Logic in Earliest Classical India

Edited by
BRENDAN S. GILLON

PAPERS OF THE 12TH WORLD SANSKRIT CONFERENCE HELD
IN HELSINKI, FINLAND, 13-18 JULY 2003
VOL. 10.2

General Editors:
PETTERI KOSKIKALLIO & ASKO PARPOLA

First Edition : Delhi, **2010**

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

On the Proof Passage of the *Carakasaṃhitā*: Editions, Manuscripts and Commentaries

ERNST PRETS

Without any doubt the *Carakasaṃhitā* – being primarily a treatise on internal medicine (*kāyacikitsā*), but also dealing with all topics of early Indian medicine – also represents one of the richest early sources for the history of Indian philosophy in general, epistemology, dialectics, logic, early Indian education, cultural and social history, as well as cultural anthropology. As already pointed out many times, in the eighth chapter of the third book of the *Carakasaṃhitā*, the Vimānasthāna, we come across a section discussing the method of debate (*saṃbhāṣāvidhi*). It depicts, in a very lively manner, the "parley of specialists" (*tadvidyasaṃbhāṣā*)[1] with its two sub-forms, the "friendly parley" (*sandhāyasaṃbhāṣā* or *anulomasaṃbhāṣā*) and the "hostile parley" (*vigrhyasaṃbhāṣā*).[2] It has already been emphasized that after this vivid description of debate practice, the following text changes stylistically and terminologically, continuing with a list of forty-four basic topics of debate (*vādamārgapada*)[3] followed by brief definitions and short examples, pointing to an adapted compilation of definitions from an earlier source that concerned debate.[4]

---

[1] CS Vimānasthāna 8.15f.

[2] Cf. Roth 1872; Kang 1998; Prets 2000: 369ff.; and TPhSI 2 s.v.

[3] CS Vimānasthāna 8.27. For interpretations of the individual topics cf. Solomon 1976: 78-87; TPhSI 1 and 2 s.v.; and Prets 2000: 371ff.

[4] CS Vimānasthāna 8.28-65.

The importance of this passage and its relation to the section in the *Nyāyasūtra* that refers to dialectical and logical terms was realized quite early[5] and its technical terminology was contrasted with other early texts.[6] However, the authors who were engaged in the analyses of the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi* did not work through the text very critically nor in great detail. For various reasons none of them analyzed the text using appropriate philological criteria with the exception of Hakuju Ui, who tried – obviously after having recognized that deviating readings of the passage existed – to prepare a sort of critical edition for his own purposes.[7] The ambiguity of the transmitted text can already be seen by the fact that the study of this subject matter in the secondary literature is based on varying textual evidence.[8] Even the list of the topics of debate referred to by these authors diverges, as for example in the positioning of "example" (*dṛṣṭānta*), listed by some following "answer" (*uttara*),[9] and by others between "reason" (*hetu*) and "application" (*upanaya*)[10] as

---

[5] Cf. e.g. Vidyabhusana 1920: 31-35; Dasgupta 1922: 377ff.

[6] Cf. Tucci 1929: xvi-xxii.

[7] Ui 1925 used copies of six editions of the *Carakasaṃhitā* for the compilation of a "critical" text. Ui mentions only editor, place of edition and year of edition. Four of these editions could be identified: CS 1877, CS 1878/79 (= 2nd edition of CS 1868) CS 1896 (= 2nd edition of CS 1877; in comparison to the first edition which is based on a manuscript of the Kashmiri recension, the second edition is based on manuscripts of the eastern recension; cf. the discussion of recension below), and CS 1897-98. The other two editions could not be identified with certainty. One of these two editions, that by Harinath Sankar, Calcutta without date, may be the edition by Yashodanandan Sarkar, Calcutta 1894 or the edition by Harinatha Visharada that includes the *Āyurvedadīpikā*, Calcutta 1892-1919. The other edition, Calcutta 1882, of which Ui does not mention the editor, may be the edition including translation by Avinashacandra Kaviratna Kaviraj, Calcutta 1884/85. But these suggestions regarding the two unidentified editions are only speculative.

[8] Cf. e.g. Vidyabhusana 1920, Dasgupta 1922 or Frauwallner 1984: 70 with Solomon 1976, TPhSI 1 and 2 s.v., Kang 1998: 133, or Prets 2000: 371, fn. 9.

[9] CS 1877, p. 300,13-16: *imāni khalu padāni vādamārgajñānārtham adhigamyāni* | ... *hetuḥ upanayo nigamanam uttaraṃ dṛṣṭāntaḥ siddhāntaḥ* ...

[10] CS Vimānasthāna 8.27: *imāni tu khalu padāni bhiṣagvādamārgajñānārtham adhigamyāni ... hetuḥ, dṛṣṭāntaḥ, upanayaḥ, nigamanam, uttaraṃ, siddhāntaḥ* ...

the sequence is found in the members of proof (*avayava*) in the *Nyāyasūtra*.[11]

It is remarkable that in the list of debate topics many of the *Carakasaṃhitā* editions of the 19th century, "example" (*dṛṣṭānta*) is listed following "answer" (*uttara*) and before "accomplished doctrine" (*siddhānta*),[12] whereas most of the editions of the 20th century display the other reading, i.e., "example" between "reason" and "application" in the sequence of proof terms.[13] It should also be mentioned that all manuscripts considered in our study so far support the former reading.[14] In contrast to other, later editions and the 19th-century edition of the *Jalpakalpataru* of Gaṅgādhara Kavirāja that support the latter reading,[15] earlier editions of the *Carakasaṃhitā* together with the *Āyurvedadīpikā* of Cakrapāṇidatta (about AD 1100) also support the former reading.[16]

A problem to be taken even more seriously is seen in connection with the manner of proof, in which of the two, as yet, recognised readings of the editions, the formulation of example (*dṛṣṭānta*) and application (*upanaya*) would lead to different conclusions regarding the early manner of proof, a fact already pointed out by Oetke.[17] In the manuscripts and all the editions which have – according to the manuscripts – "example" (*dṛṣṭānta*) following

---

[11] Cf. NSū 1.1.32: *pratijñāhetūdāharaṇopanayanigamanāny avayavāḥ*.

[12] Cf. e.g. CS 1877 above, CS 1884/85, CS 1897-98.

[13] Cf. e.g. CS above; although according to his introduction (cf. p. 17) the editor of the CS used the Lahore manuscripts (cf. Ch, below footnote 31) for his edition, which is confirmed by some variant readings found in the footnotes of the CS, he did not record the deviating order of the items of the list as found in this manuscript. It is remarkable that all other editors who present the position of *dṛṣṭānta* between *hetu* and *upanaya* do not point out the existence of an alternative order elsewhere.

[14] Cf. e.g. Ch (DAV College, Chandigarh, Lalchand Research Library, Ms. no. 2315) fol. 164r,4f.: ... *pratijñā sthāpanā pratiṣṭhāpanā hetuḥ upanayo nigamanam uttaraṃ dṛṣṭāṃtaḥ siddhāntaḥ* ...

[15] Cf. CS 1878/79 (with JKT) and CS 1927-33 (with ĀD and JKT).

[16] Cf. e.g. CS 1892-1919 (with ĀD) and CS 1922 (with ĀD).

[17] Cf. Oetke 1994: 38 and 81f.

"answer" (*uttara*) in the list and definition section, 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 (*upanaya*).[18] In contrast to this reading, in Gaṅgādhara's edition[19] and 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.[20]

Although there are more than forty editions of the *Caraka-saṃhitā* dating from the middle of the 19th century up to the last few years,[21] and new editions are even now in progress, a critical edition of the text has yet to be made. Contrary to all expectations, several editions of the *Carakasaṃhitā* are seemingly not based on new material at all. They present rather – and this situation can already be seen from the beginning of the 20th century – secondary or even tertiary compilations of texts previously edited. Only very few of these editions offer variations of the manuscripts and thus could theoretically be called critical. The few critical remarks are rather incidental, as is also the case in the perhaps most-quoted

---

[18] Cf. e.g. CS 1877, p. 301,6-15: *sthāpanā ... yathā nityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā, hetur akṛtakatvād iti, dṛṣṭāntaḥ – akṛtakam ākāśaṃ tac ca nityam, upanayo yathā cākṛtakam ākāśan tathā puruṣaḥ, nigamanan tasmān nitya iti. pratiṣṭhāpanā ... yathānityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā, hetur aindriyakatvāt, dṛṣṭānto ghaṭaḥ aindriyakaḥ sa cānityaḥ, upanayo yathā ghaṭaḥ tathā puruṣas tasmād anitya iti.* Cf. the same textual reading with minor variants in Ch fol. 164ᵛ,4-7. In this way also CS 1892-1919 (with ĀD), CS 1922 (with ĀD), CS 1970.

[19] Cf. CS 1878/79.

[20] CS Vimānasthāna 8.31f. (with ĀDī): *sthāpanā ... yathā – nityaḥ puruṣa iti pratijñā; hetuḥ – akṛtakatvād iti; dṛṣṭāntaḥ – yathākāśam iti; upanayaḥ – yathā cākṛtakam ākāśam tac ca nityaṃ 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, nigamanaṃ – tasmād anitya iti.* Cf. the same textual reading with minor variants in CS 1878/79 (with JKT), CS 1920-22 (with CU), CS 1927-33 (with ĀD and JKT) and CS 1983-88.

[21] Cf. Meulenbeld 1999, 1B: 3-6.

edition of the *Carakasaṃhitā*, namely Trikamji's edition of 1941, upon which translations of the *Carakasaṃhitā* are based today.[22]

The irregularity of the texts of the *saṃbhāṣāvidhi* in its various editions as shown in the above examples also continues in the thirty-six manuscripts containing the Vimānasthāna that have been considered in our study thus far. 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 seen in the manuscripts and in the oldest surviving commentary, Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyur-vedadīpikā*.

Consequently, the decision was made to undertake the project of a critical edition and annotated translation of the eighth chapter of the Vimānasthāna of the *Carakasaṃhitā* with the collaboration of Karin Preisendanz and funded by the Austrian Science Fund.[23] It has been decided to take all available manuscripts and editions, as well as the preserved commentaries into account.

Before going into the details of the subject matter of proof and counterproof, some remarks on the collection of manuscripts and the manuscript situation with regard to the *Carakasaṃhitā* in general should be added: At the moment the project is aware of about two hundred existing manuscripts of the *Carakasaṃhitā* and its commentaries, in part consisting only of chapters of the text or even smaller sections. The collection of manuscripts which has been drawn together in Vienna amounts to about ninety manuscripts, partly on microfilm, partly photocopied and partly in digital form, of which thirty-seven contain the relevant section of the Vimānasthāna. Unfortunately, only one manuscript of Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā* containing the complete text of Vimānasthāna 8 (CĀ) is available and regrettably this copy of the manuscript is largely illegible in relevant portions.[24]

One has also to take into account that most of the manuscripts are rather late copies dating from the 17th to the 19th century. From the 12th century we have a copy of one manuscript written in early Devanagari script,[25] but which unfortunately does not contain the Vimānasthāna, but only Cikitsasthāna 3 up to the end of the *Carakasaṃhitā*. Some relevant manuscripts have been located in Indian manuscript libraries, as for example the manuscripts in the Maharaja Sawai Man Singh II Museum, City Palace, Jaipur[26] that are mentioned by Yogindra Nath Sen in his edition,[27] but due to various reasons they could not yet be procured for the project.

Generally speaking, the thirty-six manuscripts containing the Vimānasthāna, which are written in Sharada and different kinds of Bengali and Devanagari scripts, are of heterogeneous quality with regard to the scribal habits, the occurrence of scribal errors, the legibility, etc.

As to the preliminary stemmatological results, one has to go somewhat into details. The first results of the critical work have clarified somewhat the differentiation of recensions. As early as the beginning of the last century Cordier[28] had noticed "that the text of the *Carakasaṃhitā* must have been subject of considerable variations, as is obvious from quotations found in commentaries."[29] Ann Glazier, who for a time worked on a critical edition of Caraka's Śārīrasthāna, but unfortunately discontinued her endeavour, com-

---

[25] Ms. no. 1-1648, Reel no. A 46/6 of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (184 folios [cikitsāsthāna 3 – jvaracikitsita, to the end], old Devanagari [according to catalogues: Newari], palm leaf, date: *saṃvat* 303, i.e. AD 1183).

[26] Mss. nos. 2068, 2069, 2107.

[27] Yogindra Nath Sen mentions two Mss. from Jaipur in the introduction of his edition (CS 1920-22): "Jaipur manuscript, copied in 1643 of the Saṃvat era, i.e AD 1700 [most probably either AD 1586/1586 or 1721/22]; character Devanagri; fairly correct" and "Jaipur manuscript, very old, without date; character Devanagri; correct but incomplete, from the beginning up to the end of Gulma Nidana only".

[28] Cordier 1902: 528-530 (= Roşu 1989: 546-548).

[29] Meulenbeld 1999, 1A: 96.

pared passages of the Cikitsāsthāna of the mentioned manuscript from the 12th century to a Sharada manuscript from Pune (P1)[30] and the manuscript from Lahore (Ch).[31] Based on Cordier's observations, she found convincing evidence for the existence of a Kashmiri recension. This conclusion is supported by the commentary of Cakrapāṇidatta, who mentions the deviating readings of the Kashmiri version on several occasions. In any case, the crucial criterion for the distinction of these two recensions is the different order of the chapters (*adhyāya*) in the Cikitsāsthāna from the ninth to the twenty-fifth chapter.[32] On closer examination it turns out that not only do the Sharada manuscript and the Lahore manuscript display this deviating composition, but so do five other manuscripts from manuscript libraries in Jammu (J1, J2, J3),[33] Udaipur (U),[34] Alwar (A)[35] also do, as well as a Devanagari manuscript (C7)[36] from the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. At the beginning of Vimānasthāna 8 one finds similar variant readings in both the Sharada manuscript and the other five manuscripts which are not found in any of the other manuscripts – although they are not directly interdependent with the exception of one Jammu manuscript (J2) that is a direct copy of the Sharada manuscript. Surprisingly, one Bengali manuscript, containing only fragments of the Vimānasthāna (C6),[37] also supports these variations.

---

[30] Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune, Ms. no. 555 of 1875-76.

[31] DAV College, Chandigarh (Lalchand Research Library), Ms. no. 2315.

[32] The ninth *adhyāya* of the Kashmiri recension is the fourteenth of the eastern recension, the tenth *adhyāya* of the Kashmiri recension is the nineteenth of the eastern recension, the eleventh is the twenty-first, the twelfth is the twenty-fourth, etc.

[33] Raghunath Temple Library of His Highness The Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, Ms. nos. 3266-3267 (J1), 2309 (J2), and 3330-3331 (J3).

[34] Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Udaipur, Ms. no. 1474.

[35] Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Alwar, Ms. no. 2498.

[36] According to its variant readings, C7 has the closest relation to the Alwar (A) manuscript. This manuscript (C7) most probably has been the copy used for Jīvānanda's edition (CS 1877).

[37] Asiatic Society of Bengal, Kolkata, Āyurveda handlist, Ms. no. G 2503/1.

In comparison to the western, Kashmiri recension, the eastern recension, which probably is based on the 12th-century manuscript from Nepal or a related manuscript, displays two branches: one that is represented mostly by Bengali manuscripts,[38] of which the oldest is a manuscript from Varanasi dated 1698 (V1)[39], and a second branch represented by a group of Devanagari manuscripts from manuscript libraries in Baroda (B),[40] Kota (K),[41] London (L2, L3),[42] Nepal (N1),[43] Pune (P4),[44] Tübingen (T1, T2)[45] and Varanasi (V5).[46]

Nevertheless, direct dependencies of the manuscripts of either group can be shown only in very few instances, but here is not the place to go into details. On the other hand, it may also be that most of the manuscripts will not allow a clear distinction of their interdependencies, but only a rough classification of their affiliations.

The problem of the recensions is not significant for the following proof passage, since all manuscripts of the different branches correspond to a certain extent. It rather is the problem of the editions that are influenced by the corrections and interpretations of Gaṅgādhara's *Jalpakalpataru*.

It seems clear that, in the list of topics concerning debate in the manuscripts,[47] the positioning of "example" (*dṛṣṭānta*), following

---

[38] National Library, Kolkata, Ms. no. RDS 101 (C4); Asiatic Society of Bengal, Kolkata, Āyurveda handlist, Ms. no. G 4474/3 (C5); Trinity College Library, Cambridge, Ms. no. R. 15. 85 (Ca); Sarasvati Bhavan Library, no. 108685 (V3); Sarasvati Bhavan Library, Varanasi, Ms. no. 108824 (V4, scribe Gaṅgādhara), and some other minor manuscripts which will not be specified here.

[39] Sarasvati Bhavan Library, Varanasi, Ms. no. 44842.

[40] Central Library, Baroda, Ms. no. 12489.

[41] Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Kota, Ms. no. 1563.

[42] India Office Library, London, Sanskrit Ms. no. 881 (L2) and 1445a & b (L3).

[43] Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Kathmandu-Berlin, Ms. no. E-40553 – Reel no. E 2211/10.

[44] Ānandāśrama, Pune, Ms. no. 1546.

[45] Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, Ms. M. a. I. 458 (T1) and M. a. I. 459 (T2).

[46] Benares Hindu University, Varanasi, Ms. C 3688.

[47] ... *hetur upanayo nigamanam uttaraṃ dṛṣṭāntaḥ siddhāntaḥ* ...

"reply" (*uttara*) and before "accomplished doctrine" (*siddhānta*) is the genuine sequence in both recensions. The other position of *dṛṣṭānta* between "reason" (*hetu*) and "application" (*upanaya*) as in Trikamji's edition,[48] which is not supported by any of the manuscripts, must be attributed to Gaṅgādhara's edition of his commentary *Jalpakalpataru* in which he tries to standardize the reading of the *Carakasaṃhitā* with the sequence in the *Nyāyasūtra* by stating directly following his commentary on *hetu*: "Now, according to the correct sequence [of members of proof], the example is defined."[49] Also the manuscript of the *Āyurvedadīpikā*, in its sequence of definitions, supports the manuscripts of the *Carakasaṃhitā* in the positioning of *dṛṣṭānta* after *uttara* and before *siddhānta*,[50] although Cakrapāṇidatta does not quote the list. The topic "*dṛṣṭānta*" in the *Carakasaṃhitā* is meant to define the general example (*dṛṣṭānta*), not the member of proof *udāharaṇa* (exemplification)[51] of the *Nyāyasūtra* as Gaṅgādhara suggests. Moreover, the sequence of the *Nyāyasūtra* does – to some extant – support Caraka's sequence. The general example (*dṛṣṭānta*) in the *Nyāyasūtra* is also placed directly before the *siddhānta* in the list of topics in NSū 1.1.1[52] and in the definition part of its Book 1 as well,[53] in which the definition of the example corresponds for the most part to that of the *Carakasaṃhitā*.[54]

---

[48] Cf. CS Vimānasthāna 8.27: ... *hetuḥ, dṛṣṭāntaḥ, upanayaḥ, nigamanam, uttaraṃ, siddhāntaḥ, ...*

[49] JKT 1580,23: *atha kramikatvād dṛṣṭāntaṃ lakṣayati.*

[50] Cf. CĀ fol. 70r,7–70v,2: ... *hetusāmyam uttaraṃ kriyate tadā viparyyayo bhavati evam evodāharaṇa dvayaṃ saviparyyayaṃ sampūr..m uttaraṃ bhavatīty arthaḥ. mūrkhaviduṣāṃ buddhisāmyam ity anena laukikānāṃ paṇḍitānāñ ca yo 'rthe. vivādasiddhaḥ sa dṛṣṭānto bhavati ...*

[51] NSū 1.1.36f.; cf. Prets 2004.

[52] NSū 1.1.1: *pramāṇaprameyasaṃśayaprayojanadṛṣṭāntasiddhāntāvayava-tarkanirṇayavādajalpavitaṇḍāhetvābhāsacchalajātinigrahasthānānāṃ   tattva-jñānān niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ.*

[53] Cf. NSū 1.1.25f.

[54] Cf. CS Vimānasthāna 8.34: *dṛṣṭānto nama yatra mūrkhaviduṣāṃ buddhi-sāmyaṃ yo varṇyaṃ varṇayati*; and NSū 1.1.25: *laukikaparīkṣakānāṃ yasminn arthe buddhisāmyaṃ sa dṛṣṭāntaḥ.*

Even Gaṅgādhara, in his *Mṛtyuñjayasaṃhitā*,[55] does not support the reading of his own edition,[56] but reads in accordance with the manuscripts.[57]

With regard to the text of the establishment or proof (*sthā-panā*)[58] of the proposition (*pratijñā*), it is clear that all thirty-six manuscripts that have been consulted so far do not support Gaṅgā-dhara's reading and, accordingly, Trikamji's edition that depends on Gaṅgādhara's edition.[59] Again it seems that Trikamji believed in the correct reading of his antecessors when editing the *Caraka-saṃhitā*, who for their part apparently believed more in the authen-ticity of the *Jalpakalpataru*'s reading[60] than in the evidence from the manuscripts. Gaṅgādhara comments on the example of the *sthā-panā* passage in his *Jalpakalpataru* firstly: *kaḥ punar iha dṛṣṭānta ity āha dṛṣṭānta ityādi. yathākāśam iti.* He then proceeds to explain why the ether is able to serve as an example for the case in ques-tion. Obviously it was Gaṅgādhara who placed the sequence *yathā-kāśam iti* as a Pratīka in his *Jalpakalpataru* and added it according-ly in his edition of the *Carakasaṃhitā*. And again, Gaṅgādhara

---

[55] To my knowledge this work of Gaṅgādhara exists in only a single copy in Gaṅgādhara's own hand at the Calcutta Sanskrit College (Sanskrit College, Kolkata, Āyurveda handlist, Ms. no. 153). It is a rearrangement of the *Caraka-saṃhitā*, in which he has taken the text apart and arranged it anew according to a didactical point of view. (cf. various colophons of the Mṛtyuñjayasaṃhitā: ... *iti carakakṛtasaṃhitāyāṃ gaṅgādhareṇa pravibhaktamiśritāyāṃ mṛtyuñjayasaṃhi-tāyāṃ* ...).

[56] CS 1878/79 (1st edition 1868).

[57] This fact points to the assumption that he wrote his *Jalpakalpataru* later than the *Mṛtyuñjayasaṃhitā*.

[58] CS Vimānasthāna 8.31.

[59] Cf. CS Vimānasthāna 8.30f.: *atha pratijñā – pratijñā nāma sādhya-vacanam; yathā – nityaḥ puruṣa iti. atha sthāpanā – sthāpanā nāma tasyā eva pratijñāyā hetudṛṣṭāntopanayanigamanaiḥ sthāpanā. pūrvaṃ hi pratijñā, paścāt sthāpanā, kiṃ hy apratijñātaṃ sthāpayiṣyati; 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.*

[60] JKT 1577,22-24: *kaḥ punar iha dṛṣṭānta ity āha dṛṣṭānta ityādi. yathā-kāśam iti, ākāśasamānadharmavattvena puruṣasya nityatvasādhako ākṛtakatvam iti hetuḥ.*

himself does not support this reading in his *Mṛtyuñjayasaṃhitā*, but for the most part reads in accordance with the other manuscripts.

With regard to the counter-establishment or counter-proof (*pratiṣṭhāpanā*),[61] the relation of the editions of Gaṅgādhara, and respectively Trikamji, and the manuscripts is, structurally seen, completely the same.

The formulation of example and application in the provisional critical edition (cf. appendix) still has to be understood with due care. At present, it is too early to draw conclusions from formulations that may be revised when new material appears. Nevertheless, if one compares Trikamji's edition to the formulation in the manuscripts, one may appreciate what critical work on manuscripts can bring to light: Instead of the mere representation of an instance (*yathākāśam*) in which both properties are known to coexist in a kind of relationship that implicitly allows one to deduce one property from the other, as can only be seen by the formulation of the application, the manuscript's reading explicitly mentions both properties as coexisting in this instance. The function of the application is also clearly expressed, namely that the proving property subsists in the subject of proof and therefore allows, on condition of the concomitance of the proving property and the property to be proved in the example, the conclusion that also the subject of proof exemplifies the property to be proved.

To conclude, let me finally point out that the formulation of the *sthāpanā* in this form is very close in structure to the formulation of the proof in the *Nyāyabhāṣya*.[62] However, it will be possible to draw a conclusion from this statement only when the project has made further progress.

---

[61] CS Vimānasthāna 8.32.

[62] NBh 34,12-15: *tatra sādharmyokte tāvad dhetau vākyam, anityaḥ śabda iti pratijñā, utpattidharmakatvād iti hetuḥ, utpattidharmakaṃ sthālyādi dravyam anityam ity udāharaṇam, tathā cotpattidharmakaḥ śabda ity upanayaḥ, tasmād utpattidharmakatvād anityaḥ śabda iti nigamanam.*

APPENDIX:

Preliminary critical edition of *Carakasaṃhitā*,
Vimānasthāna 8.30f. on *pratijñā* and *sthāpanā*

The preliminary critical edition is based on sixteen selected manu-
scripts. Six manuscripts (A, C6, C7, Ch, P1, U) represent the
Kashmiri recension, of which the Sharada manuscript P1 is the
oldest (1688). Ten manuscripts represent the two branches of the
eastern recension: the branch which consists mainly of Bengali
manuscripts (C4, C5, Ca, Vi, V4) of which V1 is the oldest (1698),
and the branch which comprises only Devanagari manuscripts (B,
K, L3, T1, T2), mainly from the 18th century. Additionally,
Gaṅgādhara's *Mṛtyuñjayasaṃhitā* is listed at relevant passages in
the critical apparatus to provide a comparison to the reading in his
later *Jalpakalpataru*.

    The critical edition contains only substantial variants. However,
some non-substantial variants may be recorded in cases of rele-
vance for establishing the stemmatological affiliation, etc., or in
cases of special interest.

    Punctuation and regular sandhi of the critical edition are edito-
rial. The variants of the different manuscripts and independent
sources are separated by semicolons.

Sigla (of mentioned manuscripts):

Superscript letters indicate the script of the manuscript:
d   Devanagari
b   Bengali
ś   Sharada

A^d Alwar, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute 2498
B^d Baroda, Central Library 12489
C1^b Calcutta, Sanskrit College 153, Mṛtyuñjayasaṃhitā (Gaṅgā-
          dhara)
C4^b Calcutta, National Library RDS 101
C5^b Calcutta, Asiatic Society G 4474/3

C6^b Calcutta, Asiatic Society G 2503/1
C7^d Calcutta, Asiatic Society G 4391
Ca^b Cambridge, Trinity College Ms.R.15.85
Ch^d Chandigarh, DAV College 2315
K^d Kota, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute 1563
L3^d London, India Office Library Ms IO. 1445b
P1^ś Pune, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 555 of 1875-76
T1^d Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek 458
T2^d Tübingen, Universitätsbibliothek 459
U^d Udaipur, Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute 6294
V1^b Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan 44842
V4^b Varanasi, Sarasvati Bhavan 108824

Symbols used:

	danḍa
*	virāma
'	avagraha
	illegible *akṣara*, due to blurring, etc.
	illegible part of an *akṣara*, due to blurring, etc.
	contain *akṣara* or part of text deleted by scribe; deleted text in grey
!	contain *akṣara* or part of text unambiguously deleted by second hand; deleted text in grey
	contain emendation or corrective insertion (interlinear / inter-*akṣara* / in margin); emended text in grey
⟨ ⟩²	contain emendation or corrective insertion (interlinear / inter-*akṣara* / in margin) unambiguously by second hand; emended text in grey
om.	omitted by manuscript
S:	secondary, additional testimonies / other sources / commentaries

Preliminary critical edition:

> *atha pratijñā*[1]. *pratijñā nāma sādhyavacanam; yathā nityaḥ*
> *puruṣa*[2] *iti.*

atha sthāpanā.[3] *sthāpanā nāma tasyā*[4] *eva pratijñāyā hetubhir*
dṛṣṭāntopanayanigamanaiś ca[5] *sthāpanā. pūrvaṃ hi pratijñā*[6]
paścāt sthāpanā;[7] *kiṃ hy apratijñātaṃ*[8] *sthāpayiṣyati?*[9] *yathā:*[10]
nityaḥ puruṣa[11] *iti pratijñā;*[12] *hetur akṛtakatvād*[13] *iti;*[14] *dṛṣṭāntaḥ –*
akṛtakam ākāśaṃ tac ca nityam;[15] *upanayaḥ – yathā cākṛtakam*[16]
ākāśaṃ tathā puruṣaḥ;[17] *nigamanam – tasmān nitya*[18] *iti.*

---

[1] *atha pratijñā* : B^d, C4^b, C7^d, Ca^b, Ch^d, K^d, L3^d, Pl^s, T1^d, T2^d, U^d, V1^b
pratijñā; A^d |praṭijñā|-(pratijñā kramaprāptā kathyate); om. C5^b, C6^b

[2] *nityaḥ puruṣa* : C7^d, L3^d nityapuruṣa

[3] *atha sthāpanā* : A^d, C7^d, Ca^b, Ch^d, K^d, L3^d, Pl^s, T1^d, T2^d, U^d sthāpanā; om.
B^d

[4] *nāma tasyā* : C4^b, C5^b, V1^b nāmaitasyā

[5] *hetubhir dṛṣṭāntopanayanigamanaiś ca* : T1^d hetu|bhir|˙ dṛṣṭāmtopanayabi-
gaman|au|˙aiś ca; B, T2^d hetubhir dṛṣṭāmtopāyanigamanaiś ca; L3^d hetubhi
dṛṣṭāmtopāyanigamanaiś ca; K^d hetubhir ṣṭāmdṛtopanayanigamaiś ca; A^d, C4^b,
C7^d, V1^b hetubhir dṛṣṭāntopanayanigamaiḥ; C5^b hetur dṛṣṭāntopanayani-
gamaineḥ; C6^b hetubhi .. .. nigamaiḥ; Ch^d hetubhiḥ dṛṣṭāntopa-
nayaniga(ma)˙maiḥ; Pl^s hetubhiḥ dṛṣṭāntopanayanigamaiḥ; U^d hetubhir
dṛṣṭāmtopanayanigamai; Ca^b, V4^b hetudṛṣṭāntopanayanigamaiḥ
S: ĀD 276a,19: sa ca sādhyaṃ paraṃ prati hetvādibhiś caturbhiḥ sādhyati;
C1^b hetudṛṣṭāntopanayanigamaiḥ

[6] *pratijñā* : V4 loke pratijñā; T1^d ⟨loke⟩˙ pratijñā; Ca^b loko pratijñā
S: C1^b loke pratijñā

[7] *hi pratijñā paścāt sthāpanā* : U^d hi pratijñāpanā

[8] *kiṃ hi apratijñātaṃ* : B^d, L3^d, T1^d, T2^d kiṃcit pratijñātaṃ; K^d kiṃcit
pratijñānaṃ

[9] *sthāpayiṣyati* : C4^b, C5^b, T1^d, V1^b sthāpayiṣyatīti I

[10] *yathā* : B^d, K^d, L3^d tathā; T1^d ta⟨ya⟩˙thā; T2^d sathā; om. Ch^d

[11] *nityaḥ puruṣa* : C7^d, K^d nityapuruṣa; T1^d nitya⟨ḥ⟩puruṣa

[12] *pratijñā* : T1^d |praṭijñā|˙⟨prasiddhā⟩˙

[13] *akṛtakatvād* : B^d, C4^b, C5^b, K^d, L3^d, V1^b akṛtakatvaṃ; T1^d akṛtaka-
tvaṃ⟨āt*⟩˙; T2^d akṛtakṛtvaṃ; Pl^s akṛtatvād

[14] *iti* : om. B^d, C4^b, C5^b, Ca^b, K^d, L3^d, T1^d, T2^d, V1^b

[15] *dṛṣṭāntaḥ – akṛtakam ākāśaṃ tac ca nityam* : B^d, T2^d dṛṣṭānto kṛtakam
ākāśaṃ tac ca nityam iti; L3^d dṛṣṭānto kṛtakam ākāśaṃ tac ca nityam; C6^b

REFERENCES

Texts and abbreviations

ĀD = [*Āyurvedadīpikā*]. See CS.

CU = [*Carakopaskāra*]. See CS 1920-22.

CS = [*Carakasaṃhitā*]. *The Charakasaṃhitā of Agniveśa. Revised by Charaka and Dṛidhabala. With the Āyurveda-Dīpikā Commentary of Chakrapāṇidatta.* Collated and edited by Vaidya Jādavji Trikamji Āchārya. 3rd edition. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1941 (1st edition 1933).

CS 1877 = *Carakasaṃhitā. Sūtra-nidāna-vimāna-śārīrendriya-cikitsita-kalpasiddhisthānātmakā āyurvedīya bhagavatā ātreyeṇa upadiṣṭā agniveśanāmadheyena tat śiṣyeṇa viracitā carakābhidhānena ṛṣiṇā pratisaṃskṛtā.* Śrī jīvānanda vidyāsāgara bhaṭṭācāryyeṇa bahūni ādarśapustakāni samālocya saṃskṛtā prakāśitā ca. Kalikātā: Sarasvatī Yantra, 1877.

CS 1878/79 = *Charaka-sanhita. A System of Hindu Medicine with Notes Jalpakalpa-taru by Kaviraj Gangadhar Kaviratna.* Published by Dharanidhar Ray Kaviraj. *Ayurvvedīya carakasaṃhitā. vaidyagaṅgādhararayakaviratnakavirājakṛta jalpakalpataru nāma vyākhyā sahitā.* Dharanidhar raya kavirāja karttṛka prakāśita. Baharampore-Saidābād: Pramādabhañjana-yantre mudrita 1878/1879 (saṃvat 1935). [New edition of the 1st edition. Kolkata: Saṃvādajñānaratnākarākhyayantra 1868 by Gaṅgādhara Kavirāj).

CS 1884/85 = *Carakasaṃhitā bhagavadatrinandana-punarvvasūpadiṣṭena dhīmadagniveśena viracitā carakanāmadheyena vyādhipravareṇa pratisaṃskṛtā ca.* Śrīavināśacandra kaviratna kavirājena [vaṅga-bhāṣāyāṃ] anūditā pariśodhitā ca. Kalikātā: Vidyāratna Yantra, 1884/85 (saṃvat 1941).

CS 1892-1919 = *Carakasaṃhitā, maharṣināgniveśena praṇītā maharṣicarakapratisaṃskṛtā bhiṣakkulatilakacarakacaturānanaśrīmaccakrapāṇidattakṛṭaṭīkāsamvalitaṃ* (sic!) kavirāja śrīharinātha viśāradena saṃśodhitā sampāditā. Kalikātā: 1892-1919 (śakābdā 1814-41).

---

drṣṭāntaḥ ya akṛtakam ākāśaṃ tac ca nityaṃ; C4[b], V1[b], V4[b] drṣṭānto yathā akṛtakam ākāśaṃ tac ca nityam iti; C5[b] drṣṭānto yathā I akṛtakam ākāśaṃ tava nityam iti

S: C1[b] drṣṭānto yathā cākṛtakam ākāśaṃ tac ca nityam

[16] *cākṛtakam* : T1[d] cākṛta⟨ka⟩ᐟm; C6[b], U[d] cākṛtam; A[d] cā[..]ta⟨ka⟩ᐟm; L3[d] cākṣatakam

[17] *ākāśaṃ tathā puruṣaḥ* : Ca[b] ākāśa tathā puruṣa iti; T1[d] ākāśaṃ tathā puruṣaḥ ⟨iti⟩ᐟ; C6[b], Ch[d] ākāśas tathā puruṣaḥ

[18] *nitya* : C5[b] nityam

CS 1894 = *Carakasaṃhitā*. Mūla o vaṅgānuvāda yaśodānandan sarkār. Calcutta 1894.

CS 1896 = *Carakasaṃhitā, sūtra-nidāna-vimāna-śārīrendriya-cikitsita-kalpa-siddhisthānātmakā āyurvedīya bhagavatā ātreyeṇa upadiṣṭā agniveśa-nāmadheyena tat śiṣyeṇa viracitā carakābhidhānena ṛṣiṇā pratisaṃs-kṛtā*. Śrī jīvānanda vidyāsāgara bhaṭṭācāryyeṇa bahūni ādarśapustakāni samālocya saṃskṛtā prakāśitā ca. Dvitīyasaṃskaraṇam [2nd edition]. Kalikātā: Nārāyaṇayantra, 1896.

CS 1897-98 = *Sārtha śrīcarakasaṃhitā*. Sampādaka āyurvedamahopādhyāya śaṃkara dājī śāstrī pade cikitsaka. Prakāśaka yajñeśvara gopāla dīkṣita bukselar. (Shree Charaka Sanhita. With translation & copious notes in Marāṭhī. A quarterly journal). 14 Vols.. Mumbaī 1897-98.

CS 1920-22 = *The Caraka-samhita*. Edited with an original commentary in Sanskrit by Vaidyaratna Kaviraj Pandit Jogindra Nath Sen. Vol. I, containing the Sloka-sthana (Sutra-sthana), Published by Y. N. Sen, Calcutta 1920. Vol. II, containing the Nidana, Vimana, Sarira and Indriya Sthanas. Calcutta 1922.

CS 1922 = *The Carakasaṃhita by Agnivesha. With the Āyurveda-Dīpikā Commentary of Chakrapāni Dutta*. Ed. by Vaidya Bhūshan Vāman Kesheo Dātār of Nāsik. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press, 1922.

CS 1927-33 = *Caraka-saṃhitā mahāmuninā bhagavadāgniveśena praṇītā maha-rṣicarakeṇa pratisaṃskṛtā. carakacaturānana-śrīmaccakrapāṇidatta-praṇītayā āyurvedadīpikākhyaṭīkayā mahāmahopādhyāya-śrīgaṅgā-dharakaviratnakavirājaviracitayā jalpakalpatarusamākhyayā ṭīkayā ca samalaṅkṛtā*. Kavirājaśrīnarendranāthasenaguptena kavirāja śrībalāi-candrasenaguptena ca sampāditā saṃśodhitā prakāśitā ca. Calcutta 1927, 1928, 1933.

CS 1970 = *Carakasaṃhitā maharṣiṇā bhagavadāgniveśena praṇītā mahāmuninā carakeṇa pratisaṃskṛtā, āyurvedācāryaśrījayadevavidyālaṅkāreṇa pra-ṇītayā tattvārthadīpikākhyayā hindīvyākhyayā ṭippaṇyā ca samanvitā*. Pūrvo bhāgaḥ, madhyo bhāgaḥ, uttaro bhāgaḥ. 8th edition. Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1970. [1st edition: Lahore 1934-36.]

CS 1976-97 = *Agniveśa's Caraka Saṃhitā (Text with English Translation & Critical Exposition Based on Cakrapāṇidatta's Āyurveda Dipikā)* by Dr. Ram Karan Sharma and Vaidya Bhagwan Dash. 5 vols. (Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies, 94.) Varanasi 1976-97.

CS 1981-94 = *Caraka-Saṃhitā. Agniveśa's Treatise Refined and Annotated by Caraka and Redacted by Dṛḍhabala. (Text with English translation)*. Editor-Translator Prof. Priyavrat Sharma. (Jaikrishnadas Ayurveda Series, 36.) Vol. I (Sūtrasthāna to Indriyasthāna); vol. II (Cikitsāsthāna to Siddhisthāna); vol. III Critical Notes (incorporating the commentaries of Jejjaṭa, Cakrapāṇi, Gaṅgādhara and Yogīndranātha); vol. III (Sūtra-

sthāna to Indriyasthāna); vol. IV Critical Notes (Cikitsāsthāna to Siddhi-sthāna). Varanasi: Chaukhamba Orientalia, 1981, 1983, 1985, 1994.

CS 1983-88 = *The Caraka-Saṃhitā (As Precepted by the Great Sage Ātreya Punarvasu) of Agniveśa. Elaborated by Caraka & Dṛḍhabala. Edited with "Charaka-Chandrika" Hindi Commentary along with Special Deliberation etc.* by Brahmanand Tripathi. Foreword by Ganga Sahay Pandey (1st vol.), Forword by Prabhakar Janardan Deshpande (2nd vol.). (Chaukhamba Ayurvijnan Granthamala, 11.) 2 vols. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan, 1983, 1988.

JKT = [*Jalpakalpataru*]. See CS 1927-33.

NBh = [*Nyāyabhāṣya*]. *Gautamīyanyāyadarśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana.* Ed. by Anantalal Thakur. (Nyāyacaturgranthikā Vol. I.) New Delhi 1997.

NSū = [*Nyāyasūtra*]. See Ruben 1928.

Secondary literature

CORDIER, Palmyr 1902. Récentes découvertes de Mss. médicaux sanskrits dans l'Inde (1898-1902). Mémoire présenté au Congrès des Orientalistes de Hanoi (1902). [Un sommaire de ce mémoire a été publie dans les Actes du Congrès, p. 69.] In: Roşu 1989: 539-570.

DASGUPTA, Surendranath Dasgupta 1922. *A History of Indian Philosophy*, II. Cambridge 1922. (Reprint: Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991).

FRAUWALLNER, Erich 1984. *Nachgelassene Werke*, I: *Aufsätze, Beiträge, Skizzen.* Hrsg. Ernst Steinkellner. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., Sitzungsberichte, 438 = Veröffentlich-ungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, 19.) Wien 1984.

KANG, Sung Yong 1998. *Zur altindischen Tradition der Debatte gemäß der medizinischen Überlieferung. Übersetzung und ideengeschichtliche Untersuchung von Carakasaṃhitā Vi.8.15-28.* Wissenschaftliche Haus-arbeit zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades eines Magister Artium der Universität Hamburg. Hamburg 1998.

MEULENBELD, G. Jan 1999. *A History of Indian Medical Literature.* Vol. IA: Text. Vol. IB: Annotation. (Groningen Oriental Studies, 15.) Groningen 1999.

OETKE, Claus 1994. *Vier Studien zum Altindischen Syllogismus.* (Philosophia Indica, Einsichten – Ansichten, Bd. 2.) Reinbek 1994.

PRETS, Ernst 2000. Theories of debate, proof and counter-proof in the early Indian dialectical tradition. In: Piotr Balcerowicz & Marek Mejor (eds.), *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 (Studia Indologiczne, 7): 369-382. Warsaw 2000.

—— 2004. Example and exemplification in early Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika. In: Shoryu Katsura & Ernst Steinkellner (eds.), *On the Role of the Example* (dṛṣṭānta) *in Classical Indian Logic.* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 58): 197-224. Wien 2004.

ROŞU, Arion 1989. *Un demi-siècle de recherches āyurvediques. Gustave Liétard et Palmyr Cordier. Travaux sur l'histoire de la médicine indienne. Documents réunis et présentés par Arion Roşu.* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne in-8, 56.) Paris 1989.

ROTH, Rudolf von 1872. Indische Medicin. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 26: 441-452.

RUBEN, Walter 1928. *Die Nyāyasūtra's. Text, Übersetzung, Erläuterung und Glossar.* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 18.2.) Leipzig 1928.

SOLOMON, Esther A. 1976. *Indian Dialectics. Methods of Philosophical Discussion.* 2 Vols. (B.J. Institute of Learning and Research, Research Series 70 & 74.) Ahmedabad 1976, 1978.

TUCCI, Guiseppe 1929. *Pre-Diṅnāga Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources.* (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 49.) Baroda 1929.

UI, Hakuju 1925. The Sanskrit text of the Caraka-Samhita. *Indo Tetsugaku Kenkyū* [The Studies in Indian Philosophy] 2: 600-587. Tokyo 1925.

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. (Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, 9 & 17.) Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1991, 1996.

VIDYABHUSANA, Satis Chandra 1920. *A History of Indian Logic (Ancient, Mediaeval and Modern Schools).* 3rd edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978.

ADDENDUM (March 2008)

This article is based on a paper I presented at the Helsinki World Sanskrit Conference in 2003. The final version was completed about one year later.

At the time of my final version I was engaged in the preliminary work on a critical edition of Vimānasthāna 8 of the *Carakasaṃhitā* together with Karin Preisendanz, who acted as project director. In October 2004, Philipp Maas joined the project as a second collaborator. At that point in time, the project was extended to all eight chapters of the Vimānasthāna. A year later, Cristina Pecchia also joined the project. And I left the project in 2006 to work on a new project of my own.

During the last years, not only did the number of manuscripts increase and the stemma was defined more precisely – mainly by Philipp Maas – but also the methodology of compiling the manuscripts gradually changed as well as the critical edition's method and form. Therefore my preliminary critical edition of the passage on proof, which I still hold to be more or less adequate, deviates fundamentally in form and character from the work being currently done.

In this place I must acknowledge my indebtedness to the following institutions for permitting the use of *Carakasaṃhitā* manuscripts as well as these institutes' members and employees for their gracious assistance (listed according to their appearance in this paper): DAV College, Lalchand Research Library (Chandigarh), National Library (Kolkata), Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (Hamburg), Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Pune), Raghunath Temple Library of His Highness The Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir (Jammu), Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute (Jodhpur, Udaipur, Kota, Alwar), Asiatic Society of Bengal (Kolkata), Sarasvati Bhavan Library (Varanasi), Central Library (Baroda), India Office Library (London), Ānandāśrama (Pune), Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, Benares Hindu University (Varanasi), and the Trinity College (Cambridge).