TY-2026 · 12 — Tantrayukti Studies

प्रदेशः

The Part for the Whole: Reference and Sampling

डॉ. मन्था-श्रीनिवासुः · Dr. Mantha Srinivasu · 9 Nov 2026 · AŚ 15.1.25–26; Su. Utt. 65.16

Abstract

Pradeśa means "a place" or "a part", and as a tantrayukti it is the device of reference to another place or to a part. The three authorities give it three distinct senses. Kauṭilya defines it as "establishing by what is yet to be said", with a forward reference: "or by conciliation, gifts, dissension and force — as we shall explain under calamities." Suśruta defines it as "establishing the matter at hand by what has passed", with an inference from a surgeon's record: "as he extracted the foreign body of Devadatta, so he will extract that of Yajñadatta." Cakrapāṇi defines it as stating by a part what cannot, because of its extent, be stated in full, and cites Caraka's close to the chapter on food and drink: "this portion, mostly in use, has been stated." Read together with *atideśa* (TY-11), these definitions reveal a striking mirror: Kauṭilya's atideśa looks back and his pradeśa forward, while Suśruta's pradeśa looks back and his atideśa forward. This article sets out the mirror, proposes that the three senses share the root meaning of the word — another place, or a part of the whole — and answers three objections: that one of the two authorities must be wrong, that Kauṭilya's pradeśa is indistinguishable from *anāgatāvekṣaṇa*, and that Caraka's partial statement is the fault of incompleteness. It concludes that pradeśa covers what modern research calls forward reference, inference from track record, and sampling.

Keywords: pradeśa; atideśa; tantrayukti; cross-reference; forward reference; track record; precedent; sampling; representative selection; partial enumeration; Arthaśāstra; Suśruta; Caraka; anupāna

1. प्रवेशः · Place in the lists

Pradeśa is eleventh in Kauṭilya's list, immediately after atideśa; ninth in Suśruta's, immediately *before* atideśa; and fifth in Caraka's, far from atideśa, in the opening group of devices. The variation in place is a first sign that the three authorities understand the device differently. The noun is everyday Sanskrit: *pradeśa* is a region, a spot, a portion — as in *hṛdaya-pradeśa*, "the region of the heart". Each of the technical senses draws on this root meaning.

2. लक्षणानि · The definitions

> वक्तव्येन साधनं प्रदेशः
>
> सामदानभेददण्डैर्वा, यथापत्सु व्याख्यास्याम इति
>
> "Establishing by what is yet to be said is pradeśa." — Example: "Or by conciliation, gifts, dissension and force — as we shall explain under calamities."

Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 15.1.25–26

> प्रकृतस्यातिक्रान्तेन साधनं प्रदेशः। यथा देवदत्तस्यानेन शल्यमुद्धृतं तथा यज्ञदत्तस्याप्ययमुद्धरिष्यतीति ॥
>
> "Establishing the matter at hand by what has passed is pradeśa. For example: 'as this one extracted the foreign body of Devadatta, so he will extract that of Yajñadatta too.'"

Suśruta, *Uttaratantra* 65.16

> प्रदेशो नाम यद्बहुत्वादर्थस्य कात्स्र्न्येनाभिधातुमशक्यमेकदेशेनाभिधीयते; यथा- "अनुपानैकदेशोऽयमुक्तः प्रायोपयोगिकः' (सू.अ.२७) इत्यादि।
>
> "Pradeśa is where a matter which, because of its multitude, cannot be stated in full is stated by a part. For example: 'This portion of after-drinks, mostly in use, has been stated' (Sūtrasthāna 27), and so on."

Cakrapāṇidatta, *Āyurvedadīpikā* on Caraka, *Siddhisthāna* 12.41–44

The line Cakrapāṇi cites closes Caraka's long chapter on food and drink, and gives its own reason:

> अन्नपानैकदेशोऽयमुक्तः प्रायोपयोगिकः । द्रव्याणि न हि निर्देष्टुं शक्यं कात्स्न्र्येन नामभिः ॥
>
> "This portion of food and drink, mostly in use, has been stated; for substances cannot be indicated in full by their names."

Caraka, *Sūtrasthāna* 27.329

Caraka's text reads *annapāna-ekadeśaḥ*, "a portion of food and drink"; Cakrapāṇi's citation reads *anupāna-ekadeśaḥ*, "a portion of after-drinks".

3. लक्षणपरीक्षा · Testing the definitions

3.1 The mirror

	Kauṭilya	Suśruta	Caraka (Cakrapāṇi)
Atideśa	*uktena sādhanam* — by what **has been said** (backward)	*prakṛtasya anāgatasya sādhanam* — of what is **yet to come** (forward)	"Others too are to be understood so" — extension of a list
Pradeśa	*vaktavyena sādhanam* — by what **is yet to be said** (forward)	*prakṛtasya atikrāntena sādhanam* — by what **has passed** (backward)	Statement by a **part** — selection

Kauṭilya's pair is a pair of cross-references within a text: backward (atideśa) and forward (pradeśa). Suśruta's pair is a pair of inferences about a case in time: from the past (pradeśa) and to the future (atideśa). The temporal words are exactly reversed. Caraka's pair leaves time aside and concerns the relation of part and whole: atideśa extends a part to the whole, pradeśa presents the whole through a part.

3.2 Three senses of "another place"

The root meaning of *pradeśa* — a place, a portion — runs through all three. In Kauṭilya the ground of the present point lies in another *place in the text*: the sentence closes his discussion of how a would-be conqueror attacked by a confederacy of kings should break it up (AŚ 7.14.11), and the use of conciliation, gifts, dissension and force in misfortunes is indeed worked out in the ninth book, where Kauṭilya assigns each means to each kind of person (AŚ 9.7.68–72). In Suśruta it lies in another *case*, Devadatta's, already completed. In Caraka the whole is shown by a *portion* of itself. In each, the matter at hand is established, or presented, through something located elsewhere.

3.3 Suśruta's example as inference from record

Suśruta's example concerns the most practical question a patient can ask: can this surgeon do it? The answer is drawn from the surgeon's record. The inference is not certain — Yajñadatta's foreign body may be lodged differently — but it is reasonable, because it is tied to the matter at hand (*prakṛtasya*) by sameness of agent and of procedure. The qualifier is essential: the past case must be the same kind of case. A surgeon's success with a thorn in the foot does not establish competence with an arrow in the chest.

3.4 Caraka's pradeśa as principled selection

Caraka's chapter on food and drink lists hundreds of substances, and then says that it has given only a portion. Two things make this a device and not a confession. The portion is chosen by a stated criterion — *prāyopayogika*, "mostly in use" — and the reason for partiality is stated: the substances are too many to name. The reader therefore knows both that the list is incomplete and on what principle it was drawn. That is the logic of a representative sample.

4. पूर्वपक्षः खण्डनं मण्डनं च · Objections and replies

4.1 Must one of the two authorities not be wrong?

ननु कौटिल्यस्य अतिदेशः अतीतविषयः, सुश्रुतस्य प्रदेशः अतीतविषयः; कौटिल्यस्य प्रदेशः अनागतविषयः, सुश्रुतस्य अतिदेशः अनागतविषयः। एकस्याः एव संज्ञायाः विपरीतौ अर्थौ। अतः एकः अवश्यम् अयथार्थः इति चेत्, न। संज्ञा शास्त्रकारस्य स्वाधीना — “स्वसंज्ञा” इति तन्त्रयुक्तिः एव। कौटिल्यः ग्रन्थस्य अवयवान् परस्परं सम्बध्नाति — तस्य अतिदेशप्रदेशौ ग्रन्थान्तर्गतौ निर्देशौ। सुश्रुतः रोगिणः कालक्रमं पश्यति — तस्य अतिदेशप्रदेशौ व्यवहारगतौ अनुमानौ। विषयभेदात् विभागभेदः, न विरोधः। उभयोः तु एकः साधारणः धर्मः — प्रकृतस्य अन्यस्थानेन साधनम्। स्थानं ग्रन्थे वा काले वा।

Objection: Kauṭilya’s atideśa concerns the past and Suśruta’s pradeśa concerns the past; Kauṭilya’s pradeśa concerns the future and Suśruta’s atideśa the future. One and the same name has opposite meanings. So one of them must be wrong. **Reply:** No. A technical name is at the author’s disposal — that is itself a tantrayukti, *svasaṃjñā* (TY-23). Kauṭilya connects the parts of a text with one another; his atideśa and pradeśa are references within the text. Suśruta looks at the course of a patient in time; his atideśa and pradeśa are inferences in practice. Because the domains differ, the divisions differ; there is no contradiction. Both share one common feature: the matter at hand is established through another place — a place in the text or a place in time.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.2 Is Kauṭilya’s pradeśa not the same as anāgatāvekṣaṇa?

ननु कौटिल्यः एव “पश्चादेवं विहितम् इत्यनागतावेक्षणम्” इति वदति, उदाहरति च “तुलाप्रतिमानं पौतवाध्यक्षे वक्ष्यामः” इति। प्रदेशोदाहरणम् अपि “आपत्सु व्याख्यास्यामः” इति। उभयत्र भविष्यद्वचनस्य निर्देशः। अतः पुनरुक्तिः इति चेत्, न। अनागतावेक्षणे विषयः केवलं स्थगितः — “तुलाप्रतिमानं” इह न उच्यते, अन्यत्र वक्ष्यते; इह तस्य प्रयोजनं नास्ति। प्रदेशे तु वक्तव्येन प्रकृतस्य साधनम् — “सामदानभेददण्डैर्वा” इति इह उपायः विधीयते, तस्य विस्तरः साधनं च आपत्प्रकरणे। लक्षणे “साधनम्” इति पदं भेदकम्: अनागतावेक्षणं स्थानसूचनं, प्रदेशः भाविना वचनेन वर्तमानस्य उपपादनम्।

Objection: Kauṭilya himself says “‘it will be laid down thus later’ — that is anāgatāvekṣaṇa”, with the example “we shall describe balances and weights under the superintendent of standards”. The example of pradeśa is also “we shall explain under calamities”. In both a later statement is pointed to. So one is redundant. **Reply:** No. In anāgatāvekṣaṇa the topic is simply deferred: balances and weights are not discussed here but will be elsewhere; here they serve no

purpose. In pradeśa the matter at hand is established by what is to be said: "or by conciliation, gifts, dissension and force" prescribes the means *here*, and its elaboration and justification are in the section on calamities. The word *sādhanam*, "establishing", in the definition is what distinguishes them. Anāgatāvekṣaṇa indicates a place; pradeśa supports a present statement by a future one.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.3 Is Caraka's partial statement not the fault of incompleteness?

ननु "न्यूनम्" इति वाक्यदोषः। एकदेशेन अभिधानं न्यूनम् एव — यत् वक्तव्यं तत् सर्वं न उक्तम्। अतः प्रदेशः दोषः, न युक्तिः इति चेत्, न। न्यूनं तदा दोषः यदा वक्तुं शक्यं न उच्यते, अनुक्तत्वं च न ज्ञाप्यते। प्रदेशे तु "कात्स्न्र्येन अभिधातुम् अशक्यम्" इति हेतुः, "एकदेशः अयम्" इति ज्ञापनं, "प्रायोपयोगिकः" इति ग्रहणनियमः — त्रयम् अपि उक्तम्। अशक्ये पूर्णत्वं न अपेक्ष्यते; अज्ञापिते न्यूनत्वे दोषः, ज्ञापिते तु प्रामाणिकता। अतः प्रदेशः न्यूनदोषस्य परिहारः, न तस्य उदाहरणम्।

Objection: "deficiency" (*nyūna*) is a fault of statement. Stating by a part is plainly deficient — not all that should be said has been said. So pradeśa is a fault, not a device. **Reply:** No. Deficiency is a fault when what could be said is not said and the omission is not made known. In pradeśa three things are stated: the reason — "it cannot be stated in full"; the notice — "this is a portion"; and the rule of selection — "mostly in use". Completeness is not required where it is impossible. Unannounced deficiency is a fault; announced deficiency is honesty. Pradeśa is therefore the remedy for the fault of deficiency, not an instance of it.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

5. सिद्धान्तः · The settled view

प्रकृतस्य अर्थस्य अन्यस्थानेन — ग्रन्थे वक्ष्यमाणेन, व्यवहारे अतिक्रान्तेन तुल्येन, विषये वा नियमेन गृहीतेन एकदेशेन — साधनम् अभिधानं वा, सः प्रदेशः।

"Pradeśa is the establishing or presentation of the matter at hand through another place — through what is yet to be said in the text, through a past case of the same kind in practice, or through a part of the subject taken by a stated rule."

Definition composed for this article.

The definition keeps the three senses distinct while showing their common root. Each qualifier carries a condition from the analysis above: the forward reference must *establish* (not merely defer), the past case must be *of the same kind*, and the part must be taken *by a stated rule*.

6. आधुनिकसंवादः · The modern counterpart

Classical form	Modern counterpart
Kauṭilya: support by a later section	**Forward reference** with justification deferred: "we propose X; its justification is given in Section 5"
Suśruta: inference from a past case of the same kind	**Track record** and **precedent**; prior success as evidence of capacity; case-based reasoning; reference-class forecasting
Caraka: a portion by a stated rule	**Sampling**: a representative selection with a stated sampling frame and inclusion criterion; a "selected" bibliography
"This is a portion"	The **limitations** statement: announcing what the study does not cover

Caraka's line could serve as a model sentence for any limitations section: what was covered ("this portion"), by what rule ("mostly in use"), and why the whole was not attempted ("for substances cannot be indicated in full by their names").

7. प्रयोगाः · Uses

7.1 In research

For every sample, state the three things Caraka states: that it is a sample, the rule by which it was drawn, and why the whole population could not be covered. When citing earlier success as grounds for a method, observe Suśruta's condition: the earlier case must be of the same kind. When a claim is justified later in the paper, say so at the point of the claim, so that the reader knows the support exists.

7.2 In teaching

No syllabus can cover a subject in full. Tell students which portion is being taught, by what rule it was chosen, and where the rest can be found. Students who know the shape of the whole learn the part better.

7.3 In daily life

When choosing a doctor, a builder or a teacher, we use Suśruta's pradeśa: what they have done before. The device reminds us to ask whether the past work was of the same kind as ours. When summarising for others, use Caraka's: say that it is a summary and what was left out.

8. अभ्यासः · Exercise

1. Draw up, for your own field, a table like the one in §3.1 showing how a forward reference, a backward reference, an extension and a selection appear in a typical paper.

2. Write the limitations statement of a study in the form of Caraka's line: what was covered, by what rule, and why the whole was not.
3. Give an example of a misleading pradeśa of Suśruta's type — an inference from a past case that was not of the same kind — and state the condition that was violated.

9. उपसंहारः · Conclusion

Pradeśa is reference to another place or to a part. Kauṭilya points forward in the text, Suśruta back to a completed case, Caraka to a portion of an endless subject. Set beside atideśa, the definitions of Kauṭilya and Suśruta form an exact mirror, which is explained by the difference between a text's cross-references and a practitioner's inferences in time; the common root is the establishing of the matter at hand through another place. Kauṭilya's pradeśa is distinguished from mere deferral by its function of support, and Caraka's partial statement is not a fault because it announces its partiality and its rule. Forward references, track records and representative samples are its modern forms.

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. Caraka. *Caraka Saṃhitā*, Sūtrasthāna 27 (*annapānavidhi*), with Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*.
8. Kauṭilya. *Arthaśāstra* 15.1.59–62 (*anāgatāvekṣaṇa*, *atikrāntāvekṣaṇa*).

How to cite. Mantha Srinivasu. 2026. "प्रदेशः — The Part for the Whole: Reference and Sampling." *तन्त्रयुक्तिविमर्शः · Tantrayukti Studies*, TY-2026/12. Sanskrit Manthan, 9 Nov 2026. https://sanskritmanthan.in/a/ty-12-pradesha

Author: ORCID 0000-0002-8834-3782 · Google Scholar

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23947921

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.