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Abstract

Ayurveda is serving the mankind for centuries with a holistic approach. This system has preached to treat the diseases which are only curable by the physicians. It has advised the physicians to strictly avoid treating the incurable diseases. In order to assess the incurability of the diseases or the incurable state of a patient; this system has preached the signs and symptoms of incurability which are known as arista-vijnana, which have been described in Brhattrayi of Ayurveda. Though Caraka has placed them in a separate section of his treatise, Cakrapani and Dalhana have also spent a considerable portion in their commentaries dealing with arista-vijnana. They were two renowned scholars who have commented with a depth of wisdom on Susruta Samhita. In this paper, the author has tried to present the comparative and critical comments of both commentators based on Bhanumati and Nibandha Samgraha, respectively, over arista-vijnana as described in Sutrasthana of Susruta Samhita. Dalhana was greatly influenced by Caraka Samhita with regard to the prognostic science. On the other hand, Cakrapani repeatedly recognized the superiority of the indriya-sthana of Caraka Samhita with regard to analysis of prognostic science.
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Introduction

In comparison to Caraka Samhita, Susruta Samhita does not contain indriya-sthana, which is generally observed in samhitas belonging to Atreya sampradaya. Susruta has well discussed concepts of prognostic sciences (arista-vijnana) and their importance in medical science and matter related to arista-vijnana is available in sutra-sthana. The third chapter of sutra-sthana, i.e. Adhyayana-sampradany-amadhyaya (slokas 8–9),[1] gives indications of the contents of arista-vijnana which are discussed in the chapters 28–33.

Cakrapani while commenting on the beginning of the indriya-sthana of Caraka Samhita stated that diseases are to be treated only if they are curable. A physician should know the signs which indicate the incurability of diseases and their complex phenomena leading to the death of a patient.[2]

Thus the section dealing with the prognostic aspect of diseases, i.e., indriya-sthana of any samhita, is very important and as such it has been given place before the section of cikitsa-sthana (treatment). Indra here means vital breath/life (prana) and its end-indicating signs are rista, which are known as indriya.[3] Thus the section dealing with this is also known as indriya-sthana.[4]

Materials and Methods

The present study is mainly literary in nature and therefore, mainly views of both the commentators are independently interpreted, critically discussed, and later are compared with each others’.

Selection of texts

- Dalhana, Nibandha Samgraha Tika on Susruta Samhita along with Naya Candrika Tika on Susruta Samhita of Gayadasa, edited by Acharya Yadavji Tikamji, Chaukhambha Orientalia, Varanasi, reprint edition, 1992.
- Cakrapani Dutta, Bhanumati Tika on Susruta Samhita, published by Sri Swami Laxmiram Trust, Jaipur, 1939.

Discussion

In sutra sthana of Susruta Samhita, chapters in which arista-vijnana have been discussed, i.e. chapters 28–33, there are
some differences in names of chapters as well as minor variation of texts exists in both editions of Susruta Samhita which are taken by Cakrapani and Dalhana [Table 1].

Differences exist in titles of the chapters 28, 29, and 33. In chapter 33, differences are also found in scripts of Susruta Samhita in both Cakrapani and Dalhana versions.[5] These variations of texts are also found in tadapatra (manuscripts). Even Haranacandra in some points differs from versions of Cakrapani and Dalhana.[4]

Gośwami: Studies related to the concept of Arista-Vijnana (prognostic science)

Dalhana in the very beginning of his commentary upon 28/3 classifies aristas into two types – niyata (definite) and aniyata (indefinite).[7] These two types of definite and indefinite aristas have been explained with the examples of fire and smoke, flower and fruit, and clouds and rainfall. Among these examples, fruit and rainfall are for indefinite whereas fire is for definite. For the indefinite aristas, he stated that these groups of aristas do not give rise to the effects inevitably. On the other hand, definite ones surely give rise to the effect and aristas originated by dosas come under this group. But Cakrapani accepted niyata-aristas indicating the certainty of death with quoting the supporting arguments from Caraka, indriya-sthana chapter 11[8] and chapter 2[9] and accepted that niyata-aristas are not vyabhicaritvam as a definite sign of death.

Cakrapani quoting Caraka, indriya-sthana, even discusses niyata and aniyata based on avyabhichari and vyabhichari (definite and probable indicators of death). Caraka, though did not clearly mention purusa-arista and purusa anarista aristas, but discussed clearly kala mṛtyu and akala mṛtyu with or without aristas and gave opinion basically dependent on indriya-sthana of Caraka Samhita.[10]

On the other hand, Dalhana discussed niyata and aniyata based on the examples stated in Susruta Samhita and indirectly agreed to discuss aristas based on purusa anarista subjects. Here Dalhana had not directly quoted Caraka but it seems that he got influenced by indriyadhiraka of Atreya sampradaya.[31]

In context of the interpretation of su. 28/4 regarding the meaning of asu-yaatikramat, Cakrapani has taken its meaning in the sense of quick destruction after appearance which happens without taking time. Here he quoted the examples of vidyut (thunder), etc.[12] On the other hand Dalhana explained that asu-yaatikramat- as soon as origin of aristas death takes place, thus like piercing of hundred leaves of utpala which is not observed.[13] However, some interpret that the aristas retract as soon as they appear.[14]

According to Dalhana, kīla (su. 28/5) means traditional scripture (agama)[15] but Cakrapani did not interpret the word “kīla” like Dalhana and stated the word brahama, etc. as that was not relevant to the subject, and gave the same example in this concern.[16]

Susruta Samhita, authority of surgery, deals with wound, abscess, ulcers, etc. Susruta stated that being the object of sāya-tantra; examination of vrana should be based on the perception of indriyas. Dalhana (su. 28/8) interprets that adi means sabda and sparsa should be taken. He takes svabhavatāh as prakṛttīh. Vaiśrava is that which is different from prakṛttīh.[17] While commenting on Su. 28/9–10 Dalhana has enumerated the prakṛta gandha as dwandwajya that is based on predominance of two doshas for a particular type of smell such as lāja, atasi-oil, and tīla-oil; these three are found in vata-pitta, vata-kapha, and pitta-kapha, respectively.[18] But Cakrapani interpreted prakṛta gandha as it has a relation with vata.[19] Commenting on vaikṛta gandha, Dalhana has stated purvavallura as dry meeting with pus; matkunāh is a tiny insect growing in bed, etc. whereas Cakrapani says matkunāh as ungsah (bugs).[20]

Both Cakrapani and Dalhana substantiated the view of Susruta stating the necessity of knowledge of prakṛta aswāstha and its comparison with vaikṛtaaavastha as an indicator of prognosis. Particularly when discussing a prognosis based on vārṇa (su. 28/15), Dalhana directly gives indications about what can be features of vranasotha, vidrabhi, etc.; simply localized swelling associated with different cardinal signs and symptoms, example.g., dhvani, is discussed as isat krsaṇa[20] by Dalhana but Cakrapani discussed it as gandhatrana or dark brick color.[21] The signs and symptoms of different abnormal vārṇa and rasa are to be inferred on a wound based on the predominance of any dosha. Same principles are followed in support of the views of Susruta in relation to sabda, sparsa, and ākṛti when these get vaikṛtaaavastha. Both Dalhana and Cakrapani do not elaborate these.

Dalhana mentions variation of scripts of original text (su. 28/13) but he does not agree with this variation because it is not accepted by commentators and says that this verse is followed by blind supporters. Dalhana has quoted these verses.[21]

The name of chapter 29 has variations in both commentaries as already compared in Table 1.

While commenting on su. 29/3, Dalhana has explained the word nimitta as sarpaṭidarsana,[22] (which indicates auspiciousness and inauspiciousness) whereas Cakrapani takes it as auspiciousness (purnakumbhadi).[21]

Discussing the dudarasa su. 29/5, Dalhana takes pakḍaṇḍa word for kapalika.[24] But the view of Cakrapani is more wide and full of orthodox thinking as he stated “pakmanda” as vedabahyasramasthā[27] that means those who do not believe in vedas, i.e., heterodox thinker and followers of Saṃgata daydhā (Buddha, etc.).

In the context of explaining the speech of the messenger su. 29/9, Cakrapani has interpreted rukṣa as lasita-viparita[28] means speech having the absence of affection, but on the other hand Dalhana interpreted this term as the unfriendly speaking (maṇimārtha vachā)[29] Further, Cakrapani stated nisthiram as opposite to soft speaking (pesalaviparita), but Dalhana

Table 1: Variation of texts

| Ch. Title of the chapter as per Bhānunāti | Title of the chapter as per Niśadha Samgghraha |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| २८ विपरीतविविधविन्यासमयाम् | विपरीतविविधविन्यास विन्यासमयाम् |
| २९ विपरीतविविधविन्यासमयाम् | विपरीतविविधविन्यास विन्यासमयाम् |
| ३० परीच्छेदविविधविन्यासमयाम् | परीच्छेदविविधविन्यासमयाम् |
| ३१ चित्रविविधविन्यासमयाम् | चित्रविविधविन्यासमयाम् |
| ३२ स्वभावविविधविन्याससमयाम् | स्वभावविविधविन्याससमयाम् |
| ३३ अवारणोदमयाम् | अवारणोदमयाम् |
taken nistha-ratnam as harshly speaking or rugged speaking (kathoravacanam).

Regarding the day of approach to the physician by messenger su. 29/19, Dalhana interpreted the term sandhi-dinam as the date fixed for rituals (devapretakaranyakam) while Cakrapani has accepted the sandhi-dinam as the 15th day of the dark half or every loonier month (amavasyatithi) and this is related to the Indian calendar.

During the interpretation of auspicious su. 29/27–31, Cakrapani has discussed udakumbham as a pitcher full of water (udakapurnah kumbhah) which is auspicious one and in his support he mentions a verse from Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana[12] and from Nimitta Grantha,[13] while Dalhana has interpreted it as pitcher full or empty. Further, he indicates that at the time of entry, the pitcher (kumbha) should be full and at the time of departure the pitcher should be empty.[14] Cakrapani accepts svalamkita in place of alankrita and takes it as that which is smeared with paste, etc. (alepadina manDitah) and some take it as an adjective for a virgin girl, but Dalhana stated that alankrita kanya means virgin girl wearing good apparel (bhusvanavatsakya). Dalhana accepts aksata as lajah, whereas Cakrapani takes it as unbroken barley (aksatayaradi). [15] Again Cakrapani interprets the word summonah as flower (puspan) but Dalhana says summonah as pleasant disposition of physicians. [16]

Explaining su. 29/41–45, Cakrapani has quoted a verse from the text book of astrology which predicts (nimittasastra). Dalhana mentions nimitta as which indicates well and bad (subhasubha sucakam). Here Cakrapani read lagna in place of bhagna in mulapatha and interprets it as the attachment of thorn, etc. in cloth and others. Dalhana interprets bhagna as breaking and stated that some read lagna in place of bhagna and also interpreted it as the entanglement of cloth, etc. Further, in the same context Dalhana explains daurnanasyam as deanged mind (citaviesititam).

During the interpretation of su. 29/67, both Cakrapani and Dalhana have quoted from the same source, e.g., from the fifth chapter of Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana[14] and forth chapter of Susruta Samhita sarira-sthana. [15] Further, Cakrapani has described that when the vitiated three doshas fully cover the manovaha-srotas, then a person dreams which has been accepted as aristas. In support of his views, he quoted a verse from the Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana fifth chapter.

In the context of explaining su. 30/2, Dalhana explained pancendriya as the five sense organs as ears, etc., their objects as sound, etc., and faulty perception of these due to less use or excess use. The word panca (five) is used for the elimination of motor organs (karmendriya) and mind (manas), which are both sensory and motor. The motor organs (karmendriya) are understood by sarira itself and the mind is included by indriyas itself as sensory organs do not perceive their objects without mind while Cakrapani has interpreted pancendriyarthas as objects of indriyas, namely, sabadadayah. The opposite character of these or other than these may be known as conflicting perception. Here he stated two types of ristas – (1) bhayabhutadigatam and (2) antara-sariragatam, but Dalhana has not stated so. Cakrapani discussed that the previous two chapters have been elaborated for the examination of the bhutadigatam; after that, the physician examines aturgata-ristas which are based on the abnormality of objects of the five indriyas by visiting the house of patients as described in this chapter.[16]

In su. 30/3, while considering the nature relating to physique and behavior, both Dalhana and Cakrapani have interpreted few terms in their own ways. In support of their views, both have cited references from the Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana first chapter. Views of both commentators have maximum similarities [Table 2].

Here Dalhana interpreted silam as manasohahavah and he also quoted others' interpretation of silam as samadhanayuktammanah while Cakrapani accepts silam as the function of mind (manovritti). He has indicated that manas is characterized by sila.[17] Explaining the prakriti, Dalhana cited a reference from Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana and mentioned six different types of prakriti. Cakrapani has also explained similarly[18] and even explained vikriti by citing references from Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana.

During the explanation of su. 30/10 Dalhana explained that atisugandhik here means suddenly becoming excessively fragrant without the application of fragrance. Cakrapani reads sugandhim-vati in place of sugandhirvati and interpreted it as the physiology of vata, which means transportation or movement of good fragrance, and even stated grammatical etymology of vata as va = gatigandhanayoh.

Further, in the same chapter, su. 30/19, Cakrapani explains the astapadakaram as the shape of the sarika, small pond (sarikakaram)[19] while Dalhana has discussed it as astapadakaram which means a quadruple playground seen as a chessboard marked by lines (kosthasantana).

During the interpretation of su. 31/1, both Cakrapani and Dalhana have stated verses from Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana and Dalhana opined that differences among complexion, luster, and shade are limited not only to characters but also to number; such as complexion (prakrtavarna) is of four types, luster (prabha) is of seven types, and shade (chaya) is of five types.[20]

In the context of the discussion of su. 31/4, Cakrapani only defined the term hrih as shyness (lajjaa) and not mentioned other words which are included in the original script of Susruta Samhita. Dalhana has defined and interpreted these terms in his own views.[21] Here Dalhana has also quoted other views as variation in the first line of this verse along with commentary according to others.[22]

Dalhana quoted the opinion of others and stated that all abnormalities appear related to behavior excluding luster. Further, according to others’ interpretation, meanings are as follows: shri, wealth; tejas, working power; ojas, pure essence

Table 2: Similarities in views

| Terms | Views according to Cakrapani | Views according to Dalhana |
|-------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| नरीसमुद्रम | प्राणीकायम: | पारंपरिक प्राणीकायम: |
| श्रीमु | मानसो भाव: | स्वभाविक: प्राणिको निजो धम: |
| श्रीमु | मनोविर्लित: | |
of dhatus located in the heart. Opposite to grace, wealth and working power are considered as bad prognosis within a year; again destruction of memory, strength, etc. are indicated as bad prognosis for 6 months.

In the context of interpreting su. 31/10, Cakrapani has explained the kesa-simanta by quoting a verse from Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana which indicates changing the simanta as an arista state. Dalhana has interpreted kesa-simanta as lining in the hairs and eyebrows and stated that this arista results in death within 5 days if the person concerned is diseased and in 6 days if he is healthy.

In this context, Cakrapani has mentioned a reference from Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana. While explaining edema of feet associated with complications (su. 31/19), Cakrapani interpreted ananyopadravah as the complications of only sopha. Further, he recalls the complications of sopha by citing verse 23/8 of Susruta Samhita cikitsa-sthana with a slight variation. He read sothinam ksapayanit in place of su nam sanksapayanti. He has also explained the term ananyopadravakrtah in another way. He explains it as that (sopha) which is not causing as a complication of another disease, i.e. caused as independent disease. One (sopha) which is caused as a complication of the other diseases such as arsa, pandu, etc. in legs is not an arista. Here Cakrapani has quoted a verse from Ksara-pani in reference to sotha-ropa, which shows situations of the incurability of the padasamutthita sotha. Dalhana stated that some others describe and interpret ananyopadra-vaktah as edema which is caused by factors other than pandu-ropa, udara, piles, etc. and is incurable, while that caused by pandu-ropa, etc. is curable. He further stated that some read it as ananopadravagata while others read it as ananopadravagata reaching face from feet along with complications.

In the context of explaining the effect of inappropriate treatment (su. 31/30), Dalhana has discussed the visamopacara as insufficient or inappropriate treatment. Here Cakrapani has classified the mrtuyu into three types: (1) aparacakram, (2) nitya-karmajanyam, and (3) praniswabhavamangatam. Cakrapani has explained the word karmabhisca as kalapakaniyatai karmabhих (those actions which are certain to mature due to the effect of kala) while Dalhana in this reference has given his views by giving the word karmabhисca as sarinasthapaksa (actions which hold the body) and ksinia (decreased) as the remaining part. Here he has given an account of view of other scholars who state that yuktivyapasparyya marana is indicated by the word visamopacaraena, daiyavapasya marana by karmabhисca parakritah, and swabhаva marana by anityatvaca. In this way, there are three types of causes of death.

In the context of explaining the affliction of bhuta, preta, etc. (su. 31/31), Cakrapani has defined the preta as a type of pitr, which is a specific stage after death. But Dalhana has directly explained it as a dead individual. Cakrapani has discussed the term bhuta as a type of pisaca bhedah, while Dalhana has stated bhuta as Yamanacara (follower of Yama) and pisaca as one who takes flesh as diet, a specific yoni of deva. Further, he explained raksasani as the follower of Ravana. Cakrapani has not explained the word raksasani. Dalhana has explained the word upasarpani as to move nearer (samipagacchanti).

While Cakrapani has explained it as to move nearer and consuming ojas.

In the context of explaining the transformation of naturally established bodily attributes (su. 32/3), both Cakrapani and Dalhana explained the terms which are shown in Table 3.

Dalhana has further stated that when hard parts of the body like hair, beard, nails, teeth, ligaments, vessels, channels, etc. become soft and soft organs like muscles, fat, marrow, etc. become hard all of a sudden, then these states are known as arista laksanas. Cakrapani has enumerated some organs only like bones, teeth, etc. Dalhana enumerated rakta as mrdunam (soft), while Cakrapani has enumerated mamsa-medadi as mrdunam (soft). In this group, rakta has not been considered.

In the context of explaining (su. 32/4) the term vakra-va[krakragrahā both Dalhana and Cakrapani have similar views about astrology. Dalhana explains va[kraga as the movement of graha out of its orbits (ras). Cakrapani interprets purvarasīgamanaṇam as vakratvam. Further, he has stated that punah means anuvakratvam which is the movement between starting from one house, and again nurturing back in its own house is anuvakratvam.

### Conclusion

There are considerable similarities in the method of explaining different signs and symptoms indicating arista laksana based on indriyas. Cakrapani repeatedly quoted references from Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana to substantiate his opinion, while Dalhana also refers to Caraka Samhita indriya-sthana but not so much.

### Table 3: Explanation of terms by Cakrapani and Dalhana

| Views of Cakrapani | Views of Dalhana |
|--------------------|------------------|
| शुद्धलाभामिति | अस्यमथाय शुद्धलाभान्वेकदेशानां निन्निमित्तं काण्यं भण्यं। |
| लोचनानादन्त्वायीनाम | कृष्णानामिति कृष्णानादन्त्वायीनाम। |
| कृष्णानामिति | कृष्णानादन्त्वायीनाम। |
| लोचनमधायाम | तारणये कैश्च्रेम्नुमानं। |
| रक्तानामिति | श्लुक्तलमर्गितम। |
| जित्तलावल्लायीनाम | रक्तानां नेत्रानाधिकारतलताली। |
| रसिराणां | रसिराणां कैश्च्रेम्नुमान। |
| कठिनानामाक्षेत्रंदत्तायीनाम | दन्ताराणामक्रमनात्मुखं। |
| कठिनानामाक्षेत्रंदत्तायीनाम | कैश्च्रेम्नुमान। |
| गृहश्लिष्ठामिति | गृहश्लिष्ठामिति। |
| मोहसेवंगात्त्रायीनाम | मुद्राः मात्रानिर्मितमेवाश्च। |

| अपत्तनाभास एव: | अपत्तनाभास एव: |
| अपत्तनाभास एव: | कैश्च्रेम्नुमानखन्दद:ं। |
| पत्तनाभासिणिः | पत्तनाभासिणिः। |
| स्वेदवृत्तिपालनायाद्विदा: | स्वेदवृत्तिपालनायाद्विदा:। |

| अपत्तनाभासिणिः | पत्तनाभासिणिः। |
| अपत्तनाभासिणिः | पत्तनाभासिणिः। |
| पत्तनाभासिणिः | पत्तनाभासिणिः। |
| स्वेदवृत्तिपालनायाद्विदा: | स्वेदवृत्तिपालनायाद्विदा:। |
From the above discussion of chapters 28–32, it is observed that both Cakrapani and Dalhana took the extensive help of indriya-sthana of Caraka Samhita in support of their views and substantiate the prognostic (arista laksana) views of Susruta Samhita. Apart from indriya-sthana, of Caraka Samhita, Harita, Ksara, Dalhana, Nimi, etc. are also occasionally quoted by both. Cakrapani being the well-known commentary of Caraka Samhita, so naturally a great influence of Caraka Samhita upon Cakrapani is observed. On the other hand, though Dalhana is well known for his lone work on Susruta Samhita, his frequent quoting of indriya-sthana of Caraka Samhita is a significant influence of astrology for ascertaining prognostic views, which indicates that astrology being the contemporary science was also well considered by the practitioners of Ayurveda. Cakrapani has mentioned nimitta grantha and nimitta sastra.
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हिंदी सारांश

भानुमति एवं निबन्ध संग्रह टिकाओं का अरिष्ट विज्ञान के संदर्भ में एक तुलनात्मक अध्ययन

प्रदीप कुमार गोस्वामी

यह चित्रकोष के पूर्व रोगों की शास्त्रास्थायता जानना अति जरूरी है। वृहदद्वदी के अन्तर्गत तीनों संहिताओं में रोग की साध्यासाध्यता झाप क अरिष्ट विज्ञान का वर्णन है। कायाचित्रका प्रमाण चरकसंहिता में पृथक् इन्द्रियसंहार उपलब्ध है। तुलनात्मक अध्ययन 28-33 में अरिष्ट विज्ञान का वर्णन है। चक्रयाणि दत्त एवं दल्हण दोनों की दोनों चरक संहिता एवं तुलनात्मक महत्वपूर्ण मानने के लिए प्रशंसक आधार माना जाता है। उन दोनों के संहिताओं में निबन्ध संग्रह टिकाओं का निर्णय किया था। सुश्रुत संहिता के तुलनात्मक अन्तर्गत अरिष्ट विषयक अध्ययनों पर आधार चक्रपाणिदा एवं दल्हण के मतों एवं विचारों का तुलनात्मक एवं विशेषज्ञात्मक अध्ययन के बाद यह प्रतीत होता है कि चक्रपाणि दत्त पुर्णरूपमें चरक संहिता के इन्द्रियसंहार सारांश प्रभावित थे। आचार्य दल्हण पर चरकसंहिता का प्रभाव सुरू होता है। दोनों टिकाकारों ने अपने मतों को प्रपंच करने के लिए चरक संहिता के इन्द्रियसंहार को पुनः - प्रौद्योगिक उद्देश्य किया है। चक्रपाणि दत्त ने निमित्त शास्त्र आदि का भी उल्लेख किया है।