

Sanskrit commentaries on the *Carakasamhitā*  
with special reference to Jajjāṭa's  
*Nirantarapadavyākhyā*\*

KENNETH ZYSK  
University of Copenhagen

The genre of Sanskrit commentarial literature is a largely untapped reservoir of important and often crucial information that is all too often forgotten or neglected. The significance of commentaries in technical śāstric literature in Sanskrit, such as āyurveda, cannot be over emphasised, because frequently no other way exists to understand correctly both the meaning of specialised vocabulary and the ideas particular to the śāstra or science.

According to Jan Meulenbeld, there are no less than sixty-two commentaries on the *Carakasamhitā*. Of these only seven, either in complete or fragmented form, are at present extant.<sup>1</sup> For convenience, these seven may be divided into the early and the late commentaries.

---

\* An earlier version of this paper was delivered to the second annual meeting of the working group on the Caraka Samhitā in London in November 2004. I would like to thank all those participants who offered constructive comments on it, and especially Karin Preisendanz, who took the time to read it carefully and offer many useful comments and criticisms.

Copies of the manuscripts of Jajjāṭa's commentary preserved at the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai, and the Gujarat Ayurved University, Jamnagar, were provided by FWF projects P17300 and P19866 "Philosophy and Medicine in Early Classical India" I and II (directed by Karin Preisendanz at the Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, and the Institute for South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna, respectively) under an Agreement of Cooperation and Use of Manuscript Materials.

<sup>1</sup> HIML, 1A: 180-200; 1B: 281-308.

### The early commentaries include

1. Haricandra's *Carakanyāsa*, which dates from about A.D. 600. Its extant portion covers Sūtrasthāna 3 and perhaps also 1-2 and 5.<sup>2</sup>
2. Svāmikumāra's *Pañjikā*, which is later than the *Carakanyāsa*, but earlier than Jajjāṭa's *Nirantarapadavyākhyā*. Its extant portion covers Sūtrasthāna 1 and part of 2.<sup>3</sup>
3. Jajjāṭa's *Nirantarapadavyākhyā*, which probably dates from the seventh or eighth century. Its extant portion covers parts of the beginning and end of the Cikitsāsthāna, the beginning of the Kalpasthāna and parts of the Siddhisthāna.<sup>4</sup>
4. Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*, which dates from the third quarter of the eleventh century. It is complete.<sup>5</sup>

### The later commentaries include the following

1. Śivadāsasena's *Carakatattvapradīpikā*, which was composed in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Its extant portion covers Sūtrasthāna 1.1-26.58.<sup>6</sup>
2. Gaṅgādhara Kavirāja's *Jalpakaḷpataru*, which was written in the middle of the nineteenth century. It is complete.<sup>7</sup>
3. Yogīndranāthasena's *Carakopaskāra*, which was written in the early part of the twentieth century. It is complete.<sup>8</sup>

An examination of any one of the early commentaries would prove valuable in providing information about the early history of Indian medicine. Jajjāṭa's *Nirantarapadavyākhyā*, however, is chosen for this study because it is the most extensive commentary and, in addition to manuscripts, has been edited and printed.

Meulenbeld states that Jajjāṭa also wrote a commentary on the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, but its name is unknown. Only part of it, however, is preserved and covers the Uttarantra.<sup>9</sup> He claims that Jajjāṭa's commentaries probably date from the seventh or eighth century A.D. He arrives at this conclusion on the basis of a relative chronology of commentators

<sup>2</sup> HIML, 1A: 187-90; 1B: 289-90.

<sup>3</sup> HIML, 1A: 198; 1B: 305.

<sup>4</sup> HIML, 1A: 191-94; 1B: 295-300.

<sup>5</sup> HIML, 1A: 182-85; 1B: 284-86; 2A: 92-93; 2B: 110-11.

<sup>6</sup> HIML, 1A: 196-98; 1B: 302-303.

<sup>7</sup> HIML, 1A: 186-87; 1B: 287-89.

<sup>8</sup> HIML, 1A: 199-200; 1B: 307-08.

<sup>9</sup> HIML, 1A: 192; 1B: 289.

on the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* and the *Mādhavanidāna*, whose dates fall within the period of A.D. 600-900. The order of the commentators is as follows: Jajjaṭa, Gadādhara, Vāpyacandra, Mādhavakara, and Kārttikakuṇḍa. Thus, Jajjaṭa's date comes at the beginning of the period. Others come up with a similar date for Jajjaṭa based on colophons to his commentary on Caraka. These colophons purport to say that Jajjaṭa was a student of Vāhaṭa or Vāgbhaṭa, the name of the author of the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā* and the *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha*, whose dates are estimated to be between the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. The authenticity of these colophons, however, has been called into question and thus doubt is cast on him as a pupil of Vāgbhaṭa.<sup>10</sup>

Like his date, Jajjaṭa's place of residence is also a matter of debate. Some say that he came from Sindh, others claim that he lived in Kaśmīr. Meulenbeld has no opinion on this matter. It is clear, however, that his work on the *Caraka Samhitā* was extremely erudite, as he cites authors and quotes works from a variety of genres of Sanskrit literature besides āyurveda. Likewise, his views were known to most of the subsequent commentators and authors of Sanskrit medical literature. In addition to offering an accurate interpretation of Caraka and Suśruta, Jajjaṭa was particularly concerned with the establishment of a reliable, if not a standard, text of the *Carakasamhitā*.<sup>11</sup>

In this paper, I wish to take a closer look at Jajjaṭa's commentary and the information we have about it in order to shed some light on the controversies surrounding his teacher and home and to point to some significant aspects of his work. First, I shall give a description and a comparison of the sources we have for his commentary. This is followed by an analysis of the colophons found in the extant parts of his commentary. The paper concludes with an examination of Jajjaṭa's remarks to CaCi 2.3.8-10.

### Sources for Jajjaṭa's Commentary

The information about Jajjaṭa's commentary on the *Carakasamhitā* comes from four sources: three transcriptions of a palm-leaf manuscript, and a printed edition of the *Carakasamhitā* with Jajjaṭa's and Cakrapāṇidatta's commentaries. A fifth source is purported to exist, but has not been verified. It is listed as manuscript 4 in the fifth list of manuscripts in Trippunnittura, Kerala, which belongs to a certain Āyurvedavid-

<sup>10</sup> HIML, IA:191- 94; IB: 295-300.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

vān T. Kunchu Variyar.<sup>12</sup> It is quite possible that this is the original palm-leaf manuscript from which the copies were made.

MC and PE	NC 1	NC 2-3
CaCi 1.3.32-3.289	CaCi 1.3.32-2.3.10	CaCi 2.3.10-3.217
CaCi 3.310-5.73	CaCi 3.260-289	CaCi 3.260-286 (middle)
CaCi 23.159-24.20	CaCi 23.159-24.20	
CaCi 24.29-26.10	CaCi 24.29-198 (beginning)	
CaCi 28.83cd-29.11		
CaCi 29.49-30.132		
CaCi 30.288-312		
CaKa 1.1-4		
CaSi 3.8-7.32		CaSi 3.13-7.32
CaSi 12.74-78		

(Figure 1: Jajjāta's extant commentary)

#### *Malayālam Copy (MC)*

This is no. R2983 in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library in Madras/Chennai. It is a transcription in modern Malayālam script on 254 folia begun in the latter part of 1919 and completed in 1920. Its source was a palm-leaf manuscript owed by M. R. Ry. Vaidyan Variyar, who resided at Tirappanathura in what was then called Cochin State. The text is incomplete, covering the commentary to parts of the Cikitsāsthāna, Kalpasthāna, and Siddhisthāna. Kuppuswami Sastri gives the ending of the transcription as corresponding to the commentary to CaSi 7.32,<sup>13</sup> where on page 477 the transcription ends with a statement in English about its source: Vaidya Warriar, and date: 1919. The transcription, however, continues for an additional two pages of very fragmented text, ending on page 479 with the following statement in English, "Transcribed in 1919-20 from a MS of M. R. Ry. Vaidyan Variar of Tirappunathura, Cochin State, and signed: M, 7.9.19. In addition to being in-

<sup>12</sup> V. Kutumba Sastry, ed. and K.V. Sarma, comp. and ed., *Science Texts in Sanskrit in the Manuscripts Repositories of Kerala and Tamilnadu* (New Delhi: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, 2002). p. 173 no. 2545.

<sup>13</sup> S. Kuppuswami Sastri, comp., *A Triennial Catalogue of Manuscripts collected during the triennium 1919-20 to 1921-22 for the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*. Vol. IV. Part. 1. Sanskrit A. (Madras: Printed by the Superintendent, Government Press, 1927), pp. 4331-32.

complete, the transcription contains many gaps in the text, which probably result from a damaged original.

### *Printed Edition (PE)*

There is only one edition of Jajjāṭa's commentary. It was made by Haridatta Śāstrin and is based on the Malayālam transcript (R 2983) in Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras.<sup>14</sup> Haridatta Śāstrin explains that the original is a palm-leaf manuscript and that the gaps in the text were filled in by his own hand which, he says, was guided by the context of the subject-matter surrounding the missing parts. Although Haridatta Śāstrin's attempt to provide clarity and consistency is commendable, at times his eagerness transgresses the boundary of what is considered acceptable.

### *Nāgarī Copy*

The Nāgarī copy, occurring in three parts, corresponds to manuscript no. T.850 in the collection of the University of Trivandrum Library and to no. 835 in the collection of the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum.<sup>15</sup> The two numbers refer to the same manuscript.

According to K. Mahādeva Śāstrin, the owner of the copies was a certain Nārāyaṇa Mūss Mūttatu, from Idayindathu in British Cochin.<sup>16</sup> This is confirmed by the title pages to the copies (see below). Although the pages are number consecutively from 1-307, the manuscript is divided into three parts and appears to be by two different scribes.

Part I (NC 1) covers pages 1-104, and has an introduction in Malayālam, which is signed and dated at what appears to be 7.6.105, which

<sup>14</sup> Śrī Haridatta Śāstrin, ed. Mahārṣipunarvasuśiṣyena ṛṣivareṇa agniveśena praṇītā mahāmuniṇā carakeṇa kāpilabalena dṛḍhabalena ca pratisaṃkṛtā *Carakasamhitā mahāmahopādhyāyacarakaturānanaśrīcakraṇāḍḍataviracitayā Āyurvedadīpikāvyākhyayā* (tathā cikitsāsthānataḥ siddhisthānam yāvat) śrīvāgabhaṭaśiṣyācāryavara-jajjāṭaviracitayā Nirantarapadavyākhyayā ca saṃvalitā | Āyurvedācāryeṇa Paṇ. Śrīharidattaśāstrīṇā saṃśodhitā, pūritajajjāṭaṭīkātrūṭitāmśabhāgā ca | dviṭīyo bhāgaḥ lavapurīyapaṭcābasamskṛtapustakālayādhyakṣaiḥ śrī motīlāl banārsīdās ity etaiḥ svakīye "mumbai saṃskṛta" ity ākhye mudraṇālaya mudrāpayitvā prakāśitā | (dviṭīyāvṛttiḥ) | saṃ 1997, san 1941.

<sup>15</sup> Suranad Kunjan Pillai, comp., *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum*, Vol. 1 (A to Na) (Trivandrum: The Alliance Printing Works, 1957) p. 216; and K. Mahādeva Śāstrin, comp. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum*. Vol. 5 (Trivandrum: V.V. Press Branch, 1939), pp. 1817-18.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

probably corresponds to the first day of the month Makara in the Kollam era of 1(1)05, or sometime around 30 January 1930. Its date, therefore, falls between that of parts 2 and 3.

Parts 2 and 3 (NC 2) are by the same scribe, Nā.(Nārāyaṇa?) Ananta-kṛṣṇaśarmā. NC 2 covers pages 105-228, however, numbers 1-124 have been scratched out, indicating that this was probably an independent copy, later combined with the other copy. It begins precisely where the NC 1 leaves off at CaCi 2.3.10 and ends with the commentary to CaSi 7.32, which corresponds to the ending provided by Kuppurswami Śāstrin for MC. The title page for this section provides the following information:

śrīḥ carakanirantarapadavākhyā	
kartā (author)	jajjāṭaḥ
ādarśsvāmī (copy's owner)	nārāyaṇan müss dakṣiṇa ḷayīṭam
ādarśsaṃkhyā (copy's number)	1768
puṭsaṃkhyā (page numbers)	1-124/ 105-228
pratipuṭaṃ paṅktayaḥ (lines per page)	16
lekhaknāma (scribe's name)	nā anantakṛṣṇaśarmā
pratirūpitasamayaḥ (date of copying)	1-6-1(1)05 (=1 Makara 1105 or 14-1-1930)

NC 3, covering pages 229-307, has title pages with the following information:

śrīḥ carakanirantarapadavākhyā	
kartā (author)	jajjaraḥ
granthsvāmī (book's owner)	nārāyaṇan müss ḷayīṭamtṭū tekkeṭaṃ
granthnampra (book's number)	1768
asamgratādi (incompleteness)	(asamgrā) (incomplete)
prīṣṭinampra (page numbers)	229-307
pratiprīṣṭipaṅktayaḥ (lines per page)	16
pratirūpitasamayaḥ (date of copying)	17-6-1(1)05(=17 Makara 1105 or ~30-1-1930)
lekhaknām (scribe's name)	nā anantakṛṣṇaśarmā

There is yet another Nāgarī copy deposited in the library of the Government Ayurveda College in Jamnagar, Gujarat, formerly known as the Gujarat Ayurved College, Jamnagar. It is number 115 and contains 295 pages. The copy was completed by C.N. Subramania Sastry on 1.3.1945 and compared by Sastry and another person, whose name I cannot make

out, on 6.3.1945. The title page of this copy states the following: Śrī Carakasamhitāvyākhyā [Nirantapadavyākhyā] (Jajjāṭa-kṛtā). R.no. 2983. This copy is simply a devanāgarī copy of the MC, which bears the number 2983. There is nothing new offered in this copy and is useful when difficulties occur in reading the Malayālam copy.

### *Comments*

The four extant sources for Jajjāṭa's commentary on the *Carakasamhitā* derive from a single palm-leaf manuscript in Malayālam script, owned by a certain Vaidyan Variar, who lived in Cochin. The original fragmented manuscript is now, for all intents and purposes, lost, leaving only transcriptions. The earliest transcription is also in Malayālam script. It was undertaken in 1919 and completed in early 1920. The second is in Devanāgarī script. It occurs in three parts and was completed in January 1930. The third copy, made in 1945, is also in Devanāgarī script, but is simply a copy of the earlier Malayālam copy. In 1940-41 a printed edition was published which included the text of the *Carakasamhitā*, along with the complete commentary of Cakrapāṇidatta and the fragmented commentary of Jajjāṭa.

The Malayālam copy served as the basis of the printed edition, which follows the copy very closely and which has its gaps filled in by the editor Haridatta Śāstrin. Except for the editor's emendations and the occasional typographical error, MC and PE are essentially identical. The Nāgarī copy poses an interesting problem. Although it follows the Malayālam copy in the location of the gaps, it does not correspond exactly to it. Many chapters in the Cikitsā, Kalpa, and Siddhisthānas are wanting and the size of the gaps is often larger in the Nāgarī than in the Malayālam copy. Moreover, parts 2 and 3 are full of errors, and in part 2 passages were out of sequence, suggesting that there might well have been disorder in the leaves of the original manuscript. The Nāgarī copy, therefore, is most likely a second independent witness of the original palm-leaf manuscript.

A brief comparison of the three sources illustrates more precisely the discrepancies between MC and NC, and the method of filling in the gaps employed in PE.

### **Comparison of the Sources**

The average size of the missing text in NC is approximately six to eight akṣaras; and the gaps were often larger in NC than in MC. This indicates that the gaps in the earlier copy were probably one or two akṣaras

smaller, and that the later copy was undertaken at a point where the original manuscript had undergone further deterioration. Furthermore, the regular occurrence of the gaps indicates that the missing akṣaras probably resulted from the breaking off of the ends of the original palm-leaf manuscript. The following are passages from the beginning, middle, and end of each of the three version of the commentary. They show the discrepancies in the gaps in MC and NC and the editor's reconstructions in PE.

*Beginning: CaCi 4.8-11*

MC (p. 15): śaknuvanti sa kartum iti sa...nyāyo himavāt kṣetram utkr̥ṣṭam

NC 1 (p. 14): śaknuvanti sa kartum iti... kṣetram utkr̥ṣṭam

PE (p. 829): śaknuvanti sa kartum iti sa (eva khalu) nyāyo, himavān kṣetram utkr̥ṣṭam

*Middle: CaCi 24.189-190*

MC (p. 285) and PE (p. 1378), verse Ci 24.189 cited in commentary

yad idaṃ karma nirdiṣṭam pṛthagdoṣabalaṃ prati

sannipāte daśavidhe tad vikalpyaṃ bhiṣagvidā

NC 1 (p. 103), Eight akṣaras missing.

yad idaṃ karma nirdiṣṭam pṛthagdoṣabalaṃ ...

... vidhaṃ tad vikalpyaṃ bhiṣagvidā

MC (p. 285): śītaḷānyannapānāni...daśavidhaṃ

NC 1 (p. 103): śītaḷānya...daśavidhaṃ

PE (p. 1378): śītaḷānyannapānāni (ityārabhya prakalpyaṃ) daśavidhaṃ

*End: CaSi 7.30-31*

MC (p. 476): sambaddhe datte niḥśeṣa eva vā...śād iti

NC 3 (p. 304): sambaddhe vā datte niśśeṣa e...śād iti

PE (p. 1706): sambaddhe datte niḥśeṣa eva vā/ (sachvāsya vātapūrṇā)śād iti

The gaps in MC seem to be consistent throughout, while in NC they increase from two to six akṣaras, with fewer missing akṣaras in the middle and end of the copy. The missing eight akṣaras in the middle of NC is based on a comparison of the known verse in the text and indicates the largest number of missing akṣaras.

### Comparison of Colophons

The colophons in the three principal versions do not always correspond to each other. Therefore, they deserve closer examination. Controversy exists over the precise relationship between Jajjāta and a certain Vāhāta,



mentioned in some of the colophons. Haridatta Śāstrin in his emended edition of the text indicates that Jajjaṭa was a student of Vāhaṭa or Vāgbhaṭa. This was challenged by G. Hāldār, whose doubts were echoed by P.V. Sharma and G.P. Sharma. Meulenbeld also questions the authenticity of Haridatta Śāstrin's colophons.<sup>17</sup> Their opinions, however, are based only on the colophons found in the printed edition, where an editorial hand is clearly visible.

Although limited in number, the colophons from the three versions provide a more accurate picture of the commentators' self-references. Variations to MC are indicated in bold type.

*To CaCi 1.3:*

MC and PE: iti śrīvāha[ṭa]śiṣyasya jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām kara-pracitīyo nāma rasāyaṇapādas tṛtīyaḥ samāptaḥ, "thus ends the third foot of the [chapter] on longevity therapy, called 'hand-picked [fruits],' in the 'explanation in concise words' in the composition of Jajjaṭa, the student of Śrī Vāhaṭa."

NC 1: iti **śrībāhaṭe** jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām **rasāyaṇādhyāyaḥ** samāptaḥ, "thus ends the chapter on longevity therapy in the 'explanation in concise words' in the composition of Jajjaṭa at Bāhaṭa (?)".

*To CaCi 1.4:*

MC: śrī vāhaṭaśiṣyajajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām carakasamhitāyām cikitsasthāne rasāyaṇādhyāyaḥ samāptim agamat

PE: iti śrī **vāhaṭaśiṣyasya jajjaṭasya** kṛtau **carakasamhitānirantarapadavyākhyāyām** cikitsasthāne rasāyaṇādhyāyaḥ samāptim agamat

NC 1: iti **śrībāhaṭe jajjaṭasya** kṛtau **nirantarapadavyākhyāyām rasāyaṇādhyāyaḥ** samāptaḥ ||

*To CaCi 2.1:*

MC and PE: iti śrīvāhaṭaśiṣyasya jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām saṃyogaśaramūlīyaḥ pādaḥ samāptaḥ

NC 1: iti **śrīvāhaṭe jarjaṭasya** kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām saṃyogaśaramūlīyaḥ

*To CaCi 2.2:*

MC and PE: iti śrīvāhaṭaśiṣyasya jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyā[m] māsikta-ksīrikāḥ samāptaḥ

NC 1: iti **śrībāhaṭasya** kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām māsikta-ksīrī(i)kaḥ samāptaḥ

<sup>17</sup> HIML, 1A: 193; 1B: 298.

*To CaCi 2.3:*

MC and PE: iti jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām māṣaparnabhṛṭīyaḥ samāptaḥ

NC 2: iti **jarjaṭasya** kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām māṣaparnabhṛṭīyaḥ samāptaḥ

*To CaCi 2.4:*

MC and PE: iti jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām cikitsitasthāne dvitīyo ['] dhyāyaḥ samātim agamat<sup>18</sup> ||

*To CaCi 3:*

MC: iti carakasamhitāyām cikitsitasthāne vāhaṭajajjaṭakṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām jvaracikitsitā nāma tṛtīyodhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ

PE: iti carakasamhitāyām cikitsitasthāne vāhaṭa**śiṣya**jajjaṭakṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām jvaracikitsitaṃ nāma tṛtīyo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ

*To CaCi 4:*

MC: iti mahājahnūvati śrībāhaṭajajjaṭakṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām raktapittacikitsitaṃ nāma caturthodhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ<sup>19</sup>

PE: iti mahājahnūvati śrīvāhaṭa(**śiṣya**)jajjaṭakṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām raktapittacikitsitaṃ nāma caturthodhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ

*To CaCi 23:*

MC: iti jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāṭīkāyām viṣacikitsitam

PE: iti [**vāhaṭaśiṣyasya**] **jajjaṭasya** kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām viṣacikitsitam

NC 1: iti **bāhaṭe jarjaṭasya** kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām viṣacikitsitam

*To CaCi 24:*

MC: mahājahnūvati śrī bāhaṭajajjaṭasya nirantarapadavyākhyāṭīkāyām madātyaya-cikitsitaṃ samāptam iti

PE: **iti** mahājahnūpati śrī bāhaṭa(**śiṣya**)jajjaṭasya nirantarapadavyākhyāṭīkāyām madātyaya-cikitsitaṃ samāptam iti

*To CaCi 25:*

MC: iti śrī vāhaṭajajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām divraṇīyacikitsitaṃ samāptam

PE: iti śrī bāhaṭa**śiṣya**jajjaṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyām divraṇīyacikitsitaṃ samāptam

<sup>18</sup> Printed edition omits samātim agamat

<sup>19</sup> samāptaḥ here is in nāgarī letters.

*To CaCi 28:*

MC: iti jajjāṭasya kṛtau vātacikitsitaṃ samāptam

PE: iti **śrī vāhaṭaśiṣyasya** jajjāṭasya kṛtau **nirantarapadavyākhyāyāṃ carakasamhitāyāṃ** vātacikitsitaṃ **nāma** samāptam

*To CaCi 29:*

MC: iti vāhaṭajajjāṭakṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyāṃ vātaraktacikitsitaṃ samāptam

PE: iti vāhaṭa**śiṣyasya** jajjāṭasya kṛtau nirantarapadavyākhyāyāṃ **carakasamhitāyāṃ** vātaraktacikitsitaṃ samāptam

The following colophons are brief and do not provide the information about the author or his text. The closeness between the copy and the printed edition, however, testifies to their common source.

*To CaSi 3:*

MC and PE: iti dviṭīyaṃ vastu/ iti siddhau ṛṭīyo 'dhyāyaḥ

NC 2: dviṭīyaṃ vastu/ iti siddhau ṛṭīyo 'dhyāyaḥ

*To CaSi 4:*

MC and PE: iti siddhau cathrtho 'dhyāyaḥ

NC 2: iti siddhau cathrtho 'dhyāyaḥ

*To CaSi 5:*

MC and PE: iti siddhau paṭcama 'dhyāyaḥ

NC 2: iti siddena...

*To CaSi 6:*

MC and PE: saṃgraho yayoktaḥ/ dviṭīyaṃ vastu/ iti siddhasthāne ṣaṣṭho [']dhyāyaḥ

NC 2: saṃgrahayoktaḥ dviṭīyaṃ vastu/ siddhasthāne ṣaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ

*Comments*

In general, colophons from CaCi exhibit the most, while those from CaSi, the least, variation in the three principal versions. MC and PE are very similar, while NC 1 and NC 2 to CaCi are often quite different from each MC and PE. No where does NC 1 or NC 2 mention that Jajjāṭa is the student (*śiṣya*) of Vāhaṭa, a statement that occurs in the first four colophons to CaCi in MC and PE. It would appear, therefore, that all the three principal sources state that Jajjāṭa was a student of Vāhaṭa, whose identity, however, remains uncertain. One option is that Vāhaṭa is the Malayālam spelling of Vāgbhaṭa, who could be the celebrated medical author from the seventh century A.D.

The variant readings in NC 1 and NC 2 might, like in the other parts of the text, result from the further deterioration of the original palm-leaf manuscript at the time of copying. The variations found between MC and PE, on the other hand, are considerably less significant and are due to the editor's efforts to provide uniformity in the colophons throughout the text.

Only at CaCi 4 and 24 is there mentioned the name Mahājahnūvati. PE's reading of *mahājahnūpati* at Ci 24 results from a misreading of the letter "v" in Malayālam, which looks like the letter "p". Therefore, the interpretations based on the wrong reading are untenable.<sup>20</sup> Since the correct reading is *mahājahnūvati*, P.V. Sharma and G.P. Sharma suggest that it probably refers to Mahājahnūvatī, a place in Kaśmīr, where Jajjāta lived.<sup>21</sup> I have not been able to varify the existence of such a place in Kaśmīr.

### Jajjāta remarks to CaCi 2.3.8-10

A passage from the *Caraka Saṃhitā* with the corresponding comments of Jajjāta provides an example of the commentator's style and points to certain differences between the version of the mūla text he knew and the one that is commonly used at present.

#### *Text of CaCi 2.3.8-10*

medāṃ payasyāṃ jīvantīm vidārīm kaṅṭakārikām/  
 śvadamṣṭrām kṣīrikām māśān godhūmāt chāliṣaṣṭikān// 8  
 payasy ardhodake paktvā kārṣikān āḍhakonmite/  
 vivarjayet payahśeṣaṃ tat pūtaṃ kṣaudrasarpiṣā// 9  
 yuktaṃ saśarkaraṃ pītvā vṛddhaḥ saptatiko 'pi vā/  
 vipulaṃ labhate 'patyaṃ yuveva ca sa hrṣyati // 10<sup>22</sup>

#### *Translation*

After boiling, in one *āḍhakam* (3.072 l) of milk [from the milch cow] plus half that amount (1.536 l) of water, one *karṣan* (12 g) each of [the following]: medā (*medā*), payasyā (*payasyā*), cork swallow wort (*jīvantī*), milky yam (*vidārī*), yellow berried night-

<sup>20</sup> See HIML, 1A: 193; 1B: 298.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> VP: vv 89-91, G: vs 4, Y: vv 7-9.

8c, G: māśān śvadamṣṭrām kṣīrikām.

9a, NSPC (var), GK (tha), J (var): siddhān for paktvā.

9c, G, Y: payah śeṣaṃ

10b (91b), VP, G, J (edition): vṛddhaḥ saptatiko 'pi vā

shade (*kaṇṭakārikā*), small caltrops (*śvadamṣṭrā*), kṣīrikā (*kṣīrikā*), black grams (*māśaḥ*), wheat (*godhūmah*), and both white śāli and sixty-day (*śaṣṭikāḥ*) rice, [the physician] should remove [the pasty scum of those plants]. [Then,] after drinking that milk, remaining [after boiling], which has been strained and mixed with honey (*kṣaudram*), clarified butter (*sarpiḥ*), and finally ground white sugar (*śarkarā*), an old man, or even one in his seventies, acquires abundant offspring and he becomes sexually aroused like a young man.

### Text of Jajjaṭa

medāṃ payasyām ity ādyaparam<sup>23</sup> | vṛddhaḥ sāptatika eveti<sup>24</sup> dvayam kim artham an-  
yataroktyaiva siddhatvād ucyate | saptater ūrdhvam apīty eṣo 'bhiprāyaḥ | [aprikṣiṇa-  
dhātuḥ] na tu<sup>25</sup> jīrṇatara iti | nanu ca pūrvottaravyādhātaḥ 'saptatyāḥ<sup>26</sup> parato na ca  
āyusḥkāmo<sup>27</sup> nara[h] sṛbhiḥ saṃyogaṃ gantum arhati | ' [iti ?] tan nākṛtavājī-  
karaṇasyāyaṃ pratiśedhaḥ<sup>28</sup> | tasyāpy upari striyaṃ<sup>29</sup> vrajato 'tyarthaṃ śuklakṣayād  
anarthaḥ syāt | vājīkaraṇopayogād āpyāvitaśuklasya<sup>30</sup> na doṣa iti | yuveva parihṛṣyatīty  
etāvati vācye prāpnoty apatyam vipulam iti [e]tājīṭāpayāmāsa saptateḥ parato na  
sāmarthyam<sup>31</sup> apatyotpādane nāpi harṣo 'sya tu vājīkaraṇasyāyaṃ<sup>32</sup> prabhāvaḥ | yenobha-  
yam api nirdoṣam abhigamanam apatyotpādanaṃ ceti | ayam aparo 'ṣṭamo yat  
kṣīratrayam ādyam vyākhyātam | navamam ||<sup>33</sup>

### Translation

“medā and payasyā” (*medāṃ payasyām*) is another [formula]. “An old man, barely in his seventies” (*vṛddhaḥ sāptatika eva*). [One may ask:] for what purpose are two mentioned, since it is established just by mentioning one or the other. This is the intention: even beyond seventy [he attains abundant offspring]. But [a man whose tissues are not wasted] cannot be older.<sup>34</sup> One might ask if there is a contradiction [here] in what precedes and what follows [at CaCi 2.4.40b-d], {for, it is said: }

<sup>23</sup> NC 1: ādyaparām

<sup>24</sup> NC 1: sāptatiko veti

<sup>25</sup> NC 1: omits and begins: jīrṇatara

<sup>26</sup> NC 1: saptatyām

<sup>27</sup> NC 1: “āyusḥkamo

<sup>28</sup> NC 1: arhati |” tan nākṛtavājīkaraṇasyāpy [pr]atiśedhaḥ

<sup>29</sup> NC 1: upa...yaṃ

<sup>30</sup> NC 1: śukṣayādanatvāvājīkaraṇopayogād āpyāvitaśuklasya

<sup>31</sup> NC 1: saptake...rthyam

<sup>32</sup> NC 1: vājīkaraṇaḥ syād ayam

<sup>33</sup> NC 1: ye kṣīrataya(text breaks off and NC 2 continues)m ādyam vyākhyātān navamaḥ

<sup>34</sup> According to NC 1: “an older man.”

and not after seventy, can a man, desiring a long life-span, make love with women (*saptatyāḥ parato na ca, āyuskāmo naraḥ strībhiḥ saṃyogaṃ gantum arhati*).

It is not so. This negation relates to him who has not undergone potency-therapy. In addition, for him, there would be no result if he makes love to a woman in excess because there is loss of his semen. For him whose semen has been increased on account of the application of potency-therapy, there is no flaw. In the phrase up to “[he] is completely aroused like a young man” (*yuveva pariḥṣyati*), [the author] made [it] know that “[he] acquires abundant offspring” (*prāpnoty apatyam vipulam*). Beyond seventy, there is no ability to produce offspring nor is there sexual arousal. However, potency-therapy has this specific action (*prabhāvaḥ*), by means of which, both are flawless, i.e., sexual intercourse and the begetting of offspring. This latter [formula] is the eighth. The ninth is the triad with milk, etc., which has already been mentioned [at vv 3-5].

### Comments

Jajjāṭa’s commentary offers variations in the reading of verse 10 of the *mūla*-text, which do not occur in the various printed versions thus far examined (see footnote 22, above). At 10b, Jajjāṭa reads *vṛddhaḥ saptatika eva*, “an old man, barely in his seventies.” NC 1’s version: *vṛddhaḥ saptatiko vā*, “or an old man in his seventies,” lacks a syllable, but comes close to the printed versions. At 10cd, he reads *yuveva pariḥṣyati prāpnoty apatyam vipulam*, “[he] becomes completely aroused like a young man; [he] acquires abundant offspring.” This reading not only has a slightly different vocabulary, but it also reverses the *pāda* order. NC 1 confirms this reading. These textual variations point to a version of the *Caraka Saṃhitā* different from that which has come down to us thus far, and may well be the result of the combination of commentary with text, thus blurring the boundary between *mūla*-text and commentary. NC 1’s version of the Jajjāṭa adds nothing to that of MC and PE, and in places seems to distort the meaning because of corruption or unclear reading.

In terms of its style, Jajjāṭa’s text represents a typical Sanskrit *ṭīkā*-type of commentary, in which words and phrases are glossed and explanations and arguments provided. Moreover, it is a learned commentary, aimed at giving the corrected meaning of the *mūla*-text in the context of the scholastic medical tradition in ancient India.

In the context of the formulas presented in this section of potency-therapy (*vājīkaraṇa*), it is important to notice that Jajjāṭa takes pains to count the formulas and record their numbers as part of his comment. This practice indicates a conscious effort to establish the extent of the material included in the *mūla*-text. This further suggests that the text of

the *Caraka Samhitā* probably had not yet reached its final form at the time Jajjāṭa composed his commentary.

### Conclusions

It can be established with reasonable certainty that only one archetype of Jajjāṭa's commentary existed and that both the Malayālam and Nāgarī copies were its independent witnesses. The printed edition derived from the Malayālam copy. The archetype was presumably a damaged and incomplete palm-leaf manuscript, composed in Malayālam script, which originally belonged to a certain Vaidyan Variyar from Cochin State, but now is apparently lost. The earliest copy of the archetype is the Malayālam copy, which dates from 1919-1920 and serves as the basis for the printed edition, with the exception that the editor has filled in the missing portions, based on context. The Nāgarī copy, dating from January 1930, also derives from the archetype. However, it deviates from the Malayālam copy to the extent that a significant portion is missing and the sizes of the gaps in the text are generally larger. These two variations suggest that the archetype had undergone deterioration in the interval between the two copies were made. Furthermore, along with these variations, the Nāgarī copy contains numerous mistakes and corrupt readings, therefore, making it slightly inferior to the Malayālam copy. Since it is the only other witness to the original, it needs to be consulted.

As expected the colophons of MC and PE in general correspond to each other, with the exception that PE supplies information wanting, but presumed, in MC. The colophons found in NC often show considerable variation from MC. This might have resulted from the poor state of the archetype at the time of copying.

Since MC is the best and most reliable version of the text, it can clearly be established from the first four colophons found in the Cikit-sāsthāna that Jajjāṭa was the student of Vāhaṭa, who could be the same person as Vāgbhaṭa, but the final determination must await further research. The mention of the name Mahājahnnavati in two of the colophons could well refer to a place in Kaśmīr, but the existence of such a place needs independent varification.

Finally, Jajjāṭa's scholastic style follows that of a traditional ūkā, with a specialisation in āyurvedic terminology and concepts. A principal aim of the commentator is the establishment of the correct reading of the mūla-text, which in places varies from the extant printed editions from Calcutta and Bombay. This could, therefore, point to a different recension of the *Caraka Samhitā*, which was known to Jajjāṭa or simply be the

result of his commentarial style. A comparison of his readings with the copies of various manuscripts now housed in Vienna is currently underway and should shed light on this issue. Furthermore, in his effort to provide a correct version of the mūla-text, Jajjaṭa set limits to the *Caraka Saṃhitā* by introducing a system of counting the number of formulas so that nothing more could be added or deleted after him. His employment of this technique suggests that the text of the *Caraka Saṃhitā* was still in the process of evolution at the time he composed his commentary.

This brief study of Jajjaṭa's *Nirantarapadavyākhyā* is but an introduction to a hitherto unexplored yet important early commentary on the *Caraka Saṃhitā*. Further investigations of the manuscript copies and printed edition will reveal the full extent of Jajjaṭa's contribution to the development of early āyurveda and help establish Jajjaṭa as a leading figure in the history of Indian medicine.

### Bibliography (with abbreviations)

- (VP) [Gaṅgāviṣṇu Śrīkrṣṇadāśa, ed.] Śrīmaharṣicaraka-praṇītā *Carakasamhitā* | sūtra-nidāna-vimāna-śārīra-indriya-cikitsita-kalpa-siddhisthāner(?) vibhāṣitā gaṅgāviṣṇu śrīkrṣṇadāśa | mālika-“lakṣmīveṅkaṭeśvara” steam press, Kalyāṇa-bambai, saṃvat 1989, śaka, 1854 [A.D. 1931].
- (GK) [Gulābkuṅvarbā Āyurvedic Society, ed.] Bhagavatā ”treypunavasunopadiṣṭā tac chisyēna maharṣiṇāgniveśēna tantritā carakadṛḍhabalābhyāṃ partisamkṛtā *Carakasamhitā* | sānvaya-hindī-gurjara, āngaleti bhāṣātrayānuvādālanakṛtā vividhā-pāthāntaraiḥ saṃyogitā | bhāratvarṣāntargatasaurāṣṭrapadeśe śrī jāmanagare, śrī gulābkuṅvarbā āyurvedik-society ityākhyayā saṃsthayā sampādītā prakāśitā ca | ṭṭīyāḥ khaṇḍaḥ | [Jāmnagar: Gulābkuṅvarbā Āyurvedic Society] śakābdaḥ 1871, kristābdaḥ 1949, vikramābdaḥ 2005. Text follows NSPC.
- Kutumba Sastry, V, ed. and Sarma, K.V. comp. and ed., *Science Texts in Sanskrit in the Manuscripts Repositories of Kerala and Tamilnadu* (New Delhi: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, 2002 [Saṃskṛtavarṣasmṛtigranthamālā 1].
- (J) [Śrī Haridatta Śāstrin, ed.] Maharṣipunarvasuśiṣyēna ṛṣivareṇa agniveśēna praṇītā mahāmuniṇā carakeṇa kāpilabalena dṛḍhabalena ca pratisamkṛtā *Carakasamhitā* mahāmahopādhyāyacarakacaturānana-śrīcakra-pāṇidattaviracitayā Āyurvedadīpikā-vyākhyayā (tathā cikitsāsthānataḥ siddhisthānaṃ yāvat) śrīvāgabhaṭaśiṣyācārya-varajajjaṭaviracitayā Nirantarapadavyākhyayā ca saṃvalitā | Āyurvedācāryēna Paṇ. Śrīharidattaśāstrīṇā saṃsodhitā, pūritajajjaṭaṭīkātrūṭitāmāśabhāgā ca | dvitīyo bhāgaḥ lavapurīyapatcābasamskṛtapustakālayādhyakṣaiḥ śrīmoltīlāl banārsīdās ity etaiḥ svakīye “mumbai saṃskṛta” ity ākhye mudraṇālaya mudrāpayitvā prakāśitā | (dvitīyāvṛttih) | saṃ 1997, san 1941.
- (HIML) Meulenbeld, G. Jan. *A History of Indian Medical Literature*. 3 Vols. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1999-2002.
- (G) [Narendranātha Senagupta and Balāicandra Senagupta, ed. and rev.] *Carakasamhitā* | mahāmuniṇā bhagavatāgniveśēna praṇītā maharṣicarakeṇa pratisamkṛtā carakacaturānanaśrīmaccakra-pāṇidattapraṇītayā Āyurvedadīpikāvyākhyayā mahāmaho-



- pādhyāya-śrīgaṅgādharakaviratnakavirājaviracitayā Jalpakaḥpatarusamākhyayā ṭīkayā ca samalaṅkṛtā kavirāja śrīnarendranātha senaguptena kavirāja śrībalāicandra senaguptena ca sampādītā saṁśodhitā prakāśitā ca | cikitsita-kalpa-siddhināmaka-sthānatrayasamanvitaḥ tṛtīyaḥ khaṇḍaḥ | prathamam saṁskaraṇam | si. ke. sena eṇḍ kompānī li. 29 naṁ kaluṭolā street, kalikatā | śakābdī 1856 [A.D. 1933]. [Reprinted (from a later edition?) as caturthaḥ khaṇḍaḥ, Vārāṇasī and Dillī: Chaukhambhā Orientalia, 1991 [Vidyāvilāsa āyurvedagranthamālā 1].
- Pillai, Suranad Kunjan, comp., *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum*, Vol. 1 (A to Na). Trivandrum: The Alliance Printing Works, 1957.
- (Y) [Rāmāprakāśa Svāmī and Nārāyaṇa Prasādācārya, eds.] *Carakasamhitā* | vaidyaratnaśrīyogīndranāthasenaḥprāṇitayā Carakopaskārasamākhyayā saṁskṛtavyākhyayā samanvitā (cikitsāsthānam 1-20 avyāyaparyantam) | sampādāḥ vaidyaratna śrīrāmāprakāśaḥ svāmī...vaidyaratna śrīnārāyaṇaprasādācāryaḥ... | sahasampādakaḥ śrībalarāmaḥ svāmī...mohan lāl goṭheca | prakāśaḥ mantrī “śrīsvāmilakṣmīrāma-trust” saṁsthānam | Jayapuram 1982.
- (NSPC) [Trivikramātmaja Yādavaśarmaṇ, ed.] Mahārṣiṇā punarvasunopidiṣṭā tacchiṣyeṇāgniveśena praṇītā carakadṛḍhabalābhyam pratisaṁskṛtā *Carakasamhitā* | śrīcakrapāṇidattaviracitayā Āyurvedādīpikāvākhyayā saṁvalitā | ācāryopāhvena trivikramātmajena yādavaśarmaṇā saṁśodhitā | (tṛtīyāvṛttiḥ) | mumbayyām satyabhāmābāī pāṇḍuraṅga ityētābhiḥ nirṇayasāgaramundraṇālayasya kṛte tatraiva mudrapayitvā prasiddhiṁ nītā | śakābdāḥ 1863, khristābdāḥ 1941. [Reprinted as a fourth edition; New Delhi: Munśīrām Manoharlāl Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1981.]
- Sastri, S. Kuppaswami, comp., *A Triennial Catalogue of Manuscripts collected during the triennium 1919-20 to 1921-22 for the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*. Vol. IV. Part. 1. Sanskrit A. Madras: Printed by the Superintendent, Government Press, 1927.
- Śāstrin, K. Mahādeva, comp. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Curator's Office Library, Trivandrum*. Vol. 5. Trivandrum: V.V. Press Branch, 1939.