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Introduction:

Most of the Sanskrit medical treatises are aphoristic and allow different or more than one interpretation. It is here that commentaries help in proper understanding of the content of the aphorism. A commentary brought out utilising tantrayukti clarifies in a logical manner the spirit or the theme contained therein. Bhaṭṭāra made use of this approach, and he and his follower Jajjaṭa who also followed this, were eulogised by Śīṣṭācārya as commentators of great ability. Bhaṭṭāra may be considered pioneer in this approach, and it is this method that is discernible in Kārtikakunda’s approach.

Vijayarākśita enumerated names of commentators and the sequence therein may not be considered chronological, as some of those whose names were mentioned earlier referred to the works of those whose names appear later. The position of Kārtikakunda is after Vāpyacandra and anterior to Cakrapāṇi. Vijayarākśita refers on one occasion to Kārtikakunda placing after Vāpyacandra. Śrikanṭhadatta also quotes Kārtikakunda in Siddha Yoga as posterior to Mādhavakara and anterior to Vṛndakunda.

Absence or inadequate availability of information to provide the accurate account of chronology of authors and since almost all their works have been lost now, it is necessary in case of Kārtikakunda too, to study his biographical data on the basis of internal evidence i.e., passages scattered in works of later authorities, as we also do not possess any of his actual works.

From Kārtika’s passages quoted in the commentary of Dalhana on Suṛutasaṁhitā, we have no doubt about his work on Suṛruta and it is to be

1. On Mādhavanidāna 1, 1, 2 Vijayarākśita enumerates “BHATTARA JEJJATA GADADHARA—VAPYACANDRA-SRICAKRAPANI-BAKULA-ISVARASENA BHOJA (IH)-ISANA-KARTIKA-SUKIRA-SUDHIRA ....etc. This Stanza does not represent chronological order. ISVARASENA and KARTIKAKUNDA who have been put after SRICAKRAPANI DATTAGA have been put after SRICAKRAPANI Datta are anterior to him as the latter quotes them in his work (e.g. Carakasamhita Siddhisthana 1,20-22 and Bhanumati commentary on Susruta Samhita Sutrasthana, page 237 of the Agra edition).

2. On Madhvanidana 1, 5-6, Vijayaraksita refers as: JEJJATA VAPYACANDRA-KARTIKA-KUNDADAYOVYACAKSATE—which suggests that Kārtikakunda is posterior to Vāpyacandra and Madhavakara.

3. Śrikanthadatta’s Kusumavali on Siddhayoga by Vṛndakunda records (on 12, 22-24) Kārtikakunda’s position posterior to Madhavakara and anterior to Vṛndakunda ((see page 359 in Muelenbeld’s Madhavanidana) and calls our attention to consider that Vijayaraksita’s remark on Mādhavanidana 1, 5-6 is right and he should be placed after Vāpyacandra.
supposed from Vijayarākṣita's remarks (on Mādhavanidāna, 2.61-55), that he might have commented on Caraka Samhitā also; besides, we also find his passage on Vāg bhāṭa (on Mādhavanidāna 5.43) in the same work of Vijayarākṣita. These indicate that his works on Brhattrayi were extant till late in the thirteenth century A.D. and have been later completely lost. Kārtikakunda's passages prove, however, that he was a man of great wisdom and genius and the biographical picture may be constructed by the following references:

**Variants on name and Addressing:**

Kārtikakunda is often and frequently called as Kārtika and Kārtikācārya in the works of Dalhana, Vijayarākṣita, Śrīkanṭhadatta, Niścalakara and Vācaspatimīśra who have quoted his passages. When they call him without title as in case of Kārtika it indicates their affection and his being referred with title as ‘Ācārya’ (i.e. Gurū=preceptor) shows their regard.

**Nativity:**

D. C. Bhattācārya (Bhatt., IHQ 28, 1947, p.140) is of the opinion that Kārtikakunda was born in a family of Bengali Vaidyas, bearing ‘Kunda’ (pot) as a family name, of which Vrndakunda was a descendent. Bhattācārya quotes in support of this a stanza from Bharatamallikā’s Candraprabhā (Bhatt; IHQ 23, 1947, p.155) in which it is said that Vrndakunda, the author of a medical treatise, was a resident of Eastern Bengal (Vangībhūmiikṛtāśraya). Kunda, denoting the family name is found both in Kārtikakunda and Vrndakunda. This makes us suppose that both Kārtikakunda and Vrndakunda belonged to a Vaidya family of Bengal. Except this, nothing is known about his parentage or patronage etc.

**Date:**

Vijayarākṣita places him after Śrīcakrapañidatta, in the beginning of his commentary on Mādhavanidāna (1, 1, 2), due to the metre (Vasantatilaka) and hence the verse is not considered to indicate the chronological position. However, Kārtikakunda is quoted by Cakra (Bhānumatī on Suṣruta Sutrasthāna; see Meulenbeeld’s Mādhavanidāna page 394), and is also frequently quoted by Dalhana on Suṣruta Uttaratantra both of whom belonged to the eleventh and the early twelfth century A.D. respectively, and were well acquainted with his works. The list of Vijayarākṣita can not be claimed to be wholly chronological as it is weakened due to position of Iśvarasena prior to Cakra; (on Caraka Siddhīsthāna 1, 20, 22). From other references (eg. Mādhavanidāna 1, 5-6), it is evident that Kārtikakunda is later to Jejjaṭa—Vāpyacandra and Mādhavakara; as he reads “Jējjaṭa—Vāpyacandra—Mādhavakara—Kārtikakundra dayovya’caksate” etc. This order is chronological due to the position of Mādhavakara in it, as appearing

---

from the quotations of Śrīkanṭhadatta in his work Kusumāvalī on Siddhayoga of Vṛndakunda (12, 22-24) places Kārtikakunda between Mādhavakara and Vṛndakunda. If this is to be trusted and since there are no contrary evidences, it can be concluded that Kārtikakunda lived after Mādhavakara and preceded Vṛndakunda because Vṛndakunda himself states in his Siddhayoga (1, 2) that he had modelled his work according to Rugviniscaya of Mādhavakara.

Assuming Mādhavakara’s date in the 8th century A.D. and Vṛndakunda’s date in the 9th century A.D., the date of Kārtikakunda can be fixed between the VIII Century A.D. and the IX Century A.D.

Followers:

Kārtikakunda is quoted by Śrīcakrapāṇidatta, Dalhana, Vijayarākṣita, Śrīkanṭhadatta and Niścalakara (Bhatt. IHQ 23, 1947, p. 140) and also by the later commentator Śrīvācaspatimīśra (Ātanakardarpaṇa on Mādhavanidāna 59-59 & 63).

Personality:

It is interesting to note, that Kārtikakunda, is often quoted by Dalhana, but only on Suśruta Uttaratantra. It may be due to the unique value of this section. His passages (on Suśruta Uttaratantra Chapter 39. 179; 57. 15; 48, 32 and 58, 47-48 etc.) prove him a person with an independent mind; he read certain of the stanzas (Suśruta Uttaratantra 41, 32) from Suśruta Samhita in a revised way with an alternation, on the authority of certain ancient works (chapter 39, 179; and 57, 15 etc.). Though, from the remarks of Vijayarākṣita (on Mādhavanidāna 2. 70-72), it is noted that he is an ardent follower of Jejjata but differs from him at times for the cause of correctness of interpretation. So, it may be concluded that some times he gave a genuine clarification of the conflicting ideas, and made them more traditional by adopting tantrayuktī, which gives a fair glimpse of his work and presents his personality equivalent to Bhaṭṭāra and Jejjata in the medieval period. He thus occupied a pioneering position even in the early days of the late medieval period; and was called “ācārya” by Dalhana himself and was very respectfully quoted in the introductory verse by Vijayarākṣita.

Tantrayuktī:

It is observed from works of Dalhana and Vijayarākṣita that he was the follower of authorities like Jejjata and even ancient authorities like Vṛddhakāśyapa and Viśvāmitra adopted Tantrayuktī or textual wisdom (e.g. Kārtikakundstuvṛddhakāśyapīyasyāśamaṃvādāt trapūsaivārubijānyeyvācakṣate” and “Kārtikastuvyākhyāneyati, tathāca viśvāmitraḥ” etc. Su. U. 58, 47-48). This technique is widely applied by him and this places him at a pivotal position in the medieval period as highlighting both ancient and the late medieval periods by focussing traditional meanings in his works by such means of actual approach to the aphorisms of Samhitās.
Revision:

Based on Tantrayukti, Kārtikakunḍa revised certain readings of Suārūta Samhitā and sometimes even left out readings of Jejiṭa and adopted his own (e.g. Dalhana on 51. 1-3 and 58. 58-74 etc.). This is conclusive that his wisdom was widely utilised in interpreting texts. From Dalhana’s remarks (58. 58-64 above), it appears that his readings were considered of great value and were adopted by Sukīra and Sudhīra, who called them “ārśa”, i.e. pertaining to a seer or a ṛṣi.

Salient Features:

As already observed, Kārtikakunḍa commented on Vṛddhatrayī. It is sad, indeed, that not one work of his was extant except few passages that are scattered in the works of later authorities on Śamhitās viz. Dalhana’s Commentary on Suārūta and Vijayarākṣita’s commentary on Mādhavanidāna etc. It is in them only that we come across his valuable passages on the following Śamhitās.

Caraka:

Passages attributed to Kārtikakunḍa are quoted by Vijayarākṣita (on Mādhavanidāna 2. 61-65), as a tool to solve the controversy between Caraka and Suārūta about employing a remedial agent (Kaśāya) for a fever patient. Vijayarākṣita states: “Is there no contradiction between the words of Caraka which advocate “After six days have passed (one should give) to a fever patient” (Carakacikitsāsthāna: Chapter 3, 101) to those of Suārūta which says “After seven (days and) nights” etc. (Suārūta Uttaratantra chapter 39. 119) after six days have passed the seventh day is present and a Kaśāya is prescribed on that day?—

Kārtikakunḍa explains that “after six days have elapsed”, because of (a way of) counting with omission of the day on which the production of the fever has been brought about in the same way as one calculates, with exclusion of the day on which a basti has been given, the (period of) time during which (the application of a basti should be) avoided.” (tr. Muelenbeld p. 142-43). The skillful interpretation by Kārtikakunḍa based on Tantrayukti resolves this controversy.

Suṣrūta:

His passages on Suṣrūta Samhitā reveal his personality bearing references and his abilities in revising the readings of Suṣrūta or adopting certain readings of his own. We may observe that he maintained the textual meanings according to tradition i.e. Tantrayukti and became a medium between ancient and the late medieval period to link them with tradition and technique.
Kārtikakunda tried to economise the words to provide standard meanings and for the purpose, he sometimes, entered into exhaustive discussion. the quotations and remarks found in works of Dalhana and Vijayaraksita lend support to this.

His quotation cited by Dalhana, on Sūrīta Uttaratantra 39, 179 is an evidence of economy of usage of words while informing standard value of meanings in his work. Here, he adopts “Sūrītaih” against Jejja’s “Pūrvam Kvathitaih Paścāt Śīrātaiah” and he is right as he defends Sūrīta’s opinion that in Pittajvara extremely cold (Sūrītaih) drinks are preferred to quench the troublesome thirst prolonged with the highest degree of heat (i.e. Sūrītaih Śamayet tṝṣṇām Pravṛddhām dāhameva Ca).

Similar instances are found in his quotation by Dalhana on Sūrīta Uttaratantra 44, 25; where he reads “Pībedvā” for Sūrīta’s “Līhyāt” i.e., should be drunk and not licked out. Dalhana following kārtikakunda explains the Passage similarly.

The textual wisdom and the subtle points of the basic principles of Āyurveda were made use of in certain places while interpreting. This fact, however, gets its best support in Madhukośa by Vijayaraksita on Mādhavanidāna (10, 2) where Kārtikakunda’s passages are quoted to defend his views about the specific onset of Rājayākṣmā (consumption), due to obstruction in ducts of the nutrient fluid (Rasavahasrotasa), which according to him is conducive of blood etc., in succession with respect to each of the seven dhātus; Kārtikakunda’s passages have been proofs in defence of this fact, which have had occurred in Sūrīta Uttaratantra 41, 9-10; but now only extant in works of Vijayaraksita (On Mā. ni. 10, 2 above); running as follows:

“‘The trails of the nutrient fluid’ are the ducts carrying the nutrient fluid; in this case the word ‘etcetera’ should be considered to have been elided. Therefore, obstruction of the channels— carrying blood, etc., should be understood (as aimed at) or since the nutrient fluid is the cause (of the production) of blood, etc., the very corruption of nutrient fluid (is conducive) to corruption of the blood etc., thus says Kārtika (Kuṇḍa).’/ (Translation; Meulenbeld’s. Mādhavanidāna. page 380).

Similar instance can be found in his quotations by Vijayaraksita (On Mādhavanidāna 33, 84), where, he is found to have commented on Sūrīta nidānasthāna 6, 20; as the same verse has been quoted by Mādhavakara (i.e. Mā. ni. 38, 34 above). in his work on Pramehanidāna. Kārtikakunda supports the view of Sūrīta by quoting thus.— ‘any kind of inflammation, can not ripe (i.e. get matured) unless it gets excess amount of heat due to the extreme excitement of the Pitta’ (i.e. ‘Kārtikastvāha, Pāka Kāle Pittotkaṭatvam, tasmāddhi Sarvān
Pāripākakāle pacanti śoṭhānstraya eva doṣah” (Su. Sū. Sthā. Ch. 17); which has become a tool for Vijayarākṣita for defence of his statement.

**Vagbhata:**

From some of the passages by Vijayarākṣita on Mādhavanidāna 5, 43, it is evident that he wrote a commentary on Vāgṛbhaṭa’s Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, too. He has given the location of Carmaṅkīla (warts) as “the lip of the anus” i.e. “gudauṣṭhādes’a”, which is related to the subject of the onset of wart; this occurs in the nidānasthāna 7, 57 of Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya. Vijayarākṣita, states that Kārtikakunda and others say that “And these (warts) only occur in the region of the anal lip and not elsewhere.”

Kārtikakunda was a well-versed commentator of the Brhamatrayi who maintained sound tradition of unique nature, in the field of interpretation based on Tantrayukti and principles of Āyurveda.

**SUMMARY**

KĀRTIKAKUNDA, also referred as “Kārtika” and “Kārtikācārya” was a famous commentator of Brhamatrayi. He is later to Vāpyacandra. He is quoted by Śrīcakrapāṇidatta, Dalhāna, Vijayarākṣita, Śrīkanṭhadatta, Niścalakara and also by Śrīvācaspātimiśra. According to readings of Vijayarākṣita and Śrīkanṭhadatta, he is quoted between the range of Mādhavakara and Vṛndakunda. He is considered to have flourished between Mādhavakara and Vṛndakunda i.e., between the VIII and IX Century A. D. No record of his parentage or patronage are available. He is supposed to be a native of Bengal and belongs to a Vaidya family on grounds of his common family title, tallying with Vṛndakunda. From quotations and remarks of Dalhāna and Vijayarākṣita Kārtikakunda appears as a person with an independent mind and many independent views; he revised readings in case of certain verses of Śuṣruta Uṭtaratāntra based on authority of certain traditional authoritative works ascribed to Vṛddhakāśyapa and Viśvāmitra and in some instances left out certain verses. He occupied pivotal point in the medieval period and connected it with tradition of Tantrayukti, following Bhaṭṭāraṇa and Jejjata and himself followed by later authorities of the late medieval period.
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सारांश

कार्तिककुण्ड

कार्तिककुण्ड, जिस्ते कार्तिक और कार्तिकाचार्य भी कहा जाता है, बृहत्त्रयी (चरकसुधृत और वाणे) के एक सुप्रसिद्ध ठीकाकार थे। कालकालणुसार, वे नायचार्य के परवर्ती हैं। उनके सन्दर्भ को श्री चतुपाणिदत्त, डल्ह्यण, विजयरक्षित, श्री कण्ठदत्त, जिष्ठलकर और श्रीवाचस्पति मिथ्रे ने उद्धृत किये हैं।

श्री विजयरक्षित और श्री कण्ठदत्त ने, उन्हें माधवकर और बृंदकुण्ड के मध्य में रखकर उद्धृत किया है।

इसके आधार पर, माधवकर और बृंदकुण्ड का मध्यवर्ती मानकर उनका काल ८वीं शताब्दी और ९वीं शताब्दी के बीच माना जाता है। हमारे पास उनके पितृंत्र अथवा आख्यायिता का कोई जानसौत नहीं होते हुए भी इतना माना जाता है कि वे बड़हेर वर्तमान मुख्य वाले बृंदकुण्ड में उत्पत्त हुए थे, तथा बृंदकुण्ड के पूर्ववर्ती थे। डल्ह्यण एवं विजयरक्षित के उद्धरणों और संकेतों से सिद्ध होता है कि कार्तिककुण्ड एक स्वतन्त्र सिद्धांत वाले व्यक्ति थे; उन्होंने, कई स्थानों पर गुरुत्व की ठीक में कई स्थास्त्रों में पाठ्यविद्वार्डों

की हैं, उनका आधार बृंदकालस्थित एवं विश्वासित जैसे प्राचीन आचार्यों की परम्परागत युक्तियां हैं। सारांश

यह यह है कि, कार्तिककुण्ड की कृतियों से उनका व्यक्तित्व एक ऐसे प्रकाशस्तम्भ जैसा व्यक्त होता है जो अपने आभा से प्राचीनपुरुष के महाराज एवं जेजजाधक की तन्त्रयुक्ति की विभाजन को मध्ययुग में संजोते हुए हैं,

जिसका प्रकाश बिल्भित मध्ययुग के आचार्यों को भी प्रकाशित एवं मार्गदर्शित कर रहा है।