TY-2026 · 10 — Tantrayukti Studies

अपदेशः

Citing the Ground: Authority and Reason

डॉ. मन्था-श्रीनिवासुः · Dr. Mantha Srinivasu · 8 Nov 2026 · AŚ 15.1.21–22; Su. Utt. 65.15

Abstract

Apadeśa means "pointing to the ground". The three authorities appear to define it in two different ways. For Kauṭilya it is "thus said he": the attribution of a view to its author. His example sets out four positions on the size of the king's council of ministers — twelve according to the school of Manu, sixteen according to Bṛhaspati's, twenty according to Uśanas's, and "according to capacity" according to Kauṭilya himself. For Suśruta it is "by this reason": "sweet taste increases phlegm." For Cakrapāṇi it is "the statement of a reason for establishing what has been asserted", with Caraka's rule that water, land and time are successively harder to guard against, the reason being "because of being harder to avoid". This article argues that the two senses — citation of a source and statement of a reason — are one device, since in a śāstra both the authority and the cause are grounds on which a statement rests, and the Vaiśeṣika sūtra lists *apadeśa* among the synonyms of *hetu*. Three objections are answered: that the two definitions contradict each other, that citing authorities is a fallacy of appeal to authority, and that apadeśa duplicates hetvartha. It concludes that apadeśa is the device of provenance, and that Kauṭilya's single example is a model literature review: four views, each attributed, the author's own last and distinguished from the rest.

Keywords: apadeśa; tantrayukti; citation; attribution; provenance; reason; hetu; literature review; schools of thought; Arthaśāstra; mantriparisad; Suśruta; Caraka; Vaiśeṣika

1. प्रवेशः · Place in the lists

Apadeśa is ninth in Kauṭilya, eighth in Suśruta and eleventh in Caraka, and in all three it follows *upadeśa*. The two words differ by one prefix, and the sequence is instructive: first the instruction (*upa-deśa*, TY-09), then its ground (*apa-deśa*). An instruction tells the reader what to do; the apadeśa tells the reader on what — or on whose word — it rests.

The prefix *apa-* with √*diś* gives "to point away", that is, to point to something other than the statement itself: to its source or its reason. In ordinary Sanskrit *apadeśa* can also mean a pretext; in the śāstra it is the legitimate form of the same act — pointing honestly to what supports a claim.

2. लक्षणानि · The definitions

> एवमसावाहेत्यपदेशः
>
> मन्त्रिपरिषदं द्वादशामात्यान्कुर्वीतेति मानवाः षोडशेति बार्हस्पत्या विंशतिमित्यौशनसा यथासामर्थ्यमिति कौटिल्य इति
>
> "'Thus said he' — that is apadeśa." — Example: "'One should form a council of ministers of twelve members,' say the Mānavas; 'of sixteen,' say the Bārhaspatyas; 'of twenty,' say the Auśanasas; 'according to capacity,' says Kauṭilya."
>
> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 15.1.21–22

> अनेन कारणेनेत्यपदेशः, यथापदिश्यते मधुरः श्लेष्माणमभिवर्धयतीति ॥
>
> "'By this reason' — that is apadeśa; as it is pointed out: 'sweet taste increases phlegm.'"
>
> Suśruta, *Uttaratantra* 65.15

> अपदेशो नाम यत्प्रतिज्ञातार्थसाधनाय हेतुवचनं; यथा- "वाताज्जलं जलाद्देशं देशात् कालं स्वभावतः। विद्याद्दुष्परिहार्यत्वात्" (वि.अ.३) इत्यादि, तत्र प्रतिज्ञातार्थस्य हेतुवचनं- दुष्परिहार्यत्वादिति।
>
> "Apadeśa is the statement of a reason for establishing a matter that has been asserted. For example: 'From air water, from water land, from land time — one who knows the matter should know each as weightier by nature, because of being harder to avoid' (Vimānasthāna 3), and so on. There, the statement of the reason for the asserted matter is 'because of being harder to avoid'."
>
> Cakrapāṇidatta, *Āyurvedadīpikā* on Caraka, *Siddhisthāna* 12.41–44

The verse Cakrapāṇi cites stands in full in Caraka's chapter on epidemics:

> वाताज्जलं जलाद्देशं देशात् कालं स्वभावतः। *विद्याद्दुष्परिहार्यत्वाद्गरीयस्तरमर्थवित् ॥
>
> "One who knows the matter should know water as weightier than air, land than water, and time than land, by their nature — because of being harder to avoid."
>
> Caraka, *Vimānasthāna* 3.10

3. लक्षणपरीक्षा · Testing the definitions

3.1 Two senses

Authority	What is pointed to	Example
Kauṭilya	A **source**: the person or school who holds a view	Mānavas 12, Bārhaspatyas 16, Auśanasas 20, Kauṭilya "according to capacity"
Suśruta	A **cause**: the reason something happens	Sweet taste increases kapha ("by this reason")
Cakrapāṇi	A **reason** for an asserted proposition	"Because of being harder to avoid" — the reason for the rank order of air, water, land and time in epidemics

Suśruta's example is easily misread as a bare fact. His definition shows how it is to be taken: the sentence "sweet taste increases phlegm" is cited as the reason (*anena kāraṇena*) for some instruction — for instance, that sweets are to be avoided in a disorder of phlegm. The same sentence is an apadeśa when it is used to ground something else.

3.2 The Vaiśeṣika synonym list

The second sense is confirmed outside the tantrayukti lists. The *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* gives *apadeśa* as a synonym of *hetu*:

> हेतुरपदेशो लिङ्गं प्रमाणं करणमित्यनर्थान्तरम्
>
> "Hetu, apadeśa, liṅga, pramāṇa, karaṇa — these do not differ in meaning."
>
> *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda* 9.2.4

In the Vaiśeṣika five-membered argument, as later set out by Praśastapāda, the second member is accordingly called *apadeśa* where Nyāya calls it *hetu*. Suśruta and Cakrapāṇi use the word in this sense.

3.3 Kauṭilya's example as a model of citation

Kauṭilya's example deserves to be read slowly, for it is a complete literature review in one sentence. It names four positions; attributes each to a school by the conventional plural (*mānavāḥ, bārhaspatyāḥ, auśanasāḥ*); orders them by a single variable (the number of ministers, rising from twelve to twenty); and places the author's own view last, marked with his own name and departing from all three in kind rather than degree — not another number but a principle, "according to capacity". The device that makes this possible is apadeśa: each view is pointed to its holder, so that the reader always knows whose claim is whose.

This practice runs through the whole Arthaśāstra, where the views of predecessors are repeatedly set out with *iti ācāryāḥ* or with school names before Kauṭilya's own view. Apadeśa is the device that keeps those voices distinct.

4. पूर्वपक्षः खण्डनं मण्डनं च · Objections and replies

4.1 Do the two definitions not contradict each other?

ननु कौटिल्यः “एवमसावाह” इति वक्तृनिर्देशम् अपदेशं मन्यते, सुश्रुतः “अनेन कारणेन” इति हेतुवचनम्। वक्ता च हेतुः च भिन्नौ। अतः एकस्याः तन्त्रयुक्तेः द्वे विरुद्धे लक्षणे इति चेत्, न। उभयत्र वाक्यस्य आश्रयः दिश्यते। शास्त्रे वाक्यं द्विधा प्रतिष्ठितं भवति — वक्तुः आप्तत्वेन, अर्थस्य कारणत्वेन वा। “मानवाः द्वादश इति आहुः” इति उक्ते मतस्य आश्रयः ज्ञायते; “मधुरः श्लेष्माणं वर्धयति” इति उक्ते विधेः आश्रयः। “हेतुरपदेशो लिङ्गं प्रमाणं करणम्” इति वैशेषिकसूत्रे प्रमाणम् अपि अपदेशपर्यायः — आप्तवाक्यं च प्रमाणम्। अतः “आश्रयनिर्देशः अपदेशः” इति एकं लक्षणम्, आश्रयभेदात् द्विविधम् उदाहरणम्।

Objection: Kauṭilya takes apadeśa as naming the speaker — “thus said he”; Suśruta as stating a reason — “by this reason”. A speaker and a reason are different things. So one tantrayukti has two conflicting definitions. **Reply:** No. In both, the support of a statement is pointed to. In a śāstra a statement is established in two ways: by the trustworthiness of its speaker, or by the causal force of its content. When “the Mānavas say twelve” is stated, the support of a view is made known; when “sweet taste increases phlegm” is stated, the support of an instruction. In the Vaiśeṣika sūtra — “hetu, apadeśa, liṅga, pramāṇa, karaṇa” — pramāṇa too is a synonym of apadeśa, and the word of a trustworthy speaker is a pramāṇa. So there is one definition, “pointing to the support”, with two kinds of example according to the kind of support.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.2 Is citing authorities not a fallacy?

ननु “एवमसावाह” इति वचनं प्रमाणम् इति चेत्, तत् “महाजनः आह, अतः सत्यम्” इति हेत्वाभासः — वक्तृगौरवात् अर्थसिद्धिः। परीक्षकः कथं तत् स्वीकुर्यात् इति चेत्, न। कौटिल्यः परमतम् अपदिश्य न अनुवर्तते, किन्तु भिनत्ति — “यथासामर्थ्यमिति कौटिल्यः”। अपदेशः मतस्य स्रोतोनिर्देशः, न तस्य सत्यत्वप्रतिज्ञा। तस्य फलं — कस्य वचनं किम् इति विवेकः, येन परीक्षा सम्भवति। यदि वक्ता न निर्दिश्येत, तर्हि सर्वं मतम् एकस्मिन् मिश्रीभवेत्, न च खण्डनं न च मण्डनं सिध्येत्। अतः अपदेशः परीक्षायाः पूर्वाङ्गम्, न तत्स्थानीयः।

Objection: if “thus said he” is offered as proof, that is a fallacious reason — “a great one said it, therefore it is true”: establishing a matter by the weight of the speaker. How can an examiner accept that? **Reply:** No. Kauṭilya cites the views of others not to follow them but to differ: “according to capacity, says Kauṭilya.” Apadeśa indicates the source of a view; it does not assert that the view is true. Its fruit is the discrimination of whose statement is what, by which exami-

nation becomes possible. If speakers were not named, all views would be mixed into one, and neither refutation nor defence could be carried out. Apadeśa is the preliminary to examination, not a substitute for it.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.3 Does apadeśa not duplicate hetvartha?

ननु हेत्वर्थः अपि हेतुवचनम् — “अर्थमूलौ हि धर्मकामौ” इति। अपदेशः अपि हेतुवचनम्। अतः पौनरुक्त्यम् इति चेत्, न। अपदेशः “प्रतिज्ञातार्थसाधनाय” — यत्र एव प्रतिज्ञा, तत्र एव तस्याः हेतुः उच्यते: “गरीयस्तरं विद्यात्” इति प्रतिज्ञा, “दुष्परिहार्यत्वात्” इति हेतुः, एकस्मिन् एव श्लोके। हेत्वर्थः तु “अन्यदुक्तम् अन्यार्थसाधकम्”, “अन्यत्राभिहितम् अन्यत्रोपपद्यते” — तस्य हेतुः विषयान्तरं प्रकरणान्तरं वा गच्छति। अपदेशः स्थानिकः, हेत्वर्थः सञ्चारी। अतः भेदः।

Objection: hetvartha too is the statement of a reason — “for dharma and kāma have artha as their root” — and apadeśa is the statement of a reason. So one of them is redundant. **Reply:** No. Apadeśa is “for establishing a matter that has been asserted”: the reason is stated in the very place where the assertion is made — “one should know each as weightier” is the assertion, “because of being harder to avoid” the reason, in a single verse. Hetvartha is “what, said of one thing, establishes another”, “what is stated in one place and holds in another”: its reason travels to another subject or another context. Apadeśa is local; hetvartha travels. Hence they differ.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

5. सिद्धान्तः · The settled view

यस्मिन् वाक्यं प्रतिष्ठितं तस्य — वक्तुः वा कारणस्य वा — तत्रैव निर्देशः, येन मतानां स्रोतः विधीनां च हेतुः विविच्य ज्ञायते, सः अपदेशः।

“Apadeśa is the indication, in the same place, of that on which a statement rests — its speaker or its reason — so that the source of views and the reason for instructions are known distinctly.”

Definition composed for this article.

The definition unites Kauṭilya’s sense (the speaker) and Suśruta’s and Cakrapāṇi’s (the reason) under one function: provenance. “In the same place” distinguishes it from hetvartha; “distinctly” records its purpose — that the reader can tell whose claim is whose and why it is made.

6. आधुनिकसंवादः · The modern counterpart

Classical form	Modern counterpart
Kauṭilya: "thus said he"	**Citation and attribution**; in-text references; the norm against plagiarism
Kauṭilya's four views on the council	The **literature review** organised by schools of thought, with the author's position marked off from the rest
Suśruta and Cakrapāṇi: the reason in the same place	The **warrant** attached to a claim; the rationale stated with each recommendation
"So that views are known distinctly"	**Provenance** and transparency: the reader can trace every claim to a source or an argument

Modern academic writing distinguishes the two senses with two tools — the citation and the argument — but treats them as parts of one obligation: no claim without its ground. That is the definition of apadeśa.

7. प्रयोगाः · Uses

7.1 In research

Organise the review of literature as Kauṭilya organises the council debate: identify the variable on which views differ, set out each view with its holder, and state your own position last, clearly marked. In the body of the paper, attach to each claim either its source or its reason; a claim with neither is ungrounded. Keep the two kinds of ground distinct: citing an authority is not the same as giving a reason, and the reader should be able to tell which you are doing.

7.2 In teaching

Give students a passage that mixes several voices without attribution, and ask them to rewrite it with apadeśa — "X holds …, Y holds …, I hold …". Then ask them to add a reason to each position. The exercise teaches both honesty and argument.

7.3 In daily life

When passing on news or advice, say where it came from and why it should be believed. Most rumours are statements stripped of their apadeśa. The habit of asking "who said so, and on what ground?" is the everyday form of this device.

8. अभ्यासः · Exercise

1. Find two other passages in the Arthaśāstra where Kauṭilya cites the views of predecessors (*iti ācāryāḥ*, or by school name) before his own. Tabulate the views as in Kauṭilya's council example.

2. In a paragraph of your own writing, mark every claim as grounded by a source (S), grounded by a reason (R), or ungrounded (U). Revise until there is no U.
3. In Caraka's verse on air, water, land and time, identify the assertion and the apadeśa. Can you think of a case where the stated reason would reverse the order?

9. उपसंहारः · Conclusion

Apadeśa points to the ground of a statement. Kauṭilya's ground is the speaker, and his example — four views on the council, each attributed, his own marked and last — is a model of scholarly citation. Suśruta's and Cakrapāṇi's ground is the reason, stated in the same place as the assertion it supports. The two senses are one function, provenance, as the Vaiśeṣika list of synonyms for hetu confirms; citing is not deferring, for Kauṭilya cites in order to differ; and the local reason of apadeśa is distinct from the travelling reason of hetvartha. Every reference list and every "because" in a modern paper is an apadeśa.

References

1. Kauṭilya. *Arthaśāstra*, Book 15 (Tantrayukti). E-text as used on sanskritmanthan.in. Ed. and tr. R. P. Kangle, *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra*, 3 vols., Bombay: University of Bombay, 1960–1965.
2. Suśruta. *Suśruta Saṃhitā*, Uttaratantra 65. E-text as used on sanskritmanthan.in. Ed. Yādavaji Trikamji Ācārya and Nārāyaṇa Rāma Ācārya, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1938.
3. Caraka (completed by Dṛḍhabala). *Caraka Saṃhitā*, Siddhisthāna 12, with the *Āyurvedadīpikā* of Cakrapāṇidatta. E-text as used on sanskritmanthan.in. Ed. Yādavaji Trikamji Ācārya, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, 1941.
4. W. K. Lele. *The Doctrine of the Tantrayukti: Methodology of Theoretico-Scientific Treatises in Sanskrit*. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Surbharati Prakashan, 1981.
5. Mantha Srinivasu. "तन्त्रयुक्तिः — The Method of the Śāstras." *Tantrayukti Studies*, TY-2026/01. Sanskrit Manthan, 4 November 2026. https://sanskritmanthan.in/a/ty-01-tantrayukti
6. Sanskrit Manthan. *Tantrayukti* and *Śāstra-paribhāṣā-kośa*. https://sanskritmanthan.in/tantrayukti; https://sanskritmanthan.in/paribhasha
7. Kaṇāda. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* 9.2.4. E-text as used on sanskritmanthan.in.
8. Praśastapāda. *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha* (on the five members of the argument: *pratijñā, apadeśa, nidarśana, anusandhāna, pratyāmnāya*).
9. Caraka. *Caraka Saṃhitā*, Vimānasthāna 3.10, with Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*.
10. Kauṭilya. *Arthaśāstra* 1.15 (the council of ministers).

How to cite. Mantha Srinivasu. 2026. "अपदेशः — Citing the Ground: Authority and Reason." *तन्त्रयुक्तिविमर्शः · Tantrayukti Studies*, TY-2026/10. Sanskrit Manthan, 8 Nov 2026.
https://sanskritmanthan.in/a/ty-10-apadesha
Author: ORCID 0000-0002-8834-3782 · Google Scholar
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23947917
Licence: © 2026 Dr. Mantha Srinivasu. Text, translations and figures under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0: share and cite with attribution; no commercial use; no altered versions. Sanskrit passages are quoted verbatim from the e-texts used on sanskritmanthan.in (GRETIL; Digital Corpus of Sanskrit; see /sources). Śaṅkā–samādhāna passages marked "composed" are by the author.