On the Understanding of Other Cultures

Proceedings of the International Conference
on Sanskrit and Related Studies to Commemorate
the Centenary of the Birth of Stanisław Schayer (1899-1941)
Warsaw University, Poland, October 7-10, 1999

Edited by

Piotr Balcerowicz & Marek Mejor

Theories of Debate, Proof and Counter-Proof in the Early Indian Dialectical Tradition

ERNST PRETS

In the *Vimāna-sthāna* of the *Caraka-saṁhitā*[1] we find—in addition to other philosophically interesting passages of this famous medical compendium, which have been dealt with by various scholars[2]—a whole chapter dealing with various modes of learning and teaching. Here we come across a section discussing the method of debate (*saṁbhāṣā-vidhi*) which is well known to historiographers of Indian logic and dialectic.[3]

According to this passage, debates or discussions are divided into friendly and hostile debates.[4] The friendly debate (*saṁdhāya-saṁbhāṣā*, or *anuloma-saṁbhāṣā*)[5] is carried out by learned and eloquent fellow scholars who pleasantly discuss questions or problems of their science in the spirit of co-operation, and who interrogate and answer confidently without fear of being defeated.[6] Standing in contrast to such friendly dialogues, the hostile debate (*vigṛhya-saṁbhāṣā*) is carried out in the spirit of opposition. The obvious aim of such a dispute is to defeat the opponent and to win the day.

The *Caraka-saṁhitā* gives an elaborate description[7] of what a debater must take into consideration before he agrees to enter a hostile debate. Remarkably interesting,

---

[1] CarS vim 8.

[2] Cf. e.g. (in alphabetical order): BEDEKAR (1957), COMBA (1987), FILLIOZAT (1990), FILLIOZAT (1993), KATSURA (1986), MEINDERSMA (1989), MEINDERSMA (1992), MIYASAKA (1963), RAO (1962), SASTRI (1952) and SHARMA (1984).

[3] Cf. e.g. VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA (1920: 28–31), DASGUPTA (1922: 378 f.), SOLOMON (1976: 74–78), FRAUWALLNER (1984: 67–71), MATILAL (1987: 55 f.) and MATILAL (1998: 38–41).

[4] CarS vim 8.15 f.

[5] Cf. OBERHAMMER–PRETS–PRANDSTETTER (1991: I, 61).

[6] CarS vim 8.17.

[7] Cf. CarS vim 8.18–25. This passage has already been translated as early as 1872 by Rudolf von ROTH, cf. ROTH (1872). Recently this passage has been dealt with carefully according to its importance by KANG (1998).

this description is unique in the history of the Indian dialectical tradition, giving a lively picture of various types of debaters (*vādin*) and juries (*pariṣad*), which sounds like a guide to modern public political panel or TV discussions. Accordingly, the debater must examine his opponent, the opponent's personal and intellectual strengths or weaknesses which might be superior, equal or inferior to those of his own, and must also examine the jury's level of knowledge, which is described as either learned (*jñānavat*) or ignorant (*mūḍha*), and which may have a friendly (*suhṛd*), indifferent (*udāsīna*) or hostile (*pratiniviṣṭa*) attitude towards the debater.

According to this passage, a debater should enter a debate only if the opponent is equal or inferior, and only in the presence of a friendly or, at the very least, an ignorant or indifferent jury. No discussions should be carried out in the presence of a hostile jury or with a superior opponent. After having considered the weak points of his enemy in the course of debate, he should overpower him quickly:

> 'Under these circumstances the following [procedures] are ways of quickly defeating inferior [opponents]: He should overpower an unlearned [opponent] by long citations of *sūtra*s; moreover, [he should overpower] an [opponent] who is weak in theoretical knowledge by [the use] of sentences containing troublesome words; an [opponent] who is unable to retain sentences, by a continuous series of sentences composed of long-strung *sūtra*s; an [opponent] devoid of presence of mind, by the repetition of the same [words] with a difference in meaning; an [opponent] devoid of eloquence, by pointing to half-uttered sentences; an [opponent] devoid of self-confidence, by embarrassing [him]; an [opponent] of irritable temper, by putting [him] to exertion; one who is frightened, by terrifying [him]; [and] an inattentive [opponent], by reprehending him. In these ways he should overpower an inferior opponent quickly.'[8]

Over and above that, he should take the jury into his confidence before entering such a debate, influencing it to name that with which he is familiar or that which could present great difficulties to the opponent as the subject of the debate and, at

---

[8] CarS vim 8.21: *tatra khalv ime pratyavarāṇām āśuni-grahe bhavanty upāyāḥ. tad yathā—śruta-hīnaṁ mahatā sūtra-pāṭhenâbhibhavet, vijñāna-hīnaṁ punaḥ kaṣṭa-śabdena vākyena, vākya-dhāraṇa-hīnam āviddha-dīrgha-sūtra-saṅkulair vākya-daṇḍakaiḥ, pratibhā-hīnaṁ punar-vacanenâika-vidhenânekârtha-vācinā, vacana-śakti-hīnam ardhôktasya vākyasyâkṣepeṇa, aviśāradam apatrapaṇena, kopanam āyāsena, bhīruṁ vitrâsanena, anavahitaṁ niyamanenêti. evam etair upāyaiḥ param avaram abhibhavec chīghram* <CarS₂ om. *chīghram*>.

the beginning of the debate, he should pretend that the jury will set the subject and the rules of debate independently.

After this literary exposition, the *Caraka-saṁhitā* continues with the enumeration and definition of forty-four topics of the course of debate (*vāda-mārga-pada*)[9] which should be known to debating physicians.[10] It is remarkable that this section, in contrast to the passage previously mentioned, no longer speaks of hostile or friendly discussions, but only of the formal debate (*vāda*) as such. Moreover, it is not a description of situations within a debate, but a compendium of definitions and examples which forms a homogenous whole. It is most likely that it represents the oldest version of a manual on Indian dialectic and logic transmitted to us, comparable to the ancient *vāda*-manual which may be reconstructed out of the first and last chapters of the *Nyāya-sūtras*.[11] Caraka's manual deals with the same topics to a certain extent, but apparently in a less systematic manner than that which is found in the *Nyāya-sūtras*.[12]

---

[9] Cf. CarS vim 8.27: *imāni tu* <CarS$_{1,2}$ om. *tu*> *khalu padāni bhiṣag-vāda-mārga-jñānârtham* <CarS$_{1,2}$ om. *bhiṣag*> *adhigamyāni bhavanti; tad yathā vādaḥ, dravyaṁ, guṇāḥ, karma, sāmānyaṁ, viśeṣaḥ, samavāyaḥ, pratijñā, sthāpanā, pratiṣṭhāpanā, hetuḥ, dṛṣṭântaḥ, upanayaḥ, nigamanam, uttaraṁ, siddhântaḥ, śabdaḥ, pratyakṣam, anumānam, aitihyam, aupamyaṁ, saṁśayaḥ, prayojanaṁ, savyabhicāraṁ, jijñāsā, vyavasāyaḥ, artha-prāptiḥ, saṁbhavaḥ, anuyojyam, ananuyojyam, anuyogaḥ, pratyanuyogaḥ, vākya-doṣaḥ, vākya-praśaṁsā, chalam, ahetuḥ, atīta-kālam, upālambhaḥ, parihāraḥ, pratijñā-hāniḥ, abhyanujñā, hetv-antaram, arthântaraṁ, nigraha-sthānam iti.* It should be mentioned that there exists another version of this list (cf. e.g. CarS$_2$ 357b,3 ff.) which enumerates *dṛṣṭânta* not between *hetu* and *upanaya*, but between *uttara* and *siddhânta*. This reading is also supported by the manuscripts of the *Caraka-saṁhitā* which I have inspected. All the editions and manuscripts with this reading also differ from CarS and CarS$_1$ with regard to the formulation of *dṛṣṭânta* and *upanaya* in the presentation of *sthāpanā* and *pratiṣṭhāpanā* (v. fn. 31 and 34). To decide which reading may be the genuine one, Cakrapāṇidatta's commentary is of no help since he comments only marginally on these passages (cf. ĀDī 266b,25–28, 267a,18–21 and 28–34).

[10] CarS vim 8.27–65.

[11] The idea that these two books as a whole form the basis of the original manual of debate is supported e.g. by RUBEN (1928: 218, fn. 291); TUCCI (1929: xxvii f.); RANDLE (1930: 342 f.); FRAUWALLNER (1956: 321, fn. 78); OBERHAMMER (1963: 70) etc. Recently it has been shown by a text-critical study (cf. MEUTHRATH (1996: 232 ff.)) that it is rather book 1.1 and 1.2 with the addition of book 5.2, which form a reconstructible unit, whereas book 5.1 most probably is a later insertion.

[12] Cf. FRAUWALLNER (1984: 71).

In a cursory glance, the forty-four technical terms of this manual seem to be an arbitrary compilation, but on closer inspection they show a certain structure: The central notion, the debate (*vāda*), is discussed first. It is of two kinds, namely disputation (*jalpa*) and eristic wrangle (*vitaṇḍā*). This is followed by the six Vaiśeṣika categories: substance (*dravya*), attribute (*guṇa*), movement (*karman*), universal (*sāmānya*), particularity (*viśeṣa*) and inherence (*samavāya*). Caraka then proceeds with the proposition (*pratijñā*), the description of proof (*sthāpanā*) and counter-proof (*pratiṣṭhāpanā*) as well as the members of the proof, i.e. reason (*hetu*), example (*dṛṣṭânta*), application (*upanaya*) and conclusion (*nigamana*). The following technical term, the 'rejoinder' (*uttara*),[13] is also related to the proof, since its definition hints at a close similarity to the Nyāya-category *jāti*, the so-called 'unsound rejoinder.'[14]

---

[13] Cf. CarS vim 8.36: 'A rejoinder (*uttara*) is a statement by means of dissimilarity (*vaidharmya*) when the argument (*hetu*) is brought forward by means of similarity (*sādharmya*), or a statement by means of similarity when the argument is brought forward by means of dissimilarity .... . This is a rejoinder with reversal [of arguments].'—*uttaraṁ nāma sādharmyôpadiṣṭe* <CarS$_{1,2}$ *vā*> *hetau vaidharmya-vacanaṁ, vaidharmyôpadiṣṭe vā hetau* < CarS$_2$ om. *hetau*> *sādharmya-vacanam ... etat saviparyayam uttaram*.

[14] Cf. NSū 1.2.18: 'An unsound rejoinder (*jāti*) is an objection (*pratyavasthāna*) by means of similarity (*sādharmya*) and dissimilarity (*vaidharmya*).'—*sādharmya-vaidharmyābhyāṁ pratyavasthānaṁ jātiḥ*. I will discuss the question as to whether NSū 1.2.18 understands this kind of rejoinder as being 'unsound' or not, in a forthcoming paper. The explanation of the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*'s commentary on this *Sūtra* supports at least the close similarity of the concept of *jāti* and that of Caraka's *uttara*: 'The directly following consequence (*prasaṅga*), which arises when an argument (*hetu*) has been brought forward [in a debate], that is the *jāti*. And this "directly following consequence" is an objection (*pratyavasthāna*), [i.e.] a rejection (*upālambha*), a refutation (*pratiṣedha*) by means of similarity or dissimilarity. [In the case that according to NSū 1.1.34] the reason (*hetu*) [put forward] is that which proves the [property] to be proven because of its similarity to the example (*udāharaṇa*), [the *jāti*] is the objection to this [reason] by means of its dissimilarity to the exemplification. [In the case that according to NSū 1.1.35] the reason [put forward] is that which proves the [property] to be proven [in the instance to be proven] because of its dissimilarity to the example, [the *jāti*] is the objection to this [reason] by means of its similarity to the exemplification. That [objection] which comes into existence, because it stands in opposition [to the argument], is the *jāti*.'—*prayukte hi hetau yaḥ prasaṅgo jāyate sā* <NBh$_1$; *sa* NBh> *jātiḥ. sa ca prasaṅgaḥ sādharmya-vaidharmyābhyāṁ pratyavasthānam upālambhaḥ pratiṣedha iti. udāharaṇa-sādharmyāt sādhya-sādhanaṁ hetur ity asyôdāharaṇa-vaidharmyeṇa pratyavasthānam, udāharaṇa-vaidharmyāt* <*tathā udā°* NBh$_1$> *sādhya-sādhanaṁ hetur ity asyôdāharaṇa-sādharmyeṇa pratyavasthānam. pratyanīka-bhāvāj jāyamāno 'rtho jātir iti*. (NBh 401,8–402,5).

Subsequently the four kinds of established doctrines (*siddhânta*)[15] are discussed. Then follows a group of items which is introduced with the discussion of the meaning of 'word' (*śabda*), followed by the four accepted means of cognition (*upalabdhi-kāraṇa*)[16], namely perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), verbal testimony (*aitihya*) and comparison (*aupamya*), and subsequently deals with terms which are somehow connected with cognition in a broader sense, namely doubt (*saṃśaya*), purpose (*prayojana*), inconclusiveness (*savyabhicāra*), inquiry (*jijñāsā*), ascertainment (*vyavasāya*), implication (*artha-prāpti*), and cause of origination (*saṃbhava*). The remaining sixteen terms are all of a purely dialectic nature, including—apart from general notions of conversation[17]—the defects and excellences of statement (*vākya-doṣa*[18] and *vākya-praśaṃsā*[19]), equivocation (*chala*)[20], fallacious reasons (*ahetu*)[21] and the points of defeat (*nigraha-sthāna*)[22].

---

[15] As in the *Nyāya-sūtras* (cf. NSū 1.1.26–31), Caraka supports four kinds of *siddhânta*, namely *sarva-tantra-siddhânta, pratitantra-siddhânta, adhikaraṇa-siddhânta* and *abhyupagama-siddhânta* (cf. CarS vim 8.37).

[16] Cf. CarS vim 8.33, in which the reason (*hetu*) is defined as the means of cognition: *hetur nāmôpalabdhi-kāraṇam, tat pratyakṣam anumānam aitihyam aupamyam iti. ebhis hetubhir yad upalabhyate, tat tattvam*. In this context it should be mentioned that in the *Sūtra-sthāna* of the *Caraka-saṃhitā* another set of four means of cognition (*pramāṇam*; cf. CarS sū 11.33) are taught as the four means of investigation (*parīkṣā*; cf. CarS sū 11.17: *dvividham eva khalu sarvaṃ sac câsac ca. tasya catur-vidhā parīkṣā— āptôpadeśaḥ pratyakṣam anumānam yuktiś ceti*. Cf. OBERHAMMER–PRETS– PRANDSTETTER (1996: II, 161 f.).

[17] Cf. such notions as *anuyojya* ('That which is to be objected / to be specified'; cf. CarS vim 8.50), *ananuyojya* ('That which is not to be objected'; cf. CarS vim 8.51), *anuyoga* ('Question'; cf. CarS vim 8.52), *pratyanuyoga* ('Counter-question'; cf. CarS vim 8.53), *upālambha* ('Rejection of an argument'; cf. CarS vim 8.59) and *parihāra* ('Confutation of a rejection'; cf. CarS vim 8.60) in OBERHAMMER–PRETS– PRANDSTETTER (1991, 1996: I, II) s.v.

[18] The defects of statement (*vākya-doṣa*; cf. CarS vim 8.54) in a debate, all of which are understood as points of defeat (*nigraha-sthāna*), are the following: an insufficient statement (*nyūna*), a superfluous statement (*adhika*), a senseless statement (*anarthaka*), a meaningless statement (*apārthaka*) and a contradictory statement (*viruddha*). Cf. OBERHAMMER–PRETS–PRANDSTETTER (1991, 1996: I, II) s.v.

[19] The excellences of statement (*vākya-praśaṃsā*; cf. CarS vim 8.55) consist of the negation of the *vākya-doṣa*s with the addition of one more excellency: the statements should be sufficient (*anyūna*), not superfluous (*anadhika*), senseful (*arthavat*), meaningful (*anapārthaka*), not contradictory (*aviruddha*) and the statement should be to the point (*adhigata-padârtha*).

This compilation obviously reminds one of the main sixteen categories (*padârtha*) of the *Nyāya-sūtra*s,[23] despite some terminological differences and divergent interpretations of the various topics. Both manuals discuss the question of the debate in general (*vāda, jalpa, vitaṇḍā*) with the difference that *vāda* in the *Nyāya-sūtra*s is understood as the friendly form of debate,[24] and disputation (*jalpa*) and eristic wrangle (*vitaṇḍā*)[25] are the hostile forms, whereas in the *Caraka-saṁhitā* disputation and eristic wrangle are subdivisions of *vāda*:

---

[20] According to the *Caraka-saṁhitā*, equivocation is of two kinds (cf. CarS vim 8.56): verbal equivocation (*vāk-chala*) and generalising equivocation (*sāmānya-cchala*).

[21] The CarS supports three fallacious reasons (*ahetu*; cf. CarS vim 8.57: *ahetur nāma prakaraṇa-samaḥ, saṁśaya-samaḥ, varṇya-samaś c êti.*), which seem to be understood as fallacious forms of substantiations in a broader sense, not in the strict sense of the fallacies of the logical reason (*hetv-ābhāsa*) which were supported by later logical traditions.

[22] The enumeration of the points of defeat (*nigraha-sthāna*) is somewhat non-homogenous and consists of a literal description of three censurable faults (1. the debater does not comprehend an argument even when it has been stated three times, 2. censuring a statement which is not to be censured, and 3. not censuring a statement which is to be censured), the enumeration of the defects of statement (*vākya-doṣa*), fallacious reasons (*ahetu*, without mentioning its subdivisions) and five faults which were already discussed as individual topics of debate, namely to mistime a statement (*atīta-kāla*; CarS vim 8.58), to abandon the proposition (*pratijñā-hāni*; CarS vim 8.61), concession of something undesired (*abhyanujñā*; CarS vim 8.62), change of reason (*hetv-antara*; CarS vim 8.63) and change of subject (*arthântara*; CarS vim 8.64). Cf. CarS vim 8.65: *nigraha-sthānaṁ nāma parājaya-prāptiḥ. tac ca trir abhihitasya vākyasyâparijñānaṁ <vākyasyâvijñānaṁ* CarS$_{1,2}$> *pariṣadi vijñānavatyām, yad vā ananuyojyasyânuyogo 'nuyojyasya cânanuyogaḥ. pratijñā-hāniḥ, abhyanujñā, kālātītavacanam* (scil. *atīta-kālam*), *ahetuḥ, nyūnam, adhikam <atiriktam* CarS$_{1,2}$>, *vyartham* (scil. *apārthakam*), *anarthakam, punar-uktam, viruddham, hetv-antaram, arthântaraṁ ca <*CarS$_2$ om. *ca> nigraha-sthānam.*

[23] NSū 1.1.1: *pramāṇa-prameya-saṁśaya-prayojana-dṛṣṭânta-siddhântâvayava-tarka-nirṇaya-vāda-jalpa-vitaṇḍâhetv-ābhāsa-cchala-jāti-nigraha-sthānānāṁ   tattva-jñānān niḥśreyasâdhigamaḥ.*

[24] Cf. NSū 1.2.1: 'A [friendly] debate (*vāda*) is [carried out by the opponents] taking up the thesis (*pakṣa*) and the counter-thesis (*pratipakṣa*), [both of] which contain the five members of proof (*avayava*), are not contradictory to the [respective] doctrines (*siddhânta*) and consist of the proving (*sādhana*) [of their respective thesis] and the refuting (*upālambha*) [of the counter-thesis] based upon the means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) and reasoning   (*tarka*).'—*pramāṇa-tarka-sādhanôpālambhaḥ   siddhântâviruddhaḥ pañcâvayavôpapannaḥ pakṣa-pratipakṣa-parigraho vādaḥ.*

[25] Cf. NSū 1.2.2 f: 'Disputation (*jalpa*) consists of [the same attributes] as mentioned [in the definition of the friendly debate (*vāda*) and is carried out] by proving and refuting with

'A debate (*vāda*) is when one [disputant] discusses with an opponent in a hostile way, with a doctrine presupposed. In short, this is of two kinds: disputation (*jalpa*) and eristic wrangle (*vitaṇḍā*) ... . In the following manner: The position of one [disputant] is that rebirth exists, [the position] of the other is that it does not exist. Both disputants substantiate their respective position by reasons [and] present the [respective] opposite position [for discussion]. This is disputation (*jalpa*) ... . Eristic wrangle consists exclusively of pointing out the faults with regard to the opposite position'[26]

This means that in the *Caraka-saṃhitā*, *vāda* is only the hostile variety of debate.

Both manuals also list, with one small terminological divergence,[27] the same members of the proof. Nevertheless, one central point of their interpretation is differing, a fact to which historiographers have paid too little attention: Unexpectedly, the *Nyāya-sūtra*s do not have a *terminus technicus* as an independent category for that which one would call 'proof' or 'establishing the thesis'. The five individual members of the proof are merely listed under the topic 'members' (*avayava*)[28] and are defined without any hint of a generic category.

In contrast, the manual of the *Caraka-saṃhitā* shows a different and clearly structured concept. The proposition (*pratijñā*), defined nearly identically in both works, is not a constituent of the proof and is listed as an independent topic of debate (*vāda-mārga-pada*): 'The proposition is the communication of the [object] to be proven. As example: "The *puruṣa* is eternal".'[29] Apart from the proposition,

---

[the addition] of equivocation (*chala*), unsound rejoinders (*jāti*) and points of defeat (*nigraha-sthāna*). A [disputation] without the establishment (*sthāpanā*) of the counter-thesis is an eristic wrangle (*vitaṇḍā*).'—*yathôktôpapannaś chala-jāti-nigraha-sthāna-sādhanôpālambho jalpaḥ. sa pratipakṣa-sthāpanā-hīno vitaṇḍā.*

[26] CarS vim 8.28: *vādo nāma sa yat pareṇa <paraḥ pareṇa* CarS$_{1,2}$> *saha śāstra-pūrvakaṃ vigṛhya kathayati. sa ca <vādo* CarS$_2$> *dvividhaḥ saṃgraheṇa jalpo vitaṇḍā ca ... yathā—ekasya pakṣaḥ punar-bhāvo 'stîti, nâstîty aparasya. tau ca hetubhiḥ* <CarS$_2$; *svasvahetu°* CarS$_1$; *svasvapakṣa-hetu°* CarS> *svasvapakṣaṃ sthāpayataḥ para-pakṣam udbhāvayataḥ. eṣa jalpaḥ ... vitaṇḍā nāma para-pakṣe doṣa-vacana-mātram eva.*

[27] In addition to the general example (*dṛṣṭânta*), which is mentioned in the *Caraka-saṃhitā* as the second member of *sthāpanā*, the *Nyāya-sūtra*s have the special term *udāharaṇa*, 'exemplification', as the designation of the third member of proof.

[28] Cf. NSū 1.1.32: *pratijñā-hetûdāharaṇôpanaya-nigamanāny avayavāḥ.*

[29] CarS vim 8.30: *pratijñā nāma sādhya-vacanaṃ. yathā—nityaḥ puruṣa iti.* Cf. NSū 1.1.33: *sādhya-nirdeśaḥ pratijñā.* The term *puruṣa*, literally meaning 'human being',

the dialectic proof or establishment (*sthāpanā*) of the proposition consists of the reason (*hetu*), the example (*dṛṣṭānta*), the application (*upanaya*) and the conclusion (*nigamana*): 'Proof (*sthāpanā*) is the proof (or establishment) of exactly that proposition by means of reason, example, application, and conclusion. First is the proposition and then the proof. For, what can be proven when it has not been proposed?'[30] Subsequently Caraka gives an example of this kind of dialectic proof: 'Proposition: the *puruṣa* is eternal; reason: because it is not produced; example: like the ether; application: and as the ether is unproduced and it is eternal, so is the *puruṣa*; conclusion: therefore it is eternal.'[31]

In accordance with this example, a proof of this kind could possibly represent the following structure: The thesis (*pratijñā*) that the *puruṣa* is eternal is given, followed by three further propositions, namely 1. that the *puruṣa* is not produced (*hetu*), 2. that an example—the ether—exemplifies both attributes, i.e. eternity and non-producedness (*dṛṣṭānta*), and 3. the *puruṣa* is like the example, i.e. non-produced and eternal (*upanaya*). By means of these three propositions one comes to the conclusion (*nigamana*) that the *puruṣa* is eternal. The recent book of Claus OETKE, which is an investigation of the earliest structures of the so-called Indian syllogism, offers possible logical implications and interpretations of such early types of proof.[32]

We are now confronted in the *Caraka-saṁhitā* with a unique phenomenon: The dialectic proof (*sthāpanā*) is contrasted with a counterproposition propounding exactly the opposite of the thesis,[33] which is correctly established by a statement

---

'man', 'individual soul', 'personal principal', 'supreme being' etc. is left untranslated in this context, because it is not exactly clear which concept is meant in the *Caraka-saṁhitā*. Most probably it is to be understood as the 'individual soul' or the 'personal principal'. But the question is not of real importance for the structure of the proof.

[30] CarS vim 8.31: *tasyā eva pratijñāyā hetu-dṛṣṭāntôpanaya-nigamanaiḥ sthāpanā. pūrvaṁ hi pratijñā, paścāt sthāpanā, kiṁ hy apratijñātaṁ sthāpayiṣyati.*

[31] CarS vim 8.31: *nityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā, hetuḥ—akṛtakatvād iti, dṛṣṭāntaḥ— yathâkāśam iti, upanayaḥ—yathā câkṛtakam ākāśaṁ tac ca nityaṁ tathā puruṣa iti, nigamanam—tasmān nitya iti.* In the editions and manuscripts containing the other version of the list of the *vāda-mārga-pada*s (cf. fn. 9), example (*dṛṣṭānta*) and application (*upanaya*) are formulated in the following way: 'example: the ether is unproduced, and it is eternal; application: and as the ether is unproduced, so is the *puruṣa.*'—*dṛṣṭāntaḥ—akṛtakam akāśaṁ tac ca nityam, upanayo—yathā câkṛtakam ākāśaṁ tathā puruṣaḥ.* CarS₂ 358a,31–33.

[32] OETKE (1994: 12 ff.).

[33] Although proof and counter-proof should be the normal opening of a debate, we do not have any further example in the transmitted texts.

which is called counter-proof (*pratiṣṭhāpanā*) in the *Caraka-saṃhitā*, and which consists of another set of the same proof members:

'Counter-proof is the proof (or establishment) of exactly the contrary of the opponent's proposition. For example: proposition: the *puruṣa* is non-eternal; reason: because it is perceptible by the senses; example: as the pot; application: and like the pot is perceptible, and it is non-eternal, so is the [*puruṣa*]; conclusion: therefore it is non-eternal.'[34]

Clearly this is a situation of counterbalancing arguments. But what does it imply for the interpretation of Caraka's proof? Should one suppose that one of these two proofs is logically inconsistent? There is no hint of such an assumption. Both argumentations seem to be at least formally correct. Must we differentiate in this early stage of Indian logic between logically correct argumentations, and argumentations which claim to prove the truth of the proposal? It seems so. Due to the very sparse source material in the earliest development of Indian dialectic, one can only make conjectures. But it is highly probable that, at least for the *Caraka-saṃhitā*, the function of a proof is not to guarantee truth but to justify propositions. The truth of the conclusion and with it, the truth of the thesis, depends on the truth of the propositions, which are exemplified in the first three members of the *sthāpanā*, namely *hetu*, *dṛṣṭânta* and *upanaya*. It therefore reminds one of the European classical formal criterion of correctness, which does not claim the truth of a conclusion but states that if the propositions are true then the conclusion is also true. But it is not my aim to compare Indian and European logic.

Nevertheless, Caraka's presentation of *sthāpanā* and *pratiṣṭhāpanā* seems to indicate that truth is not guaranteed by a logical proof. As for the proof in the *Nyāya-sūtras*, it is difficult to make up one's mind. On one hand, the *Nyāya-sūtras* claim that debates are carried out by the opponents establishing opposite positions (*pakṣa* and *pratipakṣa*) within a debate, on the other hand the concepts of proof (*sthāpanā*) and counter-proof (*pratiṣṭhāpanā*) are lacking in the *Sūtras*, although the term *sthāpanā* is used once to define the eristic wrangle (*vitaṇḍā*). Of course, the

---

[34] CarS vim 8.32: *pratiṣṭhāpanā nāma yā tasyā eva* <CarS₂ om. *tasyā eva*> *para-pratijñāyā viparītârtha-sthāpanā. yathā—anityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā* <(*viparītârtha*)*prati°* CarS₁>; *hetuḥ—aindriyakatvād iti; dṛṣṭântaḥ—yathā ghaṭa iti; upanayo—yathā ghaṭa aindriyakaḥ sa cânityaḥ, tathā câyam iti; nigamanaṃ—tasmād anitya iti*. The other transmitted version (cf. fn. 31) of the example (*dṛṣṭânta*) and the application (*upanaya*) in the *pratiṣṭhāpanā* is formulated in the following way: 'example: the pot is perceptible by the senses, and it is non-eternal; application: and as the pot, so is the *puruṣa*.' *dṛṣṭântaḥ—ghaṭa aindriyakaḥ sa cânityaḥ; upanayo—yathā ghaṭas tathā puruṣaḥ*. CarS₂ 358b,1 f.

definitions of debate (*vāda*) and disputation (*jalpa*)[35] in the *Nyāya-sūtra*s taken literally, according to their requirement of proving the respective thesis, must presuppose a comprehension of some kind of counter-proof as indicated in the *Caraka-saṃhitā*. But what could have been the reason not to treat the counter-proof as an independent topic of debate? Is the situation of debate so clear that there is no need to mention the counter-proof, since it consists of the same proof members anyway? Or do we have to presuppose already in the *Nyāya-sūtra*s the claim that only one of the proofs of the two disputants ensures the truth of his proposition? At least in first book of the *Nyāya-sūtra*s there seems to be no hint of a solution for these questions.

The fact that, at least in Caraka's presentation, truth is not guaranteed by one of the contradictory proofs, may have been the starting point of early speculations on solutions to these kinds of problems. One finds rudiments of such discussions in the chapter on unsound rejoinders (*jāti*) in the fifth book of the *Nyāya-sūtra*s,[36] in which at least some rejoinders remind one of the situation of proof and counter-proof in the *Caraka-saṃhitā*. In the examples of the two basic kinds of rejoinders[37] given by the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*,[38] namely the 'equally [possible rejoinder] by means of similarity' (*sādharmya-sama*) and 'equally [possible rejoinder] by means of dissimilarity' (*vaidharmya-sama*), the general question is raised as to whether the reason, the example, and the application prove the object to be proven or, whether—when another set of arguments are employed—it can also prove the exact contrary.[39] The opponent in this discussion argues that there is no decisive reason (*viśeṣa-hetu*) for the correctness of the first argumentation as opposed to his argumentation, which

---

[35] Cf. fn. 24 and 25.

[36] Cf. NSū 5.1.

[37] Cf. the general definition of *jāti* (NSū 1.2.18) in fn. 14; cf. also TUCCI's retranslation of the Chinese translation (cf. UHc) of the lost **Upāya-hṛdaya* in which these kinds of rejoinders are understood as valid refutations of syllogistic arguments (cf. KAJIYAMA (1991)): *eṣāṁ viṁśati-vidhānāṁ sāro dvividhaḥ. vaidharmyaṁ sādharmyañ ca. sajātīyatvāt sādharmyaṁ vijātīyatvād vaidharmyam. arthasya hi tat samāśrayatvāt te viṁśati-dharmān vyāpnuvataḥ* (UH 26,7–9).

[38] It is remarkable that exactly in the context of these rejoinders, Pakṣilasvāmin uses the term *sthāpanā* when he states in the introduction to the *Sūtra*s on *sādharmya-sama* and *vaidharmya-sama* (cf. NSū 5.1.2): 'An objection by means of similarity, which differs [basically] not from the reason of the [objected] proof (*sthāpanā*), is the [unsound rejoinder called] *sādharmya-sama*.'—*sādharmyeṇa pratyavasthānam aviśiṣyamāṇaṁ sthāpanā-hetutaḥ sādharmya-samaḥ*. NBh 2002,2 f.

[39] Cf. NBh 2005,6–2007,4.

would correctly prove the contrary of the former proposition.[40] Without going into the problem of unsound rejoinders here in detail, the question of the proponent of the *jāti* would indicate that his rejoinder is in no way unsound but hits the nail on the head. The notion of the correctness of proof and the justification of a thesis has shifted to the question as to whether the assumed propositions are capable of proving the object to be proven. In other words, the problem has shifted to the question of a logical relation between the proving attribute and the attribute to be proven and its applicability to the object of proof, i.e. the general justification of the three propositions *hetu*, *dṛṣṭânta* and *upanaya*.

---

[40] Another kind of *jāti* should be mentioned here because its contents concern a problem which reoccurs in Dignāga's system of logic, the *prakaraṇa-sama*. Corresponding to the example of the *Nyāya-bhāṣya*, it is the following situation in a debate: 'One [disputant] propounds [for example] as [his] thesis: "Sound is non-eternal because it [originates] directly preceded by an effort, like a pot." And the second [disputant] propounds the counterthesis on the basis of similarity to eternal [things]: "Sound is eternal because it is audible, like soundness".'—*anityaḥ śabdaḥ prayatnânantarīyakatvād ghaṭavad ity ekaḥ pakṣaṁ pravarttayati. dvitīyaś ca nitya-sādharmyāt pratipakṣaṁ pravarttayati—nityaḥ śabdaḥ śrāvaṇatvāt, śabdatvavad iti.* (NBh 2027,3–5). This example is nothing but that which is called the 'contradictory non-deviating' (*viruddhâvyabhicārin*) as a special variety of an inconclusive (*anaikāntika*) reason in Buddhist logical tradition. This fallacy is expounded by Śaṅkarasvāmin in the following way: 'A *viruddhâvyabhicārin* is for instance: Sound is non-eternal, because it is produced, like a pot; sound is eternal, because it is audible, like soundness. As the two [reasons] are occasions for doubt, although they are two, they are taken together as one inconclusive [reason] (*anaikāntika*).'—*viruddhâvyabhicārī, yathā anityaḥ śabdaḥ kṛtakatvād ghaṭavad. nityaḥ śabdaḥ śrāvaṇatvāt śabdatvavad iti. ubhayoḥ saṁśaya-hetutvād dvāv apy etāv eko 'naikāntikaḥ samuditāv eva.* (NPr 4.21–5.2). Neither of the reasons applied for proving contradictory results, taken individually, violate any of the required three conditions (*trairūpya*) of a valid reason for their respective propositions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts:

ĀDī	= *Āyur-veda-dīpikā*. See: CarS.
CarS	= *Caraka-saṁhitā. The Charakasaṁhitā of Agniveśa.* Revised by Charaka and Dṛidhabala. With the Āyurveda-Dīpikā Commentary of Chakrapāṇidatta. Ed. by V.J. Trikamji. Bombay ⁴1981.
CarS₁	= *Caraka-saṁhitā. Maharṣiṇā Agniveśena praṇītā Caraka-dṛdhabalābhyāṁ pratisaṁskṛtā Caraka-saṁhitā. Y. Śarmaṇā saṁśodhitā.* Bombay 1933.
CarS₂	= *Caraka-saṁhitā. Caraka-saṁhitā mahiṣiṇā bhagavad-agniveśena praṇītā mahā-muninā carakeṇa pratisaṁskṛtā, āyur-vedācārya-śrī-jayadeva-vidyâlaṅkāreṇa praṇitayā tattvârtha-dīpikâkhyayā hindī-vyākhyayā ṭippaṇyā ca samanvitā.* Vārāṇasī, Dilli, Patanā ⁸1970 [1ˢᵗ ed.: Lahore 1934–1936].
NBh	= *Nyāya-bhāṣya. Nyāyadarśanam. With Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotakara's Vārttika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyaṭīkā and Viśvanātha's Vṛtti* (Chapter I, Section I). Crit. Ed. with Notes by Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatirtha and (Chapters I.ii–V) by Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha. Vol. II, Crit. Ed. with Notes by Amarendramohan Tarkatirtha and Hemantakumar Tarkatirtha. *Calcutta Sanskrit Series* 18, 29, Calcutta 1936, 1944.
NBh₁	= *Nyāya-bhāṣya. Nyāyadarśana of Gautama.* With the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana, the Vārttika of Uddyotakara, the Tātparyaṭīkā of Vācaspati & the Pariśuddhi of Udayana [Volume 1, Chapter 1]. Ed. by Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga 1967.
NPr	= Śaṅkarasvāmin: *Nyāya-praveśa. Nyāyapraveśa of Diṅnāga.* With Commentaries of Haribhadrasuri & Parsavadeva. Ed. by A. B. Dhruva, *Gaekwad's Oriental Series* 38, Delhi ²1987 [Originally publ. 1930].
NSū	= *Nyāya-sūtra*. See: RUBEN 1928.
sū	= *Sūtra-sthāna*. In CarS.
UH	= **Upāya-hṛdaya*. See: TUCCI (1929).
UHc	= **Upāya-hṛdaya: fang-pien hsin-lun*, Taishō 1632, Vol. 32, 23b–28c.
vim	= *Vimāna-sthāna*. In CarS.

Secondary Sources:

BEDEKAR 1957 = Bedekar, V.M.: 'Studies in Sāṃkhya: Pañcaśikha and Caraka,' *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 38 (1957) 140–147.

COMBA 1987 = Comba, Antonella: '*Caraka-saṃhitā*, Śārīrasthāna I and Vaiśeṣika philosophy,' in: *Studies on Indian Medical History. Papers presented at the International Workshop on the Study of Indian Medicine held at the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine 2–4 September 1985.* Ed. by G. Jan Meulenbeld and Dominik Wujastyk. Groningen 1987: 43–61.

DASGUPTA 1922 = Dasgupta, Surendranath: *A History of Indian Philosophy.* Vol. II. Cambridge 1922 [Reprinted: Delhi 1991].

FILLIOZAT 1990 = Filliozat, Pierre-Sylvain: '*Yukti*, le quatrième *pramāṇa* des medecins (*Caraka-saṃhitā*, Sūtrasthāna XI. 25),' *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society* 1 (1990) 33–46.

FILLIOZAT 1993 = Filliozat, Pierre-Sylvain: 'Caraka's Proof of Rebirth,' *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society* 3 (1993) 94–111.

FRAUWALLNER 1956 = Frauwallner, Erich: *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie.* 2. Band, Salzburg 1956.

FRAUWALLNER 1984 = Frauwallner, Erich: *Nachgelassene Werke I. Aufsätze, Beiträge, Skizzen.* Hrsg. Ernst Steinkellner. Wien 1984.

KAJIYAMA 1991 = Kajiyama, Yūichi: 'On the Authorship of the Upāyahṛdaya,' in: *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition. Proceedings of the Second International Dharmakīrti Conference. Vienna, June 11–16, 1989.* Ed. by E. Steinkellner. Wien 1991: 107–117.

KANG 1998 = Kang, Sung Yong: *Zur altindischen Tradition der Debatte gemäß der medizinischen Überlieferung. Übersetzung und ideengeschichtliche Untersuchung von Caraka-saṃhitā Vi.8.15–28.* Wissenschaftliche Hausarbeit zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Magister Artium der Universität Hamburg. Hamburg 1998.

KATSURA 1986 = Katsura, Shōryū: 'Indo-ronrigaku ni okeru henjyū gainen no seisei to hatten—*Caraka-saṃhitā* kara Dharmakīrti made' ['The Origin and Development of *vyāpti* in Indian Logic—from the *Caraka-saṃhitā* to Dharmakīrti'], *Hiroshima Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō* 45/1 (1986) 1–122.

MATILAL 1987 = Matilal, Bimal Krishna: 'Debate and Dialectic in Ancient India,' in: *Philosophical Essays. Professor Anantalal Thakur Felicitation Volume.* Calcutta 1987.

MATILAL 1998 = Matilal, Bimal Krishna: *The Character of Logic in India.* Ed. by Jonardon Ganeri and Heeraman Tiwari. New York 1998.

MEINDERSMA 1989 = Meindersma, Tabe E.: '*paralokasiddhi* in the *Caraka-saṃhitā*,' *Indologica Taurinensia* 15/16 (1989/90) 265–273.

MEINDERSMA 1992   = Meindersma, Tabe E.: 'Caraka and the Materialists,' *Proceedings of the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference Vienna 1990. Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 36, Suppl. (1992) 299–306.

MEUTHRATH 1996   = Meuthrath, Annette: *Untersuchungen zur Kompositionsgeschichte der Nyāya-sūtras.* Würzburg 1996.

MIYASAKA 1963   = Miyasaka, Y.: 'The philosophical View of the Vaiśeṣika found in the *Caraka-saṁhitā*, an Indian medical Text' [in Japanese], *The Mikkyo Bunka* 64/65 (1963) 50–67.

OBERHAMMER 1963   = Oberhammer, Gerhard: 'Ein Beitrag zu den **Vāda-Traditionen** Indiens,' W*iener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 7 (1963), 63–103.

OBERHAMMER–   = Oberhammer, Gerhard; Prets, Ernst; Prandstetter, Joachim:
PRETS–PRANDSTETTER   *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien. Ein*
1991, 1996   *Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie.* Herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 248. *Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte* 17. Band 1: A-I (1991), Band 2: U-Pū (1996), Wien.

OETKE 1994   = Oetke, Claus: *Vier Studien zum Altindischen Syllogismus.* Reinbek 1994.

RANDLE 1930   = Randle, H.N.: *Indian Logic in the Early Schools.* Oxford 1930.

RAO 1962   = Rao, K.B. Ramakrishna: 'The *Sāṁkhya* Philosophy in the *Caraka-saṁhitā*,' *The Adyar Library Bulletin* 26/3–4 (1962) 193–205.

ROTH 1872   = Roth, Rudolf von: 'Indische Medicin,' *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschft* 26 (1872) 441–452.

RUBEN 1928   = Ruben, Walter: *Die Nyāyasūtra's.* Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterung und Glossar. Leipzig 1928.

SASTRI 1952   = Sastri, N. Aiyaswami: 'Comparative Study of the Sankhya Tenets Found in the Buddhacarita and the Carakasamhita,' *Bhāratīya Vidyā* 13 (1952) 102–114.

SHARMA 1984   = Sharma, Priya Vrat: 'La notion de *vedanā* dans la *Caraka-saṁhitā*,' *Indologica Taurinensia* 12 (1984) 415–418.

SOLOMON 1976   = Solomon, Esther A.: *Indian Dialectics. Methods of Philosophical Discussion.* 2 Vols. Ahmedabad 1976, 1978.

TUCCI 1929   = Tucci, Giuseppe: *Pre-Diṅnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources.* Baroda 1929.

VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA 1920 = Vidyābhūṣaṇa, Satis Chandra: *A History of Indian Logic (Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Schools).* Delhi ³1978 [Originally publ. Calcutta 1920].