

GADĀDHARA

By

A.N. PANDEY, B. RAMA RAO AND K. RAGHUNATHAN

Vijayarākṣita in his commentary on Mādhavanidāna provided a list of a few famous commentators of classical and later treatises as well as authors¹. It is believed by some of the medical historians that the names are listed chronologically maintaining metrical order. According to this view, Gadādhara's position is after Jajjaṭa among the commentators of Carakasamhitā.

D.C. Bhattacharya distinguishes two persons by name Gadādhara connected with medical treatises. They are Vaidya Gadādhara or Gadātharīā and Gadādhara, the father of Vaṅgasena². The latter is considered later to the first and he was known to the medical world only as the father of Vaṅgasena, a Bengali, living in Kāñjika and contemporary to the Sena dynasty³. The former, *i.e.*, Vaidya Gadādhara (Gadādhara) was quoted by Niścalakara, and he is considered as the medical author mentioned by Vijayarākṣita. But Gadādhara was not quoted by Cakrapāṇidatta, Dalhaṇa, Aruṇadatta or Hemāṅgi. Eventhough, Dalhaṇa does not quote him directly a close study of his commentary reveals that Dalhaṇa preferred Gadādhara's version of Suśrutasaṃhitā and modified his copy accordingly before writing Nibandhasaṅgrahavyākhyā. Information ascribed to Vaidya Gadādhara is quoted in the Saduktikarṇāṃṛta of Śrīdharadāsa, composed in 1205 A.D.⁴ Śrīkaṇṭhadatta, also quoted Gadādhara (G.D.) in his commentary on Siddhayoga. Bhāvamiśra quoted him in Jvarādhikāra⁵.

Parentage :

Very little is known about his parentage and other details. Niścalakara indicated in Ratnaprabhā that G.D. was of the dāsa's family in his reference 'antaraṅgagadādhara-dāsa'.

According to Bhattacharya⁶ the word antaraṅga means a court physician. Cakrapāṇidatta used the word for his elder brother, who was antaraṅga to Gauḍādhinātha⁷. Śivadāsasena designated this word to denote "a learned physician of good family" in addition to the previous one in his commentary called Tattvacandrika on Cakradatta. However,

1. Bhāṭṭāra jējjaṭa gadādhara vāpyacandra śrīcakrapāṇi bakuleśvarasena bhojaiḥ Iśāna kārṭika sukīra sudhīra vaidyair maitreya mādhava mukhairlikhitam vicintya
2. Indian Historical Quarterly. xxxiii p. 140
3. Indian Medicine by Jolly, p. 8
4. N. N. Dasgupta, Indian Culture 3. p. 159
5. Bhāvaprakāśa, Jvarādhikāra, interpolation verse 88
6. Indian Historical Quarterly XXIII 1947
7. Cakradatta Chap. 79 verse 15

the term "antaraṅga" only denotes that the particular person belongs to the inner circle in the court of a king, or a confidant of a king⁸. Usually, the court-physicians are "antaraṅgas" of the king. The identity of the king is not clear from the statement of Niścalakara.

It is possible that he came from the famous family of vaidyas of Bengal and was so learned that he had the honourable title of Vaidya Gadādhara or Antaraṅga since a learned physician is supposed to be the shield of everyone's heart⁹. G.D.'s nativity is also strengthened by internal evidence. He uses a Bengali word Ṭāksana for Svārṇacūḍa¹⁰ as quoted in the passages of pramehanidānam by Vijayarakṣita¹¹. Ṭakā for Svārṇa (gold) is purely a Bengali pronunciation, frequently in force for coins. This establishes that G.D. was a native of Bengal. His parents were of Dāsa family.

Works of Gadādhara

Judging from the references of G.D. quoted by Vijayarakṣita for the first ten chapters of Mādhavanidāna, Meulenbeld seems to have come to the conclusion that Gadādhara wrote a commentary on Suśrutasaṃhita. The close scrutiny of the quotations of Gadādhara mentioned by Vijayarakṣita's student Śrīkaṇṭhadatta indicates that he was associated with the commentary of Carakasaṃhita also. Śrīkaṇṭhadatta in the supplementary stanzas of Madhukośa quotes G.D.'s passages from his commentary on Carakasaṃhita pertaining to treatment (cikitsa) of prameha and Kuṣṭha respectively. Haridattasastri, in his introduction to Carakasaṃhita also mentioned G.D. as one of the commentators of Carakasaṃhita, perhaps on these grounds.

G.D. not only wrote a commentary but also seems to have revised Suśrutasaṃhita¹². This is clearly understood from the fact that Dalhaṇa preferred the G.D.'s version of Suśrutasaṃhita and revised his copy accordingly.

Majority of the quotations by Vijayarakṣita and his student Śrīkaṇṭhadatta in Madhukośa are on the verses taken from Suśrutasaṃhita particularly from Nidānasthāna and Uttaratāntra.

G.D. is stated to have written a treatise called Vaidyaprasāra. Niścalakara, pupil of Vijayarakṣita mentions G.D. by name of his work Vaidyaprasāra gadādharaḍayastu, meaning as also mentioned by G.D. and others in Vaidyaprasāra. Besides, Niścalakara often quotes Vaidyaprasāra by G.D. A work called Vaidyaprasāra is repeatedly quoted in Śrīkaṇṭhadatta's commentary on Siddhayoga¹³ and G.D. is also quoted in the same commentary but Śrīkaṇṭha nowhere correlates Vaidya-

8. antaḥ = inner, aṅga = part

9. Com. of Śivadāsaṣena on 6 above.

10. Kvacit ṭāksanā cāṣaḥ iti gadādharaḥ.

11. Mādhavanidāna verse 13 & 14

12. Madhukośa, netraroganidāna. verse 50 etc.

13. e. g. on 9-51, 11-28, 37-59.

prasāraka with G.D. The manuscript of an anonymous medical work called Bṛahadvaidya-prasāraka is in the Coll-Cordier in Paris¹⁴. Bṛhad means voluminous and is only an adjective which is often omitted in common use as names are pronounced generally without the title. It may conclude, in this case, that Vaidyaprasāraka by Gadādhara is available in its anonymous form in that manuscript.

There are indications from quotations of G.D. by Vijayarakṣita that G.D. also wrote a commentary on Vāgbhaṭa¹⁵.

Date

Bhattacharya assumes that the list of authors given by Niṣcalakara is in chronological order. According to that G.D. was later than Vāgbhaṭa, Ravigupta (author of Siddhasāra), Īśvarasena and Mādhavakara and anterior to Govardhana (author of Ratnamālā), Cakrapāṇi and Bakula.

But in the light of the references from Vijayarakṣita, it is proper to conclude that G.D. lived after Jajjaṭa and preceded Vāpyacandra.

Due to the position of Mādhavakara, another list by Vijayarakṣita also becomes chronological, because Kārtikakuṇḍa is posterior to Mādhavakara and anterior to Vṛnda-kunda, if the remark of Śrīkaṇṭhadatta on Siddhayoga is to be trusted. In this Vāpyacandra is considered earlier to Mādhavakara.

G.D. adopted the view of Dṛḍhabala who was quoted by Jajjaṭa. In the various lists, G.D. is referred to after Jajjaṭa. Therefore the upper limit of G.D.'s date is 7th century or the date of Jajjaṭa. The lower limit must be 8th century or the date of Mādhavakara, who was posterior to Vāpyacandra, who lived after G.D. Therefore G.D. can be considered to have lived between 7th and 8th centuries.

As a commentator

G.D. was a great genius and his interpretations on treatises and texts have theoretical and practical applicability. He is quoted by later authorities viz., Vijayarakṣita and his pupils, Cakrapāṇi and Bhāvamiśra etc. as he widely covered the major three treatises—Bṛhatrayi by his valuable commentaries. The following are a few of the important interpretations which focus his ability and command over disciplines relevant to medicine.

1. G.D. provides an etymological exposition for the term nidāna. Nidāna is that, by which an instruction of a disease is discerned.

14. Cordier, Le Muséeon, N.S. 4. 1903, p. 341, Filliozat, J:A. t.224, 1934, p. 162, nr. 161.

15. e.g. Madhukośa-pañcanidāna 4, Jvaranidāna 40, pramehanidāna 13 & 26 etc.

2. A grammatical observation on 'utpatsyati' (imminent) by G.D. is interesting. He revised the word utpatsyati as 'utpitsati' and derived it from the root 'pada' which is used in the sense of 'gati' (motion) with the suffix 'san'. The suffix 'isi' is added to it by applying the Paninian rule 'purvavat sanaḥ' and the word 'utpitsati' is derived in parasmaipada form of the root, meaning 'about to arise' or 'imminent(fever)'.

3. A question is raised in case of sannipāta fever. When fever occurs by concerted action (sannipātajvara) of the three morbid entities, of which the qualities are disagreeing to each other like snow and fire, how it then is possible that morbid alteration by concerted action is produced? G.D. justifies the concerted action by saying that "in a fever, by concerted action, there does not occur any mutual injury of the morbid entities by their disagreeing qualities, due to daiva (by chance) and owing to their inherent quality (of not harming each other)".

4. G.D. interpretes that Suśruta's term 'vahni' (fire) in the description of diarrhoea (atisāra) arising from grief (śokaḥ) denotes only 'pitta'.

5. The next verse mentions "if blood resembling kākaṇanti comes out from grief with smell or without smell and mixed with faeces or without faeces, the vaidyas declare this to be a very troublesome disease". It (this type of diarrhoea, i.e., caused by grief) is extremely difficult to treat without the removal of grief as it is not appeased solely by a remedy. According to G.D. a diarrhoea by grief with only such an onset is troublesome but not the other (types) arising from grief.

6. The fourth type of ajīrṇa (disintegration of the food) is due to a remnant of the rasa. G.D., however, says "A remnant of the rasa is a remnant with regard to the rasa, it is a remnant with regard to the rasa generated from the food, a component part of the food which has entered it additionally, and is not perceptible, like the water which is present in milk".

7. A verse in Vātavyādhinidāna of Mādhavanidāna (originally taken from Suśrutasaṃhitā) runs thus: "Vāta, along with kapha and pitta, and also independently causes the disease ākṣepaka and the fourth is due to injury (abhighata)". According to Madhukośa, one is caused by independent vāta only, another by vāta along with kapha and pitta and the fourth is by injury. The last is numbered fourth since daṇḍāpatānaka is also counted as

16. 'nirdiśyate vyādhiraneneti nidānam'— Madhukośa, i-14

17. Madhukośa, ii-4to 7.

18. Bhāvaprakāśa, Jvarādhikāra, interpolation verse 88.

19. Madhukośa, atisāranidāna 9.

20. Ibid. iii-10 to 21.

21. Ibid. vi- 5.

22. Kapha pittānvito vāyurvāyureva cā kevalaḥ—kuryādākṣepakam tvanyam caturthamabhighātajam. —Mādhavanidāna, vātavyādhinidāna 37.

23. Madhukośa xxii-24.

one clinical entity. It is interesting to note that G.D. does not count the daṇḍāpa-tānaka but explains convincingly as follows: "One is by independent vāta, second by vāta with kapha, third by vāta with pitta and the fourth by injury.

8. G.D. while commenting on Vāgbhaṭa's words 'doṣā^{vṛta}-pathethavā' on pramehanidānam quotes Caraka's words and proves that madhumeha is caused only due to sāvaraṇa vāyu (āvṛtavāta)

SUMMARY

Gadādhara, commentator of Caraka, Suśruta and Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya was a native of Bengal. He comes of Dāsa family. He had also revised the Suśrutasaṃhitā. Gadādhara was a great genius and his interpretations on treatises and texts have theoretical and practical applicability. Gadādhara's date is between 7th and 8th century A.D. He lived after Jejjāta and preceded Vāpyacandra and Mādhavakara.

REFERENCES

1. Bhattacharya, D.C.: New Light on Vaidyaka literature (from Niścalakara's Ratnaprabha), Indian Historical Quarterly 23, 1947, pp: 123-155.
2. Cordier, P.: Recentes decouvertes de Mss. medicaux sanscrits dans l' Inde (1898-1902). Le Museon, N.S. 4, 1903, p. 321-352.
3. Cordier, P.: The Vaidyaka literature of Bengal in the early medieval period. Indian Culture 3, 1936-37, pp. 153-160.
4. Jadavji Trikamji.: Madhavanidana, 5th ed., Bombay, Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1956.
5. Jolly, J.: Indian Medicine, Poona, C.G. Kashikar, 1951.
6. Meulenbeld, G.J.: The Madhava Nidana and its Chief Commentary, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1974.
7. Misra, B.S.: Bhavaprakasa, part-II, 2nd ed., Banaras, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1949.

सारांश

गदाधर

—ए. एन्. पाण्डेय. बि. रामाराव तथा के. रघुनाथन्।

गदाधर, चरक, सुश्रुत और अष्टाङ्गहृदय के टीकाकार थे तथा बङ्गाल के निवासी थे। वे दास कुलमें उत्पन्न हुए थे। उन्होंने सुश्रुतसंहिता की पाठशुद्धि भी की थी। गदाधर एक महान् विचारक थे, जिनकी संहिताओं और सूत्रों की व्यख्याये सैधदान्तिक तथा प्रायोगिक अनुकूलताओं से युक्त हैं। गदाधर का काल सप्तम और अष्टम शताब्दी के मध्य है। वे जेज्जट के परवर्ती तथा वाप्यचन्द्र और माधवकर के पूर्ववर्ती थे।