

V Ā P Y A C A N D R A

By

A. PANDEY & K. RAGHUNATHAN

Introduction :

Vāpyacandra, who is chronologically placed after Gadādhara is frequently quoted by Vijayarākṣita, Śrīkaṇṭhadatta, Niścalakara, Hemādri, Bopadeva and Śivadāśasena. His name varies orthographically as Bāṣpacandra in writings of Hemādri and Bopadeva. Vāpyacandra, is mentioned as a famous commentator of Caraka and Suśruta by (some modern) historians, but his passages quoted by Vijayarākṣita and his pupil, Śrīkaṇṭhadatta and by Hemādri denote that he might have commented on Vāgbhaṭa also. Vijayarākṣita and Śrīkaṇṭhadatta put him always after Jejjjaṭa and Gadādhara and before Mādhavakara and Kūrtikakuṇḍa.

According to 'Kavīndra Granthasūcī', 'Bāṣpacandra Tantra' is catalogued as his independent work; and Bopadeva quotes his passages from an independent Nig-
haṇṭu work viz. Bāṣpacandra Nig-
haṇṭu. But, it makes us sad indeed to note that we cannot be benefited by any work of Vāpyacandra as none of them are extant. We neither know about his nativity and family nor parentage nor have any knowledge about his place of education, work and the patronage etc.

Works :

Vāpyacandra, appears to have commented on Bṛhatrayī, as quotations from his commentaries have been introduced in the works of Vijayarākṣita and Śrīkaṇṭhadatta in the Madhukośa commentary on Mādhavanidāna. Besides, Hemādri also quoted his passages from his commentary on Caraka and Vāgbhaṭa.

Bopadeva quoted passages ascribed to Vāpyacandra from Bāṣpacandra Nig-
haṇṭu. Mention has been made of an another independent work viz. 'Baṣpacandra-
tantra' in the Kavīndra Granthasūcī.

Date :

It is difficult to delve into the date of Vāpyacandra and dare to decide it. Since we have very little information on his biodata, we can however, depend upon certain references made by Vijayarākṣita and his pupil Śrīkaṇṭhadatta in their works, i. e. in the Madhukośa on Mādhavanidāna and Vyākhyākusumāvalī on Siddhayoga respectively. Vāpyacandra, is always mentioned after and along with Gadādhara in the three lists mentioned by Vijayarākṣita and has been once put before Mādhavakara

and Kārtikakuṇḍa which is very interesting and helping in this case; as, Śrīkaṇṭhadatta also mentions Mādhavakara before Kārtikakuṇḍa and puts them before Vṛndakunda (author of Siddhayoga). So scholars consider it chronological to put Vāpyacandra after Gadādhara and before Mādhavakara as is done by Vijayarakṣita. * Vāpyacandra is posterior to Vāgbhaṭa, as he has commented upon his work and is put after Jejjaṭa who is the pupil of Vāgbhaṭa and anterior to Gadādhara, so Vāpyacandra's upper limit of date must be fixed to be the 7th century or the date of Gadādhara. His lower limit also must be the date of Mādhavakara, if Vijayarakṣita's remark is to be relied upon and if Śrīkaṇṭhadatta has rightly mentioned Mādhavakara before Kārtikakuṇḍa, i. e. in the 8th century. Therefore, Vāpyacandra's date may be fixed between the range of 7th century to the 8th century. He may have lived after Gadādhara or might be his contemporary. So either in the end of the 8th century or a little before, i. e. after the second half of the 8th century he should have had flourished.

Salient features:

Views on Caraka: (a) From a quotation it is evidenced that Vāpyacandra had interpreted the idea of Caraka and supported his views as follows: An illness cannot be known from the origin (*nidana*) as an isolated entity, as it may also happen some times that an illness is brought about by the accumulation of a morbid entity by a distant origin after it has repelled the near one. Vāpyacandra is of the view that the prodromes etc. are enumerated for the knowledge of an illness. (b) Vāpyacandra's views quoted by Vijayarakṣita are mentioned to distinguish the difference between *vidhi* (mode) and *samkhyā* (number) the two divisions of *samprapti* (course) mentioned by Caraka. Vāgbhaṭa, however, has not mentioned *vidhi* (mode) in his work and included it under the term *samkhyā* (number). Vijayarakṣita, while explaining Mādhavakara's verse quoted from Vāgbhaṭa quotes Vāpyacandra's passages from his Caraka commentary to show Vāpyacandra's interpretations about the differences between both the terms.

The distinction between mode and number is as follows: A mode is a manner and it only occurs in (entities) of the same class by reason of their being accompanied by some other quality (though they as such are not subject to change); there exists for instance an upward going manner in the entity (called) blood-bile, though it remains the same (conceived as an entity). Number, however, also occurs in all that which possesses distinctness; (one can say), for example, there are four jars; there are eight fevers. In this very case the mode is the manner and it cannot

* Bhaṭṭāra Jejjaṭa Gadādhara Vāpyacandra Srīcakrapāṇi Bakuleśvarasena Bhojaih Iśāna Kārtika Sukīra Sudhīra Vaidyair Maitreya Mādhava mukhairlikhitam vicintya.

be applied to distinct (things); for that reason a manner, attended by a quality of the cause, is applied to illness which are distinct with regard to number etc. The Nyāya experts say likewise: (The term) mode (is made use of) when distinct entities are conceived by means of a common quality; number, however, (is applied to) everything that may be called a distinct entity. The grammarians, on the other hand, explain "A manner is provided with something common (but) a distinction does not refer to (the occurrence of) common (qualities in the enumerated things)" thus it has been written by Vāpyacandra.

It is remarkable, to note that Vāpyacandra was a great grammarian and was well initiated into principles of Hindu philosophies, which are the basic sources for interpretation of the Indian medical views.

(c) Vāpyacandra's quotation has been mentioned by Hemādri in his commentary on Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅghṛdayam. It is the chapter on seasonal regimen and mention has been made by Vāgbhaṭa to take morning bath in autumn seasons as per rule. Here, Hemādri, however, explains the term 'as per rule' and quotes Caraka's words that since autumns are cold so one should take hot bath according to method of Jentāka and then sit in sun. Hemādri also adds the passages of Vāpyacandra and his views that "Jentāka means hot water bath of the whole body". This however, indicates that Vāpyacandra's commentary worked out on Caraka was appreciated during the 13th century.

(d) The next quotation is on Materia Medica (Dravyaguṇa) which Hemādri has taken from Vāpyacandra's commentary on Caraka. It also proves that Vāpyacandra was well-versed in the Materia Medica. Hemādri, while commenting on the property of palm-fruit, quotes Caraka's view with Vāpyacandra's commentary and mentions that ripe palm fruit should be taken here which according to Vāpyacandra can remove *Vātapitta* due to sweetness etc, but may excite *kapha*.

Views on *Susruta* :

(a) Vijayarakṣita mentions Vāpyacandra along with other commentators of *Suśrutasaṃhitā* viz. Jejjāṭa, Vāpyacandra, Mādhavakara, Kārtikakuṇḍa and says that when Vāpyacandra etc. explain *Suśruta*'s view about specific characteristics of the prodrome, like yawning etc. in *vatajvara*; they only mean to say that an undeveloped state of the *vatajvara* is indicated by yawning etc. with the fact that they make aware of the *vatajvara* (in future) and not the whole symptom is indicated.

(b) Vāpyacandra's quotation by Vijayarakṣita is mentioned to explain his views about definition of tumour (*gulma*). Here the verse is taken originally from

the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* by Mādhavakara and contains the definition of (tumour) *gulma*. Vāpyacandra, however, explains the word “*vṛttah*” (circular) and explains: “A tumour is measured according to the contracted morbid entity when a mass is formed like a circular substance, so it is called *gulma* (*guḍikā* + $\sqrt{mā}$, to measure)

(c) Vijayarakṣita, however, gives another quotation which is also based on the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*. Here (in case of ovarian tumour in women) he explains the term “*raktena*” and mentions that *Suśruta* means to say that “Entities like *Vata* etc., which are the causes of different tumours are also causes of ovarian tumour when due to unwholesome regimen there occurs impurity in Blood”.

Views on Vagbhata :

(a) It is obvious (from Vāpyacandra's quotations by Vijayarakṣita on Mādhavanidāna taken as they are by Mādhavakara from Vāgbhaṭa's *Nidānasthāna*) that Vāpyacandra had given a genius touch to Aṣṭāṅgharḍaya, too. Vāpyacandra, however, explains the traditional theory of therapeutic diagnosis, and says Vāgbhaṭa's verses “*Hetuvyādhiviparyasta... etc.*” mean to say “That substance, which eliminates illness like fever etc., is also opposed to the morbid entity (of those illnesses), but it is distinct from (a substance), opposed to a morbid entity, in the following way: That (substance) which is opposed to a morbid entity, does not necessarily eliminate an illness; emetic and reducing measures for instances (though) being eliminative of phlegm, do not eliminate a visceral swelling by phlegm (*kaphagulma*) for it has been said; “When phlegm (though) curable by reducing measures is the agent, (which brings about) fever and visceral swelling, reducing measures (do) not (constitute an) approved (therapy), even when place, time, etc. are comparable (in such a case to those in which reducing measures are beneficial) and also “A person with dimness of vision or visceral swelling should not be submitted to emetic procedures, nor a person oppressed by morbid pallor (*Panduroga*) or abdominal disease” “That which eliminates an illness, necessarily eliminates the morbid entity (of it); appeasing the illness, it also appeases the morbid entity which starts it; otherwise that disease would not be subdued at all, for its cause would remain in the same condition.

Others say that this is not very logical for the morbid entity inherent in (the disease) or is its instrumental cause; the absence of an effect is, however, not exclusively connected with the absence of the inherent (cause) or the instrumental cause, but also with the absence of the non (immediately) inherent cause, in the same way as the non existence of a jar (results) from the annihilation of a non

(immediately) inherent cause (consisting of) its connection with the series of (component) parts, in that way annihilation of a disease also (results) from the annihilation of (a non-immediately inherent cause such as) the connection of on set and characteristics.

A morbid entity, however, ceases of its own accord or by means of another therapeutical procedure. If it is accepted that (a remedial agent) opposed to the illness necessarily brings about cessation of the morbid entity, it would be difficult to demonstrate that it is distinct from (a remedial agent) opposed to both (morbid entity and illness). (An objector may ask) Why is the elimination of a morbid entity by emetic procedures, etc., prescribed in a morbid alteration started by it, if a morbid entity is an instrumental cause? For abolishment of a jar does not occur in case the stick, the potter, etc. are abolished.

The answer is : as long as an effect is lasting in an instrumental cause, annihilation of the effect results from abolishment of the instrumental cause. Morbid entities are usually of the same kind as the light (of a lamp) that is annihilated when the wick and the oil are annihilated. Food (which is contrary to the illness consists) for example, of lentils, etc. as obstipating agents in diarrhoea conduct (contrary to the illness) is e.g. strained evacuation in the retentive disease. "Conduct, contrary to the illness, also consists of spells, the bearing of (auspicious) herbs, oblations, offerings, voluntary vows, expiatory rites, sacrifices, obedience to the guru and the Gods etc." this is the opinion of Vāpyacandra.

Here, it is very clear that Vāpyacandra was a great logician and philosopher who had made a vivid explanation of the subject.

(b) Vāpyacandra's quotation has been taken by Vijayarākṣita's pupil Śrīkaṇṭhadatta in the Mādhukośa commentary on Mādhavanidāna on the Vāgbhaṭa's verse taken as it is by Mādhavakara. Vāpyacandra has explained Vāgbhaṭa's opinion about diagnostic details in case of *sukrameha* and *sikatāmeha* (spermaturia and lithuria respectively).

Vāpyacandra, however, says that Vāgbhaṭa's word "*Sukrabham sukramisram va*" means that in spermaturia, colour of the urine looks like the colour of the sperm as it is similar to the qualities of urine and mixes up with it and it can be seen in the urine affected by spermaturia and in case of lithuria, also, mixture is saturated so that it is massive to look at and here Vāgbhaṭa's word "*muṣṭanun*" means that it may be solid and sandy and particles due to morbid entities may be some times many or scanty or both,

(c) Hemādri has also quoted one reference from his Vāgbhaṭa commentary in his Āyurveda Rasāyanaṭīkā on Vāgbhaṭa. Here, Vāpyacandra seems to have clearly written the properties and botanical descriptions of *grnjanaka* (a kind of onion ‘-viz carrot) - and explains the Vāgbhaṭa’s word *tiksno grnjanakah*” as follows: “A *grnjana* is similar to the onion in odour, colour, and taste but it differs with its minute stalks with leaves at the apex”.

Views on Dravyaguna :

Although we have no record of his any work, Bopadeva quoted passages from his independent work on Dravyaguna (materia medica) in his commentary called *Prakāśavyākhyā* on his father’s work (called) ‘Siddhamantra’. Vāpyacandra’s quotations evince that he had written an independent work called by his name as *Bāṣpacandranighaṇṭu*, from which Bopadeva had taken quotations. These are devoted to depict the botanical descriptions, habitat and properties of two herbs viz. *amlīka* and *ramatha*.

SUMMARY

Vāpyacandra, whose name is also written Bāṣpacandra, was a famous commentator on Caraka, Suśruta and Vāgbhaṭa. He has been quoted by Vijayarakṣita, Śrīkaṇṭhadatta, Niścalakara, Hemādri and Bopadeva. Vāpyacandra was a great grammarian and well initiated into logic and philosophy as basic principles of medicine. He also wrote two works by his name called “Bāṣpacandratantra” and “Bāṣpacandra Nighaṇṭu”. None of his works seem to be available. His date is fixed between 7th to 8th century A.D.

REFERENCES

1. Vaidya Yādavajitricumji Acharya - Mādhavanidāna, with Madhukośa, published from Nirṇaya Sagar Press, Bombay 1955
2. G.J.Meulenbeld - Mādhavanidāna and its chief commentaries, published from Leiden (E.J. Brill) 1974
3. Bhiṣagācārya Harisastri Paradkar Vaidya : Aṣṭanga Hṛdayam with Aruṇadatta’s and Hemadri’s tīka published by Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, Bombay 1939
4. Ācārya Priyavrata Sharma - Āyurveda kā Vajjnānika Itihās published from Chowkhambhā Orientalia, Vāranasi, India 1975.

सारांश

वाप्यचन्द्र

लेखक : ए. पाण्डेय तथा के. रघुनाथन्

वाप्यचन्द्र, जिनका नाम “बाष्पचन्द्र” भी लिखा जाता है, चरक, सुश्रुत और वाग्भट के एक सुप्रसिद्ध टीकाकार थे । उन्हें, विजयरक्षित, श्रीकण्ठदत्त, निश्चलकर, हेमाद्रि और बोपदेव ने अपनी रचनाओं में उल्लिखित किया है । वाप्यचन्द्र एक सुबोध वैयाकरण तथा महान् नैयायिक एवं दार्शनिक थे, जिनकी प्रतिभा इनके सिद्धान्तों के प्रतिपादन में प्रखररूप से उद्भावित होती है; जिनका महत्व चिकित्सा विज्ञान के मौलिक सिद्धान्तों की दृष्टि से है । उनके दो और ग्रन्थ, “बाष्पचन्द्रतन्त्र” और “बाष्पचन्द्र निघण्टु” के नाम से प्रसिद्ध हैं । सम्प्रति, उनके सभी ग्रन्थ अप्राप्य हैं । उनका प्रादुर्भावकाल सप्तम और अष्टमशताब्दि खृष्टाब्द निश्चित हुआ है ।