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ABSTRACT: In this paper the author probes the identity of Candranandana a well known author and commentator of various works in Ayurvedic literature by interpreting the classical texts.

Candrananda is a well – known author in the field of Ayurveda and there is controversy about his identity. He is said to be the son of Ravinandana ( Ratinanda according to Tibetan version), grandson of Maharsinandana and a native of Kashmir. He is Placed as a contemporary of king Abhimanyu of Kashmir (958 – 972 A.D). This dates is also confirmed with of its Tibetan translation (1013 – 1055 A.D). It is further supported by Candranandana (the author of the nighantu) being quoted by ksirasvami (11th cent. A.D.), a notable commentator on Amarakosa. Thus there is no doubt that Candranandana, son of Ravinandana and the author of the nighantu lived around 10th Cent. A.D.

There is a Ms. Of the nighantu by Candranandana in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta (No. G. 8426, Folios 1 – 34). While examining this Ms., I got information about the book ‘Medanadi – Nighantu’ by Candranandana edited by Vaidya N. S. Mooss and published from Kottayam (1985). This is based on four Mss. (three from South India and one from Paris). Thus the Ms. of the Asiatic Society was not take into account while editing the work. The Paris Ms. also differs from the Asiatic Society Ms. in the initial title (Sri Ravinandanasunu – Candranandanakrtah Gananighantuh) which is not found in the latter. The Asiatic Society Ms. Reads ‘Candracandana’ but it seems to be a scriptural error and on circumstantial evidence it should be taken as Candranandana as supported by other Mss.

The title of the work, according to Asiatic Society Ms. also, is “Madanadi Nighantu” but on the margin is written ‘gana – nighantu’ in a different handwriting. Thus it is evident that the original title of the work is ‘Madanadi – Nighantu’ as it deals with the drugs enumerated in ganas, beginning with Madanadi in Vagbhata’s Astanghrdaya (Su. Ch. 15). Later on, presumably, since it deals with (ausadha) ganas, it became popular as gananighantu. In some of the Mss., it is also known as ‘Osadhinighantu’. After passage of time when ‘Madanavinoda, popularly known as Madanapala – Nighantu, came into existence, a state of confusion arose between the two works with the result that the Madanavinoda is also mentioned somewhere as Osadhinighantu.

Perhaps on prevalence of the Madanapala – Nighantu, the Madanadi – Nighantu went almost into oblivion. Gunanighantu mentioned by Cordier seems to be a misnomer.

The number of ganas in the Astangahrdaya is clearly stated as thirty three whereas the Madanadi – Nighantu has described only 32 ganas. The editor, discussing the issue leaned towards the
Paris Ms., has arrived at a conclusion which cannot be accepted. He wants to make up the deficiency by dividing the Durvadi gana into two – Durvadi and Sthiradi but there is no any such indication in the Vaghbhat’a text, the fact is quite different. The three consecutive ganas – Bhadraradvadi, Durvadi and Aragvadhadi etc. – relate to three dosas – Vata, Pitta and Kapha respectively. The former two ganas contain single drug which needed description but in the third one i.e. kapha – nasaka gana there are all groups of drugs and no single drug is mentioned. As these groups (ganas) are already described separately, the author has knowingly left this because it did not require any description which is intended only for single drugs. Hence the deficiency occurred in the number of ganas.

There are six quotations from Candranandana in Ksira – swami’s comm. on the Amarakosa all of which are traced in the Madanadinighantu. Thus it leaves no doubt that Ksiraswami has quoted this very work of Candranandana.

Dalhana has quoted Candranandana once (Susruta, U. 65. 29) in the context of tantrayukti where he is said to have proposed a different definition of ‘Vidhana’. As there is no chapter on tantrayukti in the Astangahrdaya, Dalhana evidently quotes his another work which may be a commentary on the Sutruta – Samhita that was available at Dalhana’s time.

Hemadri (A. H. Su. 7. 40) also quotes Candranandana along with other commentators such as Arunanatta, Indu. Jejjata, Brahmadeva, Madhava and Dalhana but the actual quotations (Maireyo dhanyasavah) is not found in Candranandana’s Padartha Candrika Comm. on AH, though it is different from ‘Maireyam Kharjurasavam’ which is quoted by Hemadri as the view of Arunanatta and Indu. So this needs further examinations.

Candranandana is also know as the author of the Padarthacandrika comm. on the Astangahrdaya. Now about the identity of the authors of this comm. and the Madana – Nighantu known as Candranadana, there is some controversy. Mostly the authors of these two works are taken as identical but Vogel is right in putting question mark. Further, the following points draw attention towards their different identity:

1) Although in Tibetan version of the Padartha Candrika, Candranandana is said to be the sun of Ratinandana, the Bombay edition records the parentage of the author quite differently. Here in the introductory verse (No.3), the author explicitly says – ‘Born from Kalyana – the milk – ocean and Vidya, the fathomless stream, Candraanandana is like moon pacifying the heat of ignorance”. So there is no doubt that this Candranandana was son of Kalyana said Vidya and not of Ratinandana.

2) The author of the Madanadi nighantu offers saluations, in the beginning, only to “Sarvajna” (Omniscient) which possibly refers to Lord Buddha whereas in the Padartha – Candrika comm.. He first of all bows to Hari (Visnu). It shows that the author of the Madanadi – Nighantu was a Buddhist whereas that of the comm. was a, vaisnavite.

Hence according to Bombay edition the two Candranandanaras seem to be different but according to Tibetan version as presented by Vogel they seem to be one. But in that case, the authors of
Padartha Candrika comm. would be quite different according to the two traditions particularly when the quotation of Candranandana is not found in the comm. of Bombay edition.

CONCLUSION

From the above discussions, the following facts emerge about the identity and works of Candranandana:

1. The identity of Candranandanas of the Bombay edition and Tibetan version differs because of their different parentage and religious faith.

2. Candranandana, the author of the Madanadi – Nighantu, is different from the author of the Padarthacandrika comm. bearing the same name (according to Bombay ed.) for the reasons cited above though they seem to be identical according to Tibetan version but in Thanjavore the lexicographical work of Candranandana is mentioned as ‘Vaidya – Astangahrdrayavrttau bhesajanama Paryayanama’ and not ‘Madanadi nighantu or gananighantu. Probably the former work was a glossary of only synonyms of drugs like dravyavati while the Madanadi – Nighantu describes properties and actions as well.

3. Candranandana also wrote a comm. on the Susruta – Samhita a portion of which is quoted by Dalhana. He may be the same person who wrote the comm. on the Astangahrdaya.
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