TY-2026 · 19 — Tantrayukti Studies

अनुमतम्

The Unrefuted View: Scholarly Consensus

डॉ. मन्था-श्रीनिवासुः · Dr. Mantha Srinivasu · 13 Nov 2026 · AṠ 15.1.41–42; Su. Utt. 65.28

Abstract

Anumata, "the assented", is the device by which a śāstra accepts another's view by not refuting it. Kauṭilya defines it as "another's statement, not contradicted", and his example is the division of a battle array "into wings, centre and reserve, according to Uśanas", which he cites without objection. Suśruta defines it as "another's view, not refuted": if someone says there are seven tastes, "that is assented to in a way, because it is not refuted." Cakrapāṇi defines it as "assent by not barring the view of some", and cites Caraka's treatment of a retained dead foetus, where three views on its management — expelling it with the placenta, Atharvavedic rites, extraction by an experienced surgeon — are set side by side without rejection. The device is cited by name in the Nyāyabhāṣya: Vātsyāyana justifies treating the mind as a sense-organ, though the sūtra does not list it, from the practice of another system, "for the tantrayukti is: another's view, not refuted, is assented to." This article examines what non-refutation signifies, contrasts Suśruta's qualified assent to "seven tastes" with Caraka's explicit refutation of the same view, and answers three objections: that silence is not assent, that anumata is the same as citation or pūrvapakṣa, and that partial assent is too vague to be useful. It concludes that anumata is the device of tacit acceptance, which makes every unrefuted citation a commitment, and that its modern forms are the adopted framework, the uncontested premise and the responsibility of citation.

Keywords: anumata; tantrayukti; assent; tacit acceptance; non-refutation; citation; consensus; adopted framework; Nyāyabhāṣya; Arthaśāstra; Suśruta; Caraka; rasa; garbhaśalya; vyūha

1. प्रवेशः · Place in the lists

Anumata is eighteenth in Kauṭilya's list, twentieth in Suśruta's and twenty-second in Caraka's. In the medical lists it stands near *pūrvapakṣa* and *uttarapakṣa* (TY-24, TY-25) — the devices by which other views are stated and answered — and supplies the third possibility: a view that is stated and neither answered nor rejected. The word is the past participle of *anu-√man*, "to think after, to agree": what is thought along with.

2. लक्षणानि · The definitions

> परवाक्यमप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतम्
>
> पक्षावुरस्यं प्रतिग्रहेत्यौशनसो व्यूहविभाग इति
>
> "Another's statement, not contradicted, is anumata." — Example: "Wings, centre, reserve — this is the division of the battle array according to Uśanas."

Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 15.1.41–42

> परमतमप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतम्। यथा अन्यो ब्रूयात् सप्त रसा इति, तच्चाप्रतिषेधादनुमन्यते कथंचिदिति ॥
>
> "Another's view, not refuted, is anumata. For example: another may say 'there are seven tastes'; and that, because it is not refuted, is assented to in a way."

Suśruta, *Uttaratantra* 65.28

> अनुमतं नाम एकीयमतस्यानिवारणेनानुमननं; यथा- "गर्भशल्यस्य जरायुःप्रपातनं कर्म संशमनमित्येके" (शा.अ.८) इत्याद्येकीयमतं प्रतिपाद्याप्रतिषेधादनुमन्यते।
>
> "Anumata is assent by not barring the view of some. For example: having set forth the view of some — 'the remedy for a retained foetus is the expulsion of the placenta, say some' (Śārīrasthāna 8) — it is assented to because it is not refuted."

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

The passage Cakrapāṇi cites sets out three views in sequence and then passes, without choosing among them, to the care of the patient:

> तस्य गर्भशल्यस्य जरायुप्रपातनं कर्म संशमनमित्याहुरेके, मन्त्रादिकमथर्ववेदविहितमित्येके, परिदृष्टकर्मणा शल्यहर्त्रा हरणमित्येके। व्यपगतगर्भशल्यां तु स्त्रियमामगर्भां सुरासीध्वरिष्टमधुमदिरासवानामन्यतममग्रे सामर्थ्यतः पाययेद्गर्भकोष्ठशुद्ध्यर्थमर्तिविस्मरणार्थं प्रहर्षणार्थं च , अतः परं संप्रीणनैर्- बलानुरक्षिभिरस्नेहसंप्रयुक्तैर्यवाग्वादिभिर्वा तत्कालयोगिभिराहारैरुपचरेद्दोषधातुक्लेदविशोषणमात्रं कालम्। अतः परं स्नेहपानैर्बस्तिभिराहारविधिभिश्च दीपनीयजीवनीयबृंहणीयमधुरवातहरसमाख्यातैरुपचरेत्। परिपक्वगर्भशल्यायाः पुनर्विमुक्तगर्भशल्यायास्तदहरेव स्नेहोपचारः स्यात् ॥
>
> "For that foetal foreign body, some say the remedy is the expulsion of the placenta; some, the mantras and other means laid down in the Atharvaveda; some, extraction by a remover of foreign bodies of proven skill. When the foreign body has been removed from a woman whose foetus was unripe, she should first be given, according to her capacity, one of surā, sīdhu, ariṣṭa, madhu, madirā or āsava, to cleanse the womb, to make her forget her pain and to cheer her. Thereafter, for as long as it takes to dry up the excess moisture of the doṣas and dhātus, she should be cared for with nourishing, strength-preserving foods suited to the time, such as gruels without fat. After that she should be cared for with the drinking of fats, enemas and dietary regimens made with what are called appetising, life-giving, nourishing, sweet and vāta-removing substances. But for a woman from whom a mature foetal body has been delivered, the treatment with fats should begin on that very day."

Caraka, *Śārīrasthāna* 8.31

3. लक्षणपरीक्षा · Testing the definitions

3.1 The device named in the Nyāyabhāṣya

The clearest evidence that anumata was a recognised principle of interpretation comes from outside the tantrayukti lists. The Nyāyasūtra's definition of perception (1.1.4) speaks of the contact of sense and object, but the sūtra's list of senses (1.1.12) does not include the mind. Vātsyāyana argues that the mind is nonetheless a sense, and that no separate definition is needed for perception of pleasure and pain, which arises through it. His justification ends:

> परमतमप्रतिषिद्धमनुमतमिति हि तन्त्रयुक्तिः।
>
> "For the tantrayukti is: another's view, not refuted, is assented to."
>
> *Nyāyasūtra of Gautama* 1.1.4 (vatsyayana)

The preceding sentence says that this is "to be understood from the practice of another system" (*tantrāntarasamācārāt*): the mind is counted as a sense in other śāstras, the Nyāya sūtra does not refute that, and so it is accepted. The passage shows the device at work far from polity and medicine, used by a commentator to fill a gap in his own text from a view he does not contest.

3.2 Three examples, three degrees

Authority	View of another	How it is assented to
Kauṭilya	Uśanas: the array has wings, centre and reserve	**Adopted**: cited without objection as a framework
Caraka (Cakrapāṇi)	Three views on a retained foetus	**Allowed as options**: set side by side; the text moves on to after-care
Suśruta	"There are seven tastes"	**Tolerated**: "in a way" (*kathaṃcit*) — not adopted, not rejected

Kauṭilya elsewhere is quick to disagree with Uśanas and his school (see TY-10, where he rejects their view on the size of the council). His silence here is therefore meaningful. Caraka's three views on the retained foetus are of different kinds — physiological, ritual and surgical — and none is chosen; they are left as alternatives. Suśruta's qualifier *kathaṃcit*, "in some manner", signals the weakest assent: a view is allowed to stand without being endorsed.

Kauṭilya's own text bears this out. In the chapter on battle arrays he reports the division of Uśanas and, immediately after, that of the school of Bṛhaspati, and proceeds to the arrays themselves without rejecting either:

पक्षावुरस्यं प्रतिग्रह इत्यौशनसो व्यूहविभागः ॥
पक्षौ कक्षावुरस्यम्प्रतिग्रह इति बार्हस्पत्यः ॥

"'Wings, centre, reserve' — this is the division of the array according to Uśanas. 'Wings, flanks, centre, reserve' — according to Bṛhaspati."

Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 10.6.1–2

3.3 The seven tastes: anumata in Suśruta, refuted in Caraka

Suśruta's example is the more interesting because the same view is discussed by Caraka, who does refute it. In the Sūtrasthāna, Caraka reports a symposium of sages on the number of tastes:

एक एव रस इत्युवाच भद्रकाप्यः यं पञ्चानामिन्द्रियार्थानामन्यतमं जिह्वावैषयिकं भावमाचक्षते कुशलाः स पुनरुदकादनन्य इति । द्वौ रसाविति शाकुन्तेयो ब्राह्मणः छेदनीय उपशमनीयश्चेति । त्रयो रसा इति पूर्णाक्षो मौद्गल्यः छेदनीयोपशमनीयसाधारणा इति । चत्वारो रसा इति हिरण्याक्षः कौशिकः स्वादुर्हितश्च स्वादुरहितश्चास्वादुर्हितश्चास्वादुरहितश्चेति । पञ्च रसा इति कुमारशिरा भरद्वाजः भौमौदकाग्नेयवायव्यान्तरिक्षाः । षड्रसा इति वार्योविदो राजर्षिः गुरुलघुशीतोष्णस्निग्धरूक्षाः । सप्त रसा इति निमिर्वैदेहः मधुराम्ललवणकटुतिक्तकषायक्षाराः । अष्टौ रसा इति बडिशो धामार्गवः मधुराम्ललवणकटुतिक्तकषायक्षाराव्यक्ताः । अपरिसंख्येया रसा इति काङ्कायनो बाह्लीकभिषकाश्रयगुणकर्मसंस्वादविशेषाणामपरिसंख्येयत्वात् ॥

"'Taste is only one,' said Bhadrakāpya — that which the experts call the object of the tongue, one of the five sense-objects, and it is not other than water. 'Two tastes,' said the Brahmin Śākunteya — the reducing and the pacifying. 'Three tastes,' said Pūrṇākṣa Maudgalya — the reducing, the pacifying and the common. 'Four tastes,' said Hiraṇyākṣa Kauśika — pleasant and wholesome, pleasant and unwholesome, unpleasant and wholesome, unpleasant and unwholesome. 'Five tastes,' said Kumāraśiras Bharadvāja — earthy, watery, fiery, airy and ethereal. 'Six tastes,' said the royal sage Vāryovida — heavy, light, cold, hot, unctuous and dry. 'Seven tastes,' said Nimi of Videha — sweet, sour, salt, pungent, bitter, astringent and alkaline. 'Eight tastes,' said Baḍiśa Dhāmārgava — sweet, sour, salt, pungent, bitter, astringent, alkaline and unmanifest. 'Tastes are innumerable,' said Kāṅkāyana, physician of Bāhlīka, because the substrates, qualities, actions and particular savours are innumerable."

Caraka, *Sūtrasthāna* 26.8

Ātreya then declares that there are six tastes only, and answers Nimi directly: alkali (*kṣāra*) "is not a taste" but a substance made from many tastes (1.26.9). Thus the very view that Suśruta offers as an example of anumata is, in Caraka, a *pūrvapakṣa* refuted. Whether a view is anumata depends not on

the view but on how a text treats it. Suśruta, who also holds six tastes, chooses not to quarrel with the seventh — perhaps because, read "in a way", alkali can be included as a substance of distinctive savour. Anumata is a decision of the author, and must be read as such.

4. पूर्वपक्षः खण्डनं मण्डनं च · Objections and replies

4.1 Is silence assent?

> ननु अप्रतिषेधः न अनुमतिः। ग्रन्थकारः प्रमादात्, अनवधानात्, विषयान्तरत्वात् वा परमतं न प्रतिषेधेत्। अतः "अप्रतिषिद्धम् अनुमतम्" इति नियमः असिद्धः इति चेत्, न। यः ग्रन्थकारः अन्यत्र परमतानि सततं प्रतिषेधति — "नेति कौटिल्यः", "षडेव रसा इत्युवाच भगवानात्रेयः" — तस्य अत्र मौनं सार्थकम्। प्रतिषेधस्य अभ्यासे सति अप्रतिषेधः ज्ञापकः। किञ्च परमतस्य उपन्यासः एव प्रयोजनवान् — यदि अयोग्यं, किमर्थम् उपन्यस्तम्? उपन्यस्य अप्रतिषेधः अनुमतेः लिङ्गम्। वात्स्यायनः अपि अनेन न्यायेन मनसः इन्द्रियत्वं साधयति। प्रमादः तु कल्प्यते यदा अनुमतं ग्रन्थस्य अन्यवचनैः विरुध्यते — तदा अनुमतत्वं बाध्यते।
>
> **Objection:** non-refutation is not assent. An author may fail to refute another's view through oversight, inattention, or because it lies outside his subject. So the rule "what is not refuted is assented to" is not established. **Reply:** No. When an author constantly refutes other views elsewhere — "no, says Kauṭilya"; "six tastes only, said the venerable Ātreya" — his silence in a particular place is significant. Where refutation is habitual, non-refutation is a sign. Moreover, setting forth another's view has a purpose: if it were unacceptable, why set it forth? Setting it forth without refutation is the mark of assent. Vātsyāyana establishes by this very principle that the mind is a sense. Oversight is to be supposed only when the assented view contradicts other statements of the text; then its status as anumata is overturned.
>
> Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.2 Is anumata not just citation, or pūrvapakṣa?

> ननु अपदेशे अपि परवाक्यम् उपन्यस्यते — "इति मानवाः", "इति औशनसाः"; पूर्वपक्षे अपि परवाक्यम्। अनुमते अपि। अतः त्रयाणाम् अभेदः इति चेत्, न। अपदेशः वक्तुः निर्देशः — कस्य इदं वचनम् इति; तत्र स्वीकारः प्रतिषेधः वा पश्चात् भवति। पूर्वपक्षः "प्रतिषेद्धव्यं वाक्यम्" — प्रतिषेधाय एव उपन्यस्तः। अनुमतम् "अप्रतिषिद्धम्" — स्वीकाराय उपन्यस्तम्। एकम् एव परवाक्यं — "सप्त रसाः" — चरके पूर्वपक्षः, सुश्रुते अनुमतम्; उभयत्र च अपदेशः सम्भवति। अतः अपदेशः स्रोतसः धर्मः, पूर्वपक्षानुमते ग्रन्थकारस्य वृत्तेः धर्मौ।

Objection: in apadeśa another's statement is set forth — "say the Mānavas", "say the Auśanasas"; in pūrvapakṣa too, and in anumata. So the three do not differ. **Reply:** No. Apadeśa names the speaker — whose statement this is; its acceptance or rejection comes afterwards. Pūrvapakṣa is "a statement to be refuted" — set forth precisely to be refuted. Anumata is "not refuted" — set forth to be accepted. One and the same view — "seven tastes" — is a pūrvapakṣa in Caraka and an anumata in Suśruta, and in both it can carry an apadeśa. Apadeśa is a property of the source; pūrvapakṣa and anumata are properties of the author's stance.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.3 Is partial assent not too vague?

ननु सुश्रुतः "अनुमन्यते कथंचित्" इति वदति। कियत् अनुमतम्, कथम्, इति न ज्ञायते। अनिश्चिता अनुमतिः न शास्त्रार्थः इति चेत्, न। अनुमतं न सिद्धान्तः। सिद्धान्तः ग्रन्थकारस्य प्रतिज्ञा, अनुमतं तु परमतस्य अवकाशदानम्। "कथंचित्" इति पदं पाठकं बोधयति — इदं न मम मतम्, न च विरुद्धम्; अस्य ग्रहणे विवेकः कर्तव्यः। चरकस्य त्रीणि मतानि अपि एवम् — न एकं सिद्धान्तत्वेन स्थापितं, किन्तु त्रयम् अपि अवकाशं लभते। अनुमतस्य मात्रा पाठकेन प्रकरणतः ज्ञेया। अनिश्चयः अत्र दोषः न, किन्तु सत्यस्य प्रतिबिम्बः — यत्र शास्त्रकारः अपि न निश्चिनोति, तत्र निश्चयस्य अभिनयः असत्यम्।

Objection: Suśruta says "assented to in a way". How much is assented to, and how, is not known. An uncertain assent is not the teaching of a śāstra. **Reply:** No. Anumata is not a settled doctrine. A doctrine is the author's own thesis; anumata gives room to another's view. The word "in a way" tells the reader: this is not my view, nor is it contrary to it; judgement is needed in taking it up. Caraka's three views are the same — none is established as doctrine, but all three are given room. The degree of assent is to be learnt by the reader from the context. Uncertainty here is not a fault but a reflection of the truth: where the author himself is not certain, to pretend certainty would be false.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

5. सिद्धान्तः · The settled view

परस्य मतस्य उपन्यासः, यस्य ग्रन्थकारः — अन्यत्र प्रतिषेधे प्रवृत्तः अपि — अत्र प्रतिषेधं न करोति, येन तत् मतं स्वीकृतं, विकल्पत्वेन अनुज्ञातं, कथंचित् सह्यं वा भवति, सिद्धान्तात् च पृथक् तिष्ठति, तत् अनुमतम्।

"Anumata is the setting forth of another's view which the author — though given to refutation elsewhere — does not refute here, so that the view is adopted, allowed as an option, or tolerated in a way, while remaining distinct from his own doctrine."

> Definition composed for this article.

The definition adds two elements to the classical ones: the condition that makes silence significant (refutation practised elsewhere), and the three degrees of assent seen in the examples (adopted, allowed as option, tolerated). The final clause — distinct from his own doctrine — protects the reader from mistaking anumata for siddhānta.

6. आधुनिकसंवादः · The modern counterpart

Classical form	Modern counterpart
Kauṭilya: Uśanas's array adopted	The **adopted framework**: a model or classification from another author used without critique ("following X's typology …")
Caraka: three views left standing	Reporting alternative approaches without ranking them where evidence is insufficient
Suśruta: "in a way"	Hedged acceptance: "for the purposes of this study we accept …"
Vātsyāyana: from the practice of another system	Importing a concept from a neighbouring discipline on the ground that one's own does not contradict it
Silence as a sign	The **responsibility of citation**: citing a claim without qualification is read as endorsing it

Modern academic readers apply the rule of anumata whether authors intend it or not: a claim cited without qualification is taken to be accepted. Hence the norm that one should not cite what one does not accept without saying so. Anumata explains why.

7. प्रयोगाः · Uses

7.1 In research

Review your citations for silent assent. For every view you cite, decide whether you adopt it, allow it as one option among others, tolerate it with reservation, or reject it — and let the text show which. In reading classical texts, note which views an author refutes and which he leaves standing; the second list reveals as much about his position as the first.

7.2 In teaching

Set Caraka's and Suśruta's treatments of "seven tastes" side by side and ask students to explain why the same view is refuted in one and assented to in the other. The exercise teaches that the status of a view depends on the author's stance.

7.3 In daily life

In meetings, a proposal that no one opposes is usually taken as agreed — anumata at work. If you do not agree, say so; if you agree only "in a way", say that too. Silence will be read as assent.

8. अभ्यासः · Exercise

1. In a chapter of the Arthaśāstra, list every view of a predecessor that Kauṭilya cites. Mark each as refuted (pūrvapakṣa) or not (anumata).
2. Read Caraka, Sūtrasthāna 26.8–9. Which of the eight views does Ātreya refute explicitly, and which does he answer only by stating his own?
3. In a paper you are writing, find a citation that silently implies assent. Rewrite it to state your stance.

9. उपसंहारः · Conclusion

Anumata is assent by non-refutation. Kauṭilya adopts Uśanas's battle array, Caraka leaves three views on a retained foetus standing, Suśruta tolerates "seven tastes" in a way; Vātsyāyana names the device to justify counting the mind as a sense. Silence is assent where refutation is habitual; anumata differs from citation and from pūrvapakṣa because it concerns the author's stance, not the view's source; and its degrees — adoption, option, tolerance — are a faithful record of how far the author agrees. The comparison of Suśruta and Caraka on the seven tastes shows that anumata is a decision, and every unqualified citation in a modern paper is one too.

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. Vātsyāyana. *Nyāyabhāṣya* on *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.4. E-text as used on sanskritmanthan.in.
8. Caraka. *Caraka Saṃhitā*, Sūtrasthāna 26.8–9 (on the number of tastes) and Śārīrasthāna 8.31 (*garbhaśalya*), with Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*.
9. Kauṭilya. *Arthaśāstra* 10.6 (battle arrays).

How to cite. Mantha Srinivasu. 2026. "अनुमतम् — The Unrefuted View: Scholarly Consensus." *तन्त्रयुक्तिविमर्शः · Tantrayukti Studies*, TY-2026/19. Sanskrit Manthan, 13 Nov 2026.
https://sanskritmanthan.in/a/ty-19-anumata
Author: ORCID 0000-0002-8834-3782 · Google Scholar
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23947941
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.