TY-2026 · 16 — Tantrayukti Studies

प्रसङ्गः

The Recurring Matter: Consistency across a Text

डॉ. मन्था-श्रीनिवासुः · Dr. Mantha Srinivasu · 11 Nov 2026 · AŚ 15.1.34–35; Su. Utt. 65.22

Abstract

Prasaṅga is the device of the recurring matter: a statement that belongs to more than one topic and appears in more than one place. Kauṭilya defines it as "a matter common to another topic", with a phrase that serves two sections of his work: "'on land assigned for agriculture' — this is common with the preceding." Suśruta defines it as "completion through another topic", or the matter, stated more than once in separate topics, that is completed by its recurrence, and his example can be traced in the Saṃhitā: the definition of the person as "the combination of the five great elements and the embodied self", given in the first chapter of the Sūtrasthāna, is cited again in the first chapter of the Śārīrasthāna, where it is completed by the words "this is the person of action, with whom therapeutics is concerned." Cakrapāṇi defines it as "restatement of a matter stated before, because it arises in the context and so on", with the excessive use of the senses, described in the Sūtrasthāna and described again in the Śārīrasthāna. Caraka himself counts repetition (*punarukta*) as a fault of speech and praises a śāstra "free from the fault of repetition". This article shows how prasaṅga differs from that fault, traces Suśruta's example in the text, and answers three objections: that prasaṅga is repetition, that it is the same as atideśa, and that Kauṭilya's definition differs from the physicians'. It concludes that prasaṅga is the device of consistency across a long text, and that its modern forms are the recapitulated definition, the cross-cutting theme and the incidental finding.

Keywords: prasaṅga; tantrayukti; recurrence; repetition; punarukta; consistency; cross-cutting theme; recapitulation; karmapuruṣa; Arthaśāstra; Suśruta; Caraka; Mīmāṃsā; tantra and prasaṅga

1. प्रवेशः · Place in the lists

Prasaṅga is fifteenth in all three lists — Kauṭilya's, Suśruta's and Caraka's. It shares this agreement only with arthāpatti (TY-14), which stands thirteenth in all three. The word, from *pra-* + √*sañj*, "to cling to, to attach", means an attachment or connection: a matter that attaches itself to more than one place. In ordinary usage *prasaṅgāt* means "incidentally, in passing", and the Mīmāṃsakas use *prasaṅga* for the incidental benefit one act confers on another. The tantrayukti has its own, related sense.

2. लक्षणानि · The definitions

> प्रकरणान्तरेण समानोऽर्थः प्रसङ्गः
>
> कृषिकर्मप्रदिष्टायां भूमाविति समानं पूर्वेणेति

> "A matter common to another topic is prasaṅga." — Example: "'On land assigned for agricultural work' — this is common with the preceding."
>
> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 15.1.34–35

> प्रकरणान्तरेण समापनं प्रसङ्गः, यद्वा प्रकरणान्तरितो यो ऽर्थो ऽसकृदुक्तः समाप्यते स प्रसङ्गः। यथा पञ्चमहाभूतशरीरिसमवायः पुरुषस्तस्मिन् क्रिया सो ऽधिष्ठानमिति वेदोत्पत्तावभिधाय, भूतचिन्तायां पुनरुक्तं यतो ऽभिहितं पञ्चमहाभूतशरीरिसमवायः पुरुष इति, स खल्वेष कर्मपुरुषश्चिकित्साधिकृत इति ॥
>
> "Completion through another topic is prasaṅga; or, the matter separated by other topics, stated more than once, which is completed — that is prasaṅga. For example: having said in the chapter on the origin of the Veda (Sūtrasthāna 1) that 'the person is the combination of the five great elements and the embodied self; in him is action; he is the substratum', it is said again in the reflection on the elements (Śārīrasthāna 1): 'since it has been said that the person is the combination of the five great elements and the embodied self, this indeed is the person of action, with whom therapeutics is concerned.'"
>
> Suśruta, *Uttaratantra* 65.22

> प्रसङ्गो नाम पूर्वाभिहितस्यार्थस्य प्रकरणागतत्वादिना पुनरभिधानं; यथा- "तत्रातिप्रभावतां दृश्यानातिमात्रदर्शनमतियोगः" (सू.अ.११) एवमाद्यभिधाय, पुनः "अत्युग्रशब्दश्रवणाच्छ्रवणात् सर्वशो न च" (शा.अ.१) इत्यादिना पूर्वोक्त एवार्थो ऽभिधीयते।
>
> "Prasaṅga is the restatement of a matter stated before, because it arises in the context and so on. For example: having said 'there, the excessive seeing of objects of excessive brilliance is excessive use' (Sūtrasthāna 11) and so on, the same matter is stated again in 'from hearing excessively harsh sounds, from not hearing at all …' (Śārīrasthāna 1)."
>
> Cakrapāṇidatta, *Āyurvedadīpikā* on Caraka, *Siddhisthāna* 12.41–44

3. लक्षणपरीक्षा · Testing the definitions

3.1 Suśruta's example in the text

Suśruta's example can be checked in his own work. In the first chapter of the Sūtrasthāna, the chapter on the origin of the Veda (*vedotpatti*), he defines the person:

> अस्मिन् शास्त्रे पञ्चमहाभूतशरीरिसमवायः पुरुष इत्युच्यते । तस्मिन् क्रिया सो ऽधिष्ठानं कस्मात् लोकस्य द्वैविध्यात् लोको हि द्विविधः स्थावरो जङ्गमश्च द्विविधात्मक एवाग्नेयः सौम्यश्च तद्भूयस्त्वात् पञ्चात्मको वा तत्र चतुर्विधो भूतग्रामः संस्वेदजरायुजाण्डजोद्भिज्जसंज्ञः तत्र पुरुषः प्रधानं तस्योपकरणमन्यत् तस्मात् पुरुषो ऽधिष्ठानम् ॥

> "In this śāstra the person is said to be the combination of the five great elements and the embodied self. In him is action; he is the substratum. Why? Because the world is twofold — the stationary and the moving; it is of two natures, fiery and cool, from the predominance of these, or else of five natures. There the class of beings is fourfold — sweat-born, womb-born, egg-born and sprout-born. Of these the person is principal; the rest is his equipment. Therefore the person is the substratum."
>
> Suśruta, *Sūtrasthāna* 1.22

In the first chapter of the Śārīrasthāna, the reflection on the elements (*bhūtacintā*), after a discussion of the nature of the self, he returns to it:

> न चायुर्वेदशास्त्रेषूपदिश्यन्ते सर्वगताः क्षेत्रज्ञा नित्याश्च; असर्वगतेषु च क्षेत्रज्ञेषु नित्यपुरुषख्यापकान् हेतूनुदाहरन्ति; आयुर्वेदशास्त्रसिद्धान्तेष्वसर्वगताः क्षेत्रज्ञा नित्याश्च, तिर्यग्योनिमानुषदेवेषु संचरन्ति धर्माधर्मनिमित्तं; त एते ऽनुमानग्राह्याः परमसूक्ष्माश्चेतनावन्तः शाश्वता लोहितरेतसोः सन्निपातेष्वभिव्यज्यन्ते, यतो ऽभिहितं---पञ्चमहाभूतशरीरिसमवायः पुरुष इति; स एष(एव?) कर्मपुरुषश्चिकित्साधिकृतः ॥
>
> "In the śāstras of Āyurveda the knowers of the field are not taught to be all-pervading and eternal; while holding them not all-pervading, they cite reasons that show the person to be eternal. In the settled doctrines of Āyurveda the knowers of the field are not all-pervading yet eternal; they move among animal, human and divine births, caused by merit and demerit. They are to be grasped by inference, supremely subtle, conscious, everlasting, and become manifest at the union of blood and semen. For it has been said: 'the person is the combination of the five great elements and the embodied self'. This is the person of action, with whom therapeutics is concerned."
>
> Suśruta, *Śārīrasthāna* 1.16

The second passage does not simply repeat the first. It places the definition in a new context — a discussion of the self as understood in philosophy — and completes it: the "person" of Āyurveda is the *karmapuruṣa*, the person who acts and is acted upon, not the all-pervading self of the philosophers. This is exactly what Suśruta's definition says: a matter stated more than once, in separate topics, which is *completed* (*samāpyate*) by its recurrence.

3.2 Caraka's example

Caraka discusses the excessive, deficient and wrong use of the senses (*atiyoga, ayoga, mithyāyoga*) in the Sūtrasthāna as one of the three causes of disease. In the Śārīrasthāna, discussing the causes of disease in relation to the self, he returns to the same matter:

> अत्युग्रशब्दश्रवणाच्छ्रवणात् सर्वशो न च । शब्दानां चातिहीनानां भवन्ति श्रवणाज्जडाः ॥

> "From hearing excessively harsh sounds, from not hearing at all, and from hearing sounds that are excessively faint, (the ears) become dull."
>
> Caraka, *Śārīrasthāna* 1.118

Cakrapāṇi explains the recurrence by "because it arises in the context and so on" (*prakaraṇāgatatvādinā*). The matter is needed in the second place for the argument there; to leave it out would break the argument, and to refer the reader back would interrupt it.

3.3 Kauṭilya: one statement, two topics

Kauṭilya's formulation is more economical: a matter "common to another topic" (*prakaraṇāntareṇa samānaḥ*). His example can be traced to his chapter on spies (AŚ 1.11). The procedure for the first kind of resident spy, a former renunciant, is set out in full:

> प्रव्रज्या प्रत्यवसितः प्रज्ञाशौचयुक्त उदास्थितः ॥
> स वार्त्ताकर्मप्रदिष्टायां भूमौ प्रभूतहिरण्यान्तेवासी कर्म कारयेत् ॥
> कर्मफलाच्च सर्वप्रव्रजितानां ग्रासाच्छादनावसथान्प्रतिविदध्यात् ॥
> वृत्तिकामांश्चोपजपेत् - "एतेनैव वेषेण राजार्थश्चरितव्यो भक्तवेतनकाले चोपस्थातव्यम्" इति ॥
> सर्वप्रव्रजिताश्च स्वं स्वं वर्गमेवमुपजपेयुः ॥
>
> "One who has returned from renunciation, endowed with wisdom and integrity, is the 'retired' (udāsthita) spy. On land assigned for the work of livelihood, with abundant money and many disciples, he should have work carried out. From the fruit of the work he should provide food, clothing and lodging for all renunciants. And he should win over those seeking a livelihood: 'In this very guise you are to work for the king, and present yourselves at the time of food and wages.' And all renunciants should win over their own groups in the same way."
>
> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 1.11.4–8

The next two kinds are then dealt with in a single sentence each:

> कर्षको वृत्तिक्षीणः प्रज्ञाशौचयुक्तो गृहपतिकव्यञ्जनः ॥
> स कृषिकर्मप्रदिष्टायां भूमौ - इति समानं पूर्वेण ॥
> वाणिजको वृत्तिक्षीणः प्रज्ञाशौचयुक्तो वैदेहकव्यञ्जनः ॥
> स वणिक्कर्मप्रदिष्टायां भूमौ - इति समानं पूर्वेण ॥
>
> "A cultivator fallen on hard times, endowed with wisdom and integrity, is the spy in the guise of a householder. He, on land assigned for agriculture — this is the same as the preceding. A trader fallen on hard times, endowed with wisdom and integrity, is the spy in the guise of a merchant. He, on land assigned for trade — this is the same as the preceding."
>
> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 1.11.9–12

The whole procedure — the assigned land, the workers, the support of dependants, the recruitment of agents — is common to all three topics. Kauṭilya states it once, changes the one word that differs (livelihood, agriculture, trade), and marks the identity: *samānaṃ pūrveṇa*. In Kauṭilya the emphasis falls on sameness — one statement serves several places — where in Suśruta it falls on completion, and in Caraka on restatement for the sake of the context.

3.4 The tension with the fault of repetition

Caraka lists among the marks of a good śāstra that it is "free from the fault of repetition" (*apagata-punarukta-doṣam*, Vimānasthāna 8.3), and among the faults of speech he defines repetition:

> अथ वाक्यदोषः---वाक्यदोषो नाम यथा खल्वस्मिन्नर्थ न्यूनम्, अनर्थकम्, अपार्ह्तकं, विरुद्धं चेति; एतानि ह्यन्तरेण न प्रकृतो ऽर्ह्तः प्रणश्येत्। तत्र न्यूनं---
> प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणोपनयनिगमनानामन्यतमेनापि न्यूनं न्यूनं भवति; यद्वा बहूपदिष्टहेतुकमेकेन हेतुना साध्यते तच्च न्यूनम्। अथाधिकम्---अधिकं नाम यन्न्यनविपरीतं, यद्वायुर्वेदे भाष्यमाणे बार्हस्पत्यमौशनसमन्यद्वा यत्किंचिदप्रतिसंबद्धार्थमुच्यते, यद्वा संबद्धार्थमपि द्विरभिधीयते तत् पुनरुक्तदोषत्वादधिकं; तच्च पुनरुक्तं द्विविधम्---अर्थपुनरुक्तं, शब्दपुनरुक्तं च; तत्रार्थपुनरुक्तं यथा---भेषजमौषधं साधनमिति, शब्दपुनरुक्तं पुनर्भेषजं भेषजमिति। अथानर्थकम्---अनर्ह्तकं नाम यद्वचनमक्षरग्राममात्रमेव स्यात् पञ्चवर्गवन्न चार्थतो गृह्यते। अथापार्थकम्---अपार्थकं नाम यदर्थवच्च परस्परेणासंयुज्यमानार्थकं; यथा---चक्रन(त)क्रवंशवज्रनिशाकरा इति। अथ विरुद्धं---विरुद्धं नाम यद्दृष्टान्तसिद्धान्तसमयैर्विरुद्धं; तत्र पूर्वं दृष्टान्तसिद्धान्तावुक्तौ; समयः पुनस्त्रिधा भवति; यथा---आयुर्वैदिकसमयः, याज्ञिकसमयः, कोक्षशास्त्रिकसमयश्चेति; तत्रायुर्वैदिकसमयःचतुष्पादं भेषजमिति, याज्ञिकसमयःआलभ्या यजमानैः पशव इति, मोक्षशास्त्रिकसमयःसर्वभूतेष्वहिंसेति; तत्र स्वसमयविपरीतमुच्यमानं विरुद्धं भवति। इति वाक्यदोषाः ॥
>
> "Now the faults of speech. The faults of speech in this matter are deficiency, meaninglessness, incoherence and contradiction; without these the matter at hand would not be lost. There, 'deficiency' is when any one of thesis, reason, example, application and conclusion is lacking; or when what has many reasons taught is established by one reason. Now 'excess': excess is the opposite of deficiency — as when, while Āyurveda is being discussed, something of Bṛhaspati's or Uśanas's science, or anything else unconnected in meaning, is said; or when what is connected in meaning is said twice: that is excess, because of the fault of repetition. Repetition is twofold: of sense and of word. Repetition of sense, as 'medicine, remedy, means'; repetition of word, as 'medicine, medicine'. Now 'meaninglessness': speech that is a mere collection of syllables, like the five series of consonants, and conveys no sense. Now 'incoherence': words each with a meaning, whose meanings do not connect with one another, as 'wheel, buttermilk, bamboo, thunderbolt, moon'. Now 'contradiction': what contradicts example, established doctrine or convention. Example and doctrine have been stated before; convention is threefold — that of

> Āyurveda, of the sacrificers, and of the seekers of liberation: ‘medicine has four limbs’ is the convention of Āyurveda; ‘animals are to be offered by sacrificers’ that of the sacrificers; ‘non-injury to all beings’ that of the seekers of liberation. What is said contrary to one’s own convention is contradiction. These are the faults of speech.”
>
> Caraka, *Vimānasthāna* 8.54

How can the same tradition count repetition as a fault and prasaṅga as a device? The answer is the subject of the first objection.

4. पूर्वपक्षः खण्डनं मण्डनं च · Objections and replies

4.1 Is prasaṅga not the fault of repetition?

> ननु चरकः एव “संबद्धार्थमपि द्विरभिधीयते तत् पुनरुक्तदोषत्वादधिकम्” इति वदति, “अपगतपुनरुक्तदोषम्” इति शास्त्रगुणं च। प्रसङ्गः तु पूर्वोक्तस्य पुनरभिधानम्। अतः प्रसङ्गः दोषः एव इति चेत्, न। पुनरुक्तं निष्प्रयोजनं — “भेषजम् औषधं साधनम्” इति एकस्मिन् एव स्थाने एकार्थानां शब्दानां पुनः पुनः प्रयोगः। प्रसङ्गः सप्रयोजनः — प्रकरणान्तरे, प्रकरणस्य अपेक्षया, अर्थस्य समापनाय। सुश्रुतस्य द्वितीयं वचनं “स एष कर्मपुरुषश्चिकित्साधिकृतः” इति नूतनम् अंशं योजयति। चक्रपाणिः “प्रकरणागतत्वादिना” इति हेतुं वदति। यत्र पुनर्वचनस्य हेतुः अस्ति, तत्र प्रसङ्गः; यत्र नास्ति, तत्र पुनरुक्तदोषः। एकम् एव वचनं स्थानभेदात् प्रयोजनभेदात् च गुणः दोषः वा भवति।
>
> **Objection:** Caraka himself says “what, though connected in sense, is said twice is excess, because of the fault of repetition”, and counts “free from the fault of repetition” as a merit of a śāstra. Prasaṅga is the restatement of what was said before. So prasaṅga is simply a fault. **Reply:** No. Repetition is purposeless — words of the same meaning used again and again in the same place, as “medicine, remedy, means”. Prasaṅga has a purpose: it occurs in another topic, as that topic requires, for the completion of the matter. Suśruta’s second statement adds a new element — “this is the person of action, with whom therapeutics is concerned”. Cakrapāṇi gives the reason — “because it arises in the context and so on”. Where there is a reason for restatement, it is prasaṅga; where there is none, it is the fault of repetition. The same statement becomes a merit or a fault according to its place and purpose.
>
> Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.2 Is prasaṅga not the same as atideśa?

ननु कौटिल्यस्य अतिदेशः “उक्तेन साधनम्” — पूर्वोक्तेन प्रकृतस्य साधनम्। प्रसङ्गः अपि “प्रकरणान्तरेण समानः” — पूर्वोक्तम् एव अत्र प्रयुज्यते। अतः भेदः नास्ति इति चेत्, न। अतिदेशे पूर्वोक्तः विधिः नवे विषये प्रसार्यते — ऋणादानविधिः दत्ताप्रदाने। तत्र विषयः भिन्नः, विधिः एकः। प्रसङ्गे तु विषयः अपि एकः — स एव अर्थः, स एव पुरुषः — केवलं प्रकरणं भिन्नम्। अतिदेशः विषयान्तरं गच्छति, प्रसङ्गः प्रकरणान्तरं। अतिदेशे पूर्वोक्तं न पुनः उच्यते, केवलं निर्दिश्यते; प्रसङ्गे पुनः उच्यते, यतः प्रकरणं तत् अपेक्षते।

> ननु कौटिल्यस्य अतिदेशः “उक्तेन साधनम्” — पूर्वोक्तेन प्रकृतस्य साधनम्। प्रसङ्गः अपि “प्रकरणान्तरेण समानः” — पूर्वोक्तम् एव अत्र प्रयुज्यते। अतः भेदः नास्ति इति चेत्, न। अतिदेशे पूर्वोक्तः विधिः सादृश्येन नवे विषये प्रसार्यते — ऋणादानविधिः दत्ताप्रदाने — तत्र विषयौ भिन्नौ, विधेः यथायोग्यं परिवर्तनं च अपेक्षितम्: दत्तं न ऋणं, किन्तु तद्वत् व्यवह्रियते। प्रसङ्गे तु अर्थः सर्वथा समानः — “समानं पूर्वेण” — स एव विधिः अक्षरशः, केवलम् एकं पदं परिवर्तितम्: “वार्त्ताकर्म” स्थाने “कृषिकर्म”। वैद्यानां प्रसङ्गे अपि स एव अर्थः — स एव पुरुषः, स एव इन्द्रियातियोगः — पुनः उच्यते। अतिदेशः सादृश्यस्य, प्रसङ्गः साम्यस्य। अतिदेशे पूर्वोक्तं न पुनः उच्यते, केवलं निर्दिश्यते; प्रसङ्गे पुनः पठनीयं, पुनः उच्यते वा, यतः प्रकरणं तत् अपेक्षते।
>
> **Objection:** Kauṭilya’s atideśa is “establishing by what has been said” — establishing the present matter by what was stated earlier. Prasaṅga too is “common to another topic” — what was stated earlier is applied here. So there is no difference. **Reply:** No. In atideśa a rule stated earlier is extended by likeness to a new subject — the rules on debts to undelivered gifts. The subjects differ, and the rule must be adapted as fits: a gift is not a debt, but it is treated like one. In prasaṅga the matter is wholly the same — “this is the same as the preceding”: the same procedure, word for word, with only one word changed, “agriculture” in place of “livelihood”. In the physicians’ examples too the very same matter — the same person, the same excessive use of the senses — is stated again. Atideśa is of likeness; prasaṅga of identity. In atideśa what was said is not said again but only referred to; in prasaṅga it is to be read again, or is said again, because the topic requires it.
>
> Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

ननु कौटिल्यः “समानः अर्थः” इति वदति — साम्ये बलम्; सुश्रुतः “समापनम्” इति — पूर्तौ बलम्; चक्रपाणिः “पुनरभिधानम्” इति — पुनर्वचने बलम्। त्रीणि भिन्नानि लक्षणानि इति चेत्, न। एकस्य एव व्यापारस्य त्रयः अंशाः। अर्थः एकः (कौटिल्यः), सः पुनः उच्यते (चक्रपाणिः), पुनर्वचनेन च पूर्यते (सुश्रुतः)। साम्यं विना प्रसङ्गः न, यतः अन्यः अर्थः स्यात्; पुनर्वचनं विना न, यतः अतिदेशः स्यात्; समापनं विना न, यतः पुनरुक्तं स्यात्। अतः त्रयाणां लक्षणानां समुच्चयः एव पूर्णं लक्षणम्।

Objection: Kauṭilya says “a common matter” — the stress is on sameness; Suśruta says “completion” — the stress is on fulfilment; Cakrapāṇi says “restatement” — the stress is on saying again. These are three different definitions. **Reply:** No. They are three aspects of one operation. The matter is one (Kauṭilya); it is said again (Cakrapāṇi); and by being said again it is completed (Suśruta). Without sameness there is no prasaṅga, for it would be a different matter; without restatement there is none, for it would be atideśa; without completion there is none, for it would be repetition. The three definitions together make the full definition.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

5. सिद्धान्तः · The settled view

एकस्य एव अर्थस्य प्रकरणान्तरे, तत्प्रकरणापेक्षया, पुनरभिधानं — येन सः अर्थः प्रकरणद्वये अपि सङ्गतः भवति, नवेन अंशेन वा पूर्यते — सः प्रसङ्गः।

“Prasaṅga is the restatement of one and the same matter in another topic, as that topic requires — by which the matter is shown to fit both topics, or is completed by a new element.”

Definition composed for this article.

The definition combines the three aspects and adds the criterion that separates prasaṅga from the fault of repetition: “as that topic requires”. A restatement that the new topic does not require is repetition; one that it requires is prasaṅga.

6. आधुनिकसंवादः · The modern counterpart

Classical form	Modern counterpart
Suśruta: the definition of the person restated and completed	The **recapitulated definition**: a key concept restated at the start of a later chapter and refined for its new use
Caraka: the misuse of the senses discussed in two contexts	A **cross-cutting theme** treated in each chapter where it bears on the argument

Classical form	Modern counterpart
Kauṭilya: one clause common to two sections	Shared provisions in legislation; common definitions sections
Caraka's fault of repetition	Redundancy that reviewers ask authors to remove
Mīmāṃsā *prasaṅga*: incidental benefit	The **incidental finding**: a result obtained in passing that serves another question

The difference between prasaṅga and redundancy is the difference between a thesis in which each chapter restates the key concept as its argument requires and one in which the same paragraph is pasted into every chapter. Reviewers object to the second and welcome the first.

7. प्रयोगाः · Uses

7.1 In research

In a long work, identify the matters that recur across chapters. For each recurrence, ask what the new context requires: a reminder, an application, a refinement? Restate only that much, and make the new element explicit, as Suśruta does with "the person of action". Check that every restatement agrees with the first statement; prasaṅga is also a test of consistency.

7.2 In teaching

Return to key concepts in later lessons, each time in a new context and with something added. Students learn a concept by meeting it in several places, not by hearing it repeated in one.

7.3 In daily life

Saying something again is helpful when the situation has changed and the point now bears on something new; it is tiresome when nothing has changed. Before repeating oneself, the question "what does this situation require?" separates prasaṅga from nagging.

8. अभ्यासः · Exercise

1. Find in Caraka or Suśruta another matter stated in two places. Compare the two statements: what does the second add, and what does its context require?
2. In your own thesis or a long paper, list the concepts that recur in more than one chapter. For each recurrence, mark it as prasaṅga (required and completed) or repetition (not required). Revise the repetitions.
3. Give an example of a Mīmāṃsā-type prasaṅga from your field — an action or study undertaken for one purpose that incidentally served another.

9. उपसंहारः · Conclusion

Prasaṅga is the recurring matter. Kauṭilya stresses its sameness, Caraka its restatement, Suśruta its completion; Suśruta's own definition of the person, stated in his first chapter and completed in the Śārīrasthāna as "the person of action, with whom therapeutics is concerned", shows the device at work. Prasaṅga is not the fault of repetition, because it is required by its new context and adds to the matter; it is not atideśa, because it restates one matter rather than extending a rule to another; and the three definitions are three aspects of one operation. In a long text it is the device of consistency: the same matter, wherever it appears, shown to fit and to grow.

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. Suśruta. *Suśruta Saṃhitā*, Sūtrasthāna 1.22 and Śārīrasthāna 1.16.
8. Caraka. *Caraka Saṃhitā*, Sūtrasthāna 11, Śārīrasthāna 1 and Vimānasthāna 8.3, 8.54 (on *punarukta*), with Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*.
9. Jaimini. *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, Book 12 (*tantra* and *prasaṅga*), with Śabara's *Bhāṣya*.

How to cite. Mantha Srinivasu. 2026. "प्रसङ्गः — The Recurring Matter: Consistency across a Text." *तन्त्रयुक्तिविमर्शः · Tantrayukti Studies*, TY-2026/16. Sanskrit Manthan, 11 Nov 2026. https://sanskritmanthan.in/a/ty-16-prasanga

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

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23947932

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.