

LITERARY REVIEW ON BOTANICAL SOURCES OF SARIVA

Dr Vidyalaxmi Pujari¹, Dr Shrikanth. P².

¹PhD Scholar, ² Professor & Head, Department of PhD & PG Studies in Dravyaguna, Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara College of Ayurveda, Udupi.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47071/pijar.2021.v06i03.01>

Abstract

Ayurveda is having the great demand across the globe, so the drugs and formulations used in Ayurveda science. As there is a great demand there are chances of the drugs to be adulterated or substituted to meet the demand also for gain of profit. Now a days getting genuine and pure drug is tough task, and the availability of genuine drug in the market is again under doubt. Thus it is need of the hour for the physician to have the proper knowledge regarding morphological features of the drug. Sariva is well known drug having various utilities, and has three legal substitutes and this plant is not under cultivation. In present article the literature review of morphological sources of Sariva are being discussed.

Key words: Ayurveda, Sariva, Morphological features

Introduction

The ultimate purpose of treatment is to get good health, and this is possible only if we have genuine and pure drug. In ancient period vaidyas used to stay amidst medicinal plants and they themselves used to collect medicinal herbs, prepare medicine and administer to the patients, so there were no chances of adulteration. But now a days, physician depend on third person for cultivation, collection, processing and

preparation of medicine. As Ayurveda is becoming popular all over world, today many of manufactures are doing more production by using raw materials from the market. Procurement of genuine, pure drug is need of the day.

Ayurveda mentions many drugs having multifaceted activity and attributed with Rasayana¹, Raktaprasadana² activity. One such drug is Sariva. Sariva has been used to treat a vast range of ailments through ages. Especially it is popular

mainly for its blood purifying and cooling attributes. In Ayurvedic Samhitas two types of Sariva namely Shweta and Krishna are mentioned. The white variety of Sariva (*Hemidesmus indicus R.Br*) is commonly used in medicine³. In current trade *Ichnocarpus frutescens(L) R.Br*, *Cryptolepis buchmani Rome.&Schult*, and *Decalpis hamiltonii Wight & Arn* are sold in the name of Sariva⁴.

The correct identity of this reputed drug has however, not yet been confirmed as a number of plants are largely employed and sold indiscriminately in the drug markets as Sariva. Recent compilers on indigenous drugs are of opinion that true Sariva is derived from the plant *Hemidesmus indicus Linn.R.Br* of family Asclepidaceae. And krishna sariva from *Ichnocarpus frutescens R. Br* belonging to the same family. (Nadakarni 1954; Sharma 1956; Singh 1955) and in some texts *Cryptolepis buchmani Roem & schult* also has been referred to as Krishna Sariva, Sariva and Jambu patra Sariva.

In this paper the morphological features of all the botanical sources are discussed.

1. *Hemidesmus indicus*

Habit: Perennial, twining, branched under shrubs or shrubs with milky latex;

Stem: Slender, terete, striate, glabrous or pubescent, lenticellate, swollen at the nodes.

Root: Root stock elongated, woody, thickened, and aromatic.

Leaves: Opposite, decussate, glabrous, much variable in shape from elliptic-oblong to linear-lanceolate, margin entire, apex acute apiculate or mucronate, base rounded or cuneate, 4-13x0.4-0.6 cm or 3-10x1.1-2.4cm; petiole 1-4mm long, grooved on upper surface, glabrous.

Inflorescence: Axillary or lateral sessile, umbel-like cymes.

Flower: Small, bisexual actinomorphic, hypogynous, greenish-yellow or greenish purple externally, dull yellow or light purple at the center, pedicellate; bracteates; bract 0.5-1mm long, minute; bracteoles ovate acute or lanceolate, imbricate the pedicel.

Fruit: Follicles single or paired, divaricate, 11-18 x 0.5- 0.8 cm, cylindrical slender, tapering; seeds 5 x 2 mm, elliptic-oblong, glabrous; coma hairs 3-4 cm long, silky white.

Root: Fresh or freshly dried roots have a faint agreeable odour due to aldehyde but in the fairly old and dried sample the

odour is very slight. The smoothed transverse surface show a thin cork and whitish wood. But the peircyclic fibres, stone cell and pith are absent. Fracture is short and splintery.



2. *Ichnocarpus frutescens*

The drug occurs in bundles of short cut pieces or as compact bundles consisting of entire root. The root is cylindrical, considerably long 1-5cm in diameter, irregularly bent, dark or dusty brown in colour, with fine longitudinal wrinkles on the surface. Short faint transverse cracks are also found at the bends. The fresh root is somewhat turgid and exudes plenty of creamy white latex, hen injured or incised. The smoothed transverse surface shows a thin cork, a wide phelloderm and phloem and central dull white wood, the centre of which is occupied by intraxylary phloem and a small pith. Taste is slightly sweetish and astringent and without any characteristic odor. Fracture is hard but fibrous.

PIJAR/May-June-2021/VOLUME-6/ISSUE-3

Habit : It is much branched, large climbing shrub with finely tomentose branches.

Leaves: Opposite, simple, ellipticoblong to broadly lanceolate, coriaceous, pubescent when young.

Flowers: Fragrant, greenish white or purplish in axillary or terminal panicles of cymose clusters.

Follicles: Cylindrical, slender usually two, divaricately placed.

Seeds: Slender, black, comose.



3. *Cryptolepis buchmani*

Habit: It is a large glabrous, twining shrub with terete branches.

Leaves: Opposite broad coriaceous.

Flower: Pale greenish yellow in colour, dichotomos, in short terminal or axillary paniced cymes.

Root: The roots vary in length and are 1- 1.5cm thick. They are slender, cylindrical and possess a dark or blackish exterior. The surface is rough due to fine longitudinal ridges and wrinkles running sinuously lengthwise. The thicker roots

show a few transverse cracks, fissures and longitudinal wrinkles with remnants of rootlets and few lenticles. The cork is easily peelable. Fracture is short and fibrous. The odour is indistinct with sweet astringent taste.



across, brownish outside very pale yellow inside; the outer surface is smooth when fresh, soon becomes wrinkled and longitudinally ridged on drying; it has central stout stellar and outer thick corky region.



4. *Decalepis buchnani*

Habit: Glabrous twining shrubs; branches terete, slightly sulcate, thickened at joints.

Leaves : simple, opposite, entire, obovatecuneate, unequal at base, retusely acuminate at apex, coriaceous, dark-green above, pale beneath, upto 9 x 5.5cm.

Flower: small, in axillary branched cymes, creamy white; turning yellow; lobes 5 spreading, densely whitish hair within.

Fruits: a pair of follicles, thick, lanceolate upto 7cm long.

Root: mature root hardy, 3-6 m or more long, traverse deep inside the soil, emit a strong aromatic odour when fresh, gradually diminishing on drying; they are markedly fleshy and cylindrical, 3-5cm

Discussion

Sariva is a well known drug in Ayurveda classics and it is very widely used in various diseases as a single drug and also as an ingredient of many formulations. In our classics we come across two varieties of Sariva. Those are botanically *Hemidesmus indicus* is identified as Shweta Sariva and for Krishna Sariva, *Ichnocarpus frutescens* and *Cryptolepis buchnani* are used. And in the market *Decalepis hamiltonii* roots are available in the name of Sariva. The drug Sariva is in great demand in the market and it is not in cultivation so there is a greater chance of real drug is adulterated or substituted by similar looking cheaper material. In this article the morphological features of plant

source and the part used of all the four sources of Sariva is been briefed. By this knowledge one can easily identify the plant of Sariva at the field and also in raw form available in market.

Conclusion

As the drug Sariva is having multifaceted activity and it is one among many drugs which has got huge demand from pharmaceutical industry and also this drug is not under cultivation. The procurement of the drug is done from the wild. Thus the proper identification of the drug is most important, it is done by having authentic knowledge from our literature regarding its botanical features and macroscopic features of raw part used.

References

1. Sushruta, Sushruta Samhita Ayurveda tatva sandeepika, hindi commentary, Kaviraj Dr Ambika data shastri, Edition 2007 published by Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan
2. Agnivesha, Charaka Samhita Vol- 1 (revised by Charaka and Dridhabala) with commentary of Chakrapanidatta, Edited by Acharya Vidhydhara Shukla and Ravidatta Tripathi, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishtan.
3. J L N Shastry, Dravyaguna Vignana Part 2, Chaukhamba Orientalia. Reprint 2014, pp348
4. Bapalal Vaidya, Nighnatu Adarsha, Uttarardha, Chaukhamba Bharati Academy, pp19
6. K. Rahunathan and Miss. Roma Mitra, Pharmacognosy of indigenous Drugs, Central Council For Research in Ayurveda and Siddha, 2nd reprinted 2005.
7. Jeewandarage Malini Pushpalatha, A Pharmacognostic evaluation of different species of Sariva Hemidesinus indicus (L.) R. Br., Cryptolepis buchananii Roem. Schult. and Ichnocarpus frutescens (L.) R. Br, Thesis submitted to the University of Sri Jayewardenepura in the year 2013

Corresponding author:

Dr Vidyalaxmi Pujari

PhD Scholar, Department of PhD & PG Studies in Dravyaguna, Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara College of Ayurveda, Udupi.

E-mail: drvidyapujaris@gmail.com

Source of Support: NIL
Conflict of Interest : None declared

Published BY:
Shri Prasanna Vitthala Education and Charitable Trust (Reg)