

GRONINGEN ORIENTAL STUDIES

VOLUME XV / IIA

Published under the auspices of the J. Gonda Foundation
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

Editor

H. T. Bakker, *Groningen*

Editorial Board

H. W. Bodewitz · D. D. S. Goodall

H. Isaacson · G. J. Meulenbeld

Advisory Board

C. Caillat, *Paris* · R. E. Emmerick, *Hamburg*

J. Ensink, *Groningen* · R. F. Gombrich, *Oxford*

J. C. Heesterman, *Leiden* · D. Shulman, *Jerusalem*

Ch. Vaudeville, *Paris* · J. Williams, *Berkeley*

G. Jan Meulenbeld

A History of
Indian Medical Literature

VOLUME IIA TEXT

EGBERT FORSTEN · GRONINGEN

2000

betan tradition credits them with two treatises, called *Gces-bsdus*⁶⁹ and *Byañ-khog khrims-kyi luñ-hod hphro-ba*.⁷⁰

Candranandana

Candranandana was the author of (1) the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*, (2) a commentary, called *Padārthacandrikā*, on the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā*,⁷¹ and (3) a collection of glosses (*vṛtti*) on the latter work.⁷²

The Madanādinighaṇṭu

The *Madanādinighaṇṭu*,⁷³ also called *Gaṇanighaṇṭu*,⁷⁴ and sometimes *Oṣadhinighaṇṭu*,⁷⁵ enumerates both names and properties of medicinal substances.⁷⁶ The treatise can be divided into two main parts. The first one, consisting of 592 verses, is arranged in thirty-two sections (*gaṇa*), in agreement with the number of groups of drugs (*gaṇa*) in Vāgbhaṭa's *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā* (Sū.15).⁷⁷ The second part (*viprakīrṇadravyaprakaraṇa*; about 440 verses) deals with miscellaneous drugs, not mentioned in the preceding sections, and some other subjects.⁷⁸ It is mainly devoted to medicinal plants, but also deals with inorganic substances, fermented fluids, grain and pulse, prepared dishes, animals, terms designating parts of plants, groups of drugs, and anatomical terms. The plan of the work therefore resembles that of other *nighaṇṭus*, also based on the *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā*, such as the *Aṣṭāṅganighaṇṭu* and the *Abhidhānamañjarī*. Candranandana follows Vāgbhaṭa in his order of the drugs, but adds strings of synonyms, properties, and actions.⁷⁹

The *Madanādinighaṇṭu* was translated into Tibetan under the title *Sman-dpyad yan-lag brgyad-paḥi sniñ-poḥi ḥgrel-pa-las sman-gyi miñ-gi rnam-graṅs*, i.e., *Vaidyakāṣṭāṅgahṛdayavṛtter bheṣajanāmasūcī*,⁸⁰ and forms part of the Tanjur.

The *Madanādinighaṇṭu* is quoted by Bhānuji Dīkṣita⁸¹ and Kṣīrasvāmin⁸² in their commentaries on the *Amarakoṣa*, Śivadatta in his auto-commentary on the *Śivakoṣa*,⁸³ and Śrīvallabhagaṇi in his commentary on the *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa*.⁸⁴ Some quotations from a *nighaṇṭu* in Indu's *Śāśilekhā* agree with verses from the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*.⁸⁵

A *Gaṇanighaṇṭu* is quoted in the *Śāligrāmanighaṇṭubhūṣaṇa* of the *Bṛhannighaṇṭuratnākara*.⁸⁶

Special features

Candranandana distinguishes rather frequently more than one type of a drug mentioned as a single entity by Vāgbhaṭa; sometimes he adds items to a group. Examples are: the *sthalaja* and *jalaja* varieties of *madhuka* (1.3); *nimba* and *maḥānimba* (1.7–8); a second type of *viśālā* (1.12–13); two varieties of *vidula* (1.26–27);⁸⁷ *danti* is added to *dahana* (1.31); two types of *elā* (1.63–64); *hareṇu* is added to *elā* (1.66–67); *saṛṣapa* and *raktasaṛṣapā* (1.68–69); two types of *kumbha* (= *trivṛt*; 2.1–2); two types of *lodhra* (2.19–20); three types of *śigru* (4.19–21); *madhūla* is added to *madhūka* (4.23–24); three types of *dūrvā* (6.1–3); *dhanvayāṣa* is added to *anantā* (6.5–6); *śvetakāmbojī*⁸⁸ is added to *śvetapākī* (6.16–17); two types of *vidārī* (8.1–2), of *pañcāṅgula* (8.4–5), of *vṛścīva* = *varṣābhū* (8.11–12), and of *gopasutā* (= *śārivā*; 8.18–19); *lāmajjaka* is added to *uśīra*

(9.1–4); three types of śisīra (= candana; 9.5–7); two types of bāṇa (15.14), darbha (17.7), and tuttha (18.3); kuṭheraka is added to kālamāla (22.7–8).⁸⁹ A few items, added by Candranandana, are absent from the *Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdayasaṃhitā*, for example lāmajjaka (9.3). Some names differ slightly from those employed by Vāgbhaṭa.⁹⁰

The section on miscellaneous drugs contains some items which are not found in the *Aṣṭāṅgaḥṛdayasaṃhitā*, such as ādārikā (p.22), damanaka (p.26),⁹¹ dadhipuṣpī (p.23),⁹² graiṣmī (p.28), kaṇṭakarañja (p.22), śirīṣikā (p.21), vanakārpāsī (p.21), vārṣikī (p.28), and vāsantī (p.27).

The author

One of the problems connected with Candranandana is whether one or two authors of this name should be distinguished, one who wrote the *Padārthacandrikā*, and another one who composed the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*.⁹³

P.V. Sharma adduced two arguments in favour of this distinction.⁹⁴ First, the maṅgala of the *Padārthacandrikā* is addressed to Viṣṇu, that of the *Madanādinighaṇṭu* to Sarvajña, who is probably the Buddha. This may indeed point to two different authors, but can also be explained by assuming a syncretistic attitude to religion on the part of Candranandana. The second argument is based on a discrepancy in Candranandana's genealogy. The edited Sanskrit text of the *Padārthacandrikā* mentions Kalyāṇa and Vidyā as his parents, whereas Ravinandana or Ratinandana is the name of Candranandana's father in the Tibetan version of this commentary. This argument does not carry conviction, since it appears improbable that Kalyāṇa and Vidyā are the actual names of Candranandana's parents.

The issue whether one or two Candranandanas contributed to the medical literature can be elucidated by comparing the synonyms of medicinal plants, found in the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*, with those mentioned in the *Padārthacandrikā*. It so happens that the synonyms occurring in the latter work are for the greater part one of the first of the strings of names of the former, which suggests that both works are by one and the same author. The Tibetan tradition also regards the commentator and the author of the nighaṇṭu as identical.⁹⁵

Candranandana mentions his name at the beginning of the *Padārthacandrikā* and *Madanādinighaṇṭu*.⁹⁶ His father was Ravinandana, as indicated at the beginning of the *Madanādinighaṇṭu* and in the Tibetan version of the *Padārthacandrikā*.⁹⁷ His grandfather was called Mahānandana.⁹⁸ The *Padārthacandrikā* was written at the instance of Śakunadeva.⁹⁹ Candranandana was, according to the Tibetan tradition, a native of Kaśmīr.¹⁰⁰

Date

An important clue to Candranandana's chronological position is the Tibetan translation of the *Padārthacandrikā*, made by Rin-chen bzañ-po between A.D. 1013 and 1055.¹⁰¹ A more precise dating would be reached if Candranandana were identical with Candradeva, mentioned in the biography of the Elder G-yu thog-pa,¹⁰² the chief physician of the Tibetan king Khri-sroñ lde-bcān, who lived in the eighth century. This G-yu thog-pa visited Candradeva on his way to India and received instruction from him. The same

biography relates that G-yu thog-pa met Vairocana, who claimed to have received the *Rgyud-bži* from Candradeva.¹⁰³ The identity of this Candradeva with Candranandana, considered as not impossible by R.E. Emmerick,¹⁰⁴ would place our author in the middle of the eighth century. The same date was suggested by G. Huth.¹⁰⁵ The quotations from Candranandana's works are not helpful in establishing his date, since they are found in authors who are later than Rin-chen bzañ-po.

Candraṭa

Candraṭa,¹⁰⁶ the son of Tīsaṭa, who wrote the *Cikitsākalikā*, composed the following works: (1) a commentary on the *Cikitsākalikā*, (2) *Suśrutapāṭhaśuddhi*, (3) *Yogarātna-samuccaya*, (4) *Yogaṃuṣṭi*, (5) *Dravyāvalī*, and (6) *Vaidyatrimṣaṭṭikā*.

(1) Candraṭa's authorship of the commentary on the *Cikitsākalikā*¹⁰⁷ is evident from the opening sentences of the work. It is written in a lucid style and is important for the constitution of the text of the *Cikitsākalikā* and its interpretation. At some places Candraṭa informs us of sources not referred to by Tīsaṭa himself.¹⁰⁸

Many basic āyurvedic concepts are discussed at length in the comments on verse sixteen of the *Cikitsākalikā*.¹⁰⁹ Some new ideas are put forward in this part of the commentary. Candraṭa distinguishes three types of bala (strength): bala (in its restricted sense as physical strength), ojas, and tejas. Sattva is said to be of two types: bhūrutva and sahiṣṇutva. The concept of sātmya is elaborately dealt with according to the views of various authorities. Candraṭa himself is of the opinion that sātmya is of eight types. Regarding the concept of vipāka, he agrees with Suśruta in distinguishing two types. Drugs (auśadha) are classified according to the predominance of one or more of the mahābhūtas in them.

The concept of diseases caused by one's karman is elucidated by a long quotation from a work not mentioned by name.¹¹⁰ Differences of opinion between the followers of Caraka (kāyacikitsakāḥ) and Suśruta (śalyatantrakartārah) are noticed.¹¹¹ Details on the preparation of various medicines are frequently given,¹¹² as well as the names of compound formulae.¹¹³ The interpretations of the names of drugs are mostly correct,¹¹⁴ but sometimes doubtful or wrong,¹¹⁵ probably because the identity of a number of medicinal substances had become controversial, or because of insufficient knowledge. Occasionally, a medicinal plant is described and its vernacular name mentioned.¹¹⁶ The term piccaṭa(roga) is employed as a synonym for the eye disease or group of eye diseases usually called pilla.¹¹⁷ Añjanas, to be employed in eye diseases, are divided into three types: guṭikā, rasa and cūrṇa; guṭikā is subdivided into piṇḍa, vartī and guṭikā in a restricted sense.¹¹⁸

Authorities quoted or referred to by Candraṭa are: Agniveśa (1; 2), Āstīka (mentioned by Tīsaṭa; 387), the Aśvins (1, 227, 306: mentioned by Tīsaṭa), Ātreya (1; 5), Aupadhenava (1; 145), Aurabhra (1; 2; 145), Bhaṭṭa¹¹⁹ (introductory part of the commentary), Bhela (2: mentioned by Tīsaṭa; 20; 80; 82; 248: mentioned by Tīsaṭa), Bhoja (2: mentioned by Tīsaṭa; 85; 115), Bhr̥gu (2: mentioned by Tīsaṭa), Bhr̥guja¹²⁰ (375: mentioned by Tīsaṭa), Cakṣuṣyeṇa (2; 16; 80; 81; 85; 283; 303–304;

GRONINGEN ORIENTAL STUDIES

VOLUME XV / IIB

Published under the auspices of the J. Gonda Foundation
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences

Editor

H. T. Bakker, *Groningen*

Editorial Board

H. W. Bodewitz · D. D. S. Goodall

H. Isaacson · G. J. Meulenbeld

Advisory Board

C. Caillat, *Paris* · R. E. Emmerick, *Hamburg*

J. Ensink, *Groningen* · R. F. Gombrich, *Oxford*

J. C. Heesterman, *Leiden* · D. Shulman, *Jerusalem*

Ch. Vaudeville, *Paris* · J. Williams, *Berkeley*

G. Jan Meulenbeld

A History of
Indian Medical Literature

VOLUME IIB ANNOTATION

EGBERT FORSTEN · GRONINGEN

2000

- 70 Rendered as ‘Precepts radiating from the valley of light inside the body’ by Rechung (1973: 11–12). An alternative translation may be ‘Emanations (hphro-ba) from the valley (luñ) of light (hod) consisting of precepts (khrims) concerning the interior of the body (khog)’ (the sense of byañ is not clear).
- 71 See: commentaries on the works of Vāgbhaṭa.
- 72 See: commentaries on the works of Vāgbhaṭa.
- 73 NCC VI, 355–356. Kavīndrācāryasūcipatram, Nr. 1033 (*Madanādinighaṅṭu*). Candranandana does not mention the name of his nighaṅṭu. The colophons of the Kottayam edition call it *Madanādinighaṅṭu*, a title easily explained since the first drug described is called madana.
- Edition: Candranandana’s *Madanādi-nighaṅṭu*, ed. by Aṣṭa Vaidya Vayaskara N.S. Mooss, Vaidyasarathy Sanskrit Series, Book No. 8, Kottayam 1985. This edition is based on four MSS, three from South India and one from Paris (see the Intr. to the ed. 11–17); it does not present the viprakīrṇadravyaprakaraṇa, because of the bad state of this part of the text in the only MS containing it that was available to N.S. Mooss. A fifth MS, deposited at the Asiatic Society, Calcutta (*Nr. G.8426) was examined by P.V. Sharma. His observations on this MS (see his articles: 1985b and 1986b) show the title of the work to be *Madanādinighaṅṭu*; as an alternative title, *Gaṇanighaṅṭu* is written on the margin in a different hand. P.V. Sharma also discovered that the Calcutta MS resembles the Paris MS very closely, which indicates a common source for both. The readings of the Calcutta MS enabled P.V. Sharma to improve numerous readings of the Kottayam edition and to fill part of its gaps.
- The section on miscellaneous drugs (viprakīrṇadravya) forms part of the Calcutta MS and of one of those from Kerala. It has been separately edited by P.V. Sharma: The Miscellaneous portion of Madanadi Nighantu of Chandranandana, Supplement to BIHM 16, 1986, published in 1987.
- Unfortunately, neither N.S. Mooss nor P.V. Sharma made use of the quotations from the *Madanādinighaṅṭu* and the synonyms found in Candranandana’s *Padārthacandrikā* to improve the readings of the text they edited.
- 74 NCC III, 96; V, 239; VI, 355–356: *Oṣadhinighaṅṭu* or *Gaṇanighaṅṭu*; recorded separately from the *Madanādinighaṅṭu*. Check-list Nr. 295: *Gaṇanighaṅṭu*. STMI 44: *Oṣadhinighaṅṭu*. P. Cordier (1901c: 185) referred to Candranandana’s nighaṅṭu as *Gaṇanighaṅṭu*, and once, erroneously, as *Gūṇanighaṅṭu* (1903b: 350). The work is called *Gūṇanighaṅṭu* in J. Filliozat’s list of MSS of the collection P. Cordier in Paris (Liste Nr. 31), although the title page of the MS itself clearly indicates its title as *Gaṇanighaṅṭu* (see Intr. 14 to the Kottayam ed.); the Paris MS is a copy of a MS preserved in the Palace library of Bikaner (see Intr. 17 to the Kottayam ed.). A *Gajanighaṅṭu* by Candranandana, mentioned by Bāpālāl Vaidya (1968, Intr. 37) is probably a misprint for *Gaṇanighaṅṭu*.
- 75 See preceding note.
- 76 The Tibetan translation of the *Madanādinighaṅṭu* (see below) only contains the synonyms.
- 77 Actually, Vāgbhaṭa describes thirty-three groups (see A.h.Sū.15.46), which was a source of confusion to N.S. Mooss (see the Intr. to his ed. 14–6; compare N.S. Mooss, 1980: 25), who tried to solve the difficulty, in conformity with a tradition prevalent in Kerala, by splitting up gaṇa six, the dūrvadigaṇa, into two groups, a dūrvadigaṇa proper and a sthīrādigaṇa. P.V. Sharma gave a different and more convincing explanation by pointing out that gaṇas five and six, the bhadrādāvādi- and dūrvādigaṇa, describe drugs subduing vāta and

pitta, and that the group subduing kapha has deliberately been left out because it consists of substances already mentioned as forming part of preceding groups.

- 78 The viprakīrṇadravyaprakaraṇa is not a later addition, but belongs to the original *Madanādinighaṇṭu* since it forms part of the Tibetan translation and is quoted under Candranandana's name by Kṣīrasvamin.
- 79 Vāgbhaṭa only mentions the chief actions of the gaṇa to which a drug belongs.
- 80 According to P. Cordier the correct Tibetan title is *Yan-lag brgyad-pa-nas bstan-paḥi sman-gyi miñ-gi nam-graṅs*, i.e., *Aṣṭāṅgopadiṣṭabheṣajanāmasūcī*. See on the Tibetan translation: Vaidya Bhagwan Dash (1987) (based on the Tibetan text, with Sanskrit equivalents, botanical identifications, and notes); P. Cordier (1903a): 615–616; P. Yonten Arya (1998): XIV.
- 81 E.g., ad *Amarakoṣa* 2.4.98 (*Madanādi* 24.11 is quoted).
- 82 Kṣīrasvāmin repeatedly quotes, under the names Candra and Candranandana, from the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*, e.g., ad *Amarakoṣa* 2.4.30 (*Madanādi* 1.26–27), 37 (*Madanādi* 15.16), 49 (*Madanādi*, viprakīrṇa p.4), 98 (*Madanādi* 24.11), 107 (*Madanādi* 5.3), 127 (*Madanādi* 21.26), etc. The Candra and Candranandana quoted by Kṣīrasvāmin are sometimes regarded as two different authors (AVI 380–381; DGV IV, 277 and 278).
- 83 Śivadatta quotes the *Madanādinighaṇṭu* as Candranandana ad *Śivakoṣa* 340 (= *Madanādi* 24.11); two other quotations from Candranandana agree only partially with verses from the *Madanādinighaṇṭu* (compare the quotations ad *Śivakoṣa* 2.31 with *Madanādi* 8.21, and the quotation ad 441 with viprakīrṇa, p.13: tāmalakī).
- 84 Candra and Candranandana are quoted ad *Nighaṇṭuśeṣa* 84–85ab (= *Madanādi* 3.7–8), 91–92ab (= 16.19), 130cd-131ab (= 1.26–27), 135cd-136ab (= viprakīrṇa, p.13), 137 (= 1.8), 244 (= viprakīrṇa, p.28), 256–257ab (compare *Madanādi* 24.7), 260–261ab (compare *Madanādi* 5.3), 307ab (= 24.11), and 325 (= 31.26).
- 85 See: Indu.
- 86 This *Gaṇanighaṇṭu* is a different work, for the quotations from it are not traceable in the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*. See: *Bṛhannighaṇṭuratnākara*.
- 87 Vidula is identified as *Acacia sinuata* (Lour.) Merr., *Barringtonia acutangula* (Linn.) Gaertn., *Calamus rotang* Linn., and *Salix caprea* Linn. (see M. Abdul Kareem, 1997, Nrs. 25, 214, 290, 1426).
- 88 Śvetakāmbojikā is mentioned at A.h.U.34.2. This plant is identified as *Securinega leucopyrus* (Willd.) Muell.-Arg. (see M. Abdul Kareem, 1997, Nr. 1464).
- 89 This list does in general not imply that Vāgbhaṭa is unacquainted with these distinctions and additions.
- 90 E.g., kurūṭa (19.19) instead of kuraṇṭa, jharasī (22.18) instead of sarasī.
- 91 Identified as *Artemisia nilagirica* (C.B. Clarke) Pamp. and *A. sieversiana* Ehrh. ex Willd. (see M. Abdul Kareem, 1997, Nrs. 168 and 171). See on the role of damanaka during the Kāma festival: J.J. Meyer (1937): I, 38–53.
- 92 Identified as *Mucuna monosperma* DC. (see M. Abdul Kareem, 1997, Nr. 1137).
- 93 P.V. Sharma (1986b) was temporarily convinced that the two are different; in earlier publications he assumed the two to be identical (AVI 208–209 and 380; 1976a: 107); in a recent publication (1993: Intr. 34) he returned to his early views on this issue. C. Vogel (1965: 15–16) is doubtful on this problem. Usually, however, both authors are regarded as identical (see, for example, Mooss's Intr. to his ed. of the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*, 7–11; STMI 44).
- 94 See P.V. Sharma (1986b).

- 95 See P. Cordier (1903a); Vaidya Bhagwan Dash (1987).
- 96 The Tibetan equivalent of Candranandana is Zla-ba-la dgaḥ-ba. See M. Taube (1981: 22) on the confusion of Zla-ba mñon-dgaḥ and Zla-ba(-la) dgaḥ-ba.
- 97 The Tibetan equivalent is, according to P. Cordier, Chags-la mñon-par dgaḥ-ba in the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*. Chags-pa-la dgaḥ-ba in the *Padārthacandrikā*; P. Cordier renders these names as Ravinandana, adding that Prema- or Anandanandana are more literal translations. Vaidya Bhagwan Dash renders Chags-pa-la mñon-par dgaḥ-ba as Ratyabhinandana; C. Vogel (1965: 15), who reads Chags-pa-la dgaḥ-ba, gives Ratinandana as its Sanskrit equivalent (zla-ba is the Tibetan equivalent of Sanskrit candra, chags-pa of rati, mñon-par of abhi, and dgaḥ-ba of nandana).
- 98 NCC VI, 355. See the colophon and translator's postscript to the Tibetan version of the *Padārthacandrikā*, where Candranandana's grandfather is called Mahāśrīnandana (Mooss's Intr. to the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*, 10). Compare on Candranandana's genealogy: L. Rabgay (1981): 16.
- 99 See the introduction to this commentary by Candranandana himself.
- 100 As indicated in the Tibetan translation of the *Padārthacandrikā* (see P. Cordier; C. Vogel, 1965: 15). Candranandana is regarded as a contemporary of king Abhimanyu II (A.D. 958–972) of Kaśmīr (see P. Cordier, 1909–15: *III, 472, referred to by C. Vogel, 1965: 15). The author's colophon and translator's postscript to the Tibetan translation of the *Padārthacandrikā* praise a king Thakhana, who is identified as the Śāhi ruler Thakkana, a contemporary of Abhimanyu II, against whom Yaśodhara, the latter's commander-in-chief, undertook a military expedition (Mooss's Intr. to the ed. of the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*, 9–11, based on information supplied by C. Vogel).
- 101 R.E. Emmerick (1977): 1136. C. Vogel (1965): 15. The colophon and postscript to the Tibetan translation of the *Padārthacandrikā* mention that it was made by the Indian professor Jārandhara and the monk Rin-chen bzañ-po (Mooss's Intr. to the *Madanādinighaṇṭu*, 10). Vaidya Bhagwan Dash gives A.D. 1013 as the year in which this translation was made. P.V. Sharma (AVI 208) mentions the period 1033–35. See on Rin-chen bzañ-po: Bhagwan Dash (1976): 44; T. Clifford (1984): Intr. XVI; G. Huth (1895a): 281; G.N. Roerich (1976; see index); D. Snellgrove (1987): II, 477–479; Tsepa Rigzin (1984); G. Tucci (1993); C. Vogel (1965: 20–21).
- 102 This biography has been translated into English: Rechung Rinpoche (1973). See on Candra(deva): Rechung (1973): 187, 203, 209, 228, 236, 243, 298. See on the Elder G-yu thog-pa: T. Clifford (1984): 56–58. See on the Elder and Younger G-yu thog-pa: W.A. Unkrig's Einführung to P.C. von Korvin-Krasinski (1953): 21–22. Compare the Tibetan sources on Nāgārjuna.
- 103 R.E. Emmerick (1977): 1163. Rechung (1973): 209–210. Bhagwan Dash calls the Candradeva, visited by the elder G-yu thog-pa, Candranandana (Bhagwan Dash, 1976: 4; 1987: Preface 8) and Candrābhinandana (Bhagwan Dash 1976: 15); he calls the latter a physician who may or may not be identical with Candranandana. C. Vogel (1965: 15–16) is of the opinion that Candranandana may or may not be identical with the physician Candrābhinandana (Zla-ba-la mñon-dgaḥ), who is said to have assisted Vairocana in putting the *Rgyud-bḥi* into Tibetan at the time of king Khri-sroñ lde bcan (A.D. 755–797), or with the medical lexicographer Candranandana. Lokesh Candra (Intr. to Terry Clifford, 1984: 16) asserts that Candranandana rendered the Sanskrit original of the *Rgyud-bḥi* into Tibetan. Terry Clifford too (1984: 42) is in error when claiming that Candranandana wrote down in Sanskrit the teaching of the *Rgyud-bḥi* and gave it to the Tibetan translator

- Vairocana on the occasion of the latter's pilgrimage to India; he regards Candranandana as a pupil of Aśvaghōṣa. Most sources relate that Vairocana, after receiving the original, translated it into Tibetan. See on Vairocana: Bhagwan Dash (1976a): 18; Rechung (1973): 17, 187, 203, 298. See on the Rgyud-b'zi: Vāgbhaṭa.
- Rechung (1973: 14) relates that, according to the Tibetan tradition, Zla-ba mñon-dgañ was a paṇḍit from Kaśmīr and a disciple of Aśvaghōṣa; to this Aśvaghōṣa, who was a prolific author, a number of medical treatises are attributed: *Yan-lag brgyad-pa chen-po*, *Yan-lag brgyad-pa-la hñug-pa*, and *Yan-lag brgyad-pa ni sñiñ-po bsdus-pa*. Similar statements about Aśvaghōṣa are found in Terry Clifford (1984: 42), who renders the titles of these medical treatises (correctly) as 'The great eight branches', 'Entering the eight branches' and 'Collection of the essence of the eight branches'; he adds, as a fourth treatise, an auto-commentary on the last work of the three; one of his notes says (1984: 245) that, according to the Tibetans, Aśvaghōṣa and Vāgbhaṭa are the same person (see also: P. Yonten Arya, 1998: X); T. Clifford (1984: 42) ascribes to Candranandana, Aśvaghōṣa's pupil, a commentary on his teacher's works, a dictionary of their medical terms, and major volumes of his own.
- 104 R.E. Emmerick (1977): 1136. See on this issue also R.F.G. Müller (1932): 793–794. Emmerick's view is criticized by M. Taube (1981: 18–19, 22, 28).
- 105 G. Huth (1895a): 270–271, (1895b): 280–281; compare P. Cordier (1901c): 180. Huth transcribed Candranandana's name wrongly as Candrānanda (see C. Vogel, 1965: 15). The NCC (I, 464) places Candranandana in the tenth century; P.V. Sharma (1993: Intr. 34) assigns him to about A.D. 1000.
- 106 NCC VI, 354.
- 107 The NCC (VII, 26) calls this commentary *Yogaratna*, which may be based on a confusion with Candraṭa's *Yogaratnasamuccaya*. See for the editions: Tīsaṭa. References are to ed. d. See on Candraṭa and his commentary: R.P. Bhatnagar (1992): 280–282; P.V. Sharma's Intr. to ed. d, 5–8; P.V. Sharma (1972b). See for the shorter and longer version of Candraṭa's commentary ed. a.
- 108 See the commentary ad 161–162; 208–211; 212–215.
- 109 See on Candraṭa's views regarding some basic concepts: R.P. Bhatnagar (1992): 281–282; P.V. Sharma's Intr. to ed. d; P.V. Sharma (1972b).
- 110 See the comments ad 10–12.
- 111 See the commentary ad 80.
- 112 See, for example, his comments ad 118, 130 and 270.
- 113 See, e.g., his comments ad 124.
- 114 According to P.V. Sharma (Intr. to ed. d, 7), Ḍalhaṇa seems to have followed Candraṭa in a number of interpretations.
- 115 See, e.g., the commentary ad 48: balā = samaṅgā; ad 51: uccaṭā = kapikacchu or guñjā; ad 61: morāṭa = añkolapuṣpa; ad 371: morāṭa = apāmārga.
- 116 See, e.g., the commentary ad 208–211.
- 117 See the commentary ad 340 and 354–355.
- 118 See the comments ad 341.
- 119 Probably Bhaṭṭārahariścandra. Compare: Haricandra.
- 120 I.e., Śukra. Compare: Śukra.
- 121 Compare: Bhaṭṭa.
- 122 I.e., Videha. Compare: Videha.