14. Conclusion
Conclusion

1. Evidences suggest that Sanketmanjari commentary written by Shri Damodara Ranade is a work of 17th Century. Shri. Damodara Ranade belonged to Chitpavana Jati. This shows that he was a Kokanastha Brahmin. Historical evidences suggest that many Chitpavana scholars from Maharashtra and Konkan have migrated to the nearby states and settled at Baroda, Ujjain, Indore and Gwalior during Maratha Kingdom in 17th and 18th century. Mr Damodara Ranade might be one of those scholars who had migrated to Ujjain during Scindia dynasty. This is the reason why the manuscript of Sanketmanjari commentary was found at Ujjain.

2. Study of Sharirasthana, Nidanasthana, Chikitsasthana, Kalpa-Siddhi Sthana and Uttarasthana shows that Sanketmanjari commentary is available on average 40% of total Shloka of these five Sthana.

3. The new contributions are available in average 22% Shloka of these five Sthana.

4. Many shloka that are not available in Ashtanga Hridayam (Edited by Harishastri Paradkar Vaidya) and are available in the main text of this commentary are taken from the Samhita like Sushrutsamhita, Charakasamhita and Ashtanga Sangraha. More number of Shloka has been taken from Ashtanga Sangraha.

5. This commentary follows all the three previous commentaries i.e. Sarvangasundara, Ayurveda Rasayana and Padartha Chandrika. The Author has cited Arundatta nine times in the commentary as well as study of the commentary suggests that the author has mainly followed Sarvangasundara commentary. The author has not followed the other commentaries completely therefore he has very different opinions at various places.

6. Around 28 formulations from Ashtanga Hridayam with Sanketmanjari commentary are not available in Ashtanga Hridayam (Edited by Harishastri Paradkar Vaidya) which is an important contribution for the clinicians of Ayurveda.

7. This commentary also contributes in providing the details of many formulations either by providing the proportionate contents of the formulation or by describing
the process of preparation of the formulation which is not available in the contemporary Samhita and their commentary.

8. The commentary has also contribution in the form of definitions of few technical terms of Ayurveda. It also contributes in Roganidana by describing the sign and symptoms of few clinical conditions.

9. Notable contribution is in the form of drugs and their synonyms which shows the expertise of author in Dravyaguna.

10. Most of the places cited in the commentary are from North India, which shows the author has good orientation of North Indian States and places.

11. In spite of so many contributions, the truth is, this commentary could not lure the Ayurveda scholars of that era. Though the commentary has a mention in the 18th century Aufrecht’s ‘Catalogus Catalogorum’, it remained unnoticed in the history of Ayurveda. It is unfortunate that except a few, nobody took a note of this Commentary.