

With the Eye of a Scholar and the Insight of a Physician:

Gangadhar Ray Kaviraj and the Carakasamhitā

CRISTINA PECCHIA

University of Vienna and Austrian Academy of Sciences

This essay presents a study of Gangadhar Ray Kaviraj’s philological work on the *Carakasamhitā*, the oldest Ayurvedic text. Gangadhar Ray (1798–1885) was the editor of the first printed edition of (part of) the *Carakasamhitā*, which appeared in 1868 in Calcutta and seemingly became the basis of several successive editions of the text. Gangadhar was a Kaviraj, as specialists of Ayurveda were and still are called in Bengal. He was famous for his medical ability especially in pulse diagnostics and for being a polymath who authored Sanskrit works and commentaries on ancient texts of the Sanskritic culture. His popularity can be inferred from the number of invariably laudatory articles about him, which depict him as a follower of Śaiva Tantrism and a fervent supporter of traditionalist Hindu views averse to the changes that at his time were occurring in Ayurveda. His edition of the *Carakasamhitā* and commentary on it, the *Jalpakaḷpataru*, can be counted among the important achievements of his scholarly life. This essay analyses and reflects on Gangadhar’s philological activity concerning the *Carakasamhitā*, especially as regards his edition of the text, which also represents a piece of traditional scholarship from 19th century South Asia. In the absence of documentary evidence, we will mainly be analysing the text of the *Carakasamhitā* transmitted in manuscripts and printed books associated with Gangadhar’s name. I hope it will be fascinating to examine what variants can reveal about philological practice centred on the transmission of Sanskrit texts, to explore the context made up of texts – in Ganeri’s words the “intertextual context”¹ – that actors involved in this transmission inhabited, and to reflect on the larger topic of philology² in colonial South Asia as a chapter of Indian intellectual history.

¹ Ganeri 2008: 554. The author elaborates on Q. Skinner’s methodology for the study of intellectual cultures, which presupposes contextualizing a text in order to understand “the nature of the illocutionary intervention the document embodies” (ibid., p. 553).

² Following S. Pollock’s definition (2009: 934 and 949), the term ‘philology’ is here used to indicate practices employed in “making sense of texts”.

How to study Gangadhar's philological practice

Remarks on the documents

In both pre-modern and modern South Asia, information on the philological practices followed when establishing and interpreting Sanskrit texts is notoriously scarce. Even more generally true, the record regarding intellectuals of Sanskritic culture is “a virtual blank” (Pollock 2008: 537). Historians of philology in South Asia have to look for evidence in the available texts themselves. The interpretative framework provided for texts in commentarial works, which is so typical of South Asian culture, can offer further important insights into commentators' philological attitudes. Indeed, an understanding of Gangadhar's philological activity can be gained through an examination of the *Jalpakaḷpataru* (henceforth JKT), his lengthy commentary on the *Carakasamhitā* (hereafter CaS). Moreover, the intertextual context that emerges by comparing different versions of a specific text can reveal contours of the philological practice behind a particular text version. However, in the case of Gangadhar's edition of the CaS, identifying terms of comparison for a reconstruction of this kind of intertextual context is not as straightforward as one might assume or wish.

Gangadhar's printed editions of the Carakasamhitā

As regards the printed editions of the CaS, three such are linked to Gangadhar's name.³ All of them comprise the CaS and Gangadhar's JKT. The first edition, which corresponds to the first appearance of the CaS in print, was published in samvat 1925 (1868/69 CE) by the Samvada Jnanaratnakara Press, based in Calcutta (hereafter C_{SJ}). It seems that this edition remained incomplete. Between samvat 1935 and 1937 (1878-1880 CE) Gangadhar's son, Dharanidhar Ray, republished (or perhaps to some extent continued to publish) both the CaS and the JKT at the Pramada Bhanjana Press in Saidabad (hereafter S_{PBh}). Starting from 1908, Tryambakeshvar Ray, Gangadhar's grandson, published another edition in Saidabad and Calcutta at the Kanika Press and the Siddheshvar Machine Press, respectively. This edition, however, is a version of the text revised by three former students of Gangadhar, namely Dwarak Nath Sen, Rajendra Narayan Sen, and Yogindra Nath Sen. As such, it is not relevant to our investigation.

Neither the C_{SJ} edition nor the S_{PBh} edition available at the British Library (where I consulted them) contains the complete text of the CaS and JKT; therefore, neither can be considered the *editio princeps* of the entire CaS. Since, as usual at the time for voluminous works, both editions were published serially in fascicles, their incompleteness may be reflected in the similar incompleteness of

³ Pecchia 2022, § 2.1 and Appendix I.

the total number of fascicles preserved at the British Library vis-à-vis the actual extent of the published texts. As regards the section of the CaS called Vimānasthāna, from which the data analysed below are taken, it first appears in the S_{PBh} edition, in a fascicle published in samvat 1935. This date probably corresponds to 1879 CE, because the June 1879 issue of the *Records in the Bengal Library* (p. 56, No. 12) refers to the publication of fascicles that seem to cover the chapter preceding the Vimānasthāna, namely the Nidānasthāna. As things now stand, it can be assumed that the S_{PBh} publication of the Vimānasthāna faithfully reproduces Gangadhar's edition of the text, either as the first printed version or as a reproduction of the previous version in C_{SJ}. This assumption entails another assumption, namely that the staff of the second publishing house did not insert changes, whether intentional or not, into the S_{PBh} edition – changes that in the absence of documentary evidence remain invisible.⁴ It is with these caveats in mind that we treat the Vimānasthāna in S_{PBh} as the first printed version of Gangadhar's edition of the section.

Manuscripts

The witnesses that chronologically precede Gangadhar's edition of the Vimānasthāna are in principle all fifty-three manuscripts that, to date, contain this text. An analysis of the manuscripts and the collated variants⁵ has shown that, first, Gangadhar himself partially copied the manuscript Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan Library, cat. no. 108824 (hereafter V2); more particularly, he copied the Nidānasthāna and Vimānasthāna, as stated in the respective colophons to both, and completed the task in 1839. Second, the text of V2 mainly agrees with the text of a group of manuscripts preserved in repositories located in the north-eastern region of South Asia.⁶ Third, there are manuscripts belonging to a period later than the 1868 or 1879 printed editions. Since their texts do not seem to attest the influence of any different earlier version of the CaS, their readings appear to have no added relevance beyond the sources that Gangadhar possibly used for his edition.

The first point, namely that one of the manuscripts was partially copied by Gangadhar, is especially relevant to our study. It shows that printed editions are not the only witnesses of Gangadhar's editorial activity devoted to the CaS. Manuscript V2 indeed opens up the question of the scope of the phrase "Gangadhar's edition of the CaS". Since the Vimānasthāna attested in V2 is not a derivative copy of

⁴ Pecchia 2015: 90-2 examines the case of the printed editions of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* together with Manorathanandin's commentary.

⁵ The data were collected in the FWF projects "Philosophy and Medicine in Early Classical India" I-III (2006-2012). For an overview of the manuscripts see Pecchia 2009 and 2010: 136-7.

⁶ See the *stemma codicum* of CaS, Vimānasthāna 8 in Maas 2010: 65.

any extant witness and was written in 1839 (thus long before the printed publication of Gangadhar's CaS), it should be considered Gangadhar's first edition of part of the CaS. The second point, namely that the text of V2 mainly agrees with a specific group of manuscripts, shows that Gangadhar's CaS was by and large the version that circulated in the region where he lived, and he did not use or even know other versions. The third point, namely the existence of manuscripts that were copied later than C_{SI} or S_{PBH} editions, exemplifies the well-known fluid boundaries between the production of manuscripts and that of printed books especially right after the diffusion of print technology,⁷ which in South Asia occurred starting in the late 18th century and continuing on into the 19th century. Among these late manuscripts, the copy kept in Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan Library, cat. no. 108685 (= V3), in Bengali script, agrees even in minute details with Gangadhar's first edition, namely V2, and seems to closely follow the CaS as recorded in the JKT. It was copied in 1875/1876 CE, thus after the first Calcutta edition, but before the Saidabad edition. The undated manuscript from Mysore, Oriental Research Institute 902 (= Mys), in Kannada script, presents readings that are only attested in printed editions, Gangadhar's edition being the oldest one among them. It seems safe to say that the Mys readings directly or indirectly derive from Gangadhar's printed editions. Therefore, we do not need to take into account V3 and Mys when assessing Gangadhar's philology.

Remarks on the methodology

One way to assess the modalities of Gangadhar's philological practice is to analyse innovations in his edition of the CaS. In view of the features of the documents described so far, we will examine readings attested in V2 and S_{PBH} or in one of the two, but lacking in all other witnesses that chronologically precede them. Since both V2 and S_{PBH} are Gangadhar's editions, we also need to discern commonalities and differences between the two text versions. Therefore, we have a set of data (A) that displays agreements in innovation⁸ between V2 and S_{PBH}, and another set of data (B) shows all

⁷ Bühler 1960 first examined the overlapping technologies of the written in Europe even two centuries after the advent of print.

⁸ They "characterize a specific constellation of manuscripts by being present in them and at the same time lacking in all the other manuscripts" and indicate variant readings "from the perspective of any point of the textual tradition" (Pecchia 2010: 128 and n. 33), with no reference to diachronic features that the word "innovation" might suggest.

innovations in S_{PBh}. The two sets corresponds to two segments⁹ of CaS, Vimānasthāna chapter 8 (= Vimāna 8); reference is made to the numeration of paragraphs according to Trikamji's edition from 1941. Segment A is Vimāna 8.1-15, which is made up of approximately 900 words and presents 12 cases of agreements in innovation. It is about choosing a medical career and medical education; it explains rules and attitudes of a teacher of Ayurveda, the ritual initiation of a student of Ayurveda, and forms of debate, all of which are aspects of the medical practice and, as such, of medical education. Segment B is Vimāna 8.25-66, which consists of approximately 1,665 words and displays 43 innovations. It delivers a compact treatment of the *vādamārga*, or 'course of disputation', where the forty-four technical terms (*padas*) concerning the procedures of a formal disputation (*vāda*) are explained.¹⁰

Innovations in V2 and S_{PBh} can in principle be considered "Gangadhar's innovations", and, as such, readings that convey information about his understanding of the text and his philological activity. As a heuristic tool, the label "Gangadhar's innovations" can be applied during the analysis of variant readings in his editions. However, such innovations do not necessarily attach to him personally, inasmuch as they may reflect not only (a) Gangadhar's personal reading of the text, but also (b) written sources that were accessible to him and are no longer available, or (c) an oral tradition in which Gangadhar was a living link and that is not attested otherwise. Moreover, innovations in the S_{PBh} printed edition may for their part display (d) interventions of the publisher or persons linked to him, which is an important, if totally undocumented, additional source.

As observed many years ago by L. Rocher (1994: 3f.), the question of oral transmission *versus* written transmission in South Asia is quite complex, the factors at work being "different for different branches of the extensive literary legacy of classical India." In the case of Ayurveda, aspects of traditional education and the related transmission of texts¹¹ make it probable that the impact of oral sources on a text's transmission was as determinant as the impact of personal interpretation.

⁹ The term "segment" is here adopted in the meaning suggested by Jean-Michel Adam of "textual blocks that result from the cutting of discursive material and can be immediately perceived through vision and reading" (Bretelle-Establet and Schmitt 2018: 7).

¹⁰ Vidyabhushan 1921: 31-35. Preisendanz 2013 analyses Vidyabhushan's assessment of this section in the history of Indian philosophy (pp. 69-73, 76-78, and 122) and offers a detailed analysis of Vidyabhushan's view. Pecchia 2021 discusses the history of the transmission of the section as displayed by its text divisions.

¹¹ See, for example, Scharfe 2002: 258-262 (and more generally Chapters 2, 12, and 14-15), and Cerulli 2018.

Gangadhar's personal interpretations of the text may be more clearly visible in his JKT, a commentary, that is, a genre that traditionally offered legitimate space for expressing one's own understanding and knowledge of a text. In view of this, the test of Gangadhar's reading of the CaS requires first comparing his edition with his commentary, and secondly both of them with other attested versions of the CaS. With regard to the S_{PBh} text, we need to further specify that Gangadhar edited it much later than V2; therefore, "the personal" corresponds to Gangadhar's understanding of the text after his life-long engagement with it, which was made even more intense by his composition of a vast commentary on it.

What variants reveal

We now turn to analysing the data in order to focus on innovations in Gangadhar's editions. The record shows innovations that consist in:

- (a) simplification of expression
- (b) addition of words
- (c) specific lexical choices
- (d) grammatical changes
- (e) interpretative semantic choices, here including the textual sequence

In general, these readings seemingly aim to provide the text with a suitable style and to facilitate a comprehension of the assumed meaning through clarification and simplification of certain expressions. Innovations of type **(d)** and **(e)** represent a more significant interpretative act and, unlike the other types of readings, generate a different meaning of the passage in question. A simplification of the text is obtained by eliminating a connecting word, namely *ca* and *tatra*, or a structuring element as *iti* (type **a**). Furthermore, single words that were presumably considered redundant have been eliminated (e.g. S_{PBh} reads *santy upāyāḥ* instead of *santi siddhyupāyāḥ*). Among the readings of type **(b)**, the additions seem to reflect the editor's wish to bring clarity to the structure of the text. Semantic clarity by contrast motivated readings of type **(c)**, as in the case of *vikārāṇām* added to *sādhyānām* in V2, which was changed into *vyādhīnām* in S_{PBh} . Individual lexical choices such as *avagamyā* vs. *adhigamyā* and $^{\circ}dākṣiṇyopapannam$ vs. $^{\circ}prādakṣiṇyopapannam$ may reflect the editor's expectations about the text or simply his taste. The same may be true of the list of beings to whom one should pay homage, which Gangadhar must have considered incomplete because V2 additionally has the term *ṛṣi* (type **b**). The reading *atyantam* vs. *atyartham* may reflect expectations of the editor's times or derive from an individual interpretation of the *akṣara* "rtha" (possibly blurred in the available exemplar). All cases in segment B in principle indicate similar types of changes, but the agency may be different. For, in being at variance with readings in V2, innovations in S_{PBh} such as *upamānam* vs.

aupamyam, *sambhave* vs. *sadbhāve* or *maryādā* vs. *mārga* may indicate how not only an older Gangadhar but also the publisher adopted the text.

A special type of interpretative choice concerns the sequence of some text segments which in *S_{PBh}*, while sometimes in agreement with V2, is at odds with the sequence in previous attested versions. This difference by no means always consists in mere transpositions of text from one place to another. In one case, the transposed text exhibits further changes: V2 and *S_{PBh}* agree on an altered text sequence and on the innovation *ca* vs. *ceti*, which precedes the passage. However, they differ as regards the rest of the text because they respectively read *etāni hy antareṇa na prakṛto* and *naitāni vinā prakṛto*. In another passage, as noted by E. Prets (2010: 69f. and 75f.), the manuscript witnesses have the explanation of *dr̥ṣṭānta* (‘generally acknowledged matters’) between the segments on *uttara* and *siddhānta* (‘reply’ and ‘fixed position’, *Vimāna* 8.36-37). By contrast, *S_{PBh}* has it between the segments on *hetu* and *upanaya* (‘statement of proof’ and ‘application’, *Vimāna* 8.33 and 35). The position of the segment on *dr̥ṣṭānta* between the segments on *hetu* and *upanaya* recalls the position of *udāharana* (‘exemplification’) in the *Nyāyasūtra* and *Nyāyabhāṣya*,¹² and may hint at an editorial attempt to have this sequence of topics in the CaS agreeing with the classical Nyāya order.

Another case in point concerns the order of textual segments that illustrate epistemological technical terms. The sequence of *śabda*, *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna*, *aitihya*, and *aupamya* (i.e. verbal testimony, sense perception, inference, oral tradition, and analogy), which corresponds to *Vimāna* 8.38-42 in Trikamji’s edition,¹³ is attested in V2, V3, and the manuscript from Cambridge, Trinity College Library, R 15.85 (= Ca).¹⁴ However, all other manuscripts of the CaS record these segments according to another order, namely *śabda*, *pratyakṣa*, *aupamya*, *aitihya*, and *anumāna*, which is peculiar of the CaS and is not attested in any other classical *śāstras*.¹⁵ It is thus plausible that Gangadhar along with the editors of Ca and V3 wished to harmonize epistemological contents of the CaS with the ancient Indian philosophical discourse, especially as represented by the classical Nyāya tradition. Indeed, except for *śabda*, a sequence of terms similar to that in Ca, V2 and V3 is found in *Vimāna* 8.33, where the causes (*hetus*) that constitute the sources of knowledge are listed. This list echoes *Nyāyasūtra* I.1.3, where the means of valid cognition are “*pratyakṣānumānopamānaśabdāḥ*”.

¹² See Preisendanz 2013: 86-90.

¹³ See Kang 2007 and Preisendanz 2013: 81f. and 106-123.

¹⁴ At the end of the passage concerning *anumāna*, the manuscripts V2, V3, and My read *grahaṇenety*. Ca instead reads *grahaṇenendriyāṇīty*, in agreement with the rest of the manuscript evidence.

¹⁵ Prets 2010: 69f. and 75f.

Gangadhar's S_{PBh} seems to reinforce the resemblance between the CaS and the *Nyāyasūtra* by changing *aupamya* to *upamāna*.

Numerals

A peculiarity that characterizes most of the early printed editions in South Asia is the text layout, with text division as one of the important tools adopted by printer-publishers. Numerals that mark textual divisions within the main body of the text do appear in Indic manuscripts from early periods, but they are conspicuously absent in the manuscripts bearing the CaS. Therefore, it is all the more notable that V2 as well as V3, Ca and My display sequential numerals in the section on *vādamārga*. The oldest manuscript is definitely Ca (ca. 1780). It should also be noted that since Ca is in Bengali script, it was very likely produced in the same region as V2 and V3. Considering that, in general, the numbering of textual divisions makes the text more easily accessible to readers, a concern for clarity¹⁶ may have prompted Gangadhar to adopt numerals in the *vādamārga* section reproduced in V2, after the examples offered by manuscript books (of which Ca is one such) and printed books that circulated in Bengal during his time. With regard to his printed edition of the CaS, which includes the JKT, numerals are not limited to the *vādamārga* section, but run throughout the entire book, with each page displaying short segments of the two texts one after the other and closed by a sequential numeral. It should be noted that this massive text segmentation and numeration may not be due to Gangadhar himself but to the publisher.

An instance of cautious philology

CaS Vimāna 8.15 illustrates a debate among expert physicians – a professional debate, that is. The final part of this segment reads as follows in Trikamji's edition:

āsrutam api ca kaṃcid arthaṃ śrotraviṣayam āpādayati, yac cācāryaḥ śiṣyāya śuśrūṣave prasannaḥ krameṇopadiśati guhyābhimatam arthajātaṃ tat paraspareṇa saha jalpan piṇḍena vijigīṣur āha saṃharṣāt (CaS, Vimāna 8.15)

Also, it [i.e. a professional debate] enables one to listen to certain subject matter not heard/learnt before – even the sort of matters regarded as secret that a well-disposed teacher gradually explains to a student desirous to learn; in one's excitement, one who is desirous of victory articulates [them] in a nutshell while disputing with another.

¹⁶ See Dionísio 2005: 94 with regard to text divisions as auxiliary devices connected with “the rhetorical ideal of *claritas*” in the case of the 15th century humanist Alfonso de Cartagena's translations of Latin texts into Castilian.

This passage contains some important indications about how Ayurvedic knowledge was transmitted. As Gangadhar explains in his commentary, *aśrutam* means *gurumukhād aśrutam*,¹⁷ ‘what was not heard/learnt from the mouth of the teacher’ – which refers to content specifically taught by a teacher and to the oral nature of its transmission. The following sentence (*yac cācāryaḥ* etc.) illustrates the special value of those not-yet-learnt teachings. The conjunction *ca* here announces a specification and adds emphasis to what is going to be said (that is why I have rendered it with an emphatic ‘even’). Far from ordinary content, such teachings reveal secret matters (*guhyābhimatam*), which in modern terms we might call a teacher’s “know-how” and “intellectual property”.¹⁸ As the text suggests, such content was imparted to students within a teaching setting and was not supposed to be shared with the rest of the community. In fact, it was only taught to special students by teachers who were favourably disposed to them, who had adequate pedagogical skills, and who could explain special matter at hand step by step (*kramena*). Thus what was transmitted corresponded to a special expertise that a physician inherited from his teacher and that, to go beyond the text’s actual words, probably represented a distinct trademark, as it were, both within the Ayurvedic community and when competing for patients. Driven by the desire to win a debate, a debater might even briefly reveal secret matters of the kind that one slowly imbibes while sitting in front of the teacher. That the competitor of the ‘one who is desirous of victory’ (*vijigīṣur*) may have been another physician engaged in debate is supported by some manuscripts which add *bhiṣag*.¹⁹ Other modern translations, though, make of the ‘one who is desirous of victory’ a teacher.²⁰ However, this insertion of a scene with teachers and disciples would shift the focus away from what I believe to be more likely a specific debate setting involving one’s peers wherein the pact between teacher and student no longer applies. Specialized knowledge received through a teacher’s instruction comes with the proviso of its non-shareability outside the circle of students. It is this knowledge that gives the professional an advantage over his colleagues in a professional context. The passage shows how the professional setting and the educational one stand in stark contrast to one another as regards the management of knowledge: one’s

¹⁷ JKT III: 1556.12.

¹⁸ S. Vidyabhusan’s rendering “precious mystic doctrines” (1921: 29) suggests a religious dimension of these Ayurvedic teachings – which seems to reflect an early 20th century tendency to identify religious features in non-religious knowledge systems of South Asia.

¹⁹ This interpretation is reflected in Dasgupta 1932: 378, Frauwallner 1984: 68, and Scharfe 2002: 287, n. 63.

²⁰ Kang 2003: 49-54 (with parallels to *Nyāyasūtra* IV.2.47-48), Nicholson 2010: 81, and Wujastyk 2012: 107. Their interpretation of the passage is then quite different.

own special knowledge should not be shared, but it might be the best card to play in a debate, which, as part of the broader professional context, spurs the wish to make one's own specific competence public. Whether driven by excitement (*saṃharṣāt*) or, as attested in other witnesses, a sense of rivalry (*saṃgharṣāt*), a debater might play that card and inadvertently offer to the other debater the opportunity to learn something that normally would not be shared.

On the reading piṇḍena

The way in which one might end up revealing things that should not be shared is described in different ways in the textual witnesses, from *piṇḍena* ('in a nutshell')²¹ to *paṇḍena*, *paṇḍitena*, *apaṇḍitena*, and *vitaṇḍena*. To say something 'in a nutshell' is quite adequate for debate purposes, where new subject matter can hardly be expounded in full. In the present case, of course, it should not have been explained at all. Indeed, most manuscript and printed books of CaS Vimāna 8 present *piṇḍena*, which is also confirmed in Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā* (end of the 11th century), the explanation there being *sāroddhāreṇa*, 'by extracting the essence' (p. 264b, ll. 4-5).

Gangadhar's editions present *paṇḍena*, which is an instrumental from *paṇḍa*, 'eunuch'.²² This reading can be dismissed as a meaningless misspelling that was then reproduced in print. However, the JKT, too, displays *paṇḍena* and adds an explanation of it (JKT III: 1556.12):

yac cārthaṃ paṇḍena svapāṇḍityaparakāśanena vijigīsur vijetum icchur āha.

One who is desirous of victory, one who wishes to win, **eruditely**, [i.e.] making one's learning public, **articulates even that** subject matter.

The compound *svapāṇḍityaparakāśanena* suggests that Gangadhar understood *paṇḍena* as related to *paṇḍā* ('learning') and *paṇḍita* ('learned' or 'learned person'), and so to *paṇḍitena*, 'eruditely'; hence, my translation 'eruditely' for *paṇḍena*. The copyist of V3 took *paṇḍena* so seriously that he corrected *piṇḍena* to *paṇḍena*, and Trikamji's edition presents Gangadhar's variant in a footnote on *piṇḍena*. It cannot be excluded that *paṇḍena* was understood as *paṇḍitena* in 19th century Bengal, but it may well be the case that *paṇḍena* was repeated simply because Gangadhar provided a comment on it, that is, on the weight of his authority. In fact, Gangadhar's comment *svapāṇḍityaparakāśanena* seems to presuppose the reading *paṇḍitena*, which is indeed attested in manuscripts from Bengal. It is therefore quite likely that Gangadhar's explanation was common in his region.

²¹ Nicholson 2010: 81, n. 38, renders *piṇḍena* with "in full". However, *piṇḍa* does not seem to be attested in this meaning.

²² The etymologies *paṇḍita* and *paṇḍa* are quite different (Wezler 1998: 268).

As shown by the Pune manuscript, here called P1 (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 555 of 1875-76, from Bühler 1877, p. xxxvi), an editor corrected what is now illegible text to *apaṇḍitena*, interpreting the passage as ‘... one who is desirous of victory *foolishly* says...’. This reading was seemingly an attempt to improve on *paṇḍitena*, which a reader could find problematic in the context that the passage describes. The sequence of *akṣaras* that form *jalpan paṇḍitena* might have supported this alternative interpretation because ‘*n*’ in *jalpan* could be written in three different ways, namely with or without *virāma* (*ja-lpa-n** or *ja-lpa-n^a*), or in a ligature combining ‘*n*’ and ‘*pa*’ (*ja-lpa-npa*). It is easy to imagine that in the first two cases the *akṣara* for ‘*n*’ (be it *n** or *n^a*) was interpreted as ‘*na*’ and ‘*a*’ was ascribed to the following word, forming *apaṇḍitena*. In the case of ‘*n*’ with *virāma*, the *virāma* could have been dropped, blurred, or even considered an error.

The reading *vitamḍena* (which appears in this way in the manuscripts) conjures up *viṭaṇḍā* (‘captious argumentation’). It has all the markings of an educated guess of an editor who, in view of the general context and the preceding *jalpan*, could have recollected a subsequent segment of the CaS (Vimāna 8.28) where debate is said to be of two types, namely *jalpa* and *viṭaṇḍā* (‘disputation and captious argumentation’), or a passage from the *Nyāyasūtra* where *jalpa* and *viṭaṇḍā* are referred to as determining and protecting what is real.²³ In any event, the reading *vitamḍena*, probably meant in the sense ‘with a captious argument’, cannot derive from the feminine noun *viṭaṇḍā*. The meaning of the masculine *viṭaṇḍa* (a sort of lock or bolt) can obviously not be extended into any metaphorical usage in the context of the sentence. Considering the different scripts in which the text was copied and possible alternative interpretations of *akṣaras* owing to the copyist’s specific writing systems, *vitamḍena* is only apparently distant from *piṇḍena*. In fact, it may have resulted from an attempt to interpret a sequence such as *pipamḍena*, which includes *pi* from *piṇḍena* and *pa* from *paṇḍena*, with *pi* being a correction of the immediately following *pa*.

The readings *piṇḍena*, *paṇḍitena*, and *apaṇḍitena* (‘in a nutshell’, ‘eruditely’, and ‘foolishly’) are in principle all acceptable. However, *piṇḍena* not only matches quite well the context; it is also a *lectio difficilior*, in being, in this passage, a far more unexpected word than *paṇḍita* and, arguably, far less familiar in the metaphorical usage wrung from it. Though well-known from the ritual context with the meaning of ‘ball’ (normally made of rice or other edible substances), the metaphorical extension of *piṇḍa* to other subject matters was typical of Buddhist Sanskrit. The compound

²³ *Nyāyasūtra* IV 2.50: *tattvādhyavasāyasamrakṣaṇārthaṃ jalpaviṭaṇḍe*. Kang (2003: 36) has suggested the interpretation ‘protecting the determination of the truth’ (“Beschützen der Feststellung der Wahrheit”). This implies taking °*adhyavasāyasamrakṣaṇa*° as governed by a *tatpuruṣa*-relation rather than by a *dvandva*-relation, as other interpreters (whom I follow) did.

piṇḍārtha, for example, formed titles of works that provided the essential meaning of other works by summarizing their texts (e.g. *Prajñāpāramitā-piṇḍārtha*), and was a technical term of a commentarial practice described in Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*.²⁴ The disappearance of Buddhist institutions in South Asia and the related loss of familiarity with Buddhist texts may have led to the obsolescence of *piṇḍa*'s metaphorical meaning. Therefore, it would be hard to prove that *paṇḍitena* became corrupted to *paṇḍena*, which an editor emended to *piṇḍena*. By contrast, especially in a passage whose syntax is not as neutral and straightforward as the rest of the paragraph, the reading *paṇḍena* may have prompted an editor to associate the word with *paṇḍā* and emend the text to *paṇḍitena*, whose meaning is intuitively suitable to the context, but, after careful reading, problematic – as confirmed by the alternative *apaṇḍitena*.

If all this is true, *paṇḍitena*, *apaṇḍitena*, and *viṭaṇḍena* are all evidence supporting the appearance of a corrupt reading *paṇḍena* from *piṇḍena*, Gangadhar's V2 being the only manuscript witness that attests the corruption. This reveals two important aspects of Gangadhar's philological activity, namely his clear distinction between text and interpretation of the *Carakasamhitā*, and his cautious (one might also say, respectful) philological approach to the received text. The results are the preservation of the reading *paṇḍena* attested in his witness(es) of the text and the formulation of a meaningful interpretation of it that likely reflected a traditional understanding of the passage passed on to him through education. This understanding was probably typical of the eastern part of South Asia since it is attested in a Calcutta manuscript (Library of Calcutta, Sanskrit College 23) and in a Varanasi manuscript (Sarasvati Bhavan Library, 44842).

These considerations have consequences for our assessment of Gangadhar's V2 as a witness of the CaS. Even though it is a quite recent manuscript (Gangadhar wrote parts of it in 1839), it might at least partially reflect the testimony of a no longer extant exemplar, and thus represent the case of a *recentior non deterior* witness, namely a manuscript that offers recent testimony to the text, but not necessarily worse such than that attested in older witnesses.²⁵ V2's readings, then, might prove helpful in reconstructing a stage of the transmission prior to the stage attested in representative manuscripts of the family to which V2 belongs. At any rate, Gangadhar's editions of the CaS and the JKT demonstrate the importance of the work of 19th-century Indian scholars in transmitting the testimony

²⁴ For some remarks, see Kano 2016: 234f. with n. 93 and, on Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*, Verhagen 2005: 574f. and 580f.

²⁵ Pasquali 1952, ch. 4, "Recentiores, non deteriores. Collazioni umanistiche ed editiones principes."

of old manuscripts and the inherited ancient tradition, both being integral parts of the conditions in which they performed their scholarly activity.

Another fact that emerges from the present analysis is the divergence between the text of the CaS in Gangadhar's editions and as reflected in Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*. R. Hoernle (1908: 1000-1) observed this divergence long ago, notably as regards the sequence of chapters in the *Cikitsāsthāna*. Our minor case shows that, while reflecting on a reading as *paṇḍena*, Gangadhar along with editors from the end of the 17th century did not resort to a meaningful commentarial explanation such as Cakrapāṇidatta's, which could have prompted them to emend the text to *piṇḍena*. The reason for this is arguably that they simply did not have access to the *Āyurvedadīpikā* – which raises the question of the status and actual circulation of Cakrapāṇidatta's commentary within the dynamics of the migration of Ayurvedic knowledge over the centuries.²⁶

Contextualizing: The intertextual landscape

Our remarks on Gangadhar's philological work have so far focused on data deriving from his editions of the CaS and the other witnesses of the text. The segments analysed above are a drop in the ocean when compared with the length of the CaS and the JKT. Nevertheless, the intertextual context of the CaS, namely the different versions of it transmitted in the extant manuscripts, makes it possible to identify Gangadhar's innovations and to consider stylistic variations and peculiarities that may derive from his original view of the text. Another component of the intertextual landscape of Gangadhar's philological activity consists in the text witnesses to which he had access. Our analysis of the readings *paṇḍena* and *paṇḍitena* suggests that Gangadhar gave his imprimatur to two types of readings, which belong to two different moments in the history of a branch of the transmission (rather than two different branches of it) mostly attested in manuscripts from Bengal. This implies that Gangadhar's philology doubtless represents Ayurvedic knowledge as transmitted within the Bengali tradition. Furthermore, Gangadhar made a distinction between the latitude allowed by the edition and that by the commentary: while he suspended his judgment on a specific reading of the CaS transmitted by the textual tradition available to him, he explained the same reading by deploying the (orally and written) transmitted tradition and integrating it with personal interpretation.

A further component of the intertextual context that we are here reconstructing can be identified by looking at the wider context of Gangadhar's philological activity concerning the CaS, namely his interpretative work on the text. His interpretation is chiefly displayed in the JKT, whose testimony, as we have seen above, can significantly revise the impression given by Gangadhar's edited texts.

²⁶ On the metaphor of migration with regard to the transmission of texts, see Pecchia 2021: 52-54.

The JKT was printed together with the CaS in C_{SJ} and S_{PBh}, which respectively appeared when he was in his seventies and eighties. We can assume that these editions reflected his final interpretation of the text as expounded in the JKT, whose composition, at least to some extent, ran arguably parallel to his editorial work. His previous edition, V2, which was instead made when he was in his forties, may reflect the text as transmitted in manuscript(s) available to him more than his personal interpretation of it. Besides the JKT, Gangadhar provided a succinct explanation of the contents of the CaS in the *Mrtyuñjayasamhitā*.²⁷ As observed by Prets (2010: 76), the *Mrtyuñjayasamhitā* agrees with V2, but not with S_{PBh}, with regard to the place of *dr̥ṣṭānta* in the *vādamārga* section. If confirmed by further research, the correspondence between V2 and the *Mrtyuñjayasamhitā* would represent the first stage of a trajectory in Gangadhar's philological activity, which culminated in the composition of a vast commentary and its printed publication together with the edition of the CaS itself. Assuming that disagreements between V2 and S_{PBh} do not derive from the publisher's intervention in the text (an assumption that, given the above-noted absence of documentary evidence, remains unsubstantiated), the readings analysed above provide a first set of data concerning the impact of Gangadhar's interpretation on his edition of the CaS in two distinct stages of his engagement with the text.

In order to contextualize Gangadhar's editions of and commentary on the CaS, another important factor is Indian philosophical *śāstras*. His philosophical digressions evidently impressed the compiler of the *Records in the Bengal Library*, who added the following remark to the publication data of Gangadhar's CaS and JKT (*Records*, Vol. 1879-1881, 31st December 1879, No. 35):

The exposition of these elementary principles and vital powers is in consonance with the doctrines of the Sankhya, Nyaya, and other old Hindu Philosophical systems which the commentator has done much to elucidate.

The contents of Indian philosophical *śāstras* also flowed into Gangadhar's composition of other Sanskrit works, among which there is a commentary on Udayana's *Nyāyakusumāñjalī* (10th century),²⁸ showing the wide traditional background on which his scholarly eye rested. For now, given the scanty information we have on microhistorical aspects of Ayurveda in 19th-century Bengal, we

²⁷ A manuscript of the *Mrtyuñjayasamhitā* is kept in Kolkata, Sanskrit College, Ayurveda handlist, Ms. no. 153 (Prets 2010: 76, n. 55). The *Mrtyuñjayasamhitā* is mentioned by Prabhakar Chatterjee among Gangadhar's Ayurvedic books (1958: 31), but not by Rita Chattopadhyay who, however, lists an *Āyurvedasamgraha* and an *Āyurvedasamgrahavyākhyā* (2012: 272-273).

²⁸ Chatterjee 1958: 31. Chattopadhyay mentions a "*Bhāṣya on Nyāya*" (2012: 278, item 56).

cannot say whether his familiarity with the Indian philosophical tradition was typical of the Ayurvedic culture of his time (or a regional form of it), or whether Gangadhar was a notable exception in the field. For now, it is also difficult to say whether Gangadhar was atypical in making epistemological vocabulary in *Vimānasthāna* 8 conform to Nyāya terminology, or whether he did so within a broader trend to align non-medical components of the Ayurvedic tradition with classical Nyāya. Interestingly enough, a connection between epistemological contents of the CaS and the beginnings of classical Nyāya is pointed out by the Bengali scholar Satis Chandra Vidyabhusan (1870-1920). In his *History of Indian Logic* he equated *ānvīkṣikī* with the Nyāyaśāstra and held that Medhātithi Gautama formulated the principles of *ānvīkṣikī* (1921: 17-21). He then argued as follows (1921: 25-26):

The *Carakasamhitā* gives a summary of the principal doctrines of *Ānvīkṣikī* possibly as propounded by Medhātithi Gautama. ... But while Caraka accepted them in their crude forms, Akṣapāda pruned them thoroughly before they were assimilated in the Nyāya-sūtra.

Vidyabhusan's view, which was sharply criticized by S. Dasgupta in his *History of Indian Philosophy* (1932: 392-394), may have been influenced by an interpretative trend that was already circulating in the Bengali intellectual milieu where Vidyabhusan received his education. In any case, Gangadhar's and Vidyabhusan's views are concrete examples of the important role of Nyāya philosophy in 19th-century intellectual history of Bengal (a role that was criticized, for example, by Vivekananda)²⁹ or in a centre of learning such as Banaras, in continuation of a long-standing tradition whose contours are becoming more and more clear.³⁰

On a final note

In order to contextualize Gangadhar's work concerning the CaS within a landscape made of texts, a 'contextual archive' can be reconstructed which testifies to the amalgam of śāstric knowledge, more particularly medical and philosophical knowledge, deployed by Gangadhar in his philological activity. However, the CaS was for him not only a piece of Sanskrit literature, but also a fundamental source of the medical knowledge on which his professional practice was based. In view of this, his edition and commentary not only reflect his having cast a scholarly eye on the text, but also likely reveal traces of his own insight as a physician when technical medical questions are at issue.

²⁹ See a passage from a speech that Vivekananda held in Madras as quoted in Ganeri 1996: 3.

³⁰ Dodson 2002 (especially pp. 280-287) describes Nyāya as the starting point of reference in Ballantyne's composition of his *Synopsis of Science*; see also the S. Wright's research, with his most recent article from 2021.

Furthermore, Gangadhar's professional 'liaison' with the CaS triggers a chain of questions of broader significance. This chain starts by asking why Gangadhar – a prominent physician in colonial Bengal – decided to edit the CaS, why he chose to compose a commentary on it and to do it in Sanskrit; what else he chose – paraphrasing S. Pollock – when he chose Sanskrit for talking about Ayurveda in his social and political environment;³¹ and what his edition and commentary meant for the Ayurvedic community.³² The history of the printed publication of the CaS provides evidence of an interest in, and renewed attention towards Ayurveda not only as medical science, but also as part of the cultural heritage, and a cultural identifier, of colonial India. Indeed, Gangadhar's CaS and Madhusudan Gupta's edition of the *Suśrutasamhitā* (1835-36 CE) represent the starting point of a philological drive that targeted traditional works of Ayurveda, with Indian physicians, scholars, and publishers making a sustained effort to edit, translate, comment, and print such works (Pecchia 2022, §§ 3-4). This helped to revive the study of the CaS – which, to judge by the extant manuscripts, was quite neglected in several regions of South Asia – and to reshape and strengthen awareness on the part of Indian physicians and scholars with regard to this part of their cultural heritage. Ayurvedic texts indeed became a relevant part of the Sanskritic culture that some Indian intellectual circles wanted to revive (see, for example, Panikkar 1986: 430). In the same period, except for a few scholars, especially Indologists, who began to study ancient Ayurvedic texts during the 19th century and acknowledged their antiquity and systematicity,³³ the colonial period was characterized by a widespread lack of attention to Ayurveda on the part of European institutions, scholars, and missionaries. The British authorities in fact dismissed Ayurveda as an inferior healing method,³⁴ and the missionaries, too, showed scarce interest in it. Their concern for indigenous science in other cases complemented or replaced the absence of such a lack of attention by the colonial rule (Sivasundaram 2007). The legacy of such a lack of attention may partly be the reason why the activity of a scholar-physician like Gangadhar has neither been investigated in detail (for example, there is not yet an

³¹ Pollock 1998: 7, where the author refers to a "language-for-literature".

³² Partial answers to these questions are given in Pecchia 2022.

³³ In commenting on W. Ward's *Account of the Writings, Religion, and Manners of the Hindoos* (Serampore Mission Press 1811), Sivasundaram (2007: 132) observes that "Ward's views ... demonstrate that in engaging with existent science, these Baptist missionaries hoped to recover the truths of what they saw as ancient wisdom, which were consistent with the biblical narrative."

³⁴ On this, see, for example, Arnold 1993: 54-58.

accurate record of Gangadhar's works, which are mostly in manuscript form)³⁵ nor been evaluated in connection with the social history of Ayurveda and the intellectual history of colonial India at large. An additional explanation may be seen in what B. Hatcher (2005: 701) called "the legacy of colonial attitudes about the pandit", which can reasonably be extended to the kavirajes.

It is arguably a result of both legacies that the limits imposed by the paucity of archive documents have scarcely been challenged when exploring pandits' (or kavirajes') intellectual practices and ideologies. Therefore, in offering what may otherwise soon become irretrievable information, the identification of different sources – such as the texts themselves that scholars produced (from editions of texts to original compositions) and what I have called a contextual archive – also sheds light on the narrative in which our work is embedded. If Gangadhar's philology is taken as an emblematic case, it becomes evident that this narrative hardly features anyone who did not actively interact with individuals and structures belonging to the colonial culture; in fact, it mainly focuses on the so-called encounter between India and the West.³⁶ Furthermore, this narrative is largely dependent on boundaries within Western scholarly institutions. This makes it difficult for specialists of modern South Asia to appreciate the well-established vocabularies of knowledge about Sanskritic culture in 19th- and 20th-century multilingual South Asian societies. But these vocabularies provide access to a range of sources in Sanskrit that can illuminate important actors of 19th-century Indian intellectual history. Given his scholarly and medical work as well as his legacy in the history of Ayurveda, Gangadhar Ray Kaviraj definitely was one of such actors. If a "synchronic multiperspectivism" (Brentjes 2015: 121) is crucial to a non-biased investigation of Indian intellectual activities and developments in the colonial period, it also renews the opportunity to view intellectual practices without the lens of European history and its storytelling about those practices. Investigating the features of Gangadhar's philological work on the CaS thus turns into an exercise in investigating our own assumptions about philology as a practice and a discipline, and exploring the land beyond the limits posed by these assumptions.

References

Arnold, David, 1993. *Colonizing the Body*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Āyurvedadīpikā by Cakrapāṇidatta, see *Carakasamhitā*

³⁵ The overview presented in Chattopadhyay 2012 is helpful. Some details have been added in Pecchia 2022, Appendix II, nn. 4 and 5 adds .

³⁶ For insightful remarks on the idea of 'encounter' see Mukharji 2011: 8f.

- Brentjes, Sonja, 2015. "Relationships Between Early Modern Christian and Islamic Societies in Eurasia and North Africa as Reflected in the History of Science and Medicine", *Confluence: Journal of World Philosophies* 3: 85-121.
- Bretelle-Establet, Florence, and Schmitt, Stéphane, 2018. "Introduction." *Pieces and Parts in Scientific Texts*, F. Bretelle-Establet and S. Schmitt (eds.). Cham: Springer, pp. 3-17.
- Bühler, Georg, 1877. *Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Mss. made in Kashmir, Rajputana and Central India [1875-76]*. Extra number of *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*. Bombay and London.
- Bühler, Curt F., 1960. *The Fifteenth Century Book*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.
- Carakasamhitā* = The *Charakasamhitā* by Agniveśa, revised by Charaka and Dṛidhabala, with the *Āyurveda-Dīpikā* commentary of Chakrapānidatta. Ed. Vaidya Jādavaji Trikamji Āchārya. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Prakashan, 2007 (repr. from the 1941 Bombay edition).
- Cerulli, Anthony, 2018. "Politicking Ayurvedic Education", *Asian Medicine* 13, 1-2: 298-334.
- Chatterjee, Prabhakar, 1958. "Kaviraj Gangadhar Roy Kaviratna – III. Who Inundated British India with Ayurvedic Waters Brought from Heaven", *Nagarjun* 1, Jan. 1958 (1957-58): 26-32.
- Chattopadhyay, Rita, 2012. "Gaṅgādhara Kavirāja: A 19th Century Indian Polymath in Oblivion." *Contributions of the Traditional Paṇḍits of Bengal*. Part 1. M. Banerjee and K. Das (eds.). Kolkata: Sanskrit Sahitya Parishad, pp. 266-281.
- Dasgupta, Surendranath, 1932. *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dionísio, João, 2005. "Tables of Contents in Portuguese Late Medieval Manuscripts", *The Book as Artifact, Text and Border*, A. Mette Hansen, R. Lüdeke, W. Streit, C Urchueguía and P. Shillingsburg (eds.), *Variants* 4: 89-109.
- Dodson, Michael S., 2002. "Re-presented for the Pandits: James Ballantyne, 'Useful Knowledge', and Sanskrit Scholarship in Benares College during the Mid-Nineteenth Century", *Modern Asian Studies* 36: 257-98.
- Frauwallner, Erich, 1984. *Nachgelassene Werke*. 1. Aufsätze, Beiträge, Skizzen. Herausgegeben von Ernst Steinkellner. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Ganeri, Jonardan, 1996. "The Hindu Syllogism: Nineteenth-Century Perceptions of Indian Logical Thought", *Philosophy East and West* 46, 1: 1-16.
- Ganeri, Jonardan, 2008. "Contextualism in the Study of Indian Intellectual Cultures", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 36: 551-562.
- Hatcher, Brian A., 2005. "What's Become of the Pandit? Rethinking the History of Sanskrit Scholars in Colonial Bengal", *Modern Asian Studies* 39, 3: 683-723.

- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf, 1908. “Studies in Ancient Indian Medicine. IV – The Composition of the Caraka Samhita, and the Literary Methods of the Ancient Indian Medical Writers. (A Study in Textual Criticism.)”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (Oct., 1908): 997-1028.
- Jalpakalpataru = Carakasamhitā with Āyurvedadīpikā and Jalpakalpataru*. Ed. Narendranath Sengupta and Balaichandra Sengupta. Kashi Ayurveda Series no. 1, Varanasi, Delhi 1991, 2nd ed. of this reprint 2002. (1st ed. Kolkata: Dhanvantri Steam Machine Press 1927, Dhanvantari Electric Machine Press 1928, 1933).
- Kang, Sung Yong, 2003. *Die Debatte im alten Indien*. Reinbeck: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag.
- Kang, Sung Yong, 2007. *Pañcāvayava*. Die fünfgliedrige Argumentationsform in den frühen Debattentraditionen Indiens mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der *Carakasamhitā* Vi. 8.30-36. Göttingen: Cuvillier Verlag.
- Kano, Kazuo, 2016. *Buddha-Nature and Emptiness*. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Maas, Philipp A., 2010. “Computer Aided Stemmatics – The Case of Fifty-Two Text Versions of *Carakasamhitā* Vimānasthāna 8.67-157.” *Text Genealogy, Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*. J. Hanneder and P. Maas (guest eds.), *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 52-53: 63-119.
- Mukharji, Projit B., 2011. *Nationalizing the Body*. London etc.: Anthem Press.
- Nicholson, Hugh, 2010. “The Shift from Agonistic to Non-Agonistic Debate in Early Nyāya”, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 38, 1: 75-95.
- Nyāyasūtra = Anantalal Thakur (ed.), Gautamīyanyāyadarśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. Nyāyacaturgranthikā 1. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research, 1997.
- Panikkar, K. N., 1986. “The Intellectual History of Colonial India: Some Historiographical and Conceptual Questions.” *Situating Indian History*, S. Bhattacharya and R. Thapar (eds.). Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 403-433.
- Pasquali, Giorgio, 1952. *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. Firenze: Le Monnier (1st ed. 1934).
- Pecchia, Cristina, 2009. “Transmitting the *Carakasamhitā*. Notes for a History of the Tradition”, *Indian Journal of History of Science* 44, 2: 141-161. Corrected version in: *Medical Texts and Manuscripts in Indian Cultural History*, D. Wujastyk, A. Cerulli, K. Preisendanz (eds.). New Delhi: Manohar, 2013, pp. 1-27.
- Pecchia, Cristina, 2010. “Transmission-specific (In)utility, or Dealing with Contamination: Samples from the Textual Tradition of the *Carakasamhitā*.” *Text Genealogy, Textual Criticism and*

Editorial Technique. J. Hanneder and P. Maas (guest eds.), *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 52-53: 121-159.

Pecchia, Cristina, 2015. *Dharmakīrti on the Cessation of Suffering*. Leiden: Brill.

Pecchia, Cristina, 2021. “Diachronic Migration of Ancient Indian Medical Literature. Divisions and Paratextual Elements in the *Carakasamhitā*.” *Body and Cosmos*, T. L. Knudsen, J. Schmidt-Madsen, and S. Speyer (eds.). Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 52-76.

Pecchia, Cristina, 2022. “Ayurveda, Philology and Print: On the First Printed Edition of the *Carakasamhitā* and its Context”, *Indigenous Knowledges and Colonial Sciences in South Asia*, M. Menon (guest ed.), *South Asian History and Culture* 13: 112-134.

Pollock, Sheldon, 1998. “The Cosmopolitan Vernacular”, *The Journal of Asian Studies* 57, 1: 6-37.

Pollock, Sheldon, 2008. “Is There an Indian Intellectual History? Introduction to “Theory and Method in Indian Intellectual History””, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 36: 533-542.

Pollock, Sheldon, 2009. “Future Philology? The Fate of a Soft Science in a Hard World.” *The Fate of the Disciplines*, J. Chandler and A. Davidson (guest eds.). *Critical Inquiry* 35, 4: 931-961.

Preisendanz, Karin, 2013. “Logic Debate and Epistemology in Ancient Indian Medical Science – An Investigation into the History and Historiography of Indian Philosophy.” *Medical Texts and Manuscripts in Indian Cultural History*, D. Wujastyk, A. Cerulli, K. Preisendanz (eds.). Delhi: Manohar Lal, pp. 63-139. Revised and updated version of the unauthorized, deprecated version published in *Indian Journal of History of Science* 44, 2 (2009): 261–312.

Prets, Ernst, 2010. “On the Proof Passage of the *Carakasamhitā*: Editions, Manuscripts and Commentaries.” *Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference*, Vol. 10.2: *Logic in Earliest Classical India*, Brendan S. Gillon (ed.). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp. 67-85.

Rocher, Ludo, 1994. “Orality and Textuality in the Indian Context”, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 49: 1-28.

Scharfe, Hartmut, 2002. *Education in Ancient India*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Sivasundaram, Sujit, 2007. “‘A Christian Benares’: Orientalism, Science and the Serampore Mission of Bengal”, *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 44, 2: 111-145.

Verhagen, Peter C., 2005. “Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (4). The *Vyākhyāyukti* of Vasubandhu”, *Journal Asiatique* 293: 559–602.

Vidyabhusan, Satis Chandra, 1921. *A History of Indian Logic*. Calcutta: Calcutta University.

Wezler, Albrecht, 1998. “Sanskrit *paṇḍá-/pāṇḍaka-*”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 148: 261-276.

Wright, Samuel, 2021. “Scholar Networks and the Manuscript Economy in *Nyāya-śāstra* in Early Colonial Bengal”, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 49: 323-359.

Wujastyk, Dagmar, 2012. *Well-mannered Medicine*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.