Introduction:

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

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

Sukīra

The epithet ‘Vaidya’ appears in Vijayaraksita’s work with the name of Sukīra; Dalhana mentions Sukīra and Sudhīra simply in the form of a compound word. This is reminiscent of the usage of names of Vakula and Īśvarasena as a dual
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1. Vyākhyātāri Hātichandre Jejjatanāmni ṣati suhīte ca, anyasyāyurvede vyākhyā dhārṣṭyaṁ samāvahati - Candraṭa’s commentary on Cikitsā Kalikā of Tisaṭācārya.
compound word Vakulesvarasena who also held ideas and views that synchronise with Kārtikakunda as observable in the works of Vijayarākṣita and Dalhana. Sukīrā's work perhaps must be extant at that time.

**Sudhira**

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

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

**The Date of Sudhira:**

The references of Dalhana (Suśruta Cikitsā Sthāna 1, 27 and Suśruta Uttaratantra 58, 58-64) may be considered as evidences to fix the period of Sudhira; Candrata's reference to Sudhira in the beginning of his commentary on his father's work - Cikitsā Kalikā - is another additional evidence. From these it can be deduced that Sudhira lived earlier to Dalhana and Candrata and his must have been a popular famous work of the time. Candrata, son of Tiṣata wrote a commentary on the work of his father who was identified to be the son of Vāgbhata.
leads to the view that Sudhira was a contemporary to Tiṣatācārya whose date might not be beyond 9th Century A. D. or the date of Kārtikakunḍa whose ideas had been followed by Sudhira as well as Sukira who perhaps might be colleagues. Therefore, this date may be the upper limit of Sudhira and incidentally of Sukira too. Gayadāsa cited by Dalhana (Suṣruta Ćikitsā Sthāna, I, 27) differs from Sudhira's view though there are instances of his following him (Su. ci. I, 74-75) faithfully at some places. The lower limit of Sudhira's date, therefore, is the date of Gayadāsa which must not be later to 10th Century A. D., as he was mentioned by Cakrapāṇidatta, (Bhatt. IHQ. 23, 1947, P. 154) which helps to conclude that Gayadāsa lived prior to 10th Century A. D.

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

Sudhira's Ability

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

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

SUMMARY

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

सुकीर — सुधीर

लेठ अयोध्यापण्डे ।
तथा-के रघुनाथस् ॥

बृद्धमयी के टीकाकार “सुकीर-सुधीर” जिनका सामासिक (दन्दसमास) प्रयोग विजयरक्षित और डल्हणके प्राप्तियों में हुआ है ९ वीं और १० वीं शताब्दी के हैं। इनकी टीकाओं की अनुपलब्धि के कारण इनके काल निर्णय एवं योग्यताओं के विषय में जानने के लिये परवर्ती टीकाकारों के संदर्भों में एतरिष्क सत्संगण अपेक्षित है। चन्द्रगुप्त तथा विजयरक्षित की कृतियाँ इस दिशा में उपयुक्त रूप से उक्त रहती हैं।