

KĀRTIKAKUNDA

By

A. PANDEY & K. RAGHUNATHAN

Introduction :

Most of the Sanskrit medical treatises are aphorismic 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 Tīsaṭācārya as commentators of great ability. Bhaṭṭāra may be considered pioneer in this approach, and it is this method that is discernable in Kārtikakuṇḍa's approach.

Vijayarakṣita 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 Kārtikakuṇḍa is after Vāpyacandra and anterior to Cakrapāṇi.¹ Vijayarakṣita refers on one occasion to Kārtikakuṇḍa placing after Vāpyacandra.² Śrīkaṇṭhadatta also quotes Kārtikakuṇḍa in Siddha Yoga as posterior to Mādhavakara and anterior to Vṛndakuṇḍa.³

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 Kārtikakuṇḍa 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 Dalhaṇa on Suśrutasaṃhitā, we have no doubt about his work on Suśruta and it is to be

-
1. On Mādhavanidāna 1, 1, 2 Vijayarakṣita enumerates "BHATTARA JEJATA GADADHARA—VAPYACANDRA—SRICAKRAPANI—BAKULA—ISVARASENA BHOJA (IH)—ISANA—KARTIKA—SUKIRA—SUDHIRAetc. This Stanza does not represent chronological order. ISVARASENA and KARTIKAKUNDA who 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 : JEJATA VAPYACANDRA-KARTIKA-KUNDADAYOVYACAKSATE-which suggests that Kartikakunda is posterior to Vapyacandra and Madhavakara.
 3. Srikanthadatta's Kusumavali on Siddhayoga by Vṛndakuṇḍa records (on 12, 22-24) Kartikakunda's position posterior to Madhavakara and anterior to Vṛndakuṇḍa ((see page 359 in Muelenbeld's Madhavanidana) and calls our attention to consider that Vijayaraksita's remark on Madhavanidana 1, 5-6 is right and he should be placed after Vapyacandra.

supposed from Vijayarākṣita's remarks (on Mādhavanidāna, 2,61-55), that he might have commented on Caraka Saṃhitā also; besides, we also find his passage on Vāgbhaṭa (on Mādhavanidāna 5, 43) in the same work of Vijayarākṣita. These indicate that his works on Bṛhatrayi were extant till late in the thirteenth century A.D. and have been later completely lost. Kārtikakuṇḍa'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 :

Kārtikakuṇḍa is often and frequently called as Kārtika and Kārtikācārya in the works of Dalhana, Vijayarākṣita, Śrīkaṇṭhadatta, 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. Bhaṭṭācārya (Bhatt., IHQ 23, 1947, p.140) is of the opinion that Kārtikakuṇḍa was born in a family of Bengali Vaidyas, bearing "Kuṇḍa" (pot) as a family name, of which Vṛndakuṇḍa was a descendent. Bhaṭṭācārya quotes in support of this, a stanza from Bharatamallikā's Candraprabhā (Bhatt; IHQ 23, 1947, p. 155) in which it is said that Vṛndakuṇḍa, the author of a medical treatise, was a resident of Eastern Bengal (Vangabhūmikṛtāśraya). Kuṇḍa, denoting the family name is found both in Kārtikakuṇḍa and Vṛndakuṇḍa. This makes us suppose that both Kārtikakuṇḍa and Vṛndakuṇḍa belonged to a Vaidya family of Bengal.⁴ Except this, nothing is known about his parentage or patronage etc.

Date :

Vijayarākṣita places him after Śrīcakrapānidatta, in the beginning of his commentary on Mādhavanidāna (1, 1, 2), due to the metre (Vasantatilakā) and hence the verse is not considered to indicate the chronological position. However, Kārtikakuṇḍa is quoted by Cakra (Bhānumatī on Suśruta Sutrasthāna; see Meulenbeid's Mādhavanidāna page 394), and is also frequently quoted by Dalhana on Suśruta 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 Śvarasena prior to Cakra; (on Caraka Siddhisthāna 1, 20, 22). From other references (eg. Mādhavanidāna 1, 5-6), it is evident that Kārtikakuṇḍa is later to Jejjāta—Vāpyacandra and Mādhavakara; as he reads "Jejjāta—Vāpyacandra—Mādhavakara—Kārtikakuṇḍādayovyācakṣate" etc. This order is chronological due to the position of Mādhavakara in it, as appearing

4. "Kundavans'e Vṛndakundo Viji Vaidyakasastrkr. Sa'Bharadvāja Sambhuto Vangabhūmikṛtāśrayah."

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

Assuming Mādhavakara's date in the 8th century A.D. and Vṛndakunḍa's date in the 9th century A.D., the date of Kārtikakunḍa can be fixed between the VIII Century A.D. and the IX Century A.D.

Followers :

Kārtikakunḍa is quoted by Śrīcakrapānidatta, Dalhaṇa, Vijayarakṣita, Śrīkaṇṭhadatta and Niścālakara (Bhatt, IHQ 23, 1947, p. 140) and also by the later commentator Śrīvācaspatimiśra (Ātankadarpaṇa on Mādhavanidāna 59-59 & 63).

Personality :

It is interesting to note, that Kārtikakunḍa, is often quoted by Dalhaṇa, but only on Suśruta Uttarantra. It may be due to the unique value of this section. His passages (on Suśruta Uttarantra 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 Uttarantra 41, 32) from Suśruta Saṃhitā 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 Vijayarakṣita (on Mādhavanidāna 2, 70-72), it is noted that he is an ardent follower of Jejjāta 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 *tantrayukti*, which gives a fair glimpse of his work and presents his personality equivalent to Bhaṭṭāra and Jejjāta 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 Dalhaṇa himself and was very respectfully quoted in the introductory verse by Vijayarakṣita.

Tantrayukti :

It is observed from works of Dalhaṇa and Vijayarakṣita that he was the follower of authorities like Jejjāta and even ancient authorities like Vṛddhakāśyapa and Viśvāmitra adopted Tantrayukti or textual wisdom (e.g. Kārtikakunḍastu Vṛddhakāśyapīyasamvādāt trapusairvārubijānyevācakṣate" and "Kārtikastu..... vyākhyānāyati, 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 Saṃhitās.

Revision :

Based on *Tantrayukti*, Kārtikakuṇḍa revised certain readings of *Suśruta Samhitā* and sometimes even left out readings of Jejjāta and adopted his own (e.g. Dalhaṇa on 51, 1-3 and 58, 58-74 etc.). This is conclusive that his wisdom was widely utilised in interpreting texts. From Dalhaṇa'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 "ārṣa", i.e. pertaining to a seer or a ṛṣi.

Salient Features :

As already observed, Kārtikakuṇḍa 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 *Samhitās* viz. Dalhaṇa's *Commentary on Suśruta* and Vijayarakṣita's *commentary on Mādhavanidāna* etc. It is in them only that we come across his valuable passages on the following *Samhitās*.

Caraka :

Passages attributed to Kārtikakuṇḍa are quoted by Vijayarakṣita (on *Mādhavanidāna* 2. 61-65), as a tool to solve the controversy between Caraka and *Suśruta* about employing a remedial agent (*Kaṣāya*) for a fever patient. Vijayarakṣita 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, 161) to those of *Suśruta* which says "After seven (days and) nights" etc. (*Suśruta Uttaratantra* chapter 39, 119) after six days have passed the seventh day is present and a *Kaṣāya* is prescribed on that day ?—

Kārtikakuṇḍa 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 skilful interpretation by Kārtikakuṇḍa based on *Tantrayukti* resolves this controversy.

Suśruta :

His passages on *Suśruta Samhitā* reveal his personality bearing references and his abilities in revising the readings of *Suśruta* 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.

Kārtikakuṇḍa 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 Dalhaṇa and Vijayarakṣita lend support to this.

His quotation cited by Dalhaṇa, on Suśruta Uttaratantra 39, 179 is an evidence of economy of usage of words while informing standard value of meanings in his work. Here, he adopts "Suśītaiḥ" against Jejjāṭa's "Pūrvam Kvathitaiḥ Paścāt Sītīkr̥taiḥ" and he is right, as he defends Suśruta's opinion that in Pittajvara extremely cold (Suśītaiḥ) drinks are preferred to quench the troublesome thirst prolonged with the highest degree of heat (i.e. Suśītaiḥ Śamayet tṛṣṇām Pṛavṛddhām dāhameva Ca).

Similar instances are found in his quotation by Dalhaṇa on Suśruta Uttaratantra 44, 25; where he reads "Pībedvā" for Suśruta's "Lihyāt" i.e., should be drunk and not licked out. Dalhaṇa following kārtikakuṇḍa 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 Vijayarakṣita on Mādhavanidāna (10, 2) where Kārtikakuṇḍa's passages are quoted to defend his views about the specific onset of Rājayakṣmā (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; Kārtikakuṇḍa's passages have been proofs in defence of this fact, which have had occurred in Suśruta Uttaratantra 41, 9-10; but now only extant in works of Vijayarakṣita (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 Vijayarakṣita (On Mādhavanidāna 33, 34), where, he is found to have commented on Suśruta nidānasthāna 6, 20; as the same verse has been quoted by Mādhavakara (ie. Mā. ni. 33, 34 above), in his work on Pramehanidāna. Kārtikakuṇḍa supports the view of Suśruta 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 śothānstraya eva doṣāh” (Su. Sū. Sthā. Ch. 17); which has become a tool for Vijayarakṣita for defence of his statement.

Vagbhata :

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

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

S U M M A R Y

KĀRTIKAKUNDA, also referred as “Kārtika” and “Kārtikācārya” was a famous commentator of Bṛhatrayī. He is later to Vāpyacandra. He is quoted by Śrīcakrapāṇīdatta, Dalhaa, Vijayarakṣita, Śrīkaṅṭhadatta, Niścalakara and also by Śrīvācaspatimiśra. According to readings of Vijayarakṣita and Śrīkaṅṭhadatta, he is quoted between the range of Mādhvakara and Vṛndakuṇḍa. He is considered to have flourished between Mādhvakara and Vṛndakuṇḍa 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 Vṛndakuṇḍa. From quotations and remarks of Dalhana and Vijayarakṣita Kārtikakuṇḍa appears as a person with an independent mind and many independent views; he revised readings in case of certain verses of Śūsruta Uttara Tantra 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 Bhaṭṭāra and Jejjāta and himself followed by later authorities of the late medieval period.

R E F E R E N C E S

1. Vaidya Yadavaji Trikamji Acharya—
The Susrutasaṃhita of Susruta with the Nibandhasaṅgraha Commentary of Sri Dalhanachārya, published from Nirnayasāgar Press, Bombay in 1938.
2. Vaidya Yadavaji Trikamji Acharya —
Madhavanidana by Madhavakara, with the Madhukosa by Vijayarakṣita Srikantadatta and with extracts from Atankadarpana by Vacaspati Misra, published from Nirnayasāgar Press, Bombay in 1955.

3. G. J. Meulenbeld—

Madhavanidana (and its chief commentary) published from Leiden (E. J. Brill) in 1974.

4. Bhāttācārya, D. C.—

New light on Vaidyaka Literature (IHQ, June 1947).

सारांश

कार्तिककुण्ड

ले० अयोध्यापाण्डेय तथा के० रघुनाथन्

कार्तिककुण्ड, जिन्हें कार्तिक और कार्तिकाचार्य भी कहा जाता है, बृहत्त्रयी (चरकसुश्रुत और वाग्भट) के एक सुप्रसिद्ध टीकाकार थे। कालक्रमानुसार, वे वाप्यचन्द्र के परवर्ती हैं। उनके सन्दर्भों को श्री चक्रपाणिदत्त, डल्हण, विजयरक्षित, श्री कण्ठदत्त, निश्चलकर और श्रीवाचस्पति मिश्र ने उद्धृत किये हैं। श्री विजयरक्षित और श्री कण्ठदत्त ने, उन्हें माधवकर और वृन्दकुण्ड के मध्य में रखकर उद्धृत किया है। इसके आधार पर, माधवकर और वृन्दकुण्ड का मध्यवर्ती मानकर उनका काल ८वीं शताब्दी और ९वीं शताब्दी के बीच माना जाता है। हमारे पास उनके पितृत्व अथवा आश्रयदाता का कोई ज्ञानस्रोत नहीं होते हुए भी इतना माना जाता है कि वे वङ्गदेश में कुण्ड उपाधि वाले वैद्यकुल में उत्पन्न हुए थे, तथा वृन्दकुण्ड के पूर्ववर्ती थे। डल्हण एवं विजयरक्षित के उद्धरणों और संकेतों से सिद्ध होता है कि, कार्तिककुण्ड एक स्वतन्त्र सिद्धान्त वाले व्यक्ति थे; उन्होंने, कई स्थलों पर सुश्रुत की टीका में कई श्लोकों में पाठशुद्धियाँ की हैं, उनका आधार वृद्धकाश्यप एवं विश्वामित्र जैसे प्राचीन आचार्यों की परम्परागत युक्तियाँ हैं। सारांश यह है कि, कार्तिककुण्ड की कृतियों से उनका व्यक्तित्व एक ऐसे प्रकाशस्तम्भ जैसा द्योतित होता है जो अपनी आभा से प्राचीनयुग के भट्टार एवं जेज्जट की तन्त्रयुक्ति की परम्परा को मध्ययुग में संजोये हुए है, जिसका प्रकाश बिलम्बित मध्ययुग के आचार्यों को भी प्रकाशित एवं मार्गदर्शित कर रहा है।