

Book Review**“Bhela Samhita”****Dr. Chinmay Tandale****Dr. Alkananda Kulkarni****Mr. Akshay Chougule****Introduction -**

Bringing reputable old Sanskrit literature to the expert notice of non-Sanskrit-knowing contemporary is a specialised scholarly endeavour with multiple benefits. But only if everything is done carefully.

A purported, early Ayurvedic work of this kind, the fragmentary Bhela-samhita, predates the Caraka Samhita, which has been redacted. As a result, it immediately takes on a significant historical value. The current effort is a ground-breaking one that has made the most corrections to the text by utilising all of the editions' strengths.

The Bhela Samhita, authored by Bhela Caryya, is one of the earliest Samhitas that dates back to Agnivesa's time. Bhela Caryya was one of Punarvasu Atreya's six students. Bhela held the second-highest ranking, behind Agnivesa, among Punarvasu Atreya's six disciples. Therefore, it should

'Book Review: The Bhela Samhita

come as no surprise that Agnivesa wrote the first treatise, Agniveatantra, based on the advice of his master and including the conclusions reached throughout many sage conferences. Following a similar format, Bhela also wrote a treatise called the Bhelatantra, which later became the Bhelasamhita. The Carakasamhita, a developed and annotated version of the Agniveatantra, held the top spot as other treatises withered under the weight of time and also because their subject matter was nearly identical and their presentation was less spectacular than the former. Vagbhata's assertion demonstrates that, even during his lifetime, the treatises of Bhela and others had lost favour (5-6 cent. A.D). Nevertheless, Bhela is cited by numerous writers and commentators up to the mediaeval era, demonstrating that the work was still in print at that time despite certain textual changes

In his list of manuscripts, Burnell describes it as item 107 73. First discovered in the palace library in Tanjore was a palm leaf copy of the Bhela Samhita, which was written in Telugu script but penned in Sanskrit. The original edition of this ancient treatise's rare manuscript appeared in Volume VI of the Journal of Department of Letters, which was initially published by the Calcutta University in 1921. After being unfinished in certain areas, this important work is not known to have been edited or reduced from the original tantra into a smaller Samhita, which has the advantage that it has maintained its individuality despite languishing for many years. The Nidana Sthana, Vimana Sthana, Sarirasthana, Indriyasthana, Cikitsasthana, Kalpasthana, and Siddhisthana sections of the Bhela Samhita are divided into these sections: "Nidana Sthana," "Vimana Sthana," "Sarirasthana," "Indriyasthana," "Cikitsasthana," and "Siddhis Again, Bhela is unique in explaining how many symptoms appear in Dhatus as a result of pitta vitiation, disordered pregnancy with its distinctive outcome, and defining numerous disorders as Karmaja and other

'Book Review: The Bhela Samhita

such things. Therefore, as a result of his creative genius, Bhela has advanced his own ideas and shed light on certain flora and fauna, customs, illness frequency, natural history, etc., suggesting additions and changes. His writing has frequently been criticised for being overly generic and vague. In actuality, it should be regarded as a unique work that was primarily created for practitioners and included some attention on neurology.

Summary:

This exceptional old work was initially published in 1921 by the Calcutta University. In 1959, the Chaukhamba Bharati Academy in Varanasi once more released the book. Editor Sri Girija Dayal Shukla worked on the text. According to Mr. Ghananand Pant, Bhela belonged to Rajasthan's Marubhumi (barren area) because camel milk and grains cultivated in dry and waterless regions are frequently referenced in the text when discussing dietetics and other topics. A frequent occurrence of non-Paninian forms in the Bhela Samhita text places him earlier than Panini, who dates from the 7th century B.C.

In his writings, Panini alludes to Jatukarna, Parasara, and other Gargadigana characters instead of Bhela. Since Bhela is a fellow disciple of Agnivesa, Jatukarna, Parasara, and others, this reference also applies to Bhela. Bhelacarya presented his text with an equal number of sthanas and adhyayas as those in Agnivesa's samhita, and the fact that many of these adhyaya even share the same nomenclature leads us to believe that Bhela Samhita is at least as old as Burnell creates Bhela, who yearns for the former Gandhara region. Asvagosha names Atreya as a contributor to a medical treatise, which suggests that Atreya's writings were well-liked in the first century B.C. The Bower

'Book Review: The Bhela Samhita

manuscript or Navanitakam quotes from the work of Bhela. Therefore, Bhela should have lived between second century A.D., and sixth century B.C.

Panini refers to Jatukarna, Parasara, and other Gargadigana names rather than Bhela in his writings. Given that Bhela is a fellow pupil of Agnivesa, Jatukarna, Parasara, etc. This allusion also applies to Bhela because Rajarshi Nagnajit, a contemporary of Bhela who is listed in the Bhela Samhita, is referenced in the Shatapatha Brahmana and the Aitereya Brahmana. As a result, it can be deduced that Atreya and his pupil Bhela lived at or before the time of the Aranyakas, Brahmanas, sutra, and Mahabharata.

Hoernle notes that the "Amatisara" equations are quoted indirectly from the Bhela Samhita rather than directly from the Susruta Samhita in the Bower manuscript. This assumes the existence of the Susruta Samhita because it not only mentions the Samhita by name but also teaches about Susruta's beliefs surrounding the gulma sickness. Even though Agnivesa and Bhela were both followers of the same people, Agnivesa's composition is more detailed and rich, whereas Bhela's is much more condensed.

According to Burnell, Bhela Samhita owes Vagbhata a great deal. According to some verses known as Bhela, Jvara Samuchaya is thought to be a thousand years old. Some poems from Bhela are referenced and quoted by Yogaratna Samucchaya in the Chandrata. We may learn a lot about the region where the Bhela Samhita was widely read and used as authority by focusing on other Sanskrit medical manuscripts and printed materials.

'Book Review: The Bhela Samhita

When talking about Jatharagni, Bhela explains that it is found in the Surya mandala, which is in the umbilical region's somamandala. Additionally, he measures this Jatharagni. He claims that Kayachikitsa is the name of the doctor who treats these digestive burning issues.

Alocaka pitta is one of the five forms of pitta that are categorised throughout the Samhitas. The two divisions made by Bhela are Chakshu vaisesika and Buddhivaisesika.

It is not mentioned in the Caraka Samhita, but the final chapter of the Kashyapa Samhita, titled "Deshasatmyadhyaya," discusses this topic. Bhela describes the diseases that are most frequently seen in various regions of the nation due to local customs, diets, etc. in the chapter Janapada Vibhaktiya.

Bhela values daiva vyapasraya chikitsa highly. He views various illnesses as karmaja. Unlike the others, Bhela Carya divides the 18 Kusthas into two groups, nine of which are Dosaja Kusthas and the remaining nine are Karmaja Kusthas. It also includes Visaja Kusta and Switra Kusthas.

To improve tolerance, Bhelacarya advises applying ghee to the mouth before performing the prayogika dhumapana. He stands out by suggesting that after meals, you dry your hands by holding them over a fire (S.U. 6/45). None of the other Ayurvedic acaryas mention udgara when they discuss the three phases of digestion as three avasthapaka. The three various types of udgara that occur during digestion are mentioned by Bhelacarya. Once more, Bhela is clear in elaborating on the many symptoms that emerged in Dhatus as a result of Pitta morbidity. S.U. 25/25.

The three myrobalanic components of Triphala are administered in a different order and sequence according to Bhela Samhita. When discussing matrasitiya, Bhela recommends taking amalaki

'Book Review: The Bhela Samhita

before meals, haritaki after meals, and vibhitaki after digestion. He also provides pharmacological justification for this arrangement. Regarding the effects of water consumed before, during, or after meals, there again seems to be a conflict between Bhela and subsequent samhitas. Similar to how other acaryas forbade contact with and use of cold water, Bhelacarya encourages its use while describing kutisweda to lessen the exhalation caused by sudation S.U. 2/30. Likewise, while the preceptor forbade mixing fish and milk for consumption, Bhela does so—with the exception of chilichima fish.

Although there are several references to Bhela in the books listed below, including Hemadri Vyakhya on A.H.Si1. 7/55 and A.H. Sutra 7/65, Chakrapani Vyakhya on Cha. Ch. 3/275, Tatwacandrika, and Chikitsa Kalikavivrutti Dalhana commentary on S.Su. 33-29, the same references are not present in the manuscript that is currently being edited, giving However, this Bhela Samhita is being disregarded for the reasons listed below. 1. The text frequently has errors of a grammatical nature and uses non-Panamanian forms. 2. The philosophical foundations are inadequate for listing theories. Along with generally supporting the Agnivesa Samhita's common structural shape, Bhela also advanced a number of novel concepts that occasionally ran counter to significant notions. Thus, new concepts and comments that seem to contradict one another might be interpreted as evidence of improvements and additions as a result of his brilliant talent.

Analysis:

The Bhela samhita follows a similar structure to that of the Carakasamhita in terms of planning and arranging of the subject matter, but the former is somewhat less thorough. However, there are many concepts shared by the Suruta samhita and the Bhelasamhita's current form. In addition to this, it features a few odd concepts that give the work individuality. Alocak ägni's bifurcation, the

'Book Review: The Bhela Samhita

placement of the chakras in the pigataka, hrdaya, and nabhi, and the visual representation of the jahatragni as a lamp inside a gourd-shell floating on water (representing the roles of vāta, pitta, and kapha in digestion) are some of the concepts that seem more novel and developed. It is solely Bhela's responsibility for framing the definition of Kayacikitasaka that is currently frequently cited.

Conclusion:

In my research, I found that, unlike Agnivesa Samhita, Bhela Samhita did not gain fame, popularity, or propagation in the succeeding ages. However, up until recently, it has not been redacted or the author has never written a commentary on it, which has the advantage of indirectly preserving its originality. The gathering and examination of these dispersed manuscripts should now be the focus of a focused study by a number of persons and institutions.