

# JAJJATA

By

V. V. S. SASTRY AND A. N. PANDEY

## Introduction

The three major classical works on Ayurveda *viz.*, Charaka Samhita, Susruta Samhita and Ashtanga Hridaya of Vagbhata are combinedly known as Vriddhatrayi. Charaka Samhita, as originally written by Agnivesa is a book on Kayachikitsa and Susruta Samhita, a text book mainly devoted to surgery as preached by Dhanvantari Divodasa. The disciples of these two schools are usually denominated as physicians and surgeons who occasionally do not concur with each other regarding some of the important medical thoughts. Though stated as an abbreviation of Ashtanga Sangraha, Vagbhata's Ashtanga Hridaya is almost based on the theories as explained by the Atreya school. A number of Ayurvedic scholars have written commentaries on these three classics. But the person who has written commentaries on all these three books should be considered as a great scholar and an extraordinary genius as far as Ayurveda is concerned. Such a genius is Jajjata who is chronologically after Bhattara Harichandra and Swamikumara.

The orthography of the name Jajjata varies widely: "Jajjata" according to the colophons of the preserved parts of his commentary on Charaka Samhita; "Jarjata" according to the Ashtanga Sangraha, Trichur edition; "Jejjata" according to the following people: (1) Gayadasa in Susruta Nidan, (2) Chakrapanidatta, (3) Dalhana, (4) Vijayarakhita, (5) Vachaspathi, (6) Hedmadri etc; "Jejjhata" as mentioned by Dalhana in some places; "Jejjada" according to Nischalakara; "Jaijjata" according to Susruta Samhita with Dalhana's commentary edited by Jivananda Vidyasagar, 1889, Hoernle and Jolly; "Jaijjhata" according to Roth referred by Jolly and "Jaiyyata" according to Das Gupta. Jajjata was also quoted as "Jada" about 5 times in the manuscript of Gayadasa's commentary on Susruta Samhita, Sarirasthana. Since the letters 'Ja' and 'Ya' are phonetically interchangeable, some historians agree that the names "Jajjata" and "Jaiyyata" indicate the same person. A study of these different names by which Jajjata has been mentioned will lead us to conclude that these differences in the spellings and pronunciations of the name are only because of the differences in the languages of these people who wrote his name.

Chandrata refers to Jajjata in the beginning of his commentary on Tisata's Chikitsa Kalika: "As there exist the commentaries of Harichandra and the learned Jajjata it is sheer presumptuousness for anyone else to attempt to comment on the texts of Ayurveda". Chandrata also states that he consulted Jajjata's commentary on Sursuta Samhita before he wrote his Susruta Patha Suddhi. Vrinda referred to Jajjata as a commentator of

Charaka Samhita. Chakrapani Datta has referred to Jajjata in his famous commentary Ayurveda Deepika of Charaka Samhita. Dalhana states in the beginning of his commentary Nibandha Sangraha of Susruta Samhita, that he referred to the commentary of Jajjata on Susruta Samhita before starting his own commentary. Vijayarakshita mentions Jajjata's name along with Bhattara Harichandra and others, whose commentaries he referred before writing his Madhukosavyakhyā of Madhava Nidana. Hemadri has also referred to Jajjata as a commentator of Susruta Samhita in his Ayurveda Rasayana of Ashtanga Hridaya.

### **His Parentage :**

There are two controversial statements regarding the relationship between Jajjata and Kayyata. Some scholars believe that Jajjata was the son of Kayyata. But Haridatta Shastri in his introduction to Charaka Samhita observes that Kayyata, in his introduction to his commentary on the Mahabhashya, stated that he is a son of Jayyata. Here again phonetical interchangeability of letters "Ja" and "Ya" has been resorted to explain that Jajjata and Jayyata indicate the same person. According to Indian tradition there is always a possibility of a grand-son being named after his grand father. Therefore even though Kayyata has stated that he is the son of Jayyata, it is still acceptable that the name of the father of Jajjata might be Kayyata.

It has been suggested that Jajjata is a Kashmirian, because the "Ta" ending of names is very common among the Kashmirians e.g. Kayyata, Mammata and others. This particular "Ta" ending is also noticed in the names of the inhabitants of Sind or Sindhudesā e.g. Vagbhata, Tisata, Chandrata etc. Since Jajjata himself has stated that he was a student of Vagbhata, there is every possibility that Jajjata may also belong to Sindhu. It is also a fact that Vagbhata, who had divided and classified the Ayurveda into 8 parts, was well known as an author of Ashtanga Hridaya and therefore some scholars have surmised that Jajjata being a Kashmirian did travel down to Sindhu to study under Vagbhata. But it is very difficult to accept that one person, however strongly desirous of studying Ayurveda, travelling such a long distance through the country of barbarous Mlecchas and Sakas who were then reigning the Sindhu region.

The internal evidence, wherein Jajjata compared the opinions of the physicians of Kashmira and Sindhudesā supports the view that Jajjata was a Kashmirian.

### **His Preceptor and Place of Education :**

In his Nirantarapadyakhyā of Charaka Samhita, Jajjata has clearly stated that he was the disciple of "Mahajahnupati Sri Vahata", at the end of the 4th chapter of Charaka Chikitsa. From this statement arise two important questions :—

- (1) What does the word "Mahajahnupati" explain ?
- (2) Whether "Vahata" and "Vagbhata" are the same persons?

The word "Pati" is usually used to explain either the Husband or the King. Therefore it is not clear whether the word "Mahajahnu" denotes Kingdom/City or the name of the wife of Vahata who might have been famous like her husband. According to Bhattacharya, "Mahajahnu" is a town in Sindhudesa which has been recognised as a place now called as "Majhanda" about 50 miles away from Hyderabad (Pakistan), on the West Bank of the River Indus.

Both Vagbhata-I and Vagbhata-II were never mentioned as "Mahajahnupati". Therefore, it is very difficult to decide whether Vahata as the Preceptor of Jajjata, be considered as anyone of the famous Vagbhatas. Jajjata has always referred to Vagbhata by his name only. If Vagbhata was his preceptor, with due reverence for him, Jajjata would have added either "Guru" or "Acharya" as a prefix. Even the statement "Shri Vahata Sishyasya Jajjatasya" is also not available throughout the commentary and therefore casts doubt whether Jajjata was really a student of even Vahata. Based on this argument some historians do not accept Vagbhata as the preceptor of Jajjata.

The place of education of Jajjata is entirely dependant upon the decision taken about the identity of his preceptor. Since the date of Vagbhata i.e. about 7th century and during this period only, the Yavanas have successfully invaded India from the Western regions. Some scholars believe that Vagbhata being an inhabitant of Sindhudesa and a famous physician, was invited/migrated to the court of Vikramaditya of Ujjayini to be installed as one of the "Nine Gems". This is also supported by the similarities between some of the passages in Vrihat Samhita of Varahamihira and some passages of the Ashtanga Hridaya of Vagbhata. P.V. Sharma considers that Vagbhata was installed as Dhanvantari one of the Nine Gems of the court of Vikramaditya. But here again arises the question of the identity of Vikramaditya and related problem of fixation of dates.

If it can be accepted that Vagbhata was the preceptor of Jajjata and Jajjata belonged to Sindhudesa only, we can safely conclude that the place of education of Jajjata is Sindhudesa but not Ujjayini.

#### **His Date :**

Jajjata's date seems to be linked with the date of Vagbhata-II. Jajjata has quoted Bhattara Harichandra in his Nirantarapadavyakhya. Therefore he should be posterior to the latter. Bhattara Harichandra's date has been fixed as 6th century A.D. Jajjata has quoted Dridhabala also.

Chandrata the grand-son of Vagbhata-II revised Susruta Samhita on the basis of the Susrutatika of Jajjata. Chandrata, being the grand-son of Vagbhata-II, must have lived in the end of 9th century A.D. But Hoernle dates him in 1000 A.D. But whatever may be the date of Chandrata, Jajjata must definitely be anterior to him. Therefore, to narrow down the limits, Jajjata should have flourished between 6th century and 9th century. If Jajjata's preceptor is accepted as Vagbhata-II, who would have flourished earlier than the date

of the visit of Itsing to India i.e. 675 A.D. 685 A.D., Jajjata's date also should be decided as being early 7th century.

### **His Religion and Philosophy:**

Two references are usually quoted to show that Jajjata was a Buddhist.

(1) He being the student of Vagbhata who was also considered as a Buddhist :— There is a statement by Rudraparasava, the Editor of Ashtanga Sangraha with Indu's commentary. He quotes a "Universally known" meditation stanza, which describes Vagbhata while he was teaching his disciples, Indu and Jajjata etc: "I steadily meditate on Vagbhata: the tassel of his beard-hair dangling (and) the brightness of his complexion resembling a lotus; always instructing his medical pupils Indu, Jajjata et al; the splendor of his sacred thread being (but) slightly visible, distinguished (as he is) by a spotless coat reaching down to his ankles; aloe-sap being in his throat (and) his eyes bedaubed". Whatever may be the authenticity of this stanza it clearly explains that Vagbhata was never a Buddhist.

The dangling tassel of the beard-hair and the sacred thread are the signs of a Hindu but never those of a Buddhist. Therefore Jajjata also should have been a Hindu. Further it should be noted that Jajjata, being the author of Susrutatika of Susruta Samhita, should have been a famous surgeon, who professionally had to inflict painful wounds on human beings which act is against the philosophy of Buddhism.

(2) Some scholars quote a statement of Jajjata as stated by Dalhana wherein he is supposed to have refuted the existence of God. This statement is also in line with the philosophy of Buddhism. But this refutation of the existence of God by Jajjata is on the lines of the Sankhya philosophy on which Ayurveda is mainly based. Therefore Jajjata should not be considered as a Buddhist.

### **His Works:**

(1) Nirantarapadavyakhya on Charaka Samhita: This commentary of Jajjata on Charaka Samhita seems to be the effort of the original genius. Even though the Charaka Samhita was redacted by Dridhabala by the time of Jajjata, Jajjata seems to have referred to the original Agnivesa Tantra only for writing his commentary. Jajjata has quoted some verses which were not found in Charaka Samhita and hence it is possible that he must have quoted these verses from the original Agnivesa Tantra, which must have been available in his days. If Agnivesa Tantra is extant even to the time of Jajjata, the pertinent question is about the necessity to redact the classic both by Charaka and Dridhabala.

The originality of expression of Jajjata in Nirantarapadavyakhya was possibly based on his knowledge of the Sanskrit language gained from his father, Kayyata, a famous grammarian. This has also attracted attention of the later commentators of Charaka Samhita. The later authorities like Bhavamisra, Saragadhara and others have almost quoted Jajjata verbatim in their texts.

A close study of Jajjata's commentary of Charaka Samhita may possibly help in solving the problem of the difference of opinion regarding the portion of Chikitsa Sthana that has been restored by Dridhabala. Dridhabala has clearly stated in the last chapter of Chikitsa Sthana that 17 chapters which were composed by Agnivesa and later revised by Charaka have not been found and therefore were reconstructed to complete the work, but without giving any indication as to which 17 chapters were redacted by him. For solving this problem we have only to depend upon the statements of the commentators. It is accepted universally that the first 8 chapters of Chikitsa Sthana have been redacted by Charaka. The identification of the remaining 5 chapters which were stated to be redacted by Charaka need some elucidation. Chakrapani, in his commentary on 9th and 30th chapters of Chikitsa Sthana has stated that the remaining 5 chapters of Charaka are Arsas, Atisara, Visarpa, Madatyaya and Dvivraniya. Jajjata has clearly stated in the commentaries of Madatyaya and Dvivraniya chapters that these two have been redacted by Charaka. But a difference of opinion was expressed in the commentary on the 30th chapter of Chikitsa Sthana, that the last 17 chapters were redacted by Dridhabala. If the order of the chapters of different Sthanas of Charaka Samhita as detailed in the end of Sutra Sthana is considered as genuine, the last 17 chapters of Chikitsa Sthana cannot be accepted as redacted by Dridhabala. Yadavji and the scholars of Shree Gulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society, Jamnagar have discussed the problem in the introductions of the books edited by them. But even though they have accepted that Visha Chikitsa was redacted by Dridhabala and Dvivraniya by Charaka, it is not clear why the colophons of these chapters indicate differently. Haridatta Sastri in the book edited by him has deleted the word "Aprapte Dridhabala Sampurite" or "Aprapte Dridhabala Pratisamskrite" in the colophons of the respective chapters. Narendranatha Sengupta and Balaichandra Sengupta have taken the first 13 chapters of Chikitsa Sthana as redacted by Charaka and the remaining by Dridhabala.

Jajjata referred to the following medical authors and books in his Nirantarapada-  
vyakhya, in addition to Vedas, Manu and some Grammarians :—

**(A) Authors :**

- |                           |                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| (1) Susruta.              | (10) Bhela.     |
| (2) Dridhabala.           | (11) Kharanada. |
| (3) Jatukarna.            | (12) Himadatta. |
| (4) Ksharapani.           | (13) Swamidasa. |
| (5) Daruvaha.             | (14) Bhoja.     |
| (6) Harita.               | (15) Parasara.  |
| (7) Sivasaindhava.        | (16) Vaishnava. |
| (8) Ashadhvarma.          | (17) Paitamaha. |
| (9) Bhattara Harichandra. | (18) Celladeva. |

**(B) Books :**

- (1) Agnivesa Tantra.
- (2) Bhaluki Tantra.

An incomplete portion of this Nirantarapadavyakhya of Jajjata is preserved in the G.O.M.L. Madras in a paper manuscript form (R 2983). The character of the manuscript is Malayalam. Another copy, which is also incomplete and written in Devanagari script, is preserved in the Government Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum. A revised work of this commentary was published by Vaidya Haridatta Shastri from Lahore in 1940. In this published work the Nirantarapadavyakhya for the following sections only is available :—

Cha. Chi. 1(3)-32 to Cha. Chi. 3-289; Chi. 3-311 to 5-73; 23-160 to 26-10; 27-83 to 30-132; 30-288 to 312; Cha. Ka. 1-1 to 1-4; Cha. Si. 3-8 to 7-32.

(2) Susrutatika on Susruta Samhita : This commentary on Susruta Samhita by Jajjata has been referred to by Chandrata before he wrote his Susruta Pathasuddhi. This Susrutatika has been referred by both Dalhana and Hemadri. But this commentary is not presently available for the benefit of the Ayurvedic Scholars.

(3) In his introduction to Ashtanga Hridaya, Harisastri Paradkar states that Jajjata has written a commentary on Ashtanga Hridaya also. It is also justifiable for Jajjata to write a commentary on Ashtanga Hridaya which was written by his preceptor Vagbhata. This commentary also is not presently available.

### SUMMARY

Jajjata was a famous Ayurvedic scholar who expressed his genius by writing commentaries on the three major classical works of Ayurveda viz., Charaka Samhita, Susruta Samhita and Ashtanga Hridaya. Chronologically he is after Bhattara Harichandra and Swami Kumara. The orthography of the name of Jajjata varies widely. This difference is probably due to the difference in the languages of the authors who referred to him. Chandrata, Vrinda, Chakrapanidatta, Dalhana, Vijayarakhita and Hemadri referred to Jajjata's commentaries on Charaka Samhita and Susruta Samhita.

Kayyata the famous grammarian was considered to be the father of Jajjata. There was a dispute about the nativity of Jajjata. Some scholars considered him to be a Kashmirian and others as an inhabitant of Sindhudesa. But the internal evidence, wherein Jajjata compared the opinions of the physicians of Kashmira and Sindhudesa, Jajjata was a Kashmirian.

Jajjata himself stated that he was the disciple of "Mahajahnupati Sri Vahata". Since both Vagbhata-I and Vagbhata-II were never mentioned as Mahajahnupati, it is very difficult to decide the identity of this preceptor of Jajjata. Further Jajjata has always referred to Vagbhata by his name only. If Jajjata's preceptor was considered as Vagbhata-II, the place of education of Jajjata will definitely be Sindhudesa only.

Jajjata's date is linked with the date of Vagbhata-II. Since Jajjata has quoted Bhattara Harichandra and Dridhabala and Chandrata revised Susruta Samhita on the basis

of the *Susrutatika* of Jajjata, Jajjata should have flourished during the early 7th century A.D. Regarding the religion, Jajjata can be considered as a Hindu but never as a Buddhist.

Even though the *Nirantarapadavyakhya* is not completely available, this commentary is considered as an authority and has been referred by later commentators of *Charaka Samhita*. Some of the later authorities like Bhavamisra and Sarngadhara have almost quoted Jajjata verbatim in their texts. Since Jajjata quoted some verses which were not found in *Charaka Samhita*, it is considered possibly that these verses must have been from the original *Agnivesa Tantra* which was extant in his days. A close study of *Nirantarapadavyakhya* will help in solving the problem of the difference of opinion regarding the portion of *Chikitsa Sthana* of *Charaka Samhita*, that has been restored by *Dridhabala*. Jajjata referred to many medical authors and also books in his *Nirantarapadavyakhya* in addition to *Vedas*, *Manu* and some grammarians. *Susrutatika* on *Susruta Samhita* and a commentary on *Ashtanga Hridaya* by Jajjata are not presently available for the benefit of the Ayurvedic scholars.

#### REFERENCES

- (1) *Ashtang Sangraha* with *Sasilekha* commentary by Indu, Ed. & Pub. by T. Rudraparashav, Trichur, 1913.
- (2) *Carakasamhita*, Vol. I, Jamnagar, Sri Gulabkunverba Ayurvedic Society, 1949.
- (3) *Jadavaji Trikamji* : *The Carakasamhita*, 3rd ed., Bombay, Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1938.
- (4) *Jadavaji Trikamji* : *The Susruta Samhita*, 3rd ed., Bombay, Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1938.
- (5) *Meulenbeld, G.J.*: *The Madhava Nidana and its Chief Commentary*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1974.
- (6) *Paradkar, Harisastri* : *The Astangahridaya*, 6th ed., Bombay, Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1939.
- (7) *Shastri, H.D.*: *Caraka Samhita*, Lahore, Motilal Banarasidas, 1941.
- (8) *Sengupta, N.N. and Sengupta, B.C.*: *Caraka Samhita*, Vol. III, Calcutta, C.K. Sen & Co., 1933.
- (9) *Sharma, P.V.*: *Caraka Chintana*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan, 1970.
- (10) *Sharma P.V.*: *Vagbhata Vivechana*, Varanasi, Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan, 1968.
- (11) *Vogel, Claus* : *Vagbhata's Astangahridayasamhita*, Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner, GmbH, 1965.

सारांश

## जज्जट

--वि. वि. एस्. शास्त्री तथा ए. एन्-पाण्डेय

जज्जट एक सुप्रसिद्ध आयुर्वेदवेत्ता थे, जिन्होंने अपनी असाधारण प्रतिभा का प्रदर्शन वृद्धव्ययी पर टीकायें लिखकर किया था, जो चरक सुश्रुत, एव अष्टाङ्गहृदय पर थीं। कालक्रमानुसार वे भट्टारहरिचंद्र और स्वामिकुमार के परवर्ती हैं। जज्जट के नामों का भिन्नतायें वर्णविन्यासों के क्रमसे होतीगयी, जो उन निबन्धकारों की भाषाओं की भिन्नतायें प्रायः सूचित करती हैं, जिन्होंने उन्हें भिन्न-भिन्न नामोंसे व्यक्त किया। उनकी चरक और सुश्रुतसंहिताओं की टीकायें, चन्द्रट, वृन्द, चक्रपाणिदत्त, डल्हण, विनयरक्षित और हेमाद्रि, द्वारा समुद्धृत हुई हैं।

प्रसिद्ध वैयाकरण कैयट, जज्जट का पिता था। यह विवाद का विषय रहा है कि, जज्जट कौनसा देशवासी था। कुछ विद्वान् उसे काश्मीरदेशीय तथा दूसरे सिन्धुदेशीय बताते हैं। किन्तु अभ्यन्तरमाक्ष्यों से पता चलताहै कि वह काश्मीर-देशीय था, क्योंकि उसने काश्मीर और सिन्धुदेश के वेद्यों की तुलनात्मक विचारपद्धतियाँ प्रस्तुत की हैं। जज्जटने स्वयं को "महाजहनुपति श्रीवाहट शिष्य" घोषित किया है। किन्तु 'महाजहनुपति' नाम से वाग्भट प्रथम अथवा वाग्भट द्वितीय दोनों में से किसी का भी निर्देश नहीं प्राप्त होता, अतः निश्चयकरके कहना बहुत कठिन है, कि उनके तथाकथित गुरु कौन थे। तदनन्तर जज्जटने केवल 'वाग्भट' कहकर उनके नामसे ही उन्हें सर्वत्र समुद्धृत किया है। यदि जज्जट के गुरु को वाग्भट द्वितीय होना मानलें, तो निश्चय ही उनकी शिक्षा-दीक्षा का स्थान सिन्धुदेश होना चाहिये।

जज्जट का कालनिर्णय भी वाग्भट द्वितीय के कालनिर्णयसे सम्बन्धित है। चूंकि, जज्जटने भट्टारहरिचंद्र और वृद्धबल के उद्धरण दिये हैं; और चन्द्रटने जज्जटकृत सुश्रुतटीकासे सुश्रुत की पाठशुद्धि की थी, अतः उनका आविर्भावकाल मत्तमशती के प्रारम्भ में होना चाहिये। जज्जट को हिन्दू धर्मावलम्बी मानना ठीक है, बौद्ध नहीं।

यद्यपि निरन्तरपदव्याख्या सम्पूर्ण प्राप्त नहीं होती, तथापि इस टीका को आधिकारिक कृति मानकर चरकसंहिता के परवर्ती टीकाकारों ने इसके उद्धरण दिये हैं। भावमिश्र तथा शग्दुर्ग भ्रूति कतिपय परवर्ती आचार्यों ने, अपने ग्रंथों में जज्जट के उद्धरणों को प्रायः अक्षरशः प्रस्तुत किया है। जज्जटने कुछ ऐसे श्लोकों के उद्धरण दिये हैं, जो चरकसंहिता में नहीं मिलते; इससे ऐसा माना जाता है कि वे उद्धरण अग्निवेशतन्त्र से ही प्रायः उद्धृत हैं, जो उनके समयमें उपलब्ध था। निरन्तरपदव्याख्या का संकृष्ट अध्ययन इस शब्दा का समाधान करने में सहायक हो सकता है कि-चरक के चिकित्सास्थान के किन किन अंशों को वृद्धबलने संस्कृत किया था, जो विभिन्न विचार भेदों का एक विषय बना हुआ है। जज्जटने अपनी निरन्तरपदव्याख्याटीकामें कई प्राचीन भिषगाचार्यों के नाम उनके ग्रंथों सहित उद्धृत किये हैं, तथा वेद, मनु और कतिपय वैयाकरणों को भी समुद्धृत किये हैं। जज्जटकृत सुश्रुतटीका और अष्टाङ्गहृदय की टीका, दोनों में कोई भी सम्प्रति उपलब्ध नहीं हैं, जिनसे आयुर्वेदिक विद्वानों को लाभान्वित कराया जासके।