### GAYADASA

### G. J. MEULENBELD

De. Zwaan 11, Bedum 97815, Holland.

#### Received: March 26, 1984

#### Accepted: April 15, 1984

ABSTRACT: Some of the problems connected with Gayadasa and his activity as a commentator are discussed, as well as the date to which he can be assigned

Gayadasa was the author of a commentary (panjika)<sup>1</sup>, called Nyayacandrika<sup>2</sup>, on the Susrutasamhita. The humerous quotations from it, an all the sections of the Susrutasamhita, especially to be found in Dalhana's commentary, prove that it covered the whole of that text<sup>3</sup>. In spite of its great fame it has only been partially preserved. The Nyayacandrika on the Nidanasthana is known in one manuscriopt<sup>4</sup> and has been edited<sup>5</sup>. The commentary on the Sarirasthana, still unedited can also preserved in one unique manuscript<sup>6</sup>, is now being studied by Jean-Louis Ruyters, a student of the Institute of Indian Studies of University of Groningen in the the Some authors assume that Netherlands. Gayadasa also wrote a commentary on the Carakasamhita<sup>7</sup>, but conclusive proofs have not been adduced and not a single fragment of it has survived. Gayadasa was one of Dalhana's chief authorities and is profusely quoted by him. Other sources of quotations the Vyakhyamadhukosa, are Vyakhyakusumavali, Niscalakara's Ratnaprabha - Gopaladasa's Cikitsamrta, and Sivadasasenas commentaries. Dalhana often quotes Gayadasa by name, but also refers to him as Gaya<sup>8</sup>. The Nyayacandrika is mentioned once only by name<sup>9</sup>. Apart from these unambiguous references Dalhana

mentions a number of panjikas and two It is difficult to determine panjikakaras. which of these indicate gayadasa and his commentary. In the introduction too his commentary on the Susrutasamhita, the Nibandhasamgraha, where Dalhana informs us about his sources, he remarks that he consulted the panjikakaras quoted by him are evidently these two authors, but this is of little avail in identifying the quotations since . Dalhana never quotes Bhaskara by name only refers to the opinion of the and panjikakara<sup>10</sup> or the two panjikarakas<sup>11</sup>. Moreover, the title of Bhaskara's commentary is left unmentioned by him. The situation is complicated by the fact that Dalhana quotes three panjikas, the Brhat<sup>12</sup>-Maha<sup>13</sup> and Laghupanjika<sup>14</sup>. This number can be reduced to two by assuming that the Brihat and panjika are identical. Since Gayadasa was Dalhana's greatest authority it is tempting to suppose that the Brhat or Mahapanjika is Gayadasa's Nyayacandrika the Laghupanjika Bhaskara's and commentary<sup>15</sup>, which explains why some authors subscribed to this view<sup>16</sup>, but proofs have not been adduced. As we have seen, the two panjikakaras quoted by dalhana are gayadasa and Bhaskara's, but who is the panjikakara in the singular?. It is not admissible suppose, to without anv

evidence, that gayadasa is alluded to in this way. On the contraty, a closer study of the relevant passages shows that this panjikakara is not regarded as an authority by dalhana, who disagrees with him in half of the cases. Since this is at variance with Dalhana's respectful attitude towards gayadasa, I am in facour of the hypothesis that the panjikakara is Bhaskara. Another problem is raised a Candrika and candrikakara, quoted by several commentators<sup>17</sup>. The view that this candrikakara is Gayadasa<sup>18</sup> and this Candrika his Nyayacandrika or his lost commentaty on the Carakasamhita is still open to doubt and requires further study<sup>19</sup>.

Gayadasa does not give us any information about himself, but P.Cordier<sup>20</sup> already noted that he is called an antaranga<sup>21</sup>, i.e. a courtphysician, in the colophon of the manuscript of his commentary on the Nidanasthana of the susrutasamhita. D. Ch. Bhattacharyya<sup>22</sup> discovered later that Niscalakara calls him gaudesvarantaranga srigayadasasena, which means that he was court-physician to a king of Bengal.

For a long time it was difficult to reach some precision with regard to Gayadasa's date. J. Jolly<sup>23</sup> only remarked that he some precision with regard to gayadasa's be earlier than Dalhana (about 1200) because the latter quotes him. A.F.R. Hoernle<sup>24</sup> stated that he is not later than the eleventh century and supposed Gayadasa and Cakrapanidatta (second half of the eleventh century) to be contemporaries. G. Haldar assigned Gayadasa to the tenth<sup>25</sup> or the tenth-eleventh century<sup>26</sup> or the opinion that he is earlier than Cakrapanidatta<sup>27</sup>. P.V Sharma regards him as a contemporary of Cakrapanidatta<sup>28</sup>.

Important in narrowing the limits in which gayadasa must have lived is the fact that Jejjata (about 600) is quoted by  $him^{29}$ . The lower limit cannot be established with more precision. The quotations from Gayadasa by Vijayaraksita<sup>30</sup> (about 1100) and Dalhana (about 1200) provide us with a provisional limit. D. Ch. Bhattacharyy's upper contention<sup>31</sup> that Gayadasa is quoted in Cakrapanidatta's commentary on the Carakasamhita does not carry much weight because it is based on a reference by Cakrapanidatta to a candrikakrt on susruta<sup>32</sup>, and, as pointed out earlier, it remains to be proved that this is Gayadasa<sup>33</sup>.

More light on the problem of Gayadasa's terminus and quem was shed by my study of Brahmadeva<sup>34</sup>, in which I reached the conclusion that Brahmadeva is posterior to Gayadasa and anterior Cakrapanidatta. This enables me to assign Gayadasa to the period between Jejjata and Brahmadeva, which means that he is earlier than Cakrapanidatta and not a contemporary of the latter. This conclusion implies that D. Ch. Bhatacharyya's date of Gayadasa (about  $(1100)^{36}$ , who reigned from 988 to  $1038^{37}$ .

# REFERENCES

- See on the definition of a panjika; Hemacandra's Abhidhanacintamani
  2.170; Yadavasarman (i.e. Vaidya Jadavji Trikamji Acharya)'s upodghata (p.21) to his ed. Of the Susrutasamhita (Bombay 1938); G Haldar Vrddhatrayi 197)
- 2. An alternative title is Nayacandrika (Yadavasarman's upodghata, p. 21, NCC V, 312).

- See e.g. a quotation from Gayadasa in Dalhana's comments ad Su. U. 50. 10 cd-12ab.
- 4. The manuscript forms part of the Bikaner collection. A copy of it was acquired by P. Cordier and is now in the collection P. Cordier of the Bibliotheque Nationale at Paris (see J. Filliozat. Liste des manuscripts de Cordier la collection Palmyr conserves la Bibliotheque а Nationale. JA 1934, Nr. 65). The manuscript dates from the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century (P. Cordier. Recentes decouvertes de MSS. Medicaux dans 1'Inde, 1898-1902, 'Le Museon, N.S.4, 1903, 332-333) and is mentioned for the first time in P.Cordier's review of J. Jolly's Zur Ouellenkunde der indischen Medizin: 1. Vagbhata (JA 1901, 182 and 186).
- Susrutasamhita, ed. Jadavji Trikamji Acharya, revised 3d ed., Bombay 1938; repr. Varanasi 1980, with Intr by P.V. Sharma, Jaikrishnadas Ayurveda Series.
- 6. The earliest publication on this an article by J.Jolly, Zur Quellenkunde der indischen Medizin; 3, Ein alter Kommentar zu Susruta, ZDMG 58, 1904, 114-116. See on it also A.F.R. hoernle, Studies in ancient Indian medicine, I. The commentaries on Susruta, JRAS 1906, 294-302: The first and the two last leaves are missing, as well as leaves 4 to 14 (both inclusive); the manuscript now consists of 66 leaves and must have somprised 80 leaves.

- D. Ch. Bhattacharyya, New light on Valdyaka liternature, IHQ 23, 1947, 141; J. Filliozat in L.Renon and J. Filliozat, L'Inde Classique II, Paris 1953, 159; G. Haldar, Vrddhatrayi 47; P.V. Sharma, Ayurveda ka Vaijnanika itihasa, Varanasi 1975, 210.
- 8. G. Haldar (Vrddatrayi 182 and 200) regards Gayi, Gayisena as a commentator on the Susrutasamhita who differs from Gayadasa and who lived in the eleventh-twelfth century. Compare P.V.Sharma's Ayurveda ka vaijnanika itihasa 212.
- 9. Ad Su. Su. 27, 26.
- 10. Ad Su. Su. 46, 162 and 468 cd-471 ab; Ni. 13. 37; Ci. 33. 33; U.3. 3-4 and 19; 5. 9ab; 6.24; 7. 6-7 ab; 10. 10; 15. 30-33 ab; 21. 34cd-36 ab; 39. 116 cd-119 ab and 127-129.
- 11. Ad Su. Su. 46. 130-133 (twice). 141-142 and 202-203 ab.
- 12. Ad Su. U. I. 4 cd-8 ab (accepted as authoritative); Su. 45. 157 (brhallaghupanjikah; their reading is accepted against that of Jejjata).
- 13. Ad. Su. Su. 45. 96 and 112.
- 14. See note 12.
- 15. A copy of Bhaskara's panjika is recorded in Kavindracary's Granthasuci, dating from 1656 (G. Haldar, Vrddhatrayi 197; Atrideva, Ayurveda ka brhat itihasa 200; P.V.Sharma, Ayurveda ka vaijnanika itihasa 210).

- 16. The Brhatpanjika is regarded as Gayadasa's commentary by G. Haldar (Vrddhatrayi 197 and 201), Atrideva (Ayurveda ka brhat itihasa 200), and P.V. Sharma (Ayurveda ka vaijnanika itihasa 210).
- 17. The Candrika is quoted by Cakrapanidatta (ad. Ca. Su. 27. 129). Niscalakara, Gopaladasa, Sivadasasena (in his commentaries on Cakrapanidatta's Cikitsasamgraha and Dravyaguna), Medhadeva (in commentary his on the Madhavadravyaguna), and Todarananda. The candrikakara, krt. karaka is quoted or by Cakrapanidatta (ad. Ca. Ci. 26, 293), Vijayaraksita (ad Madhavanidana 2. 61 cd-65and 10. 20), Srikanthadatta (ad madhavanidana 59, 95 and 97-98), Dalhana (ad su. U. 49, 19), Sivadasasena and Nagaratha (in his Nidanapradipa).
- 18. P.V.Sharma (Ayurveda ka vaijnanika itihasa 210) subscribes to this view.
- 19. A comparison of the reference to the candrikakrt by Cakrapanidatta (ad Ca. Ci. 26. 293) and a quotation from Gayadasa byVijayaraksita (ad Madhavanidana 2. 18-23) seems to support the view that the Candrika is in this case gayadasa's Nyayacandrika. Compare my Madhavanidana 403.
- 20. Le Museon, N.S. 4, 1903, 333. The term antaranga does not occur in the colophon of the printed text.

- 21. See on this term N.N.Das Gupta, A note on the term 'antaranga', Indian Culture 1, 1934-35, 684-686.
- 22. IHQ 23, 1947, 154.
- 23. ZDMG 58, 1904, 116 (see note 6).
- 24. JRAS 1906, 291 and 301-302 (see note 6); see also his Osteology, Oxford 1907, Intr. 16
- 25. Vrddhatrayi 47 and 52-53.
- 26. Vrddhatrayi 54, 197 and 201.
- 27. Vrddatrayi 197.
- 28. Ayurveda ka vaijnanika itihasa 210.
- 29. Ad Su. Ni. 5. 8, etc.
- 30. Ad Madhavanidana 2. 18-23; 9, 11, etc.
- 31. IHQ 23, 1947, 154.
- 32. Ad Ca, Ci. 26, 293.
- 33. Compare note 19.
- 34. Some notes on Brahmadeva's activity as a commentator, Ancient Science of Life 2, 1 (July 1982), 7-10.
- 35. IHQ 23, 1947, 154.
- 36. Ibidem.
- 37. R.C. Majumdar, History of ancient Bengal, repr. 1974, 131/

# Abbreviations

Ca	-	Carakasamhita
Ci	-	Cikitsasthana
IHQ	-	Indian Historical Quarterly
JA	-	Journal Asiatique
JRAS	-	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
NCC	-	New Catalogorus Catalogorum
Ni	-	Nidanasthana
Su.	-	Susrutasamhita
Su.	-	Sutrasthana
U.	-	Uttaratantra
ZDMC	- <del>〔</del>	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Geselischaft