12. Discussion
Discussion

Period of Sanketmanjari Commentary

The very first reference of Sanketmanjari commentary on Ashtanga Hridayam is found in the Aufrechts’s ‘Catalogus Catalogorum’ written in 19th century. In Sanketmanjari Commentary, reference of various commentaries and the name of the commentators are cited at various places which range from 6th Century AD to 13th Century AD. So the timeline of this commentary can be set up from 14th Century AD to 19th century AD. As per the information available in the colophon of last chapter of Uttarasthana, the commentator introduces himself as Damodara Ranade belonging to Chitpavana Jati. The Chitpavan or Chitpawan, part of the Konkanastha Brahmins (i.e. "Brahmins native to the Konkan"), are a Brahmin community of Konkan, the coastal region of western India. In Sanskrit, the rich language of ancient India, "Chita" - means pyre and "Pavan" means pure. Hence the term Chitapavan means those who were purified by fire. Unheard of before the late seventeenth century, the Chitpavans served not only in the cities of the Marathi-speaking area but also in the other kingdoms of the Maratha expansion: Gwalior, Baroda, Indore. According to reknonown historian from Ujjain, Late Dr Shyamsundar Nigam many Sanskrit scholars who were from Maharashtra or Konkan region migrated to Ujjain during Gwalior dynasty. So it can be speculated that Mr Damodara Ranade might have shifted to Ujjain from Konkan during Scindhia dynasty. There are very few references about Chitpavana Jati prior to 17th century. On the basis of these evidences, this commentary and the commentator can be placed in the 17th century.

Cause of remaining unnoticed

Very few references of this commentary in the history of Ayurveda reveal its less popularity. Sarvangasundara is the most accepted commentary available on all the chapters of Ashtanga Hridaya. Sanketmanjari commentary is also on all the chapters of Ashtanga Hridaya. After the study of five Sthana of Sanketmanjari commentary, it is clear that the commentator has commented on average 40% Shloka of five Sthana of Ashtanga Hridayayam. On rest of the 60% Shloka, the commentary is mentioned as ‘Iti
Spashtam’ which means everything written in the main verse is so clear that there is no need to comment on these verses. Wide popularity and acceptability of any commentary depends on the main content of that commentary. Less number of commented verses might be the reason of its less recognition and hence it remained unnoticed by the scholars of Ayurveda of that era.

**Following other Samhitas and Commentary**

There is a difference between the number of Shloka in the chapters between the Ashtanga Hridaya by Harishastri Paradkar Vaidya and Ashtanga Hridaya with Sanketmanjari commentary. Many of the Shloka which are found extra in AHSM are either taken from Charkasamhita or Sushrutsamhita or Ashtanga Sangraha. Even many shloka which are available in Ayurveda Rasayana commentary are available in the main text of Ashtanga Hridaya. Even the whole SM commentary follows three commentaries on Ashtanga Hridaya i.e. Sarvangasundara by Arundatta, Ayurveda Rasayana by Hemadri and Padarthachandrika by Chandranandana. These three commentators are cited at different places in this commentary. The author of Sanketmanjari commentary must have referred these commentaries while writing the Sanketmanjari commentary. The chapters where Arunadatta commentary is not available, it follows Padarthachandrika commentary. The study of five Sthana proves that this commentary has majorly followed Sarvangasundara commentary and this might be the reason that amongst all commentators, Arunadatta has been cited at maximum. Even there are few places where there are different opinions in SM commentary other than the rest of the three commentaries.

**New formulations and synonyms of Dravyas**

There are many formulations which are not discussed in detail in SS, AR or PC commentaries. Such formulations are discussed in detail in SM commentary on the basis of the proportion of their ingredients and preparation methods. This shows the expertise of author in the manufacturing of various formulations.

In Dravyaguna, many drugs have the same synonym. In that condition it becomes very difficult to find out which drug is to be taken for the compound formulation. In such condition, the commentators play an important role in providing the proper guidance.
This commentary provides significant contribution in providing the information of selection of drug. Besides SS and AR commentary, SM commentary guides at around 156 places for finalizing the particular drug in the particular formulation. This shows the expertise of author in Dravyaguna, Bhaishajyakalpana and Kayachikitsa.

SM commentary provides almost 28 new formulations. These formulations are not available in the Ashtanga Hridayam edited by Harishastri Paradkar Vaidya. These Shloka and these formulations are considered as an important contribution of this commentary in the treatment of various diseases. These formulations must have been taken from the contemporary Samhita. The author must have found these formulations in practice and therefore might have added these formulations. These new formulations are from various categories i.e. Churna, tail, Ghrita, Lepa, Dhooma etc.

**Cited Places**

The commentator has cited around 16 places in the commentary of five Sthana. Out of these 16 places, most of the places are from North India. It shows that the author has either visited these places or he has a good orientation of these places from North India.

**Contribution in Roganidana**

The commentary also contributes in Roganidana by describing various Lakshanas like Samanya Marmaviddha Lakshana, Marmabhighat Lakshana, Dhatugata Jwara Lakshana, Vibandha Lakshana etc. The most important amongst this is, description of different color shades in Kachadosha as per the Dosha predominance. Also the commentary describes Fish bite symptoms and Makshika bite symptoms which are not available in other commentaries.

Study of five Sthana shows that SM commentary is available on 40% shloka of Ashtanga Hridayam. Out of these 40% Shloka, around 22% Shloka have some new information other than the SS, AR and PC commentaries. This much contribution cannot be considered as less contribution from history point of view. Besides this, the contribution in the subjects like Dravyaguna, Bhaishajyakalpana, Roganidana and Kayachikitsa is
remarkable and one cannot afford to ignore this contribution. This is a real treasure from our ancient literature which needs to be explored.

Sutrasthana of Sanketmanjari commentary is not included in present study. There might be few unique contributions in Basic Principles, Dravyaguna etc. Study of five Sthana of Ashtanga Hridayam except Sutrasthana shows significant additions in the field of Ayurveda. There were many commentaries written on Ayurveda Samhita and disappeared in the due course of time. Even many commentaries are either incomplete or lost. It is responsibility of the scholars of Ayurveda to find out such oriental literature. Such ancient literature should thoroughly be studied and explored. The contributions made by such ancient literature should be documented, published and circulated to the Ayurveda community. The works of such commentators cannot be measured on the basis of statistical analysis. The statistical data does not reduce the importance of the commentary and its novel contribution. If such literature contributes something in oriental literature of Ayurveda, it will be of great benefit to the scholars of Ayurveda.