Chapter 7: DISCUSSION

Understanding Charaka’s basic Sootra with help of commentators is the classical method of Ayurvedic studies. It is important to discuss the coordination between the concepts those are evolved and understood in study with their application and importance.

In above type of conceptual study the explanation or elaboration of commentators may suppress the meaning of author’s basic Sootra and become more popular. To put a light on this, comparative and bridging study is necessary. It is also helpful to find similarities or dissimilarities or specificity of the concept from other classical texts to understand the greatness or limitations of Charaka’s principle concept regarding to this topic. This discussion is putting light on it.

7.1. Conceptual study

Aspect of padarthavigyana clears the term, Buddh at the platform beyond the body. We think, Nitya type of buddhi may direct towards the cosmic consciousness. The explanation of Guna and Karma buddhi seems very practical as there are many people deserve some properties but they do not present them functionally or not in that strength due to many causes.

The six types of Sannikarsha demonstrate the steps of development of buddhi performance in one way but the direction to assess the buddhi function and to invent the tools to develop the buddhi function in other way. In the same way we think that Para Apara, Prithaktva etc. properties are directing the domains of interaction in one way but the dimension of assessment of buddhi performance in other way.

Consideration of buddhi (Mano and Indriya) as the out product of past life Karma i.e. Daiva explaining with example of children of the same parents is very logical. The other example of the children of the parents having deafness or blindness is also the same. Consideration of role of Beeja shows more balanced and practical approach regarding this subject.

Charaka Samhita is focussing more on the classical i.e. principle part of Buddhi. Chakrapani is explaining it well with some practical applications; but Gangadhara is seen contributing a lot by conceptual elaboration in practical perspectives.
E.g. Understanding buddhi function principally separate and practically in composite type,

Considering *Sama* performance based on *Sattva Raja*, Considering *Vyavasayatmika* along with *Nischayatmika* i.e. principle correctness and practical properness of buddhi performance,

Practically considering *Asama* performances as a part of buddhi function (improper)

We found method i.e. different steps of Buddhi function, its different types, and sub types those represent his genuine approach and holistic approach i.e. considering attitude of the person, emotional state and practical status, priority and humbleness in presentation of buddhi along with correctness of the decision is the view of *Charaka* from his text. His approach in mentioning *Bhuvridha Buddhi* proves his rational perception towards the limitation in classification and abundant range infinite variability of this field.

Incorporating the reference of *Ashtavidha Buddhi Devata* in study of buddhi concept has proved *Charaka*, the Grandfather, or the theme maker of current philosophical development of buddhi field; as it is the recent consideration in conventional thinking.

Concept of *Sama* and *Asama/ Vishama buddhi* with different etiological origins and different symptomatic representation at different level may help to understand the routine cognitive, decision making problems or can help to trace the stagnation and rule out the confusion. Presentation of *Vishama buddhi* or *Sama buddhi* with *Vatadi Dosha, Rasadi Dhatu*, and *Srotus* shows relevance of *Ayurveda* science in the field of body mind medicine.

His views on different types of assessment and model tools are definitely touch different dimensions like cognitive, comparative or group assessments, methodical assessment of each step with different steps of buddhi functions. These tools are matching to current demand of the field. The study of these tools with their merits and demerits and comparison has directed us for designing appropriate proper tool for mass scale clinical work.

The study of inter relations of *Charaka’s view* and his commentetors’ views and also views of other authors like *Sushruta* and *Vagbhata* differentiates *Charaka* on the basis of his dimensional application and deep thinking. Due respecting other authors’ and commentators’ views we can say that there is no other alternative than *Charaka Samhita* for the core and detail understanding of Buddhi concept and related dimensions.
Vast range of herbal, mineral and dietary recommendations are seen more focused on buddhi related functions like Medha, Smriti, Dhriti in Charaka. Some of them are concerned with the Indriya, mind and related Dosha, Dhatu promotion. Charaka has mentioned very few recommendations as Buddhivardhaka, Buddhikaram (e.g. butter, Mamsarasa, some of the Rasayana formulations and Maha paishyachya ghee). On the contrary his recommendation of regular study, thinking, discussing, sharing the knowledge and Guru Seva are the factors show more relevancy in promotion of decision making strength.

He never recommended Madya (alcohol) type of articles for promotion of buddhi although he recommended it for promotion of Medha and Pratibha; that proves his core thinking of buddhi performance as Sattva based function.

7.2. Opinions of Charaka and commentators

The study clears the ideology that buddhi is the property of Atman and is from Daiva; i.e. on the basis of maturity corpus of the past life Karma. Charaka and Gangadhara both have the same view. Gangadhara extended that maturity corpus of past life Karma means the ‘Bhagyam’ and only because of that children of the same mother and father are not of the same colour, voice, and buddhi.

The Atman enters in the cluster of Shukra and Shonita and at that time its property buddhi get activated to start the performance. Charaka has mentioned this in short. Gangadhara elaborated the steps in detail like Atman, Mahat, buddhi– Sattvadi Ahamkara – Indriya etc. -- buddhi performance.

Both gave the example that children of the blind, dumb, deaf parent don’t have the same problem (ch.sh.3). It is to prove that buddhi is not from any Jada matters like Indriya, though it presents through them and at them. It is from Atman.

Charaka said that Indriyas are formed and heart is connected to mother at the third month of foetal development so the presentation of buddhi performance in the form of happiness, sorrows etc. is activated from that time. Gangadhara differs here with his opinion about the period of foundation of Indriya. According to him buddhi starts presenting the knowledge exactly after half of third month till up to the first half of fourth month. Both agree with the seventh month for the efficient presentation of buddhi.
All of them agree that place of buddhi is the heart at chest region, they are also agree with *Indriya Pranavaha, Rasa Sangyavaha Srotus.*

There are many differences seen at the conceptual level, terminological level and also in explanation. *Charaka* has quoted the concept of buddhi in very short and perfect words that buddhi is the decisive power. The thinking of merits and demerits of the perceived knowledge further leads the process of interpretations and interrelations then what the decision arises is called as buddhi. This is called as *Nischayatmika.* Then the action takes place accordingly, this is the clear opinion of *Charaka.* *Gangadhara* agreed with the same but according to him the execution is separate than decision. He named it as *Vyavasayatmika* and classified the buddhi performance at these two levels.

*Chakrapani* and *Gangadhara* understood buddhi performance as the result of the collective performance of *Dhi, Dhriti, and Smriti.* They mentioned it as ‘*Thridha buddhi*’. (ch.su.1/21, ch.su.1/26 page 1835). *Charaka* has never explained buddhi performance at this level directly. He has accepted the same by considering them in the concept of *Vishama buddhi* i.e. *Pragyaparadha* as the causative factors (ch.su.1/32).

*Gangadhara* has accepted (ch.su.1/21, page62) the balanced collaboration of proper functions of *Dhi, Dhriti, and Smriti* as the proper buddhi performance. He accepted proper and improper knowledge are the collective performances of *Dhi, Dhriti,* and *Smriti.* He accepted both of them as the forms of buddhi performances. He stated that the improper knowledge is also the improper buddhi performance.

*Charaka* is clear about the concept of *Dhi* i.e. the decision power after the analysis between proper and beneficial or improper and no beneficial (ch.su.1/20, page170). *Gangadhara* also mentioned it about the same. According to him (ch.su.1/20, page 120) the balanced vision between what to do and what not to do, benefit and non benefits is the buddhi. Both of them are putting similar views on *Smriti and Dhriti* concept.

Whenever *Charaka* explains some herbs or the *Rasayana* or the medicines has quoted the terminologies like *Dhritivardhana, Buddhivardhana, Medhakara, Smritikara* etc. separately and in one *shloka.* It shows both of them accepted the separate functional existence of *Dhi, Dhriti, and Smriti.* *Charaka* has accepted their collective performance in *Vishama buddhi* i.e. *Pragyaparadha;* so accepted their collective role indirectly. But he has never quoted their collective performance as buddhi.
The buddhi performance cannot understand directly. It is understood by inference only with the help of its execution through action, talking and thinking style. It is very difficult to differentiate and analyse the relative presentation of Dhriti performance, Smriti performance and the Dhi performance separately from the collective performance of buddhi.

The relation of ‘I’ always changes and influences the control of Dhriti, so the clear analysis of only Dhi is very difficult. On this background the opinion of Chakrapani and Gangadhara to accept buddhi performance as the collective function of Dhi, Dhriti, and Smriti seems very acceptable conceptually and practically. It is clearly accepted in Pragyaparadha by Charaka; so it doesn’t oppose him conceptually, it doesn’t seem unexpected to him or it doesn’t over exceed his concept at all.

Charaka is very clear about the concept of buddhi that it is the performance of pure Sattva without Raja and Tama influence (ch.sh.1/11). At this point Gangadhara differs with Charaka and mentions that the knowledge which is used for day to day practices is always based on the Sattva but in association with Raja (ch.vi.8, page 1669). According to him the association of Raja in balanced state is the Sattviki, the exaggerated state of Raja leads to the Rajasi buddhi, and with Tama in exaggerated state is called Tamasi buddhi. According to him there are three types of buddhi performances in practice one is Sattvika based on Sattva which is by proper interaction and other are Rajasi buddhi and Tamasi buddhi which are derived by improper interaction. In day today life what the performances we observe are the combinations of these three components.

Hence Charaka’s Sattva buddhi is the concept, not the practice. Chakrapani here explains that if the concept of Sattva buddhi is accepted then the concept of Purusha of 24 elements becomes redundant. Then all the day to day practices don’t deserve any meaning (ch.sh.1/11 page 1798). Thus Charaka’s conceptual explanation is the core concept like the Sootravat pratipadana, but Gangadhara’s explanation is the thinking of the Sootra based on practice.

Ganagadhar’s opinions to accept collective performance of Dhi, Dhriti and Smriti, to accept three types of presentation of buddhi performance as Sattviki, Rajasi and Tamasi buddhi and to accept Bhrama, Samshaya etc. Vishama buddhi as the part of buddhi performance are very conductive to each other and conceptually very clear. It proves the relevance in his thinking and his explanation.
Charaka accepted the collective performance of Indriya, Indriya object, buddhi and the Atman with mind in the concept of Indriya buddhi (ch.sh.1/10). It means he has agreed that the knowledge generated from the collective interaction as the buddhi. It means he has accepted the buddhi performance based on the Sattva in association with Raja indirectly. Chakrapani also has accepted (ch.su.1/21) that the buddhi means knowledge and further Gangadhara had cleared that Bhrama etc. improper knowledge is also the part of buddhi performance; which coincides his fundamentals to consider the applied knowledge in association of Raja.

The direct relationship between Ahamkara and buddhi is accepted by three of them (Ch.sh.1/18). Chakrapani and Gangadhara also applied this concept time to time in their explanation. They all conclude that ‘Aham’ is the cause for the proper and improper performance of buddhi i.e. proper or improper decision. (Ch.sh.1/10, Chakra) (Chakra 1814) (Gang.1812) (Gang.1807).

Charaka has mentioned the seven types of buddhi Atmapratyagastha (1), Manobuddhi (1), and Indriya buddhi (5). Further he accepted the concept of Bahuvidha Indriya Buddhi. Gangadhara also has accepted the same. Gangadhara has mentioned his views separately without opposing Charaka in his elaboration.

E.g. Charaka has mentioned the ‘Chintana’ as the objective of mind but Gangadhara mentioned it as Manobuddhi which is different than Indriya buddhi.(Ch.Su.8/4, page411) and so he explained that the balanced ‘Chintana’ is the proper buddhi and imbalanced Chintana (Achintan, Atichintana, Mithya Chintana) is the improper buddhi. Gangadhara ‘s explanation is more practical and easily evolving its practical sense. It is again coincides his line of thinking and explanation about buddhi. Charaka has explained the methodology of buddhi performance stepwise like thinking merits and demerits of the object before to decide.

Gangadhara has mentioned separate Upadana buddhi that thinks on merits and Hana buddhi that thinks on demerits. It is also seems very practical as there are many people in society having the attitude of thinking prominently the benefits or good side and also some others thinking prominently the losses and bad side. The proper buddhi performance thinks of the both in balance.

By accepting these thinking attitudes in the form of buddhi, Gangadhara has proved his logical excellence as these coincides his concept of considering ‘Chintana’ as a buddhi
performance and also coincides the approach to consider Vishama buddhi as buddhi performance.

Charaka has quoted the process of Nischayatmika buddhi through thinking merits or demerits and reasoning etc. Gangadhara also considered Nischayatmika but he further classified it into sub types Anupahata buddhi (ch.su.8/67, ch.su.11/2), and Upahata buddhi. Elaborating the different dynamos of Anupahata buddhi Gangadhara gave more detailed classifications like Vyahata and Vyavrita. He has just mentioned the Vyahata buddhi (ch. Su.11, Gangahara, page 512), but not explained it. Chakrapani explained it (ch.su.1/18, Chakrapani, page 61) as the performance based on the style of thinking of commonness. The logic follows the similarity in concerned factors in the decision process. Further he explained the opposite type of buddhi, in which the logic follows the differential analytical thinking in concerned factors. Here Gangadhara just explained it but didn’t name it. Chakrapani has named it as Vyavrita buddhi. Chakrapani has explained Vyahata and Gangadhara named it; Gangadhara explained Vyavrita and Chakrapani find named it.

This classification feel very practical as there are many people so critical by nature to take the decision and many other just let go with the similar/common factor and hold the relationship, community power and easily get success and fame with their determining performance.

Gangadhara further classifies (ch.su.9/17) the logically correlating thinking in to two types and mentioned more two buddhi performances 1) Sahaja buddhi 2) Vainayaki buddhi.

Chakrapani has given one more classification like 1. Sthoola buddhi: it deserves the materialist approach, morphological approach and 2. Sooksma buddhi: it deserves energy approach, subtle factorial approach (spiritual approach). (Ch. Vi.8)

The assessment of buddhi is understood from Charaka directly from his views scattered under different titles in the text. We think, most of the places both the commentators followed his views and explained and elaborated it.

In short this discussion clears that

Charaka’s style is more theoretical putting the concept with its applications.

Chakrapani’s style provides detail meaning of Buddhi concept.
Gangadhara elaborates and explains the concepts by the applied and practical sense. His efforts do not pollute or over exceed or oppose Charaka conceptually.

The different thinking styles are in scattered form in Charaka text. Chakrapani and Gangadhara have accepted and presented them properly with their meanings.

It proves that Charaka’s concept of buddhi is as well holistic in concept as practical and applied for present.

7.3. Opinions of Astanga Hridayam

The Ashtanga Hridaya’s concept of buddhi performance is understood through his commentator Arunadatta by his commentary ‘Sarvanga Sundar Teeka’ (S.S.) and Hemadri by his commentary ‘Ayurveda Rasayani Teeka’ (A.R.).

Arunadatta said that the analytical common sense between right and wrong or the capacity to classify the beneficial and non beneficial between external materialistic and internal spiritual factors is understood as buddhi.\(^1\) Further he elaborated that buddhi performance clears the confusion in the mind through proper decision but it must exist with its meanings. It means that the buddhi performance is not concerned only with its rightness or wrongness but more concerned with its logical background i.e. method of determination\(^2\). This explanation presents the agenda of Ashtanga Hridaya regarding to buddhi.

Hemadri accepts the concept of buddhi as the knowledge; whereas Arunadatta accept it as Pragya i.e. proper knowledge\(^3\). Arunadatta said that the capacity of perception or the knowledge process (Vastu Gahana Shakti) can be considered as buddhi; whereas Hemadri accepts it as the capacity to understand the dictated, taught or read things (perceived knowledge).

---

\(^1\) धी–दृशिः बाह्य अध्यात्मिकानां भावानां हिताहितपरिच्छेदविभागकारणी। (अ.ङ. सू. ९/२६ ए.एस.)

\(^2\) मनोद्विशर्यस्य निश्चयं कृतः तद् अर्थं अध्यवसायोपरत्र । सा दृशि:। हदय सू.१२/१३ अरुणदत्त

\(^3\) मेधाध्यक्षरत्नमद्येतः। अ.ङ.सू. ११/३ धि.-जानम्। A.R., धि.-प्रजा 5.5।
Vagbhata mentions Dhi, Medha, and Smriti separately in the explanation of advantages of ghee. Hemadri, the Commentator explained Medha as the restoration power or the retentive power. It is the power that retains the perceived knowledge uninterruptedly and in sequence.

Above references show that both of the commentators have not agreed to consider perceptive power i.e. Medha as the buddhi.

In another reference, Arunadatta said that buddhi means the capacity to understand the meaning with respect to ongoing time.

The above references make it clear that buddhi performance means understanding of perceived knowledge with its logical defence and the present ongoing time. This explanation of buddhi more deals with the practical sense. This definition of buddhi considers better practical mode.

Charaka considers Medha as perceptive and restoration power. The concept Upadista Grahana and Vastu Grahana co-exist the Charaka’s concept ‘knowledge is buddhi’. Arunadatta’s concept of understanding knowledge with respect to time follows Charaka’s concept of Kalapratipatti. Here both of the commentators have agreed; as Hemadri also said the same. He has quoted his views in Vagbhata’s treatment for the psychological problems. It includes the Atmadi knowledge means the knowledge of him, his country, / place and also about the time of execution.

Vagbhat has agreed with the place of buddhi as the heart like Charaka. His concept of Chittavaha Srotus or the Manovaha Marga or the Sangyavaha Srotus coexists with Charaka’s concept of Rasa Sangya vaha.
In Apasmara chapter he has cleared his separate understanding about the place of buddhi and place of Indriya and the symptoms of their vitiated state.\(^8\)

Charaka has quoted that the alcohol is the best drug that hampers the buddhi performance; whereas Vagbhata has quoted that the person cannot understand to differentiate ethical and unethical or joy and worries or correct and wrong when consumes alcohol.\(^9\) He agrees about Sattvika state of buddhi as like Charaka but he also considered Rajasika and Tamasika performance of buddhi as like Gangadhara.\(^10\)

Hemadri’s directives of differential assessment of Dharana and Smriti are very peculiar, useful and applied in practice. He said that interrupted presentation of perceived knowledge represents Smriti and uninterrupted presentation of the knowledge represents Dharana. We think these directives are definitely supportive for Charaka’s practice if incorporated.\(^11\)

The terminologies indicating improper buddhi are seen quoted in Vagbhata Uttar Tantra i.e. Buddhi Bhrama and Dhi Samplava which also follows Charaka.

In short Charaka’s buddhi concept is more classical and has broad range than Vagbhata but the teekakar’s explanation shows that Vagbhata is accepting many of conceptual prose and cones of Charaka indirectly.

### 7.4. Opinions of Sushruta

Sushruta has mentioned buddhi as Atmaja bhava (su.sha.2) and agreed its connection with Daiva i.e. luck (su.sh.1/4). According to him buddhi starts its performance to execute from fourth month of development by expressing his wills or expectations in the form of Indriya objects through mother i.e. will to hear specific music, see nature, water, cinema, pungent or sweet food etc. (su.sh.2/18)

Actually according to him Indriya starts to get knowledge of Indriya object (su.sh.2/30) especially music, vibrations, touch; from the sixth months of development of Garbha.

---

8. हीन सन्त्वस्य इतिदेशाः.....कालुश्यं हत्वा मार्यायन्मनोवहानः। अ.ह.३.६/४-५ इदये प्रदुषितः: सन्त्तो.....चित्तवहनिमोतांसि हत्तवा उपमादूं कुरोते।।।

9. ध्रमाध्यमं सूक्तयदा अर्थानां तिचित्तमहितम्। यदा (मद्य) साधारण न जानाति...। अ.ह.३.६/३

10. स्मृतिमेधादयोो॓ षक्कन्देयो एव। शौयं उपचारता,लोलुपत्वं,हर्षकामादयं: रजसाः। भयाददद तामसातन।।।

11. तामसाय अविच्छेदन मेघाः।।
Charaka has quoted the mid of the third and fourth month for Manobuddhi performance and the seventh month for full fledged performance of mind and Indriya.

Sushruta has mentioned like Charaka that the place of Indriya is the head region and heart is the place of mind and buddhi. (su.sha.2/32)

He has quoted the Sangyavaha Srotus and mentioned that there is loss of understanding of the object if it is blocked by Tama (su.sh.4/33). His another explanation in Unmada chapter about Manovaha Srotusa (su.u. 61/ ) shows that Sushruta’s statement coexists with Charaka’s view that the Rasa Sangyavaha is the Manovaha Srotusa in a purpose to understand the meaning of perceived knowledge.

Sushruta said that mind only associated with Raja can understand the right and wrong knowledge (su.sha.4/36). This practical approach shows similarity to Charaka’s approach’ Rajonubandham Manah loke tatvagyanasya karanam’

Sushruts’s Medha and Dhriti are similar as Charaka. Sushruta’s approach about Dhriti represents the level of satisfaction; which is more applied. In day to day practice we experience that the strength of mind control depends on the level of satisfaction.

Sushruta agrees with Charaka that reexperiencing the past experienced knowledge is Smriti. He has directly mentioned that it is the half of the strength of Dharana. It shows that he was very clear about Dharana and Dhriti and the interrelation between them.

Sushruta’s concept of Mati (su.su.2/3 D) and concept of Pragya (su.su. 35/16) are the similar concepts. His concept of Mati is having knowledge of past, present with future; which coincides Charaka’s concept of Pragya in Sushupti state. Sushruta has defined Mati like Pragya but utilised it under common practices like Nipunamati, Dridhashastramati etc.

In another reference Sushruta says that Buddhi means the knowledge of the object; which deserves the relation with the time (su.sh.1/18 D). We think, it clearly fits Charaka’s concept of Kalapratipatti.

Sushruta has defined buddhi performance as Nischayatmika (su.sh.1 D) but elaborated the meaning as determination and attempting (su.sha.1). Further he mentioned that the performance can be accessed on the basis of knowledge that is perceived and presented. (su. sha.1) We see the same view in Charaka’s strategy of assessment of buddhi performance.
Prayatna represents activation of mind; Utsaha represents the firm mode of mind in execution of buddhi performance (Sankalpa). Sushruta’s this explanation about mind functions underlines their role in execution of decision i.e. in Vyavasayatmika buddhi performance.

Sushruta has explained that buddhi is of two types; one that performs through mind and other through five senses. (su.sh.1/4) Sushruta mentioned that the Indriya provides the placement to buddhi for its performance where as Charaka mentions that Mano buddhi expressed at the level of Indriya is Indriya buddhi.

Sushruta mentions the abnormalities of interaction i.e. Ateeyoga, Ayoga and Mithya yoga of interaction of mind with the object (Manobuddhi) (su.u.61/6). The concept of Cheto Moha is very similar to Charaka’s Buddhi Vibhramsha

Sushruta has mentioned buddhi performances of each Prakriti separately like Avyavastita Mati of Vata, Nipuna Mati of Pitta and Dridha Shastra Mati of Kapha.(su.sh.4/66, 75)

He has also provided a program to maintain the properness of buddhi, for promotion and development of buddhi and Medha. E.g. Buddhi Medhakara Gana; where he recommended following regular self studies, practice, and referring other concerned Shastra / sciences and serving the Aacharya those deserve profound knowledge (su.ch.29/27).

He has advised to have Sneha (ghee) internally for strengthening the senses or maintaining the strength of senses. (su.ch.31/56) It is also recommended by him in deprivation in performance of Medha and Smriti due to vitiated Vata and Pitta. (su.ch.31/15)

He has mentioned that Shodhana treatment is soothing for buddhi performance and empowering the Indriya strength. Further he has defended that the Shodhana treatment cleanses the body at the deeper level. The mind also gets purified through body purification therapies. As mind gets purified it results in soothing performance of buddhi.

Sushruta is seen emphasising the holistic approach specifically in following dietary plan for empowerment of buddhi and other components. He mentions nourishment to all Dhatu empowers the general strength; then the elements of the body and mind get properly aware about their work to be done (su.su.15/20) and start to function punctually (su.su.45/100 D) and harmoniously.
The balanced buddhi performance is expected from healthy body and mind; which is the ultimate aim of Ayurveda. Charaka’s approach is the Tatvabodha for disease less body is more from outside; whereas Sushruta’s approach is seen more from inner side. Dalhana’s approach correlates with Charaka’s approach that nourishment to body elements balances their respective functions and results into the improved performance of Buddhi.

There are lot of dietary and medicinal prescriptions in Sushruta Samhita especially for promotion of Medha and Smriti. Their range is wide as from Yava and sesame to Kushmanda and Ksheera Paladu, from fish eggs to Kebab or dried meat, from Ghee to the animal fats of Godha (wild lizard).

Most of Sushruta’s references are accepting Charaka’s view in mentioning the food articles; as they are mentioned for Medha and Smriti than for Buddhi.

Sushruta mentioned that Smriti and Anubhava i.e. memory and experience are the two types of Buddhi. Sushruta has considered the Smriti as a separate entity but considered it as type of buddhi; on the contrary Charaka has included Smriti as an integral part of Buddhi performance. Charaka (with his commenter) has insisted Dhi, Dhriti, and Smriti as the inseparable parts of the Buddhi performance; considering the practicability of the concept. Charaka’s concept of Buddhi is not the theoretical concept but it is more practical and applied than Sushruta.

Charaka Samhita and the Commentator are seen focussing more on the classical i.e. principle part of Buddhi in detail but the other texts are seen putting their views on the basis of extracted meaning of those principles. Hence we find different steps of Buddhi function, its different types, and views on different types of assessment and model tools in Charaka but not in other texts.

These other texts are mentioning different dietary articles, drugs, and Rasayana for Buddhi, Medha, and Smriti in wide range. It might be because of their focus on applied composite view in Buddhi performance and its application in practice.

The applied aspect of Sushruta in Dhriti assessment by relating it to the range satisfaction can be helpful in application of Charaka’s concept of ‘Alaulyen dhritim.’

---

12 वृद्धितिर्द्विपित्तिः अनुभवः । संस्कारामात्र जन्यज्ञानं स्मृतिः । तद्भिन्नन्तं अनुभवः । प्रत्येकेऽ अनुभवान उपमाशब्द...... (सुश्रुत)
Astanga Hridayakar’s applied differentiation about Dharana and Dhriti and Chakrapani’s clarification related to the time of assessment of Dharana can be helpful to apply Charaka’s core concept; if combined properly.

Many dietary and behavioural recommendations can be used in application of Charaka’s principles.

Above discussion ends with the strong thinking that there is no other alternative than Charaka Samhita for the core and detail understanding of Buddhi concept and related things. The views of Commentator and of other Aacharya are beautifully executing Charaka’s concept in its application.

7.5. Discussion on clinical observations

a. General observations

The participated students were from both genders (female 367, male 317) and from second (416) and third (340) standard of both the medium school. The students from Marathi medium are more in number (487) than the English medium (268); which represent the current status of society; where the common population in India still go in state language (Marathi) medium schools. The students from all type of social classes and economical classes participated in the assessment. Hence, the student population in this assessment represent the society in general.

The TBS range is higher in third standard than in second standard which is again obvious and logical considering the age factor. The graph indicates that the 40 % students from second standard and 50% students from the third Std. have the same TBS. It means that only 50% students from third standard have the upgraded score than the second Std.

There is a lot difference in the score of students from English medium than those from Marathi medium (P < 0.001). It may represent due to the extreme difference in socioeconomic factor in both the schools or it may be the picture of selected sample.

The previous attempts or the practice related to the similar type of questionnaire i.e. Abhyasa shows the significant role in TBS (P < 0.001). It indicates the importance of repeated study or specific trainings in development of buddhi.

b. Socioeconomic status and TBS versus Std. and school medium
94.5% class in English medium was socioeconomically in sound position (buz1, job1); where as 35% class in Marathi showed the same status.

65% class in Marathi medium was in middle or lower middle socioeconomic position (job2, buz2); which was only 2.6% in English. It definitely represents the difference in cultivation; which has the major role at the initial stage. Hence the major difference observed in TBS in Std.2 is logical. Later in Std.3 it was observed in reducing mode.

Thus the study supports the scholarship program conducted by government for Std.4; which is same for both the medium but not before it. The study shows the best performance in ‘buz1’ class followed by ‘job 1’ class, then after ‘buz 2’ and then ‘job2’ class are seen weaker by performance gradually.

Although there was a lot variation in socioeconomic status; Buddhi performance (TBS) in Marathi medium students seen little inferior than in English medium from the same socioeconomic class (6.6 in sound class and 4.6 in lower medium class). As the difference is small; it would not be the overstretched statement to say that the observation is supporting the role of socioeconomic status in buddhi performance.

With the help of previous observation we can infer that the little difference can get reduced more in further Std. and the difference between both the medium would be negligible for same the socioeconomic class; if both of them studying the same syllabus or getting the same exposure.

c. School performance and TBS

The school Grades conventionally classifies the brilliancy. The positive correlation of this Grade with TBS again proves the reliability of the questionnaire. The 95% students from Grade ‘A’ represent the TBS above 35; which is strongly remarkable to prove the relevance, reliability, and efficacy of the assessment tool (questionnaire).

Throughout the year teachers are in contact with the students. We have assessed the students only for 40 mints in this assessment. These findings show that the assessment done in 40 mints significantly coincides (P < 0.001) with the teachers comment on the basis of their assessment of whole year. It definitely suggests the credibility of the questionnaire.

The most of the students those are active have ‘medium’ performance and most of the sharp have the ‘average’ performance above 35; where average performance is about 32.
Hyperactive students showed unpredictable inconsistent performance with vast range. Maximum ‘sharp’ students commented by teacher were representing Pitta prakriti and ‘active’ were in Vata prakriti; which correlates with the Ayurvedic concept of Prakriti. Thus the questionnaire is properly demonstrating the teachers comment about student’s performance in general.

d. Health and TBS

The general health status of the student was with reference to BMI and with the status of some other components of healthy state according to Ayurveda.

It was found no significant correlation between TBS and BMI regarding to this assessment. Although there seen the positive reflection; it can be said that the performance of buddhi doesn’t relate to BMI; at least in this assessment. This reflection is statistically not significant.

We observed same trend for Swasthya score. The BMI and Swasthya score were not related due to following possible causes,

1. Either the four factors (face lustre, Vakabala, Utsaha and nutritional status) to define the Swasthya status were insufficient. As concept of Swasthya is comprehensive and cannot be clubbed in just four components. However, the focus of the study was not on assessment of comprehensive health, which was a limiting factor.

2. The level of the questions was showing no influence on the decision making power at this age group. Actually BMI is the quantitative assessment; whereas the Swasthya Score is the qualitative assessment; there is no specific correlation between these two components but the TBS shows the same relations with both the parameters.

The relation of the Swasthya components with Swasthya Score shows that the face lustre is better in students having higher Swasthya Score. It means that the components selected to derive the Swasthya score are relevant but not sufficient. Utsaha shows the significant positive relation (P <0.001) with the TBS. The Vakabala shows absolutely no relation with TBS. Both the observations are logically acceptable. It means the talkative people may not have decision making ability all the time; but enthusiastic people can perform better.

The significant inverse correlation was observed between the Swasthya and Illness (P < 0.001); which obviously emphasises that the components of Swasthya score are definitely
relevant; although they may not be sufficient. It clears the reliability of the concept of Swasthya score with the help of the selected component as mentioned earlier.

TBS demonstrates the decision power specifically related to Chakshu; where there characteristics of Prakriti doesn’t play any important role as like in Manobuddhi or in Vyavasayatmika buddhi. Hence it is obvious that Prakriti is not showing any variation in TBS.

e. Different dimensions and modes of interactions and TBS

The Dharana is one of the dimensions of buddhi performance; where the interaction takes place to restore and present the knowledge in the same word and in the same sequence. Observations show the positive reflection between them. It means that those who have better restorative and presentation capacity perform better in total performance.

Since thousands of years our cultural discipline recommends the promotion of this basic dimension from the childhood for development of Buddhi performance. Traditionally recommended time for study is the early morning time i.e. Prana kala and morning time i.e. Kapha kala; where the Prana does active retention and Kapha helps to restore it. Hence it is the scientific time for study according to Ayurveda. The night time is not recommended by Ayurveda.

The Grade from the school performance is the result of Dharana and Smriti; so the Dharana Score is compared to the school grades shows the positive correlation. It is true that the decision making power is totally different than the Dharana performance but the observations and routine practice do not reject the relation of school performance and TBS; at least related to this type of questionnaire. This relation proves the reliability of the assessment. Hence this questionnaire can be used as a tool for buddhi assessment.

The observation also shows the positive relation of TBS with the interactions like ‘Comparison’ and ‘Separation’. It means building up of this type of interacting skills definitely improves the general decision making power.

The ‘Krama Samyoga’ and the ‘cross addition’ are higher graded questions to compare, to combine, and to separate. The observations are significantly indicating the positive relation with the TBS.
The observations show that the proportion of student succeeded to attain these both questions from Std. 3 is 1.5 higher than that of from Std. 2 in English medium school. In the same observation it shows 2 time higher proportion for addition type of question and more than 3 times higher in Krama Samyoga type of question in Marathi medium school. This suggests the role of age in development of Buddhi performance and its socioeconomic connection through the medium of the school in general.

The observations also show that the proportion of the students succeeded to attain these questions is half in Marathi medium school than that of in English medium schools. It is also observed that the proportion of the students of third Std. succeeded from Marathi is similar to the proportion of those of second Std. students from English medium; which may proves the role of socioeconomic and educational surrounding in development of buddhi.

The observations related to each question and the response of the students of both the standard from both the medium showed that there was very minuet difference in response but it must to be noted that the pattern has showed positive tilt toward English medium.

It is also notable that the difference in response observed generally reducing by about half in std. 3 which was in std. 2 of English and Marathi. It might be due to lack of exposure or slow or gradual start of the level of education in Marathi medium schools.

f. Buddhi and rapid presentation

The comparison of response pattern in all other questions and in rapid answer question was observed. The response to rapid questions and Buddhi score has correlation = 0.5, which can not be called as a strong relation, however, the same can not be ignored. This observation emphasises that the power of decision making (Nischayatmika) and power of decision making at right/ proper time (Vyavasayatmika) are different. The inference needs further cannot be confirmatory. Hence just the pattern is quoted to suggest trends. There could be questions for further study to show that the difference is true with the appropriate sample size and study design.

g. Assessment of other senses and TBS

The assessment of other senses was carried out randomly in 74 students with a single question based on sense related activity. This was additional to routine assessment planned for the study.
The irregularity in the pattern of observation was observed noted in relation with TBS. The assessment done in other senses was with a single activity as a representation. This observation is just suggestive but the efforts are made to observe the requirement of multisensory assessment of Buddhi in total Buddhi assessment.

The observations stimulate the thought of multisensory assessment, which can be the topic for further studies. The representative study of assessment of other senses creates a question not only to Ayurvedic experts but also for psychologists to think on holistic sensorial assessment than conventional visual assessment for proper consideration of decision making.

h. Multivariate analysis

We find the dendograms as one of the useful methods to depict internal linkages of the variables to assess Buddhi functions. The dendogram presents links between buddhi score, Dharana, Para Apratva, Pruthaktva. The regression analysis shows Paraparatva, Pruthaktva, rapid questions, and Games are contributing to Buddhi function. The negative correlation (P=0.006) with illness shows, more the illness, lesser the Buddhi function.

i. Analysis of internal consistency

The Cronbach's Alpha is a measure of internal consistency of the questionnaire. The value of the Cronbach's Alpha is 0.7607, which indicates good internal constancy of the questionnaire components. The components of the questionnaire are consistent to determine Buddhi. The internal consistency is one of the important aspects of any questionnaire. Good consistency suggests that the objective of the questionnaire to measure Buddhi can be achieved with sufficient precision.

The item analysis shows Paraparatva, Pruthaktva, rapid questions, and Games are contributing to various other components of Buddhi function.

However, contrary to our expectation, internal consistency for the different diagnostic aspects of participating students was not achieved. This may be due to insufficient information on those aspects. (For example BMI, illness status, Utsaha etc) This is also considered as a limiting factor of the study. However, this was not a focus of this work.
7.6. Concept behind clinical observations

Charaka’s core concept of buddhi is the decision making power. The assessment demonstrates the pure Chakshu Indriya Nischayatmika Buddhi Pareeksha i.e. only on the decision making power except the question for Dharana.

Students’ performance in the assessment shifted towards the better socioeconomic class, which may be due to their efforts of cultivation and training, better availability and affordability.

The significant difference in the TBS of students of both standard and also in the response to other specific questions (Q. 4 and Q.9) has demonstrated the concept of age related development of buddhi performance. Charaka’s core concept and the observation are supporting the role of Samskara (cultivation) and Abhyasa (practice) in presentation of buddhi.

Dharana is the presentation of basic intelligence and the basic tool of its promotion in the tradition. The positive correlation of Dharana score and the school grade or Dharana score and the TBS from the questionnaire coexists with general intelligence. Thus Dharana and Smriti meant for the baseline development of buddhi in child age.

The students commented by their teacher as ‘active’ are observed with average TBS, ‘sharp’ are observed above average and ‘hyperactive’ are observed unpredictable. These observation demonstrates the performance of buddhi of hyperactive type of students i.e. students of Vata type as like in Ayurvedic book picture. It is the same about ‘sharp’ comment and Pitta Prakriti students.

In different types of interactions like Para, Apara, Samyoga, Krama Samyoga, Prithaktva, Sankhya, Sankhya, Samyoga, Parimana the factors like age, training, culture etc. are influencing the presentation. Actually it is the critical classification of Samyukta Samaveta Samavaya type of interaction.

Thus above observations underline Ayurvedic view that though buddhi originates from Daiva; cultivation, repeated studies, and facilitation play an important role in its presentation.

The observations underlines the Indian way of education by tradition; which is based on Dharana and Smriti as a basic line of education and basic line of promotion of Buddhi by
‘Pathantara’. It also underlines further development of buddhi at different level and in different types of interactions depending on age and the cultivation and training.

The observation shows that there is no any correlation in Vakabala and TBS. According to Ayurveda there is influence of Vakabala in Vyavasayatmika; so study again concludes that the observations are nothing but only the decision power.

The observations shows the direct positive relation in grade of Lustre and Swasthya score, also the same with high Utsaha score; which underlines the Ayurvedic way of understanding the status of health in general. The observations do not show positive relation for minor or moderate Utsaha score; which clears psychological factors has the role only at their strong existence; not in general grade.

The general observational pattern showed different response in rapid answer than TBS; which supports the aim of classification of Nischayatmika and Vyavasayatmika separately.
7.7. Outcome of the work done

First of all selecting this topic related to Buddhi and putting Ayurvedic perspectives based on Charaka is the main outcome of the work; as it was an untouched topic in conceptual field of Ayurveda and there are many grey areas in Ayurvedic and also in conventional sciences related to Buddhi. In Ayurveda clinical trials, clinical practice, drug related studies are ongoing on this topic with the conventional questionnaires without considering core Ayurvedic perspective (without influence of Yoga and Vedantic perspectives) and clarity in the terminologies and also without knowing the way of assessment explained in Ayurveda.

a. It is a general belief that Buddhi relate to parents; but this work put the clear Ayurvedic perspective with sufficient references that it is incorrect. The outcome of the study says that it is the entity, which reflects the corpus of the past life Karma and studies made by that Atman in past lives and what we correlate with the parents is the ways of representation of Buddhi. The presentation is more concerned with the governing factors of the body and the way of cultivation of the Buddhi in parenting. The governing factors i.e. Vata etc. represents the resultant of parent’s body types.

b. The study of Guna buddhi and Karma buddhi focuses more on this topic of buddhi performance, presentation, and cultivation; otherwise the gifted qualities also many times seen not represented properly or fully. The study also shows the Ayurvedic different steps of presentation of buddhi from the birth or in each new topic. It has the great role in educational strategies, programming the studies, designing games, and assessment tools for the children or any individual.

c. The study clears the Charaka’s view about the proper time of activation and the active level of buddhi in its foetal state; hence it provides the scientific and strategic views in the field of intrauterine activity programmes like Garbhasamskara to fortify buddhi of the foetus.

d. The study of related terminologies like Medha, Pragya, Dharana, Smriti Dhriti etc. clears the existence of individual function and differentiates them from the other. It has a great role in understanding the composite actions and understanding the particular abnormality and treating that particular problem. The difference between Dharana and Dhriti, Dharana and Smriti, Pragya and Buddhi was made clear by this study with the help of references from Charaka and other some texts.

e. Study clears Ayurvedic perspective about Buddhi that the power of making proper decision is the core Buddhi. It also provides the methodical steps for the process of
proper decision. **Consideration of the proper Medha along with proper Dhi, Dhriti, and Smriti in the process of proper decision is the other conceptual contribution** of this study; which is supposed to fulfil the functional insufficiency in practical sense.

f. Establishing Charaka’s view of ‘Vyavasyate Buddhipurvakam’ i.e. the concept of Vyavasayatmika Buddhi and concept of ‘Ashta Buddhijanika Devata’ in delivery of knowledge in practice is the another inventive outcome of this work.

The elaborated topic from this study represents the integral and important role of emotional understanding, emotionally controlled delivery of the knowledge in the function of Buddhi that Charaka had contributed through his thinking at that time, and conventional psychology currently growing in the same direction. This outcome of the **study exposes the Charaka’s strategy in designing the Buddhi development programmes.**

g. It is also going to help for assessing the power of decision towards the success or the lacunae in the unsuccessful decisions. The outcomes of the study will definitely contribute in Ayurvedic Psychiatry and its application to solve the complexes, failures or the stresses of the life of common man and direct him towards the success and happiness.

h. This study exposes the different types of buddhi that Charaka and his Commentator has mentioned under different titles in different chapters. It provides the different types according to the levels of decision, according to the type or the style and the direction of the decision. **It might be the first effort at exposing the types, subtypes of buddhi functions mentioned in the text.**

i. The study represents Charaka’s **holistic approach in Buddhi functioning** like importance of direct interaction i.e. sense related Buddhi functioning, importance of thinking and logical interpretations (logical intelligence of sense and psych), emotional understanding and control (emotional intelligence).

j. The study is putting Charaka’s **views on assessment of Buddhi,** different types of assessments, some models or tools those he mentioned in the text and some of the models or tools that can be designed on the basis of his directions. It is the other contributory and directive output of the work to the field of Buddhi assessment; where there are many grey areas and challenges at present.
k. Emphasising Charaka’s opinion that promotion of Buddhi is the other great outcome of the study. He clears that up gradation of Buddhi is not by diet (except Butter) and medicines or Rasayana but by learning, sharing, and discussion. The study exposes Charaka’s view in titling his chapter as ‘Medhya Rasayana’ but not as ‘Buddhi Rasayana’ and also clears the role of dietary products, Rasayana products in Buddhi functions.

l. Outcome of the conceptual comparison in this study exhibits Charaka’s and his Teekakar’s classical depth, dimensional approach and practical modelling for application in the field of Buddhi than other authors. This study proves Charaka’s authority in this topic and authenticity of the study on the basis of his principles.

m. Founding Charaka’s strategy for assessment of buddhi with the help of his different views mentioned under different domains and presenting the assessment model tools with references is the other great outcome of the study; which is one of the best examples of modelling the ancient concept for practice.

n. This study is based on concepts and research methods described by Charaka. This work present an example of practical application of Charaka’s analytical approach described as Paradi Guna.

o. Designing the questionnaire for clinical work is one of the examples of process of transformation of the concept to clinical form and the understanding the assessment on the basis of designed questionnaire is the example of the process of better understanding the concepts through clinical observations. This journey is the important outcome of this study.

p. The tools are present in routine psychological examination; however the appropriate use, grouping and its relation with respective Indriya considering Charaka’s concept is another outcome of this study. Understanding functional aspect of the concept and its applied interpretation are the contributory specification of the study. E.g. Para, Apara, Abhyasa, Samskara etc.

q. The assessment with designed tool demonstrates the way of assessment of core decisional strength in the composite action of perception like decision, restoration, and memory (Buddhi, Dharana, Dhriti, and Smriti). Thus the outcome of the study gives the directions to assess the specific part of the collective function of specific Indriya. It also gives the directions for development of other questionnaire tools to assess some other aspects of Buddhi function.
r. Pointing out the questions on the need of *multisensory assessment* and need of bifurcation of *normal and rapid mode in assessment of power of decision making* is also the directive output of this study. This is eminent to stimulate and direct psychologist to think and work on it.
7.8. Limitations of the work done

1. This is the first and fundamental study to derive and use assessment tool based on Charaka’s concept. More clinical work needs to be done at multiple centres involving many investigators to improve reliability and validity of the tool.

2. We could not assess all the components (like Para, Apara etc., and Pratibhanam) in all senses (Indriya) due to limitation of the resources.

3. This study was self funded, hence we could not include any intervention for improvement in Buddhi as it was a cross sectional observational study.

4. The age group selected was between 7 yrs to 9 yrs; hence the findings could be restricted to school going children.

5. The number of questions for each component may not be enough to comment. They are just representing the time for assessment for that age group demands the time limit to maintain student’s involvement in the assessment.

6. The work is restricted to the Charaka’s concept only and views of other author were not incorporated in the conceptual studies.
7.9. Scope for the future studies

a. Similar study need to be done in students above 12 age or in adults by preparing questionnaire for their age to show its application in all age groups.

b. It is necessary to design extensive questionnaire to get worth assessment of these components in a purpose to conclude student’s performance accordingly.

c. The assessment need to follow ‘Bahuvindhaihi pareekshet’. It means the assessment to be conducted in various countries and by various investigators to prove the reliability and validity of the tool.

d. Designing different other tools to assess other different components of Buddhi function and also the assessment work to prove its reliability and validity. E.g. Methodical assessment of buddhi, assessment of Dharana, assessment of Smriti

e. The pharmacological study is expected to be done with the help of tools to assess the power of decision and the power of grasping with restoration by controlling it with the group invented by sharing knowledge and discussion. It also needs to prove the efficacy of the tool by inventing some drug for the student having low TBS.

f. Some other observations need to be observed and followed especially in English and Marathi Medium of study and TBS, Socio economic status and TBS, socioeconomic status vs. efforts of cultivation done and TBS.

g. The concept of Manda buddhi was studied in this study but the different treatments for different imbalanced state must to be studied. The interventional studies should be conducted to prove the efficacy of specific drug or Rasayana by considering that states.

h. The comparative study on approach of multisensory assessment and only visual assessment to prove their necessity.

i. The role of normal and rapid decision making in power of proper decision making can be the ruled out by classified assessment study in future.