup Sanskrit Library of Bikaner could be only collated on the spot. About ten manuscripts that are kept in public and private libraries in India could not be used so far. The original manuscript books are written on paper and in different scripts: Devanagari, Bengali, Śāraḍa and Kannada.

A first remark regarding these data is that the text of the *Vim.* is only contained in a few manuscripts. In fact, only a minority of the manuscripts containing the CaS includes the entire work, while many manuscripts only contain one or more *sthānas*. This shows that the CaS, at least at a certain point of its history, also circulated as a composite work, as a set of texts, each *sthāna* being a distinct unity. In fact, we have manuscript books that contain individual *sthānas*, but sometimes their foliation, or pagination suggests that they belonged to a larger book, because the first folio does not bear the number one. It is likely that the work was fragmented in connection with a “preservation policy”, or “market policy”, or just on practical grounds. Furthermore, the undoubted fact that some books bear two foliations, namely one for the entire book and one for each individual *sthāna*, indicates that the work was perceived as a set of independent parts. This way of perceiving the work facilitated and legitimized its circulation by way of individual *sthānas*.

## 3. TIME OF THE MANUSCRIPT TRANSMISSION: THE DOCUMENTED PERIOD

We have a huge chronological gap between the composition of the *Vim.*, which approximately goes back to the second century AD, and the oldest dated available manuscript, Alipur, Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology 4-5283, which was copied in 1592. The manuscripts that have no date, which are approximately 50%, do not present signs of considerable antiquity. Neither the

material, nor the types of scripts indicate that the witnesses might be older than the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The most recent manuscripts, on the contrary, are unusually late. Even though they are not dated, they may be assigned to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Two of these manuscripts are preserved in Jamnagar, at the Gujarat Ayurved University Library,<sup>11</sup> and share some similarities with another manuscript that is dated 1<sup>st</sup> November 1945.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, the directly documented history of the manuscript transmission of the *Vim.* spans more than three centuries and begins at the very end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Other *sthānas* have a different history. The *Cikitsāsthāna*, in particular, is attested in a manuscript kept in Kathmandu, the National Archives, Durbar Library 1-1648, dated 1183 AD, written in old Devanagari on palm leaf.

The available manuscripts of the *Vim.* presuppose a long chain of copies, of which just the last part is extant. The critical reconstruction of the text has thus to rely on witnesses that belong to a much later historical period and are actually the result of processes by which the text was fashioned over the centuries. The conditions of the manuscript tradition suggest that in the course of its history no dramatic break occurred, but different lines of transmission crystallized. The fact that books containing the entire CaS, including the *Vim.*, appear at the end of the sixteenth-century firstly indicates that the work was copied several times in that period and, secondly, that manuscripts were relatively well kept, that is to say, books of the *Vim.* appear in a period in which courtly or state institutions support, control and organize the intellectual inheritance of their territory, as the existence of a preservation policy shows. Moreover, it would be difficult to place a substantial appearing of manuscripts of the entire CaS in a period different from that in which textual foundations of knowledge-systems are not only recuperated with new textual and stylistical attention, but also seen for the first time as *part* (indeed the fundamental centre) of a tradition from which the idea of innovation cannot be dissociated.<sup>13</sup> As stated by Sheldon Pollock, the two centuries from about 1550 to 1750 “witnessed a flowering of scholarship, [...] including a degree of attentiveness to the historicity of intellectual life previously unexampled.”<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, a “revitalized interest in textual foundations seems to be a hallmark of the early-modern knowledge-systems.”<sup>15</sup>

#### 4. THE PLACES OF THE TRANSMISSION

The present provenance of the manuscripts of the CaS, namely the public or private libraries and collections in which the manuscripts are found at the

moment (see Appendix), can offer an approximate indication of the area of their primary provenance. This consideration also implies that there is no reason why the manuscript copies of a work that are preserved in a library should be related one each other in terms of genealogy.<sup>16</sup> The actual origin of a manuscript remains to be inferred by means of the manuscript itself, namely by means of the information that can be gathered from the manuscript both as archeological object and textual content, especially when other primary sources for the book-history are missing.

The provenance of the *Vim.* manuscripts first of all reveals that this text is almost absent in the libraries of South India, except for a very recent and incomplete copy that is kept at the Oriental Research Institute of Mysore. The type of ink, paper and script, a very cursive Kannada, seems to suggest that the copy was most probably written in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Furthermore, the presence of some forms of paratext, like chapter titles, indicates that it is not a modern transcription of an older manuscript, or, at least, certainly not only a transcription. Two other fragments of the CaS, which, however, do not contain the *Vim.*, are kept in Madras, one at the Archaeological Department (no. 183) and another at the Government Oriental Manuscript Library (no. 13090). Except for these very fragmentary copies from Madras and Mysore, the most ‘Southern’, so to say, manuscripts of the *Vim.*, but also of the CaS, come from the Asiatic Society of Bombay (dated śaka 1786, i.e. 1864 AD) and from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute and the Ānandāśrama in Pune. This fact indicates that at a certain point, in South India, the CaS’s popularity declined. Most likely the dominance of another work belonging to the same discipline caused a decrease in the production of new copies, to such an extent that the number of circulating manuscripts was not sufficient to guarantee the preservation of the work.

By looking at the list of the extant manuscripts containing the *Vim.* (see Appendix), their places of provenance are distributed over two main geographical areas, namely Bengal and North-West India. They roughly correspond to the areas of the Kaśmīri recension and the Eastern recension, namely the two main versions of the text that can be identified through the textual critical work. Both versions, however, circulated in the whole northern area. For some textual features, namely variant readings and typology of scribal mistakes, suggest that a few manuscripts, which are written in Devanagari and preserved in libraries of the North-West India, derive from a Bengali version. In this regard, we can suppose a few scenarios: manuscripts that had a specific version of the text and were written in Bengali script were copied in Devanagari and eventually arrived in

North-West manuscript collections. Another possibility is that they migrated towards the North-West India, where they were either faithfully copied in Devanagari, or, by conflation, partially incorporated in a local extant version of the text. Also the opposite direction of migration has to be assumed, because two manuscripts that are written in Bengali show very strong features of the Kaśmīri recension, mixed with those of the Eastern recension; they are the Varanasi manuscript, Sarasvati Bhavan 44842, and the Calcutta manuscript, Asiatic Society G 2503/1.

#### 4.1. CENTRES OF MANUSCRIPT BOOKS COLLECTIONS: MODERN INDIA

It is reasonable to assume that the written transmission of the *Vim.* and CaS in South India had already broken up before the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when a number of scholars went in search of manuscripts in different areas of the Indian Subcontinent, collecting the manuscripts and writing Reports and Notices on their activity. Their main impulse was the wish to take possession of the Indian knowledge, which was still deposited in the form of manuscript books, not in printed books.<sup>17</sup> This wish was also inspired by “a purely utilitarian principle”, as it can be understood from the following statement by the Major-General H. M. Durand:<sup>18</sup>

“I am not in favour of devoting exorbitant sums to the sentimental nurture of Sanskrit or Arabic literature; but, so long as both these languages remain what they are, — the radical sources of enormous spiritual influence on millions under our rule, — I am averse, even from a purely utilitarian principle, to neglect their ancient utterances; for they remain a living power among those millions.”

The search continued for many years and in large areas, because it became clear that various sources had to be reached, from private collections to libraries connected to different cultural institutions.

A large quantity of manuscript books, which were the result of this search, constituted the main, or even the first fund of public repositories of manuscripts.<sup>19</sup> In Calcutta, for instance, “[t]he collection of ayurvedic manuscripts of the Asiatic Society can be traced as early as 1871 A.D., when the ‘Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Vol. I’ was published by Sir Rājendralāla Mitra.”<sup>20</sup> The five manuscripts containing the CaS that are kept at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, in Pune, were collected by R. G. Bhandarkar during the years 1882-83<sup>21</sup> and by Abaji Vishnu Kathavate during the years 1891-95.<sup>22</sup> The collection at the Gujarat Ayurved University Library in Jamnagar, with 27 manuscripts of the CaS,

was most likely enlarged in connection with the edition and translation of the CaS made by the Shree Gulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society, whose result was the work's publication in 1949.<sup>23</sup> Some of the Jamnagar manuscripts are twentieth century transcriptions of older manuscripts. In the case of the *Vim.*, one manuscript was certainly directly copied from a manuscript that is now kept in Bikaner and another one was most probably copied also collating the same Bikaner manuscript.<sup>24</sup> The Gulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society represents a recent case of "courtly" patronage. For patron of the Society was His Highness Namdar Maharaja Jam Saheb Shree and president of the Society was Her Highness Maharani Shree Gulabkunverba Sahiba of Nawanagar.

#### 4.2. CENTRES OF MANUSCRIPT BOOKS COLLECTIONS: EARLY-MODERN NORTH-WEST INDIA

Large manuscripts collections were established in court libraries of the North-West medieval India.<sup>25</sup> They normally contained books that were an exclusive product made for the patron, i.e. the Mahārājas' families, who were interested in collecting works belonging to various fields of knowledge as part of their larger enterprise of collecting the contents of the intellectual culture produced in their kingdoms. Bikaner and Jaipur, for example, were and still are great repositories of manuscript books. Āyurveda was an important knowledge-system of the time, because each manuscript collection contains many āyurvedic works.

##### 4.2.1. Jaipur

The Mahārājas had an active role as 'cultural entrepreneurs'.<sup>26</sup> Their collection of manuscripts and paintings was constantly enlarged by acquisition and production. They also had a refined system of maintenance, preservation and classification of manuscripts.<sup>27</sup> Surely their library (*pothīkhānā*) testifies to their interest in Āyurveda and other systems of medical knowledge.<sup>28</sup> Mirza Rājā Jay Singh (1621-1667)<sup>29</sup> was the first ruler who properly organized the collection of manuscripts he had inherited from his forefathers. His son Ram Singh I (1667-1689)<sup>30</sup> continued the family tradition concerning the increase of the manuscript production and the organization of the library. Ram Singh I also used to put his own seal on his manuscripts. It has, from the top to the bottom, *rāma*, a lion and the case-ending *sya*; at the top, splitted in two parts, the date 1718 (Vikrama *saṃvat*), that is 1661 AD.<sup>31</sup> This date shows that he began organizing his library

when he was not yet the ruler of Amber (the capital was moved to Jaipur by Sawai Jay Singh II, reign 1699-1743).

On the basis of the Ram Singh I's seal, a *terminus ante quem* can be assigned to the undated manuscript Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum 2068, in Jaipur. Because the manuscript bears the Ram Singh I's seal, the date before which it must have been written is 1661 AD.

The next generations of Mahārājas maintained and enlarged the library, in which medical texts had a conspicuous role. Sawai Pratap Singh (1778-1803)<sup>32</sup> is also said to have composed an āyurvedic work, the *Amṛtsāgar* (Ocean of Nectar, 1864), even though, most likely, somebody else composed it for him.<sup>33</sup>

An interesting aspect of these early Mahārājas of Amber and Jaipur is their contact with the city of Kāśī. Mirza Rājā Jay Singh, in fact, founded a college in Kāśī, in which also his son, the future Ram Singh I, studied. Furthermore, both rulers were associated with pandits and poets who lived in Kāśī; hence the implication that they held Sanskrit literature and language in high esteem.<sup>34</sup> This fact gives evidence of a vital cultural exchange between Rajasthan and Eastern India (with special reference to the cultural centre of Kāśī) and can be related, and supposed to be the cause of, the exchange that is observed in the textual tradition of the *Vim.* (see above, § 4).

Another interesting aspect of the early Mahārājas of Amber and Jaipur is their contact with the Bikaner ruling family. Ram Singh I, in particular, was Anup Singh's "friend and fellow bibliophile" and they also exchanged manuscripts.<sup>35</sup>

#### 4.2.2. Bikaner

Bikaner is the place in which the highest number of manuscripts containing the CaS or sections of it are preserved. The city has at present two libraries, in which manuscripts are kept: the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute of Bikaner, where the Shree Motichand Khajanchi Collection is preserved, with three manuscripts of the CaS, and the Anup Sanskrit Library, which has 33 manuscripts of the CaS, although only two of them contain the complete work. The Anup Sanskrit Library houses the collection of manuscripts assembled by Anup Singh (also spelt "Anūpasimha", reign 1669 to 1698)<sup>36</sup> and the following Mahārājas of Bikaner. One important feature of this library is that it contains many manuscripts that come from the Deccan. There was, in fact, "a vast influx of scientific texts

from the South into Rājasthān”<sup>37</sup> when Anup Singh was campaigning in the Deccan together with the Aurangzīb’s army.<sup>38</sup> As far as the CaS is concerned, however, the Rajasthan copies do not reveal any particular influence or direct provenance from traditions different from those transmitted by other northern copies.

Bikaner was most probably a centre in which āyurvedic manuscripts were also collected from other areas. For a manuscript in Śarada script, which is now in Pune, the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 65, was acquired in Bikaner by Georg Bühler during his search of Sanskrit manuscripts in 1875-76.<sup>39</sup> However, on the basis of its script and also the vertical format of its folios, it can be stated that the manuscript was produced in Kaśmīr.

## 5. PATRONS AND COPYISTS OF THE VIMĀNASTHĀNA: SOME CASES<sup>40</sup>

### 5.1. PATRONAGE

As the manuscripts funds in the libraries show, the professional hand-written production of books was a flourishing activity in the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> century India. This activity was sponsored, or mainly sponsored, by cultural and political institutions, which, aiming at preserving, transmitting and developing different knowledge-systems, also set up or supported the book production. The presence of a generous patronage involved the presence of professionals of writing (*lekhaka*). For they can only exist if a significant category of people who commission manuscripts exists. When such a category of professionals of writing is established, then it is available on the market of the book production and can also be employed by wealthy people who want to have their own library.

Somebody who commissioned a manuscript book will not necessarily make use of it, but he, or she, may just want to possess a copy of a specific work. Therefore, the exterior and physical conditions of the manuscripts not only provide some quite accurate information about the kind of copyist who produced them, but also, if this is the case, about the patronage that supported their production. Some manuscripts of the *Vim.*, which are in very good material conditions, show that they were not intensively used, or even not used at all. This fact suggests that the main purpose of the persons who commissioned the copies was simply the possession and/or preservation of the work itself. If this is typical of royal patrons, it must have been true also for other types of wealthy patrons, who organize and maintain large libraries, because only a minority of the extant manuscripts were commissioned by royal patrons.

Among other possible sources of patronage for the CaS also the specific category of physicians has to be taken into account. They might have been interested in commissioning copies of the work on practical grounds, namely in order to use it as a reference book in the medical practice and in the teaching activity, both for himself and for his students.

## 5.2. PROFESSIONALS OF WRITING

The task of professional copyists consisted in reading and copying the text of their exemplar; it was distinct from the act of understanding the text's content. As readings in the manuscripts show again and again, professional copyists were often not much conversant with the language of the text they were copying. Hence, it can be inferred that, in actual fact, a low level of linguistic competence was not an obstacle to the profession. Furthermore, the act of writing was not an elitarian intellectual activity in itself, but also 'just a job' (conversely, Sanskrit was deliberately administered as an elitarian language). The competence in writing is very specific, but this does not *per se* imply that writing is an exclusive activity of the intellectual elite. The activity of writing can certainly be the distinctive feature of an elite, but the one that is chiefly defined by the fact that it exists in a context of illiteracy.

The manuscripts of the *Vim.* are, in most of the cases, produced by professional copyists. The typical feature of their work is that the general exterior aspect of the manuscript looks nice and neat and its script regular, with no particular inclination and with no unbalanced distribution of letters in the line; however, the manuscript may easily bear an inaccurate text.

The copyist of the Pune manuscript Ānandāśrama 1546 (dated 1799), for example, explicitly states the limits of his task, which he duly performed. For he writes in the colophon a *śloka* that is a copyists standard phrase:<sup>41</sup> “*yādṛśaṃ pustakaṃ dṛṣṭvā tādṛśaṃ likhitaṃ mayā yadi śuddham aśuddham vā mama doṣo na dīyate*” (‘As I read the book, so I have written it. If it is correct or incorrect, it is not my fault’). The copyist clearly distinguishes between the material and textual aspects of the book. By means of the former aspect, a manuscript serves its function of exemplar and is the object of the copying activity (*likhitaṃ*). The latter aspect does not belong to that activity; this is the reason why the copyist is not responsible for the correctness of the text, about which, however, he raises doubts.<sup>42</sup>

An extreme case of the combination of nice appearance and inaccurate text, as well as of the copyist's awareness of the specificity of copying, is the manuscript Bikaner, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute (RORI) 1566, in Devanagari, dated 1797 AD. In the colophon, the copyist says his name, Trpāthīraghunātha, and place of origin, Saravāḍa,<sup>43</sup> which might be the modern Sarwar, near Ajmer.<sup>44</sup> Its copyist just wrote what he could read in his exemplar, sometimes producing sequences of letters that do not make any sense. Analyzing a sample section of the *Vim.*, namely 8.1-14, the manuscript has a number of individual readings that corresponds to 27 per cent of the text. The appearance of the folios, on the contrary, is good and the style of writing very clear and regular. About the reasons why a manuscript bears a text with so many mistakes, it can be assumed that the copyist not only made orthographical mistakes, as it is usual, but he also read an exemplar that must have been very bad in terms of text and also physical conditions. For it is clear from the variant readings that the copyist interpreted sequences of *akṣaras* as mere visual objects, and not as unities bearing a meaning, to such an extent that it is plausible to assume that he was forced to do that from the bad quality of what he could read in his exemplar. This "bad" exemplar was most likely the final result of a long sequence of reproductions, in which involuntary orthographical mistakes induced by features of the handwriting were multiplied by the features of a script that represented a writing system different from the one adopted by the copyist. Some readings in the Bikaner manuscript, in fact, can be explained as the result of a sequence of mistakes in reading and writing that developed from one act of copying to the other, but one can still recognize some traces of a previous exemplar that must have been written in a kind of Devanagari with *pr̥ṣṭhamātrā* "e", or in a Bengali script, in which this kind of "e" is the most common.

This Bikaner manuscript also evidences the conditions in which some representatives of the CaS tradition were at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Considering the textual meaning that can be gained from this Bikaner manuscript, it is evident that the actual content of the manuscript was not a primary factor for the one who commissioned the copy. We may thus infer that he wanted to have a copy of the work in his personal library, but not necessarily in order to consult it. About the reasons why the exemplar of this Bikaner manuscript was valuable enough to be copied, one can speculate that its provenance made it valuable, or its being a

unique copy of the CaS in the area in which it was copied. For it is highly probable that the commission was due to the material conditions of the book, which had already reached a critical stage. Copying the manuscript was the only way to save it.<sup>45</sup> Copying, in fact, also had the specific function of reproducing an existing manuscript book, whose value was the text as such, no matter what the letter of the text of the work was.

### 5.3. SEMI-PROFESSIONAL COPYISTS

A second category of copyists is that of the semi-professional copyists. In the case of āyurvedic works, two main types can be assumed: 1) physicians who were not scholars, who copied the text to have it as a reference book at their disposal, and 2) students, who copied the work in order to study it, or for their teacher. None of the *Vim.* copies, however, seems to bear explicit signs of this kind of production.

### 5.4. LEARNED COPYISTS: PROFESSIONALS AND COPYISTS FOR THEMSELVES

Because writing was also a competence of learned people, we may find copyists for whom writing is not exclusively, or not at all, a work occupation. They represent the category of the ‘learned’ copyists, who may transcribe books as professionals, but also as part of their wider intellectual activity. In fact, learned copyists can be copyists “for themselves”, who copy texts for their own use. With regard to āyurvedic works, they may typically be scholar-physicians, who also copied texts to make them available to their students. The work of copyists for themselves can be sometimes recognized through the mere appearance of the book. For these copyists can neglect the formal aspects of the books: because they were much poorer in means than the institutions, they might transcribe the text they copied just for their own use on a cheap material, with a bad quality ink and, especially, with an irregular and inaccurate way of writing.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, copyists for themselves employed the margins as space to note down personal comments as well as paraphrases and quotations from other works.<sup>47</sup>

An important feature of learned copyists and copyists for themselves is that they may easily manipulate the letter of what they read in their exemplar, either according to other copies at their disposal or according to their own understanding, going through aware or unaware processes, from deliberate alterations to Freudian slips.<sup>48</sup> For this kind of copyists, in fact, the priority is the

manuscript as a content, and not as a material object. They also show that the tradition of the work is alive, that there are scholars who study the work.

An example of a copy made (also) for personal use is most probably Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan Library 108685, which is written in a very cursive bengali script. The manuscript, which contains many glosses written in the margins, was evidently a copy that was used to study the work, making comments here and there on the folios, without paying attention to the way in which the manuscript will appear afterwards. This copy has striking textual similarities with the manuscript Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan Library 108824, which belonged to Gaṅgādhara, the author of the CaS's commentary *Jalpakaḷpataṛu* and first editor of the CaS. For his edition of the *Sūtrasthāna* of the CaS appeared in 1868, in Bengali script, by Samvadajnanaratnakar Press (Calcutta). The next edition, which contained the entire CaS together with Gaṅgādhara's *Jalpakaḷpataṛu* was published by Dharanidhar Ray Kaviraj and printed by Pramadaḷbhanjana Press, in Bahrapur, Saidabad, in 1878/79 (Samvat 1935).<sup>49</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Even though there are so many gaps in our knowledge of the history of the CaS's manuscript tradition, certain patterns are discernible and point to a diversified, but unbroken, textual tradition. Through the different lines of transmission that are witnessed by the genealogical relationships among manuscripts, we still have traces of the interpretative acts that were performed in the course of the transmission and traces of the changes in the perception of the text that scholarship and education brought about. The reproduction of manuscripts by professional copyists, because of the patronage that they presuppose, shows that Āyurveda was not only a practice, an applied knowledge, with a set of efficacious preparations, but it did represent a specific system of knowledge, with a body of works in which this knowledge is contained, also including foundational works. The CaS is an instance of this kind of work, because it has a bidirectional function: it has a content that bears a specific scientific value and, at the same time, it is an authoritative representative of a specific knowledge-system, systematized by somebody called Caraka. The foundational role of the CaS together with the awareness of the existence of a specific medical system did not stop over centuries, and so did the transmission of the work. One may speculate about the reasons of the awareness of the specificity of one's own tradition. One of the possible reasons is that it also

developed because of the contemporaneous presence, in the same place, of other medical traditions, with regard to North-West India, especially the Unani system.

#### Appendix

List of the extant manuscripts available to the project (see n. 1 and 10) containing the *Vimānasthāna*

1. Alwar, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute 2498
2. Ahmedabad, B.J. Institute of Learning and Research 758
3. Alipur, Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology 4-5283
4. Alipur, Bhogilal Leherchand Institute of Indology 5527
5. Bikaner, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute 1566
6. Bikaner, Anup Sanskrit Library 124
7. Bikaner, Anup Sanskrit Library, 125
8. Bikaner, Anup Sanskrit Library 134
9. Bikaner, Anup Sanskrit Library 135
10. Bikaner, Anup Sanskrit Library 136
11. Baroda, Oriental Institute 12489
12. Baroda, Oriental Institute, āyurveda 8-52
13. Bombay, Asiatic Society 172
14. Calcutta, National Library RDS 101
15. Calcutta, Library of Calcutta Sanskrit College 23
16. Calcutta, Library of Calcutta Sanskrit College 24
17. Calcutta, Asiatic Society G 4474/3
18. Calcutta, Asiatic Society G 2503/1
19. Calcutta, Asiatic Society G 4391
20. Cambridge, Trinity College Library R 15.85
21. Chandigarh, Lal Chand Research Library 2315
22. Ilāhābad, G. Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha 25398
23. Ilāhābad, G. Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha 8783/87
24. Ilāhābad, G. Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha 37089
25. Jaipur, Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum Museum 2068
26. Jaipur, Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum Museum 2069
27. Jaipur, Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum Museum 2561
28. Jammu, Raghunath Temple Library 3266
29. Jammu, Raghunath Temple Library 3209
30. Jammu, Raghunath Temple Library 3330

31. Jamnagar, Gujarat Ayurved University Library GAS 103
32. Jamnagar, Gujarat Ayurved University Library GAS 118
33. Jamnagar, Gujarat Ayurved University Library GAS 96/2
34. Jamnagar, Gujarat Ayurved University Library GAS 119
35. Koṭa, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute 1563
36. Kathmandu, Nepal German Manuscript Preservation Project E-40553
37. London, Indian Office Library, Sanskrit 335
38. London, Indian Office Library, Sanskrit 881
39. London, Indian Office Library, Sanskrit 1445b
40. Mysore, Oriental Research Institute 902 (107,6)
41. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 64
42. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 65
43. Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 68
44. Pune, Ānandāśrama 1546
45. Tübingen, Universität Bibliothek I.458
46. Tübingen, Universität Bibliothek I.459
47. Tübingen, Universität Bibliothek I.460
48. Tübingen, Universität Bibliothek I.474
49. Udaipur, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute 1474
50. Varanasi, Benares Hindu University, Gaekwada Library C3688
51. Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan 44842
52. Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan 44870
53. Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan 108824
54. Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan 108685

#### Notes and References

<sup>1</sup> The present research was funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) within the research project P19866, *Philosophy and Medicine in Early Classical India* 2, based at the University of Vienna, under the direction of Karin Preisendanz, with Philipp A. Maas and the present writer as collaborators. My gratitude also goes to the Arya Vaidya Pharmacy for its generous invitation to the Conference “The History of Medicine in India. Past and Present Theories and Practices in the Light of the Classical Textual Sources”, held in Coimbatore, 22 August 2008, where a previous version of the present paper was read.

<sup>2</sup> Paraphrase of Pasquali 1952: 123: “Il miglior critico di un testo greco di tradizione bizantina sarà quello che, oltre a essere un perfetto grecista, sia anche perfetto bizantinista. Il miglior editore di un autore latino trasmesso in codici medievali o postmedievali sarà colui che, quanto il suo autore e la sua lingua e i suoi tempi e la lingua dei suoi tempi, altrettanto bene conosca il Medioevo o l’umanesimo.” Pasquali adds that such an editor is an ideal that nobody can perfectly embody, but everyone

should strive to come close to it (“Un critico siffatto è un ideale che nessuno può incarnare in sé perfettamente, ma al quale ognuno ha il dovere di cercare di avvicinarsi.”)

<sup>3</sup> A classic work that exposes the processes by which Greek and Latin literature have been preserved and transmitted is Reynolds & Wilson 1991.

<sup>4</sup> See n. 1 and 10.

<sup>5</sup> The word “manuscript book” is used with reference to a set of sheets of paper, or other material, that is a text-bearer. No reference is made to the aspect of binding. Throughout the present paper, the word “manuscript” will be freely used in the sense of “manuscript book”.

<sup>6</sup> This will be the subject of a future publication.

<sup>7</sup> See Scherrer-Schaub & Bonani 2002: 186.

<sup>8</sup> In the field of indological studies, the discipline of the study of manuscripts as cultural artifacts is called, for some reason, “manuscriptology”, using a neologism (maybe on the basis of the German word *Handschriftkunde*?), instead of “codicology”, which is the existing current designation. The technical terminology of codicology has been fixed by Muzerelle in his 1985 major publication; its language is French, which, for historical reasons, is one of the main vehicular languages of the discipline. On the basis of Muzerelle’s work, a codicological vocabulary is being established in other languages.

<sup>9</sup> Colophons in Medioeval European texts have become since a long time a separate subject of study. This kind of analysis is also being developed in the field of Tibetan studies; more recently, see Clemente 2007. With regard to manuscripts containing Sanskrit texts, Banerjee 1987 provides some examples and related reflections. Most of them are repeated with slight changes in his 1991 article.

<sup>10</sup> The material to which I will refer in the following has been collected by Karin Preisendanz, Ernst Prets and Philipp A. Maas, for the research project P17300, *Philosophy and Medicine in Early Classical India* 1, funded by Austrian Science Fund (FWF); one manuscript was photographed by Yasutaka Muroya on behalf of the same project.

<sup>11</sup> They are the manuscripts GAS 103 and GAS 118.

<sup>12</sup> Jamnagar, Gujarat Ayurved University Library, GAS 113.

<sup>13</sup> In the present sentence, I have paraphrased, *mutatis mutandis*, a passage in Antonelli 1985: 145, in which the author shows the link between tradition, interpretation and textual criticism in the culture of Medieval Europe by referring to some sort of manual on textual criticism, written in the twelfth-century Rome. It is worth noting that the problematic of language and science, which is exposed by Pollock 2007 (especially pp. 209-215) with reference to early-modern India, is already a major subject in thirteenth-century Medieval European “countries” (“country” is used here for practical reasons, although the notion and distribution of countries in today’s Europe is very different from that of Medieval Europe).

<sup>14</sup> Pollock 2007: 204. See also Pollock 2001.

<sup>15</sup> Pollock 2002: 434.

<sup>16</sup> See Pasquali 1952: 39, n. 2.

<sup>17</sup> The concern for the loss of “Indian” knowledge appeared also more recently, in terms of loss of a system of knowledge, in Vatsyayan 2006, p. 56 in particular.

<sup>18</sup> Gough 1878: 8, in: “Minute by Major-General the Hon’ble Sir H. M. Durand, C.B., K.C.S.I., — dated Simla, the 13th August 1868”. I would like to thank Thomas Kintaert (University of Vienna), who provided me with this book.

<sup>19</sup> See Sarma 2001: 414f., and Patel & Kumar 2001: 10.

<sup>20</sup> Bandury & Gupta 2006: viii.

<sup>21</sup> Bhandarkar 1884: 83.

<sup>22</sup> Kathavate 1901.

<sup>23</sup> The names of the components of the editorial board are listed at pp. 1-2 of the first volume of the edition.

<sup>24</sup> See Pecchia forthcoming, § 6.3 and 6.4.

<sup>25</sup> See Patel & Kumar 2001: 5-7.

<sup>26</sup> For information about the Mahārājas dynasty, their literary activity and heritage, see the first section, “Literary Heritage of the Rulers of Amber and Jaipur”, in Bahura 1976.

<sup>27</sup> See Bahura 1976: 15-20 (first section). Bahura also reports that “it had been a practice among the princes and the potentates to store such objects [i.e., manuscripts and paintings] close by their bedrooms.” (ibidem, p. 15)

<sup>28</sup> See Bahura 1976: 3-130 (second section “An Index to the register of manuscripts in the Pothikhana of Jaipur – (i) Khas-mohor”), in which Bahura provides an alphabetical Index of the Sanskrit Works according to the Register of Manuscripts.

<sup>29</sup> See Bahura 1976: 15 and 37-42 (first section). For the genealogy of the rulers of Amber and Jaipur and their reigns, see Bahura 1976: 11.

<sup>30</sup> See Bahura 1976: 11, 16 and 42-45 (first section).

<sup>31</sup> See Bahura 1976: 16 (first section) and Plate VI.b.

<sup>32</sup> The reign is taken from Bahura 1976: 11. The date that is given in Stark 2007: 409, seems to put together Sawai Prthivi Singh’s and Sawai Pratap Singh’s reign.

<sup>33</sup> See Bahura 1976: 80 (first section), and Stark 2007: 409.

<sup>34</sup> Bahura 1976: 38 and 44 (first section), and Pingree 1997: 103.

<sup>35</sup> See Bahura 1976: 44 (first section) and Pingree 1997, *ibidem*.

<sup>36</sup> See Pingree 1997: 91. See Pingree 1997: 91-103 for a survey of Anup Singh's activity as collector of manuscripts, with special reference to those of *vyōtiṣa* texts.

<sup>37</sup> Pingree 1997: 103.

<sup>38</sup> Pingree 1997: 99.

<sup>39</sup> The manuscript corresponds to no. 555 of the 1875-76 list by Bühler (see Bühler 1877: xxxvi) and belongs to the Deccan College Collection; it is dated 1688 AD.

<sup>40</sup> For the general remarks contained in the following paragraphs, I mainly consulted Bühler 1960, in which the production of the European fifteenth-century book is under examination.

<sup>41</sup> See Filliozat 1941: xviii, Banerjee 1987: 76 and 1991: 10. For similar phrases in Medieval European books, see Bühler 1960: 21.

<sup>42</sup> Banerjee's interpretation of the copyist's intent in this *śloka* differs from the one I exposed. He says (1991: 10): "Here the copyist frankly admits that he is not always competent enough to discriminate between what is correct (*śuddha*) and what is incorrect (*aśuddha*) in the MSS. It appears that it was not possible for one to judge the correctness of the language of a MS with the content of which he was not always conversant."

<sup>43</sup> *saṃvat 1854 [.. .ke] vaiśāṣasūklapaṃcamī somabāre liṣitaṃ | tṛpāthī raghunātha saravāḍamadhye ||*

<sup>44</sup> From the same place another copyist comes: Pujārīgopālaḥ, who wrote the ms. preserved in Bikaner, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, no. 1564 (1799/1800 AD), containing the Cikitsasthāna only. On the basis of the colophons of these two Bikaner mss., we can say that, at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> cent., a place called Saravāḍa was a centre of the ms. production and the Carakasamhitā was one of the texts that were commissioned there.

<sup>45</sup> See Colas 1999: 31.

<sup>46</sup> This description of a type of learned copyist is a paraphrase from Pasquali 1952: 32, n. 1.

<sup>47</sup> It cannot be excluded that marginal notes contain information deriving from the oral tradition.

<sup>48</sup> See Timpanaro 1975 for some interesting considerations of the subject of the Freudian slip as applied to textual criticism.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Meulenbeld 1999, IB, p. 3.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antonelli 1985

Roberto Antonelli, "Interpretazione e critica del testo". In: Alberto Asor Rosa (ed.) *Letteratura italiana*, Vol. 4: *L'interpretazione*. Torino: Giulio Einaudi Editore, 1985; pp. 141-243.

Bahura 1976

Gopal Narayan Bahura, *Literary Heritage of the Rulers of Amber and Jaipur*. With an Index to the Register of Manuscripts in the Pothikhana of Jaipur (I. Khasmohor Collection). Jaipur: Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, City Palace, 1976.

- Bandury & Gupta 2006 Dalia Bandury and Brahmananda Gupta, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collection of the Asiatic Society*, Vol. XV, Āyurvedic Manuscripts, Part I, Compiled by Dalia Bandury, Edited with an Introduction and Index by Brahmananda Gupta. Bombay: The Asiatic Society, 2006.
- Banerjee 1987 Manabendu Banerjee, “On Some Interesting Post-colophon Statements of Sanskrit Manuscripts Preserved in the Asiatic Society Library”. In: S.K. Maity & Upendra Thakur (eds.), *Indological studies: Prof. D.C. Sircar commemoration volume*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications, 1987; pp. 75-80.
- Banerjee 1991 Manabendu Banerjee, “On Some Copyists of Sanskrit Manuscripts”. *Journal of the Asiatic Society* 33 (1991): 1-14.
- Bhandarkar 1884 Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar, Report on the Search for Sanskrit Mss. in the Bombay Presidency during the years 1882-83. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1884.
- Bühler 1877 Georg Bühler, *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Mss. Made in Kaśmîr, Rajputana, and Central India*. - Extra Number of the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Bombay: Society’s Library, and London: Trübner & Co., 1877.
- Bühler 1960 Curt Ferdinand Bühler, *The Fifteenth Century Book*. The Scribes, the Printers, the Decorators. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1960.
- CaS *Carakasamhitā*
- CaS<sub>Jam</sub> *The Caraka Samhitā*. Expounded by the worshipful Ātreya Punarvasu, compiled by the great sage Agniveśa and redacted by Caraka & Dṛḍhabala. Ed. and transl. in Hindi, Gujarati and English Shree Ġulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society. Jamnagar 1949.
- Clemente 2007 Michela Clemente, “Colophons as Sources: Historical Information from Some Brag dkar rta so Xylographies”. *Rivista di Studi Sudasiatici* 2 (2007): 121-158.
- Colas 1999 Gérard Colas, “The Criticism and Transmission of Texts in Classical India”. *Diogenes* 47/2 (1999): 30-43.
- Filliozat 1941 Jean Filliozat, *Catalogue du fonds sanscrit* [Bibliothèque Nationale], Fasc. I, Paris.

- Gough 1878 Archibald Edward Gough (ed.), *Papers relating to the Collection and Preservation of the Records of Ancient Sanskrit Literature in India*. Calcutta: Office of Superintendent of Government Printing, 1878.
- Kathavate 1901 Abaji Vishnu Kathavate, *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency during the Years 1891/92-1894/95*. Bombay, 1901.
- Meulenbeld 1999 G. Jan Meulenbeld, *A History of Indian Medical History*. Vol IB, Annotation. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1999.
- Muzerelle 1985 Denis Muzerelle, *Vocabulaire codicologique: répertoire méthodique des termes français relatifs aux manuscrits*. Paris: Editions CEMI, 1985. Also available in a multilingual version on the Internet: [http:// vocabulaire.irht.cnrs.fr/pages/vocab1.htm](http://vocabulaire.irht.cnrs.fr/pages/vocab1.htm)
- Pasquali 1952 Giorgio Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. Firenze: Le Monnier, <sup>2</sup>1952 (1st ed. 1934).
- Patel & Kumar 2001 Jashu Patel and Krishan Kumar, *Libraries and Librarianship in India*. Westport, Conn., and London: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Pecchia forthcoming Cristina Pecchia, "Transmission-specific (In)utility, or Dealing with Contamination: Samples from the Textual Tradition of the Carakasamhitā." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 52, forthcoming.
- Pingree 1997 David Edwin Pingree, *From Astral Omens to Astrology. From Babylon to Bīkāner*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 1997.
- Pollock 2001 Sheldon Pollock, "New Intellectuals in Seventeenth-Century India". *Economic and Social History Review* 38/1 (2001): 3-31.
- Pollock 2002 Sheldon Pollock, "Introduction: Working Papers on Sanskrit Knowledge-Systems on the Eve of Colonialism". *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 30 (2002): 431-439.
- Pollock 2007 Sheldon Pollock, "The Language of Science in Early-Modern India". In: Karin Preisendanz (ed.), *Expanding and Merging Horizons*. Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007; pp. 203-220.

- Reynolds & Wilson 1991      Leighton D. Reynolds and Nigel G. Wilson: *Scribes and Scholars*. A guide to the transmission of Greek and Latin literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press, <sup>3</sup>1991 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1968).
- Sarma 2001      K.V. Sarma, “Manuscripts Repositories in India: An Analytical Survey”. In: François Grimal (ed.), *Les sources et le temps*. Sources and Time. A colloquium, Pondicherry 11-13 January 1997. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry, École française d’Extrême-Orient, 2001; 413-417.
- Scherrer-Schaub & Bonani 2002      Cristina A. Scherrer-Schaub, George Bonani, “Establishing a Typology of the Old Tibetan Manuscripts: A Multidisciplinary Approach”. In: Susan Whitfield (ed.), *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*. London: The British Library, 2002; pp. 184-215.
- Stark 2007      Ulrike Stark, *An Empire of Books*. The Naval Kishore Press and the Diffusion of the Printed Word in Colonial India, 1858-1895. New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2007.
- Timpanaro 1975      Sebastiano Timpanaro, “The Freudian Slip”. *New Left Review* I, May-June 91 (1975): 43-56 (Translation by John Matthews; the article presents an abridged version of two chapters from: Sebastiano Timpanaro, *Il lapsus freudiano*: Psicanalisi e critica testuale. Firenze: La nuova Italia 1974.)
- Vatsyayan 2006      Kapila Vatsyayan, “Is the Unpublished Manuscript Heritage of India Relevant to Contemporary Academia?” In: Sudha Gopalakrishnan (ed.), *Tattvabodha*. Essays from the Lecture Series of the National Mission for Manuscripts. Vol. I. Delhi: National Mission for Manuscripts & Munshiram Manoharlal, 2006; pp.48-56.
- Vim.      *Vimānasthāna*