

Ernst Prets, "Theories of Debate in the Context of Indian Medical History: Towards a Critical Edition of the *Carakasamhitā*," in Ramkaran Sharma (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Indian Wisdom: Prof. Satya Vrat Shastri felicitation volume*, Delhi 2005, pp. 394-403.

Theories of Debate in the Context of Indian Medical History:

Towards a Critical Edition of the *Carakasamhitā**

Ernst Prets, Vienna

In the intellectual history of India, important questions and controversial philosophical and religious doctrines were debated upon in public discussions from the earliest times.¹ In the course of history one hears again and again about such arguments, in which important teachers advocated their opinion and defeated their respective opponents in verbal debate. SOLOMON, FRAUWALLNER and MATILAL pointed especially to this,² but many others have also.

This much applied method of discussion was followed by the development of various attempts to describe how such arguments

* I am grateful to Ms. Peck-Kubaczek for translating the first draft of the manuscript and correcting the English of the final version. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my indebtedness to Prof. K. Preisendanz for reading this paper and improving it with her thoughtful comments.

1 Cf. e.g. the discussions in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* (BĀU) 3.1; cf. OBERLIES 1998 pp. 399ff.

were to be held and which rules they should follow, when a debater could be considered the winner or loser in the verbal fight, etc. Presumably, lists of rules emerged that may have been subsequently formulated in handbooks on debating. Two sources, specifically the section about debate (*saṃbhāṣā vidhi*) in one of the most important medical works of the classical period, the *Carakasamhitā* (Vim 8.15-67), and the first and fifth chapters of the *Nyāyasūtra*, which the Nyāya philosophy refers to as its fundamental text, can give us a graphic picture of the rules which were to be observed in actual arguments and an indication of how such handbooks or manuals may have looked. In this context one must also not neglect the relevant Buddhist sources, specifically the **Upāyahṛdaya* (UH, *fang-pien hsin-lun*) which has unfortunately only survived in Chinese³ and which has been retranslated into Sanskrit by TUCCI,⁴ as well as the section called *hetuvidyā* of the *Śrutamayībhūmi* (ŚruBhū),⁵ and the delineation of debate related matters in Asaṅga's *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (AS),⁶ two well-known passages on debate from the Yogācāra tradition. The importance of these handbooks or

2 Cf. e.g. SOLOMON 1976 pp. 10ff, FRAUWALLNER 1984 pp. 66ff, MATILAL 1987 pp. 53-66 and MATILAL 1998 pp. 31ff.

3 Cf. UH_C.

4 Cf. TUCCI 1929.

5 Cf. YAITA 1992; cf. also the earlier edition by PĀṆḌEYA 1986.

6 Cf. AS 104,8 – 106,18. Since the relevant passages in the *Abhidharma samuccaya* are reconstructions from the Tibetan and from the Chinese by the editor, cf. also ASBh 150,20 – 155,5. For the system of proof in the *Abhidharma samuccaya* cf. PRETS 1994.

delineations and the terms that they discuss,⁷ which contain, in addition to purely technical contents referring to debates as for example the “points of defeat” (*nigrahassthāna*), models of early proof procedures and definitions of means of cognition (*pramāṇa*), is the significant impulse they gave to the development of later epistemological doctrines and, in particular, theories of logic in Indian philosophy.

In addition to the definitions in the first and fifth chapters of the *Nyāyasūtra*, the section on debate (*saṃbhāṣāvidhi*) in the *Carakasamhitā*, apparently revised by physicians, is of special interest as it is presumably based on the terminology and ensuing exposition from older, lost sources. In an introductory passage, the “parley of specialists” (*tad vidya saṃ bhāṣā*)⁸ with its two sub-forms, the “friendly parley” (*saṃ dhā ya saṃbhāṣā* or *anulomasam-bhāṣā*) and the “hostile parley” (*vi-grhya saṃ bhāṣā*) is depicted in a very lively manner.⁹

After this description, the text continues with a list of 44

⁷ Cf. e.g. the unifying term *vādamārgapada* designated in CarS Vim 8.66.

⁸ CarS Vim 8.15f.

⁹ Cf. ROTH 1872, KANG 1998 and PRETS 2000.

basic terms of debate (*vādamārgapada*)¹⁰ and their definitions.¹¹ In this section, one can observe a stylistic change as well as a change in the terminology. In contrast to the detailed descriptions in the previous section, here we find brief definitions with short examples; together, with regard to their contents, they form a closed, homogeneous whole. Evidently this is a compilation of definitions from an earlier source that concerns debate.

The importance of the *Carakasamhitā*'s *saṃbhāṣāvidhi* and its relation to the section in the *Nyāyasūtra* referring to dialectical and logical terms was realized very early,¹² and its technical terminology was contrasted to other early texts.¹³ However, the analyses of the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi* were not carried through very critically nor in great detail, possibly also because the description was regarded as immature in contrast to the later tradition. None of the authors dealing with the basic terminology of debate analysed the text using appropriate philological criteria. This can already be seen by

¹⁰ CarS Vim 8.27: *imāni tu khalu padāni bhi śag vāda mārgajñānārtham adhi gamyāni bha vanti; tadyathā vādaḥ, dravyam, guṇāḥ, karma, sāmānyam, vi śeṣaḥ, samavāy-aḥ, prati jñā, sthāpanā, pratiṣṭhā panā, hetuḥ, dṛṣṭāntaḥ, upanayaḥ, ni ga manam, uttaram, siddhān taḥ, śabdaḥ, pratyakṣam, anumānam, aitihyam, aupamyam, saṃ śa yaḥ, pra yo ja nam, savyabhicāram, jijñāsā, vyavasāyaḥ, artha prāptiḥ, saṃ bha vaḥ, anuyojyam, ananuy-ojyam, anuyogaḥ, praty a nu yogaḥ, vā kya doṣaḥ, vākya pra śamsā, chalam, ahetuḥ, atīta kā lam, upālam bhaḥ, parihāraḥ, pratijñāhāniḥ, abhy anujñā, hetv anta ram, arthāntaram, ni gra ha sthānam iti.* For interpretations of the individual terms cf. TPhSI 1 and 2; cf. also SOLOMON 1976 pp. 78-87 and PRETS 2000.

¹¹ CarS Vim 8.28-65.

¹² Cf. e.g. VIDYĀBHUṢAṆA 1920 pp. 31-35 or DASGUPTA 1922 II, pp. 377ff.

¹³ Cf. TUCCI 1929 pp. xvi - xxii.

the fact that the study of this subject matter in the secondary literature is based on varying texts.¹⁴ Even the list of debate terms referred to by these authors diverges, as for example in the positioning of the “example” (*dr̥ṣṭānta*), on the one hand listed following the “answer” (*uttara*),¹⁵ and on the other, between the “reason” (*hetu*) and the “application” (*upanaya*).

It is remarkable that most of the *Carakasamhitā* editions of the 19th century contain the list of debate terms according to the former reading,¹⁶ whereas most of the editions of the 20th century display the latter reading.¹⁷ It should also be mentioned that all manuscripts so far considered by the author support the former reading.¹⁸ In contrast to the later editions and the editions of the

14 Compare e.g. VIDYĀBHUṢAṆA 1920 or DASGUPTA 1922 with SOLOMON 1976 or KANG 1998 p. 133.

15 In this way also FRAUWALLNER 1984 p. 70.

16 Cf. e.g. CarS₃ 300,15f: . . . *pratijñā sthāpanā pratiṣṭhāpanā hetuḥ upanayo nigama nam uttaram dr̥ṣṭāntaḥ siddhāntaḥ* . . . ; in this way also CarS₂.

17 Cf. e.g. CarS as quoted in fn. . Although the editor of CarS used the Lahore manuscripts (cf. CarS_m) for his edition (cf. introduction p. 17) which is confirmed by some variant readings found in CarS, he did not record the deviating order of the items of the list as found in CarS_m. It is remarkable that all other editors which present the position of the *dr̥ṣṭānta* between *hetu* and *upanaya* do not point out the existence of an alternative order elsewhere.

18 Cf. e.g. CarS_m f.164^f,4f: . . . *pratijñā sthāpanā pratiṣṭhāpanā hetuḥ upanayo nigamanam uttaram dr̥ṣṭāntaḥ siddhāntaḥ* . . . In this place, I would like to thank the Honorary Director, Dr. K.K. Dhavan, the librarian and the staff of the Lalchand Research Library (Lahore) which is presently housed in the DAV College in Chandigarh, for their most efficient support of my work with the original manuscripts.

19th century *Jaḷpakalpataru* of Gaṅgādhara Kavirāja that support the latter reading,¹⁹ earlier editions of the *Carakasamhitā* together with the *Āyurveda dīpikā* of Cakrapāṇidatta (about 1100 A.D.) also support the former reading.²⁰

To be taken even more seriously is the problem seen in connection with the manner of proof, in which the formulation of example (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) and application (*upanaya*) of the two, as yet, recognised traditions, would lead to different conclusions regarding the early manner of proof, a fact already pointed out by OETKE.²¹ In the manuscripts and all the editions which have the “example” (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) following the “answer” (*uttara*) in the list and the definition part, the example in the proof (*sthāpanā*) and the counterproof (*pratiṣṭhāpanā*) verbally exemplifies both properties: the property to be proved (*sādhya*) and the proving property (*sādhana*), and is accordingly also followed by a different reading of the application

They also most generously facilitated the purchase of scanned copies of the manuscripts. In addition, I was able to consult more than ten manuscripts of the *Carakasamhitā* with the same reading at the Research Library of the Wellcome Institute in London during a research stay in 1997. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Wellcome Trust for their financial support, the Library staff for its hospitality and, primarily, Dr. Dominik Wujastyk for his assistance and most valuable interlocutions about the *Carakasamhitā* and the Indian medical tradition in general.

19 Cf. CarS₁₀ (Vol. II?) Vim p. 145,2f (with JKT) and CarS₁₁ 1566,1f (with ĀDī₁ and JKT₁).

20 Cf. e.g. in CarS₄ (Vol.II?) Vim p. 104,11f (with ĀDī₂) and CarS₅ 262b10f (with ĀDī₃).

21 Cf. OETKE 1994 p. 38 and 81f.

(*upanaya*).²² In contrast to this reading, in most of the later editions the example mentions only the exemplifying object without adducing the two respective properties, whereas these properties are explicitly formulated in the application.²³

Strikingly, the irregularity of the texts of the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi* in its various editions as shown in these two examples also continues in the manuscripts that have been considered until now. In addition to this, there are more than a hundred other variant readings in the usual editions alone, to which must be added those variants that are revealed in the manuscripts and in the oldest surviving commentary, Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*.

A desideratum in the research of the early period of classical Indian philosophy is a critical edition of the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi*, which is so important for the development of Indian dialectic, the early teaching of the means of cognition and logic. The ideal editing

22 Cf. e.g. CarS₃ 301,6-15: *sthāpanā . . . yathā nityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā, hetur akṛtakatvād iti, dṛṣṭāntaḥ – akṛtakam ākāśam tac ca nityam, upanayo yathā cākṛtakam ākāśam tathā puruṣaḥ, nigamanam tasmān nitya iti. pratiṣṭhāpanā . . . yathānityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā, hetur aindriyakatvāt, dṛṣṭānto ghaṭa aindriyakaḥ sa cānityaḥ, upanayo yathā ghaṭaḥ tathā puruṣas tasmād anitya iti.* Cf. the same textual reading with minor variants in CarS_m f.164^V,4-7. In this way also CarS₂, CarS₄ (with ĀDī₂), CarS₅ (with ĀDī₃).

23 CarS Vim 8.31f (with ĀDī): *sthāpanā . . . yathā - nityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā; hetuḥ – akṛtakatvād iti; dṛṣṭāntaḥ – yathākāśam iti; upanayaḥ – yathā cākṛtakam ākāśam tac ca nityam tathā puruṣa iti; nigamanam – tasmān nitya iti. pratiṣṭhāpanā . . . yathā - anityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā, hetuḥ – aindriyakatvād iti, dṛṣṭāntaḥ – yathā ghaṭa iti, upanayo yathā ghaṭa aindriyakaḥ sa cānityaḥ, tathā cāyam iti, nigamanam – tasmād anitya iti.* Cf. the same textual reading with minor variants in CarS₁, CarS₆₋₉, CarS₁₀ (with JKT), CarS₁₁ (with ĀDī₁ and JKT₁).

process should incorporate the relevant passages of the *Āyurvedadīpikā* as well as the consideration of the later commentaries on this important passage in the *Carakasamhitā*, of which unfortunately only a few have survived, namely, Gaṅgādhara Kavirāja's *Jalpakaḷpa taru* (JKT) and Yogīndranāthasena's *Carakopaskāra* (CarU). Through the consideration of all previous editions, this critical edition would be a primary reference point for the evaluation of the *Carakasamhitā*'s editions and their publication history. Several editions of the *Carakasamhitā* are seemingly not based on new material, rather they present secondary or even tertiary compilations of texts already previously edited. For the philologist who is interested in the *Carakasamhitā*, the stemmatological examination of the editions, with special focus on the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi*, as well as of the manuscripts, and the clarification of their reciprocal relationship would provide completely new access to the text. A significant impulse would be given to a future examination of the complete *Carakasamhitā* or to larger, individual portions of its text along these lines.

This would be even more valid, if, in order to tie the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi* to the context in which it appears in the *Carakasamhitā*, the entire section (CarS Vim 8), which in any case encompasses approximately half of the *Vimānasthāna*, were to be critically edited. It is necessary to edit the entire section from a philological viewpoint in order to be able to regard the text as a self-contained unit, including the introduction, the internal transitions, and the closing remarks that summarize the section's contents. This comprehensive manner of proceeding is also based on the contents, as the section, over and above the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi*, conceals several aspects that are interesting for historians of the sociology of knowledge and histori-

ans of science, specifically its medical didactical contents (the portrayal of vocational training) and a general description of diagnosis, for which the classical medical literature can present little source material.²⁴

In particular, the eighth section of the *Vimānasthāna* is opened with a description of the study of Āyurveda,²⁵ which is then followed by the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi*. In this initial passage, the advantages of medical teachings are pointed out, and study methods (*adhyayanavidhi*) and teaching methods (*adhyāpana vidhi*), as well as daily life and the ethical and practical behaviour of students and teachers are explained. Directly following the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi*, the text introduces ten important interrelated topics²⁶ that a physician must first have studied, and then must consider case by case before he undertakes treatment. The description of the examination (*parīkṣā*)²⁷ and its methods as such, as well as the detailed discussion of these ten points “to be examined” (*parīkṣya*) provides a general insight into early Indian medical diagnosis. In addition to this, the description briefly deals with the duties and qualifications of a physician in general, and attests to the holistically oriented attitude as well as to the individually thorough anamnesis in traditional Indian medicine. Before the concluding verses, various substances that are suitable for use in the five methods of treatment (*pañcakarman*) are

24 One exception, namely the initiation of the student (*śiṣyopanayana*) can be found in the *Sūtrasthāna* if the *Suśrutasamhitā* (SuS).

25 CarS Vim 8.3-14.

26 Cf. CarS Vim 8.68: *jñātvā hi kāraṇakaraṇa kārya yoni kārya kārya phalānu bandha deśa kāla pra vṛtтыupāyān . . .*

27 Cf. TPhSI 2 pp. 161f.

classified and listed.

Only with the a critical edition will it be possible to carry through a philologically sound comparison of the contents of the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi* and the related dialectic passages of the *Nyāyasūtra*. RUBEN's excellent text-critical edition of this text,²⁸ published at the beginning of the 20th century, should be the basis for such an examination.

It has been shown recently, in a continuation of RUBEN's research, by a text-critical study of A. MEUTHRATH based on formal criteria that, contrary to the common assumption,²⁹ it is rather book 1.1 and 1.2 of the *Nyāyasūtra* with the addition of book 5.2 which can be reconstructed to form a unit,³⁰ whereas book 5.1, containing mainly definitions of dialectical rejoinders (*jāti*) to proofs and their refutation, is most probably a later insertion.³¹ This does not mean, however, that the subject matter discussed in book 5.1, as such, did not exist in the body of topics in the *Nyāyasūtra*'s sources for debate technique, and in related sources such as those of the *sambhāṣāvidhi*.³²

28 Cf. RUBEN 1928.

29 Cf. e.g. RUBEN 1928 p. 218 fn. 291; TUCCI 1929 pp. xxviii; FRAUWALLNER 1956 p. 321 fn. 78; OBERHAMMER 1963 p. 70.

30 Irrespective of other, later insertions also found in these chapters; cf. MEUTHRATH 1996 pp. 232ff.

31 Cf. MEUTHRATH 1996 pp. 243ff and PRETS 2001.

32 Cf. the definition of *jāti* in NSū 1.2.18 and the related definition of *uttara* in CarS Vim 8.36, most probably both representing the most basic type of such kinds of rejoinders.

In addition to the formal criteria applied by MEUTHRATH, there are also plausible reasons based on the contents of book 5.1 for the supposition that it was added later. The **Upāyahṛdaya*'s structure, being comparable to that of the supposed sources of the *Nyāyasūtra* and the *sambhāṣāvidhi*, seems to confirm this. An entire chapter of the **Upāyahṛdaya* is devoted to the type of retorts³³ that are called *jāti* in the *Nyāyasūtra*. In TUCCI's retranslation into Sanskrit³⁴ these are designated as *dūṣaṇa*, the "exposing of mistakes"; they are understood as an argumentation means that is valid in the rebut of an opposing proof.³⁵ It seems as if these various ways of pointing out mistakes are basically opposing the manner of proof characteristic in the period of the early passages of the *Nyāyasūtra*, to which the *Nyāyasūtras*' authors then reacted with the discussion and refutation of such retorts. Seen historically, therefore, the **Upāyahṛdaya* must be dated between an older debate handbook as represented in books 1.1 and 1.2 as well in book 5.2 of the *Nyāyasūtra*, and the passage discussing the *jāti*s in book 5.1.³⁶

For this reason, only those parts of the *Nyāyasūtra* that represent the oldest components should be used as a comparison to the *sambhāṣāvidhi*. Such a new comparison is desirable because the comparisons of the debate related topics in the preserved materials,³⁷ presented as yet, remain to a large extent superficial. The

33 UH pp. 26-32.

34 Except for the retranslation of TUCCI, there is only one other translation of the *Upāyahṛdaya* by UI (from Chinese into Japanese); cf. UI 1925.

35 Cf. KAJIYAMA 1991 pp. 110ff.

36 Cf. PRETS 2001.

translation and exact analysis of CarS Vim 8 are required as the foundation for a historical juxtaposition of the two texts that goes further than previous attempts.

Of particular interest is the assimilation of Cakrapāṇidatta, who, evidently through his detailed knowledge of the *Nyāyasūtras*, tries as far as is possible to homogenize the 44 basic terms defined in the *sambhāṣāvidhi* with the tenets of the Nyāya. In order to precisely analyse and evaluate Cakrapāṇidatta's interpretation, a critical working edition is indispensable of at least that portion of the *Āyurvedadīpikā* that expounds on the *sambhāṣāvidhi* as handed down in the *Carakasamhitā*.

The New Catalogus Catalogorum also lists anonymous commentaries on the *Vimānasthāna*³⁷ whose dates, origins and their relation to the basic texts remain to be clarified. Only an examination of the actual manuscripts will show whether these sources are identical with the three edited commentaries, or if they are one of the numerous and, in some cases, early commentaries, the existence of which Meulenbeld has already indicated.³⁸ These commentaries, which are as yet not identified, could bring valuable information

37 Cf. e.g. the comparative lists in TUCCI 1929 pp. xviff.

38 Cf. NCC VI p. 397a.

39 MEULENBELD 1999 1A pp. 180-200 mentions more than 50 commentaries. Most of these commentaries are only referred to in other medical treatises and are most likely lost. However, a few of these manuscripts still exist, although as fragments, such as several parts of the *Carakasamhitāvyākhyā* of Haricandra (cf. MEULENBELD 1999 1B p. 289, fn. 230) and portions of a commentary thereto by Svāmikumāra (cf. MEULENBELD 1999 1B p. 305, fn. 558f) or Jejjāṭa's commentary *Nirantarapadavyākhyā* (cf. MEULENBELD 1999 1B p. 295, fn. 341ff).

about the *sambhāṣāvidhi*'s text.

In view of the facts described above, the author, together with Prof. Dr. Karin Preisendanz, Institute of South Asian, Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, University of Vienna, has embarked upon the critical edition and annotated translation of the eighth chapter of the *Vimānasthāna* of the *Carakasamhitā*. The project, funded by the Austrian Science Fund, Vienna, will proceed along the lines sketched above. As a result, reliable access to the original source material, especially of the *sambhāṣāvidhi* in the *Carakasamhitā*, will be offered for the first time to the scholar of South Asia, whereas the indologically untrained historian of science and philosophy will be able to gain first-hand insight into this valuable testimony of the history of Indian medicine and dialectics.

To summarize, the following partial results are envisaged:

1. A critical edition of *Carakasamhitā*, *Vimānasthāna* 8, including the stemmatic and palaeographic examination of the manuscripts.
2. A working edition of the *Āyurvedadīpikā* and possibly also of the above mentioned, as yet unidentified commentaries on the *sambhāṣā vidhi*.
3. An annotated translation of *Vimānasthāna* 8 on the basis of the critical edition and under consideration of the commentaries.
4. A compositional analysis of *Vimānasthāna* 8 from the point of view of its structure and style.
5. A historical study of the *sambhāṣāvidhi* in the *Carakasamhitā* accompanied by a comparative analysis of *Nyāyasūtra*

1 and 5.2 together with the *Nyāyabhāṣya* (NBh).

6. The reconstruction and evaluation of the history of *Caraka saṃ hitā* publication aimed at contributing to the research on the history of the transmission and intellectual reception of the *Caraka saṃ hitā* in the late colonial period.

References

1. Primary literature

AS	Abhidharmasamuccaya: <i>Abhidharma Samuccaya of Asanga</i> . Crit. ed. and studied by Pralhad Pradhan. (Visva-Bharati Studies 12). Santiniketan 1950.
ASBh	Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya: <i>Abhidharma samuccaya-Bhāṣyam</i> . deciphered and edited by Nathmal Tatia. (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 17). Patna 1976.
ĀDī	Āyurvedadīpikā: s. CarS
ĀDī ₁	Āyurvedadīpikā: s. CarS ₁₁
ĀDī ₂	Āyurvedadīpikā: s. CarS ₄
ĀDī ₃	Āyurvedadīpikā: s. CarS ₅
UH	*Upāyahr̥daya: s. TUCCI 1929
UH _c	*Upāyahr̥daya: <i>fang-pien hsin-lun</i> , Taishō 1632, Vol.32, 23b-28c.
CarU	Carakopaskāra: The Caraka-samhita, edited with an original

commentary in Sanskrit by Vaidyaratna Kaviraj Pandit Yogindra Nath Sen. Vol. I, containing the Sloka-sthana (Sutra-sthana), Calcutta 1920. Vol. II, containing the Nidana, Vimana, Sarira and Indriya Sthanas. Calcutta 1922.

CarS Carakasamhitā: The Charakasamhitā of Agniveśa. Revised by Charaka and Dṛḍhabala. With the Āyurveda-Dīpikā Commentary of Chakra pāṇidatta. Ed. by V.J. Trikamji. Bombay ⁴1981.

CarS₁ Carakasamhitā: Maharṣinā Agniveśena praṇītā Carakadr̥ḍhabalā bhyāṃ pratisamskṛtā Carakasamhitā. Y. Śarmaṇa saṃśodhitā. Bombay 1933.

CarS₂ Carakasamhitā: Carakasamhitā mahiṣiṇā bhagavad-agniveśena praṇītā mahāmuniṇā carakeṇa pratisamskṛtā, āyurvedācāryaśrī-jaya deva vidyā laṅkā reṇa praṇītayā tattvārthadīpikākhyayā hindīvyākhyayā ṭippanyā ca samanvitā. Vārāṇasī, Dillī, Patanā ⁸1970 [1st ed.: Lahore 1934-1936].

CarS₃ Carakasamhitā: Carakasamhitā . . . Śrī Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara Bhaṭṭā cārye ṇa . . . samskṛtā prakāśitā ca. Calcutta 1877.

CarS₄ Carakasamhitā: Carakasamhitā. maharṣināgniveśena praṇītā maharṣi carakeṇa pratisamskṛtā . . . śrīmacakrapāṇidattakṛtāṭikāsamvalitā kavirājaśrīharināthaviśārādēna saṃśodhitā. Calcutta 1892 – 1919.

CarS₅ Carakasamhitā: The Carakasamhita by Agnivesha. With the Āyurveda-Dīpikā Commentary of Chakrapāṇi Dutta. Ed. by Vaidya Bhūshan Vāman Kesheo Dātār. Bombay 1922.

CarS₆ Carakasamhitā: The Caraka Samhitā of Agniveśa. Revised by Charaka and Dṛḍhabala. With Elaborated Vidyotinī Hindī Commentary by K.S. Śāstrī & G.N. Chaturvedī. Ed. by R. Śāstrī. Varanasi 1969

CarS₇ Carakasamhitā: The Caraka-Samhitā (As precepted by the great

- sage Ātreya Punarvasu) of Agniveśa. Elaborated by Caraka & Dṛḍhabala. Ed. by B. Tripathi. Varanasi 1983-88
- CarS₈ Carakasamhitā: Agniveśa's Caraka Samhitā (Text with English Translation & Critical Exposition Based on Cakrapāṇi Datta's Āyurveda Dīpikā). Ed. by R.K. Sharma. Varanasi 1976-1988
- CarS₉ Carakasamhitā: Caraka-Samhitā. Agniveśa's treatise refined and annotated by Caraka and redacted by Dṛḍhabala. (Text with English translation). Ed. & transl. by P. Sharma. Varanasi 1981.
- CarS₁₀ Carakasamhitā: The Caraka Samhita with Gangadhara's Commentary. Second Edition. Under the supervision of his renowned pupils Mahamahopadhyaya Kaviraj Dwaraka Nath Sen Kaviratna and Kaviraj Narayana Sen Kaviratna. Revised and corrected by Kaviraj Yogindranath Sen Vidyabhusan. Published by Kaviraj Tryambakeshwar Raya. Calcutta ²1908 (1st Ed. Calcutta ?1868, 1878).
- CarS₁₁ Carakasamhitā: Caraka-Samhitā by The Great Sage Bhagavata Agniveśa. Thoroughly revised by Maharṣi Caraka with Āyurveda dīpikā Commentaries of Śrīmat Cakra pāṇidatta and Jalpa kalpa taru Explanatory Notes and Annotations of Mahamahopādhyāya Śrī Gaṅgādhara Kaviratna Kavirāja. Ed. by Kaviraja Shree Narendranath Sengupta & Kaviraja Shree Balaichandra Sengupta. (Vidyavilasa Ayurveda Series No.1) Varanasi, Delhi 1991.
- CarS_m Manuscript of the Carakasamhitā: D.A.V. College, Lālacanda Śodha Pustakālaya (Lahaur) No. 2315: Carakasamhitā (kāśmīrīpāṭha).
- JKT Jalpakalpataru: s. CarS₁₀
- JKT₁ Jalpakalpataru: s. CarS₁₁
- NBh Nyāyabhāṣya: Gautamiyanyāyadarśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana. Ed. by Anantalal Thakur. Nyāyacaturgranthikā

	Vol.I. New Delhi 1997.
NSū	Nyāyasūtra: s. RUBEN 1928
BĀU	Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad: Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads. Vol. 1 (Upaniṣadic Texts with Parallels from Extent Vedic Literature, Exegetical and Grammatical Notes). Ed. by V.P. Limaye, R.D. Vadekar. Poona 1958.
Vim	Vimānasthāna: in CarS
ŚruBhū	Śrutamayībhūmi: s. YAITA 1992.
SuS	Suśrutasamhitā: Suśrutasamhitā of Suśruta. With the Nibandha saṅgraha Commentary of Śrī Ḍalhaṇāchārya and the Nyāya candri kā Pañjikā of Śrī Gayadāsāchārya on Nidānasthāna. Ed. From the Beginning to the 9th Adhyāya of Cikitsāsthāna by V.J. Trikamji and the Rest by N. Rām. Introd. by P.V. Sharma. (Jaikrishnadas Ayurveda Series 34). Varanasi, Delhi ⁴ 1980.

2. Secondary literature

DASGUPTA 1922	Surendranath Dasgupta: <i>A History of Indian Philosophy</i> . Vol. II. Cambridge 1922 (reprint Delhi 1991)
FRAUWALLNER 1956	Erich Frauwallner: <i>Geschichte der indischen Philosophie</i> . Bd. II. Salzburg 1956.
FRAUWALLNER 1984	Erich Frauwallner: <i>Nachgelassene Werke I. Aufsätze, Beiträge, Skizzen</i> . Hrsg. Ernst Steinkellner. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissen schaf ten, phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungs berichte 438 = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 19). Wien 1984.

- KAJIYAMA 1991 Yūichi Kajiyama: "On the Authorship of the Upāyahraya," in: *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemological Tradition. Proceedings of the Second International Dharma-kīrti Conference. Vienna, June 11-16, 1989*. Ed. by E. Steinkellner. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Denkschriften 222 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 8). Wien 1991, 107-117.
- KANG 1998 Sung Yong Kang: *Zur altindischen Tradition der Debatte gemäß der medizinischen Überlieferung. Übersetzung und ideengeschichtliche Untersuchung von Carakasamhitā VI.8.15-28*. Wissenschaftliche Hausarbeit zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Magister Artium der Universität Hamburg. Hamburg 1998.
- MATILAL 1987 Bimal Krishna Matilal: "Debate and Dialectic in Ancient India," in: *Philosophical Essays. Professor Anantalal Thakur Felicitation Volume*. Calcutta 1987.
- MATILAL 1998 BIMAL KRISHNA MATILAL: *The Character of Logic in India*. Ed. by Jonardon Ganeri and Heeraman Tiwari. New York 1998.
- MEULENBELD 1999 G. Jan Meulenbeld: *A History of Indian Medical Literature. Vol. IA Text. Vol IB Annotation*. (Groningen Oriental Studies Vol. XV/IA, IB) Groningen 1999.
- MEUTHRATH 1996 Annette Meuthrath: *Untersuchungen zur Kompositionsgeschichte der Nyāyasūtras*. (Religionswissenschaftliche Studien 36. Hrsg. A. Th. Khoury u. L. Hagemann). Würzburg 1996.
- NCC *New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors. Vol. SIX*. [Ed. by] K. Kunjunni Raja. Madras 1971.
- OBERHAMMER 1963 Gerhard Oberhammer: "Ein Beitrag zu den Vāda-Traditionen Indiens," in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 7 (1963), 63-103.

- OBERLIES 1998 Thomas Oberlies, *Die Religion des ṛgveda. Erster Teil. Das Religiöse System des ṛgveda.* (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library Vol. XXVI) Wien 1998.
- OETKE 1994 C. Oetke, *Vier Studien zum Altindischen Syllogismus.* (Philo sophia Indica, Einsichten - Ansichten, Bd 2). Reinbek 1994.
- PĀṆDEYA 1986 Jagdīśvara Pāṇḍeya, "Bauddgācārya Asaṅgākṛta Yogācāra bhūmiśāstra meṃ Hetuvidyā," in: *Homage to Bhikku Jagadish Ashyap (Commemoration Volume)*. Ed. P.N. Ojha. Nalanda 1986, pp. 315-349.
- PRETS 1994 Ernst Prets, "The Structure of *sādhana* in the Abhi dharma samuccaya," in: *Wiener Zeit schrift für die Kunde Südasians* 38, 1994, 337-350.
- PRETS 2000 Ernst Prets, "Theories of Debate, Proof and Counter-Proof in the Early Indian Dialectical Tradition," in: *Studia Indologiczne* 7, 2000. 'On Understanding Other Cultures' – *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sanskrit and Related Studies to Commemorate the Centenary of the Birth of Stanislaw Schayer (1899-1941)*. Warsaw University, Poland, October 7-10, 1999. Ed. by Piotr Balcerowicz & Marek Mejer. Warszawa 2000, 369-382.
- PRETS 2001 Ernst Prets, "Futile and False Rejoinders, Sophistical Arguments and Early Indian Logic," in: *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, forthcoming.
- ROTH 1872 Rudolf von Roth: "Indische Medicin," in: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 26 (1872), 441-452.
- RUBEN 1928 Walter Ruben: *Die Nyāyasūtrats. Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterung und Glossar* von W. Ruben. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgen landes 18/2). Leipzig 1928.
- SOLOMON 1976 Esther A. Solomon: *Indian Dialectics. Methods of Philoso*

- phical Discussion*. 2 Vols. (B.J. Institute of Learning and Research, Research Series 70, 74). Ahmedabad 1976, 1978.
- TUCCI 1929 Guiseppe Tucci: *Pre-Diñnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources*. [G.O.S. No. 49] Baroda 1929.
- UI 1925 Hakuju Ui: “*Hōbenshinron no chūshakuteki kenkyū*,” [Analytical Study of the *Upāyahṛdaya*] in: *Indo Tetsugaku Kenkyū* 2, 1925, 473-585 (repr. 1965).
- TPhSI 1, 2 *Terminologie der frühen philosophischen Scholastik in Indien. Ein Begriffswörterbuch zur altindischen Dialektik, Erkenntnislehre und Methodologie*. Gerhard Oberhammer, Ernst Prets und Joachim Prandstetter. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer. Band 1: A-I, Band 2: U-Pū. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., Denkschriften 223., 248. Band = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 9, 17). Wien 1991, 1996.
- VIDYĀBHUṢAṆA 1920 S. CH. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *A History of Indian Logic (Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Schools)*. Delhi ³1978.
- YAITA 1992 H. Yaita, *Yugaron no inmyō: Bonbun tekisuto to wayaku*. [hetuvidyā in the Yogācāra bhūmi. Sanskrit text und Japanese translation]. [Ed. and transl.] H.Yaita. (Naritasan bukkyō kenkyūjo kiyō 15, Bukkyō bunkashironshū 2). Naritasan Shinshōji 1992, 505-576.