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Introduction

Several medical manuscripts in different libraries in India are lying unexplored. A detailed survey and scrutiny of the manuscripts would help to throw light on the history of Ayurveda and its development through various periods. This Institute has taken up the collection of the information on medical manuscripts and also detailed study of some of the manuscripts of medico-historical interest and importance.

Among the Ayurvedic classics, Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdaya (Ahr) of Vāgbhaṭa seems to be one with the largest number of commentaries. It shows the popularity of Ahr and also the interest of the scholar-physicians during the medieval period, in interpreting and commenting upon the popular classics, than in composing original works. Specially in the regions of Andhra and Kerala, Ahr was very popular as known by several manuscripts of this work, scattered all over the region. Many manuscripts of Ahr are with notes in Telugu and translations in Telugu verse also appeared.

Harishastri Paradkar, in his introduction to the edition of Ahr listed 34 commentaries on Ahr and the present commentary does not find place in it. P.V. Sarma has added ten more to this list, including the present Dīpika of Udayāditya. (The list of the Commentaries is given in the annexure).

Manuscript:

The manuscript now under study is a palmleaf manuscript preserved in the Osmania University library. Only 9 leaves, written on both sides are available. It is very unfortunate that only a small part is available from the fairly large commentary on a popular comprehensive compendium.

The size of the leaves is 42 x 3.5 cms., and there are 8 lines per page with about 64 letters to a line. The language is Sanskrit and the script is Telugu. Handwriting is good and legible and appears not to be of a very old period. There are several mistakes in the writing, as is common with many manuscripts. Folios are numbered on one side but the number of one leaf is missing. The numbers of the remaining leaves are 34, 48, 44, 52, 58, 54, 61 and 62. The unnumbered leaf appears to be one between 55 and 60. The condition of the leaves is satisfactory but some letters are lost on the edges and also in the middle of leaves bearing numbers 34, 48 and 44.

Other manuscripts of this commentary:

The New Catalogus Catalogorum furnishes the following information on the commentary of Udayāditya on Ahr.
Folio numbers: 34, 44, 53, 54 and 62 (from above downwards)
Reverse of folio numbers: 34, 44, 53, 54 and 62 (from above downwards)
Folio numbers: (No. missing), 43, 52 and 61 (from above downwards)
Reverse of folio numbers: (No missing), 43, 52 and 61 (from above downwards)
It is known from the above that the copies of the present work are available in Trivandrum and Madras. On our efforts to get information and copies of manuscripts from these two places, we received some information, only from the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras. Brief notes on the 8 manuscripts of commentaries of Ahr in the library are furnished and only two of them appear to be related to the present work. The information furnished on the 8 manuscripts is given in the annexure for general information to research workers. The first manuscript in the annexure is said to be of Hṛdayabodhika which is by Dāsapāṇḍita but is similar to that of Udayāditya. This may be due to the presence of sentences and passages of Hṛdayabodhika in Dipika and hence the second manuscript only can be considered as the work of Udayāditya. However, this is again said to be similar to the commentary by Hātakāṅka. The correct position can only be known after a detailed study of the three manuscripts. The note appearing in the New Catalogus Catalogorum on the name of the author as well as of the commentary is probably based on the note of the Madras Library. P.V. Sarma, in his list of commentaries of Ahr also mentions the name of the author of Dīpika as ‘Purandara (Udayāditya)’.

Author, Date and Place:

There are two Colophons in the text available to us. The colophon runs thus ‘Iti Ṣrīṣṭhitagrāma makṣikāranya janmano Mādhavabhaṭṭasya sūnunā Udayāditya-nāmnā saṅgrhitāyā maṣṭāṅgahṛdayadīpikāyām nidānē...adhyāyah’.

(This is the......th chapter in the nidāna of Ahr dīpika by Udayāditya, son of Mādhavabhaṭṭa, having his birth in the ‘Ṣrīṣṭhitagrāma makṣikāranya’. In one colophon Bhaṭṭa is added to the name Udayāditya and an adjective ‘vaidyapurandara’, meaning king (of gods) of the physicians, is also found.

The note in the Catalogus Catalogorum mentions that Udayāditya belonged to Śrīṣṭhitagrāma, a village now called Tinnanur in Chingleput district in Tamilnadu. No evidences are available to us to establish the identity of the village Śrīṣṭhitagrāma. But the fact that this commentary follows the commentary of Dāsapāṇḍita, who belongs to Keralā, supports the view. The word grāma means a village and hence the word Śrīṣṭhita can be the name of the village. But the meaning of the next part of the compound word ‘makṣikāranya’ is not clear. It is not known whether or not the same compound word occurs in the other manuscripts, on whose basis the note appeared in the Catalogus Catalogorum. Makṣikāranya literally means “forest of the flies”. There is a place known as Igalapenta near Śrīsaila, the abode of Lord Mallikarjuna and Goddess Bhramaramba. Śrīsaila occupied an important position during the medieval period. Igalapenta means a village (or place of business or bazar), of flies. Peṇṭa is the old form of peṭa.
which is now also used to mean a village. Srīsaila is situated in the middle of
a big dense forest and the word 'forest' might have been used instead of
village. Could māksikārāṇya be the translation of Igalapentha and Srīsthita used
to denote Srīsailasthita? If the same compound word occurs in the other manus-
scripts also, this view seems to be more probable, also because in the compound
word 'Srīsthitagrāma māksikārāṇya janmanah', māksikārāṇya appears to be the
name of the village and not Srīsthita.

The Catalogus Catalogorum mentions that Udayāditya was also called Puran-
dara or Suvarṇapurandara. The name Purandara and Suvarṇapurandara are not
found in these two colophons. The word Vaidyapurandara, which is only an
adjective to the author in praise of his mastership in medicine, is found. This
suggests the possibility of mistaking it to be the name of the author, if it is associa-
ted with some omission or mistakes of the scribe or the loss of letters in the copy
of the manuscript. In the absence of adequate evidence, it is doubtful whether
these two names i.e. Purandara and Suvarṇapurandara, have any relation to the
name of Udayāditya.

The part of the text available is very meagre to draw any conclusion with regard
to his time. It is unfortunate that not a single name of a book or author or
commentary appears in the text.

Udayāditya clearly mentions that his commentary is a compilation and a
perusal of the text indicates that it is largely based on the commentary of Dāsapān-
dita, whose period is placed around 13th Century A.D. In view of this, it is possi-
ble to suppose that Udayāditya lived after 13th Century A.D.

Subject and Salient features:

The text in the nine leaves, written on both sides, is the commentary on the
following verses of the nidānasthāna-

Chapter VI-10 to 28; Ch.X- 1 to 6; Ch.XI- 49 to the end; Ch.XII- 1 to 35;
Ch.XIII- 1 to 16; Ch. XIV-21 to the end; Ch. XV- 1;

The above verses relate to the nidāna of the diseases: madātyaya (intoxication),
mada, prameha (Polyuria), raktagulma (a kind of uterine swelling related
to blood), vidradhi (tumour; non-inflammatory swelling), udara (swelling of abdo-
men), kuṣṭha (a kind of skin disease), pāṇḍu (anaemia), śvitra (leucoderma),
and kīmi (worm infestation).

Though Udayāditya compiled his commentary on the basis of Hṛdayabodhika
of Dāsapāṇḍita, some ideas and statements of other commentators like Arunadatta
and Hemādri are also found, with no mention to their names.
In the chapter on madātyaya, Vāgbhṛta says that food, if not used judiciously, causes diseases and even death; and such use of intoxicants destroys trivarga (first three of the four pūrṇārthās—objectives of life for the human beings i.e. dharma, artha, kama and mokṣa). This is explained by Udayāditya as also indicative of becoming the instrument for the fulfilment of trivarga. This explanation finds place in Sarvāṅga-sundari also.

Mehas (urinary diseases) are twenty-ten caused by the vitiation of the humour kapha, six by pitta and four by vāta. Dīpika explains why the number twenty is mentioned again, when the total number is already made known by the separate numbers of mehas, due to the three humours. It is to indicate that the two types of madhumeha (the last of the twenty) are to be considered under the term madhumeha only and not to be enumerated separately making the total twenty one. Similarly it explains that the ten types of mehas due to the vitiation of kapha are due to the predominance of each of the ten qualities of kapha viz; svēta, śīta, mūrta, picchila, accha, snigdha, guru, madhura, sāndrā and manda. Dīpika also divides the twenty mehas into two categories—kramakṛta and akramakṛta. This division is mentioned indirectly by Arunadatta and Dāsapaṇḍita also; while explaining the last verse of the chapter, where the prognosis is reiterated.

In raktagula the obstructed ārtava (menstrual fluid) causes the abdominal enlargement along with the appearance of the characteristic signs and symptoms of pregnancy. Enlargement of abdomen is understandable, due to the obstructed ārtava, but doubt arises as regards the appearance of other characteristics of pregnancy. Dāsapaṇḍita quotes one Āgamaṭīka, which answers that it is due to the influence of the place i.e. uterus, where the obstructed ārtava lies. Dīpika says that the appearance of the characteristics is due to samkalpa (psychological influence): just in the same way the effects of poisoning are seen in individuals who presume or feel that they are bitten by a poisonous insect or affected by poisoning. However, he next gives the explanation of Āgamaṭīka also, without mentioning the name.

In the nidāna of udara (diseases of the abdomen or stomach) it is said that all diseases, particularly of the stomach are caused by the weak digestive power. While describing the samprāpti (Pathogenesis), it is mentioned that the humours vitiate the prāṇa and apāṇa (divisions of vāta), and anala (digestive fire) and obstruct the passages etc. and cause udaras. The digestive fire is already mentioned as a causative factor and its vitiation is again indicated under samprāpti. Dīpika says that the first weak digestive fire is due to the ingestion of vitiated food materials, whereas the latter is due to that of three humours.

**SUMMARY**

There are more than 40 known commentaries on Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdaya. Of these a copy of Dīpika by Udayāditya, with nine leaves is available in the Osmania University
Library. These leaves pertain to different chapters in nidānasthāna. The language is Sanskrit and the script is Telugu. From the colophons it is known that the author, Udayāditya was the son of Mādhavabhaṭṭa. having birth in Śrīsthitagāmā, The Catalogus Catalogorum identifies the village as Tinnanur in Chingleput district, and also mentions that the author is known as Purandara or Suvarṇapurandara. But these require further evidence for confirmation.

The author says that his commentary is a compilation and it appears that it follows the Hṛdayabodhika of Dāsapaṇḍita to a great extent. The text available does not mention names of any book, author or commentary. Dāsapaṇḍita is said to have lived before 18th century A.D. and hence the date of Udayāditya may be placed subsequent to this period.

श्री उदयादित्य की अष्टाङ्ग हृदय दीपिका टोका

लेखक श्री उदयादित्य के अनुसार उसकी टीका संग्रह की गयी है और देखने से ऐसा लगता है कि इसमें श्री दास-पण्डित की हृदय दीपिका के बहुत अंशों का अनुप्रमाण किया गया है। प्राथ्य पुस्तक में किसी पुस्तक या लेखक अवश्य किसी टीका का उदर्द्ध नहीं है। दास पण्डित का समय १२ वीं शती के पूर्व माना जाता है, तदनु-सार उदयादित्य काल उसके बाद माना जा सकता है।

Grateful acknowledgements are due to the Librarian, Osmania University, Hyderabad, for permitting to refer and microfilm the manuscript and also to the Curator, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras for furnishing the information on the manuscripts of commentary of Astangahrdaya in their library.
## ANNEXURE

### Commentaries on Astāṅgahṛdaya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Name of the Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aruṇadatta</td>
<td>Sarvāṅgasundara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemādri</td>
<td>Āyurvedarasāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandranandana</td>
<td>Padārthacandrika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indu</td>
<td>Śasilekha or Indumati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aśādhara</td>
<td>Ahr. Udyota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toḍaramalla</td>
<td>Manojīna or Cintāmaṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmanātha</td>
<td>Ahr. īki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hātakāṇḍa</td>
<td>Ahr. dīpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaṅkara</td>
<td>Lalita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramēśvara</td>
<td>Vākyapradipika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvesvarapāṇḍita</td>
<td>Vijñeyārthapraκāśika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāsapaṇḍita</td>
<td>Hṛdayabodhīka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīkrṣṇasemalika</td>
<td>Vāgbhaṭārthā Kaumudi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāmodara</td>
<td>Śaṅketamañjari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasodānandana Sarkar</td>
<td>Pradīpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaṭṭanarāhari</td>
<td>Vāgbhaṭakhaṇḍanamaṇḍana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmānujaścārya</td>
<td>Āṇḍhraṭīka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jejjata</td>
<td>Ahr. īki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaṭṭāraharicandrasuvar</td>
<td>Manodayādityabhaṭṭīya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vācaspatimisra</td>
<td>Śāroddhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manodayādityabhaṭṭa</td>
<td>Bālaprabodhīka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaṭṭa Śrīvardhamānaisuru</td>
<td>Balabodhīni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karnāṭi</td>
<td>Drāvidī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugata</td>
<td>Pathya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerali</td>
<td>Bhṛhatpathya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathya</td>
<td>Vyākhyaśāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhṛhatvyākhyaśāra</td>
<td>Hṛḍya or Hṛḍyārthā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Śiv Śarma</td>
<td>Śiva Dīpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himadatta</td>
<td>Sarvahita mitradatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśvarasena</td>
<td>Anvayamāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāsudeva</td>
<td>Bhṛhatvyākhyaśāra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
89. Disciple of Narāyaṇayogindra —
40. Purandara (Udayāditya) — Dīpika
41. Vāgbhaṭa — Vaiḍūryaka Bhāṣya
42. Viṭṭhalapandita — Dīpika
43. — — Pañjika
44. Śrīkaṇṭha — Alpabuddhiprabodhana

Short Descriptive notes on the Manuscripts of Astangahrdaya in the Govt. Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.

(1) R. 4873 (b) : Ahr vyākhya - Hṛdayabodhika Foll. 19 a-63 (b) Leaf, Telugu Script. Lines 8 in a page, injured.

Similar to the commentary described under R.No. 3699 ante. By Udayadityabhāṭṭa alias Suvarṇapurandara, son of Mādhavabhaṭṭa of Śrīsthitagrāma, a village now called Tinna-nur in the Chingelput District.

Breaks off in the sixth Adhyāya.

(2) R. 3699 : Ahr vyākhya - Dīpika, Paper, Foll. 58 Line 20 in a page, Devanagari, Good.

Similar to the commentary described R.No. 3266 ante. by Hātakāṅka.

Contains the Adhyāyas one to ten in the Sutrasthana, but wants the beginning.


Foll.1a-340 a Fol. 340/ is left blank. Bound in Two Volumes.

Contains 88 Adhyayas in Uttarsthāna.

(4) R. 8419 : Ahr vyākhya, Paper, Foll. 184 Lines 20 in a page, Devanagari and Malayalam, Good.

Similar to the work described under R.No. 3266 ante.

Contains the Adhyayas 1 to 24 complete and 25 Adhyaya of the Uttarasthāna incomplete.

(5) R. 3782 : Ahr vyākhya - Paper, Foll. 290 Lines 20 in a page, Devanagari and Malayalam, Good.
A commentary on the Ahr which work has been described under No. 13072 of the Descriptive Catalogue Sanskrit Manuscripts Vol. XXIII; contains the Adhyāyas - in the Uttarasthāna.

(6) R. 2804: Ahr vyākhya. Paper, Foll. 128; Lines 20 in a page, Devanagari, Good. A commentary on Ahr of Vāgbhaṭa which work has been described under No. 18072 of the Descriptive Catalogue Sanskrit Manuscripts Vol. XXIII. According to the Commentator, Vāgbhaṭa was a disciple of Nārāyaṇayogīndra.

Breaks off in the 15th Adhyāya of Sūtrastrāna.


Similar to the work described under R.No. 87 ante.

Contains complete fourth and fifth adhyāyas in the Ālrāstrāna and the sixth incomplete. The meaning of some words is given in the Malayalam language.

(1) R. 87 Ahr vyākhya - Sarvāṅgasundari. Paper Foll. 25 Lines 20 in a page, Devanagari, Good. incomplete.

(2) R. 8266: Ahr vyākhya - Vākyapradipika, Paper, Foll. 57 Lines 20 in a page, Devanagari, Good.

Foll. la-56a. Fol. 56b is left blank. Fol. 57 gives the contents of this work.

Similar to the work described under R.No. 2898 ante. by Parameśvara, who lived in the village of Aśvattha situated on the bank of the river Nila.

Contains the Nīdānasthāna only, complete.


Foll. 4a-19lb. Fol. la-8b gives the contents of work. A commentary of Śrīdharapāṇḍita on Vāgbhaṭa’s Ahr which work has been described under No. 18072 of the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts Vol. XXIII. it is stated that the author of the Commentary was the pupil of Vāsudeva.

Breaks off in the 11th Adhyāya in the Sūtrastrāna.
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