TY-2026 · 26 — Tantrayukti Studies

उत्तरपक्षः · निर्णयः

The Decisive Reply: the Conclusion

डॉ. मन्था-श्रीनिवासुः · Dr. Mantha Srinivasu · 16 Nov 2026 · AŚ 15.1.55–56; Su. Utt. 65.26–27

Abstract

The reply that settles a dispute is called *uttarapakṣa* by Kauṭilya and *nirṇaya* by Suśruta and Caraka. Kauṭilya defines it as "the sentence that decides it" and closes his answer to Bhāradvāja's claim that a minister's calamity is graver than the king's with two clauses: "because (the subjects) depend on him; for the king stands in the place of the summit." Suśruta defines nirṇaya as "the answer to it", and answers the question why vāta-caused prameha is incurable with a mechanism: vāta, having afflicted the body, goes downward and passes urine mixed with fat, adipose tissue and marrow. Cakrapāṇi defines it as "the establishing of a matter that has been deliberated", and points to Caraka's tenth chapter, where Maitreya argues that medicine makes no difference — some who are treated die and some who are not treated recover — and Ātreya answers him point by point, concluding that the sixteen-part medicine, applied with reasoning, is sufficient for health. This article sets these replies beside the Nyāya definition of nirṇaya as "the determination of a matter after deliberation, through thesis and counter-thesis", shows that Ātreya's reply to Maitreya contains the logic of the modern controlled comparison, and answers three objections: that the reply is merely the author's assertion, that Kauṭilya's and the physicians' terms name different things, and that no settlement can be final. It concludes that uttarapakṣa–nirṇaya is the device that earns a conclusion by answering the strongest opposing case, and that its modern forms are the conclusion section, the response to reviewers and the adjudication of competing hypotheses.

Keywords: uttarapakṣa; nirṇaya; tantrayukti; reply; conclusion; settlement; adjudication; controlled comparison; effect modification; curability; Nyāyasūtra; Arthaśāstra; Suśruta; prameha; Caraka; Maitreya; Ātreya

1. प्रवेशः · Place in the lists

Uttarapakṣa is twenty-fifth in Kauṭilya's list; nirṇaya is nineteenth in Suśruta's and fourteenth in Caraka's. In all three it is the partner of *pūrvapakṣa* (TY-25). The two names describe the same act from two sides: *uttara-pakṣa*, "the later side", names its place in the argument, after the prior view; *nirṇaya*, from *nis-* + √*nī*, "to lead out, to bring to an end", names its result — the matter brought to a conclusion.

2. लक्षणानि · The definitions

> तस्य निर्णयनवाक्यमुत्तरपक्षः
>
> तदायत्तत्वात्, तत्कूटस्थानीयो हि स्वामीति
>
> "The sentence that decides it is uttarapakṣa." — Example: "Because (the subjects) depend on him; for the king stands in the place of the summit."
>
> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 15.1.55–56

> तस्योत्तरं निर्णयः। यथा शरीरं प्रपीड्य पश्चादधो गत्वा वसामेदोमज्जानुविद्धं मूत्रं विसृजति वातः, एवमसाध्या वातजा इति ॥
>
> "The answer to it is nirṇaya. For example: vāta, having afflicted the body, then goes downward and passes urine mixed with fat, adipose tissue and marrow; thus the vāta types are incurable."
>
> Suśruta, *Uttaratantra* 65.26

> निर्णयो नाम विचारितस्यार्थस्य व्यवस्थापनं; यथा- चतुष्पदभेषजत्वादि विचारं कृत्वाभिधीयते- "यदुक्तं षोडशकलं पूर्वाध्याये भेषजं तद्युक्तियुक्तमलमारोग्याय" (सू.अ.१०) इति।
>
> "Nirṇaya is the establishing of a matter that has been deliberated. For example: having deliberated on the four-limbed medicine and so on, it is stated: 'The sixteen-part medicine stated in the previous chapter, applied with reasoning, is sufficient for health' (Sūtrasthāna 10)."
>
> Cakrapāṇidatta, *Āyurvedadīpikā* on Caraka, *Siddhisthāna* 12.41–44

3. लक्षणपरीक्षा · Testing the definitions

3.1 The Nyāya definition

> विमृश्य पक्षप्रतिपक्षाभ्यामर्थावधारणं निर्णयः
>
> "Nirṇaya is the determination of a matter after deliberation, through thesis and counter-thesis."
>
> *Nyāyasūtra of Gautama* 1.1.41

> तयोरन्यतरस्य निवृत्तिरेकतरस्यावस्थानमवश्यम्भावि, यस्यावस्थानं तस्यार्थावधारणं निर्णयः।
>
> "Of the two, the withdrawal of one and the standing of the other is inevitable; the determination of the matter of that which stands is nirṇaya."
>
> *Nyāyasūtra of Gautama* 1.1.41 (vatsyayana)

The Nyāya definition makes explicit what the tantrayukti definitions assume: a settlement presupposes a dispute. Kauṭilya's "it" (*tasya*, "of it") refers back to the pūrvapakṣa; Suśruta's "the answer to it" does the same. Nirṇaya is not a conclusion in isolation but the outcome of a contest in which one side withdraws.

3.2 Kauṭilya: decision by structure

Kauṭilya's reply to Bhāradvāja (whose argument is quoted in TY-25) reads in full:

> नेति कौटिल्यः ॥
>
> मन्त्रिपुरोहितादिभृत्यवर्गमध्यक्षप्रचारं पुरुषद्रव्यप्रकृतिव्यसनप्रतीकारमेधनं च राजैव करोति ॥
>
> व्यसनिषु वामात्येष्वन्यानव्यसनिनः करोति ॥
>
> पूज्यपूजने दूष्यावग्रहे च नित्ययुक्तस्तिष्ठति ॥
>
> स्वामी च सम्पन्नः स्वसम्पद्भिः प्रकृतीः सम्पादयति ॥
>
> स यत्शीलस्तत्शीलाः प्रकृतयो भवन्ति, उत्थाने प्रमादे च तदायत्तत्वात् ॥
>
> तत्कूटस्थानीयो हि स्वामीति ॥
>
> "'No,' says Kauṭilya. It is the king alone who carries out (the appointment of) the group of servants — counsellors, chaplain and the rest — the conduct of the superintendents, the remedying of calamities of men and materials and constituents, and their increase. When the ministers are in calamity, he appoints others who are not. He remains ever active in honouring the worthy and suppressing the wicked. A king endowed with his own excellences endows the constituents with excellences. Of whatever character he is, of that character the constituents become, because in activity and in negligence they depend on him. For the king stands in the place of the summit."
>
> Kauṭilya, *Arthaśāstra* 8.1.12–18

Bhāradvāja had listed what the ministers do. Kauṭilya does not deny the list; he points to the structure that makes it possible. The king appoints the ministers, replaces those who fail, and sets the character of the whole state: "in activity and in negligence they depend on him" (*tad-āyattatvāt*). He is the *kūṭa* — the summit, the ridge-pole on which the structure rests. Bhāradvāja counted functions; Kauṭilya located the dependency. A good uttarapakṣa often works this way: it does not deny the facts of the pūrvapakṣa but shows that they point the other way. The two clauses that Kauṭilya cites in his definition are the last two sentences of this reply — the decisive sentence (*nirṇayana-vākya*) that closes the argument.

3.3 Suśruta: decision by mechanism

Suśruta's question asked how vātaja prameha could be incurable. His answer gives a mechanism: vāta, having first afflicted the body, moves downward and drives out with the urine the very tissues — fat, adipose tissue, marrow — on which the body depends. A disease that drains the body's deep-

est tissues is incurable. The objection implied in the question (that vāta disorders ought to be curable) is answered not by authority but by an account of what happens.

3.4 Caraka: decision by point-by-point reply

Caraka's tenth chapter is the fullest example of the device in the tantrayukti sources. It opens with Ātreya's thesis:

> चतुष्पादं षोडशकलं भेषजमिति भेषजो भाषन्ते, यदुक्तं पूर्वाध्याये षोडशगुणमिति, तद्भेषजं युक्तियुक्तमलमारोग्यायेति भगवान् पुनर्वसुरात्रेयः ॥
>
> "'The physicians say that medicine has four limbs and sixteen parts; what was stated in the previous chapter as having sixteen qualities — that medicine, applied with reasoning, is sufficient for health,' said the venerable Punarvasu Ātreya."
>
> Caraka, *Sūtrasthāna* 10.3

Maitreya states the pūrvapakṣa:

> नेति मैत्रेयः, किं कारणं दृश्यन्ते ह्यातुराः केचिदुपकरणवन्तश्च परिचारकसंपन्नाश्चात्मवन्तश्च कुशलैश्च भिषग्भिरनुष्ठिताः समुत्तिष्ठमानाः, तथायुक्ताश्चापरे म्रियमाणाः; तस्माद्भेषजमकिंचित्करं भवति, तद्यथा --- श्वभ्रे सरसि च प्रसिक्तमल्पमुदकं, नद्यां वा स्यन्दमानायां पांसुधाने वा पांसुमुष्टिः प्रकीर्ण इति; तथापरे दृश्यन्ते ऽनुपकरणाश्चापरिचारकाश्चानात्मवन्तश्चाकुशलैश्च भिषग्भिरनुष्ठिताः समुत्तिष्ठमानाः, तथायुक्ता म्रियमाणाश्चापरे । यतश्च प्रतिकुर्वन् सिध्यति, प्रतिकुर्वन् म्रियते; अप्रतिकुर्वन् सिध्यति, अप्रतिकुर्वन् म्रियते; ततश्चिन्त्यते भेषजमभेषजेनाविशिष्टमिति ॥
>
> "'No,' said Maitreya. 'Why? Some patients are seen to recover who have the means, are well attended, self-controlled and treated by skilled physicians; and others, similarly placed, die. So medicine accomplishes nothing — like a little water poured into a pit or a lake, or a handful of dust thrown into a flowing river or a dust-heap. Again, others are seen to recover who have no means, no attendants, no self-control and are treated by unskilled physicians; and others, similarly placed, die. Since one who is treated recovers and one who is treated dies, one who is not treated recovers and one who is not treated dies, it is thought that medicine does not differ from no medicine.'"
>
> Caraka, *Sūtrasthāna* 10.4

Ātreya replies:

मैत्रेय! मिथ्या चिन्त्यत इत्यात्रेयः; किं कारणं, ये ह्यातुराः षोडशगुणसमुदितेनानेन भेषजेनोपपद्यमाना म्रियन्त इत्युक्तं तदनुपपन्नं, न हि भेषजसाध्यानां व्याधीनां भेषजमकारणं भवति; ये पुनरातुराः केवलाद्भेषजाद्दते समुत्तिष्ठन्ते, न तेषां संपूर्णभेषजोपपादनाय समुत्थानविशेषो नास्ति; यथा हि पतितं पुरुषं समरथमुत्थानायोत्थापयन् पुरुषो बलमस्योपादध्यात्, स क्षिप्रतरमपरिक्लिष्ट एवोत्तिष्ठेत्, तद्वत् संपूर्णभेषजोपलम्भादातुराः; ये चातुराः केवलाद्भेषजादपि म्रियन्ते, न च सर्व एव ते भेषजोपपन्नाः समुत्थिष्ठेरन्, नहि सर्वे व्याधयो भवन्त्युपायसाध्याः, न चोपायसाध्यानां व्याधीनामनुपायेन सिद्धिरस्ति, न चासाध्यानां व्याधीनां भेषजसमुदायोऽयमस्ति, न ह्यलं ज्ञानवान् भिषङ्मुमूर्षुमातुरमुत्थापयितुं; परीक्ष्यकारिणो हि कुशला भवन्ति, यथा हि योगज्ञोऽभ्यासनित्य इष्वासो धनुरादायेषुमस्यन्नातिविप्रकृष्टे महति काये नापराधवान् भवति, संपादयति चेष्टकार्यं, तथा भिषक् स्वगुणसंपन्न उपकरणवान् वीक्ष्य कर्मारभमाणः साध्यरोगमनपराधः संपादयत्येवातुरमारोग्येण; तस्मान्न भेषजमभेषजेनाविशिष्टं भवति ॥

"'Maitreya, that is wrongly thought,' said Ātreya. 'Why? It was said that patients die who receive this medicine endowed with its sixteen qualities — that is untenable: for diseases curable by medicine, medicine is not without effect. As for patients who recover without medicine, it is not that complete medicine would make no difference to their recovery: as a man who helps a fallen man able to rise lends him his strength, so that he rises more quickly and without strain — so are patients who receive complete medicine. And as for patients who die even with medicine, not all of them would recover if given medicine; for not all diseases are curable by means; diseases curable by means do not succeed without means, and for incurable diseases this assemblage of medicine does not avail; a knowledgeable physician is not able to raise a patient who is bound to die. Those who act after examination are skilful: as an archer who knows his craft and practises constantly, taking his bow and shooting at a large target not too far off, is not at fault and achieves what he intends — so a physician endowed with his own qualities, with the means at hand, beginning his work after examination, is not at fault with a curable disease and brings the patient to health. Therefore medicine does not fail to differ from no medicine.'"

Caraka, *Sūtrasthāna* 10.5

The reply answers each of Maitreya's observations in turn. Treated patients who die had incurable diseases; untreated patients who recover would recover faster and more easily with treatment; the physician's skill matters for curable disease. The chapter's summary verse records the outcome as the settlement of a dispute between two views:

तत्र श्लोकौ इहौषधं पादगुणाः प्रभवो भेषजाश्रयः । आत्रेयमैत्रेयमती मतिद्वैविध्यनिश्चयः ॥

"There, two verses: Here, medicine, the qualities of the four limbs, efficacy, the substratum of medicine, the views of Ātreya and Maitreya, the settlement of the twofold view —"

Caraka, *Sūtrasthāna* 10.23

> चतुर्विधविकल्पाश्च व्याधयः स्वस्वलक्षणाः । उक्ता महाचतुष्पादे येष्वायत्तं भिषग्जितम् ॥
>
> "— and diseases of four kinds, each with its own marks, on which treatment depends: (all these) are stated in the Mahācatuṣpāda."

Caraka, *Sūtrasthāna* 10.24

3.5 The modern logic of Ātreya's reply

Maitreya's argument is the one that every uncontrolled observation of treatment invites: some treated patients die, some untreated patients recover, so treatment makes no difference. Ātreya's reply contains three moves that modern clinical reasoning makes. First, **stratification**: diseases must be divided into curable and incurable before the effect of treatment is judged, since treatment can work only in the first. Second, **effect size rather than all-or-nothing outcome**: a patient who would recover anyway may recover "more quickly and without strain". Third, **conditions of competent application**: the archer analogy says that a skilled physician acting after examination will succeed with a curable disease. Ātreya's nirṇaya is an argument that the comparison Maitreya made was not a fair one.

4. पूर्वपक्षः खण्डनं मण्डनं च · Objections and replies

4.1 Is the reply not merely the author's assertion?

> ननु शास्त्रकारः एव पूर्वपक्षम् उत्तरपक्षं च रचयति । तस्य उत्तरपक्षः तस्य एव मतम् — न तत्र निर्णयः, किन्तु स्वपक्षस्य आग्रहः इति चेत्, न । निर्णयः "विमृश्य पक्षप्रतिपक्षाभ्याम्" — पूर्वपक्षस्य हेतवः एकैकशः परीक्ष्यन्ते । मैत्रेयः "प्रतिकुर्वन् म्रियते" इति वदति; आत्रेयः "असाध्याः ते व्याधयः" इति तं हेतुं निराकरोति । मैत्रेयः "अप्रतिकुर्वन् सिध्यति" इति; आत्रेयः "भेषजेन क्षिप्रतरं सिध्येत्" इति । यत्र पूर्वपक्षस्य प्रत्येकं हेतुः उत्तरितः, तत्र निर्णयः । यत्र हेतवः अनुत्तरिताः तिष्ठन्ति, तत्र आग्रहः । परीक्षकः तत् स्वयं परीक्षितुं शक्नोति — अतः निर्णयः न वक्तुः इच्छा, किन्तु वादस्य फलम् ।
>
> **Objection:** the author composes both the prior view and the reply. His reply is just his own opinion — there is no settlement there, only insistence on his own side. **Reply:** No. Nirṇaya is "after deliberation, through thesis and counter-thesis": the reasons of the prior view are examined one by one. Maitreya says "one who is treated dies"; Ātreya removes that reason: "those diseases are incurable". Maitreya says "one who is not treated recovers"; Ātreya: "with medicine he would recover more quickly". Where every reason of the prior view has been answered, there is a settlement; where reasons remain unanswered, there is only insistence. The examiner can check this for himself. So nirṇaya is not the speaker's wish but the fruit of the debate.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.2 Do uttarapakṣa and nirṇaya name different things?

ननु कौटिल्यः “उत्तरपक्षः” इति पक्षं वदति, वैद्याः “निर्णयः” इति निश्चयम्। पक्षः वादिनः, निश्चयः परीक्षकस्य। अतः भिन्ने वस्तुनी इति चेत्, न। कौटिल्यस्य लक्षणम् एव “निर्णयनवाक्यम्” — निर्णयस्य करणं वाक्यम्। उत्तरपक्षः करणं, निर्णयः फलम्। एकः व्यापारः द्वाभ्यां नामभ्यां — क्रियया फलेन च — उच्यते। यथा “पाकः” इति क्रिया अपि, पक्वम् अन्नम् अपि। अतः कौटिल्यः वाक्यस्य स्थानं पश्यति (उत्तरं पक्षम्), वैद्याः तस्य फलं (निर्णयम्); अर्थः एकः।

Objection: Kauṭilya speaks of a “side” (uttarapakṣa), the physicians of a “determination” (nirṇaya). A side belongs to a disputant, a determination to an examiner. So they are different things. **Reply:** No. Kauṭilya’s definition itself is “the sentence that decides” (*nirṇayana-vākya*) — the sentence is the instrument of the determination. Uttarapakṣa is the instrument; nirṇaya the result. One operation is named in two ways, by its act and by its fruit — as “cooking” names both the act and the cooked food. Kauṭilya looks to the place of the sentence (the later side), the physicians to its result (the determination); the meaning is one.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

4.3 Can a settlement be final?

ननु शास्त्रेषु निर्णीतम् अपि कालान्तरे अन्यैः प्रत्युक्तं दृश्यते। नवः पूर्वपक्षः उत्पद्यते, पूर्वः निर्णयः बाध्यते। अतः निर्णयः न निर्णयः, किन्तु तात्कालिकः मतविशेषः इति चेत्, न। निर्णयः “पक्षप्रतिपक्षाभ्याम्” — यावान् पूर्वपक्षः परीक्षितः, तावान् निर्णयः। सः तस्मिन् विवादे स्थिरः। नवे पूर्वपक्षे नवः विचारः, नवः निर्णयः — एवं शास्त्रं वर्धते। किञ्च सम्यक् निर्णयः स्वसीमां वदति — आत्रेयः “साध्यासाध्यविभागज्ञः” इति, “भेषजसाध्यानां व्याधीनाम्” इति स्वनिर्णयस्य विषयं नियच्छति। सीमायुक्तः निर्णयः स्वसीमायां दृढः; सीमारहितः एव बाध्यते।

Objection: even what is settled in the śāstras is seen to be contradicted by others in later times. A new prior view arises and the earlier settlement is overturned. So a settlement is not a settlement but a passing opinion. **Reply:** No. Nirṇaya is “through thesis and counter-thesis”: it is as wide as the prior view that was examined. Within that dispute it stands firm. With a new prior view comes a new deliberation and a new settlement; thus the śāstra grows. Moreover, a sound settlement states its own limits — Ātreya restricts his to “diseases curable by medicine” and to one “who knows the division of curable and incurable”. A settlement with its limits stated is firm within them; it is the unlimited one that is overturned.

Śaṅkā–samādhāna composed for this article.

5. सिद्धान्तः · The settled view

> पूर्वपक्षस्य प्रत्येकं हेतुं परीक्ष्य निराकृत्य च, स्वसीमया सहितं, अर्थस्य व्यवस्थापकं वाक्यं — संरचनया, प्रक्रियया, प्रत्युत्तरेण वा — उत्तरपक्षः; तस्य फलं निर्णयः।
>
> "Uttarapakṣa is the sentence that establishes a matter — by structure, by mechanism, or by point-by-point reply — after examining and removing each reason of the prior view, together with its own limits; its fruit is nirṇaya."
>
> Definition composed for this article.

The three modes correspond to the three authorities. The two conditions — that every reason of the pūrvapakṣa be answered, and that the settlement state its limits — are drawn from Ātreya's reply and answer the charges of mere assertion and of impermanence.

6. आधुनिकसंवादः · The modern counterpart

Classical form	Modern counterpart
Uttarapakṣa answering a pūrvapakṣa	The **conclusion** of a paper that answers its research question; the point-by-point **response to reviewers**
Kauṭilya: the dependency that reverses the conclusion	Structural or causal analysis that reinterprets the same facts
Suśruta: settlement by mechanism	Mechanistic explanation as the resolution of a clinical question
Ātreya against Maitreya	The logic of the **controlled comparison**: stratification by prognosis, effect size, competent delivery — the reasoning behind clinical trials
Settlement with stated limits	**Scope of conclusions**; the limitations section; conditions of generalisability

Maitreya's argument appears again and again in the history of medicine, and Ātreya's reply is still the right one: before judging whether a treatment works, compare like with like, attend to how much and how quickly patients improve, and ensure the treatment is properly given.

7. प्रयोगाः · Uses

7.1 In research

Write the conclusion of a paper as an uttarapakṣa: list the reasons of the strongest opposing view (TY-25) and answer each. State the limits within which your conclusion holds. In responding to reviewers, follow Ātreya's method — quote each point, answer each point, and say what the answer changes.

7.2 In teaching

Stage Caraka's tenth chapter as a debate: one group argues Maitreya's case with modern examples, another answers as Ātreya. Then ask students to design a study that would settle the question.

7.3 In daily life

When settling a disagreement, answer the other person's reasons, not just their conclusion; and say where your answer stops applying. A decision reached this way is accepted more readily than one imposed.

8. अभ्यासः · Exercise

1. Tabulate Maitreya's observations and Ātreya's answers in Caraka, Sūtrasthāna 10.4–5. Does any observation remain unanswered?
2. Read AŚ 8.1 in full. List Bhāradvāja's reasons and show how Kauṭilya's reply answers each.
3. Take a conclusion from your own research and write it as an uttarapakṣa with its limits stated.

9. उपसंहारः · Conclusion

Uttarapakṣa is the sentence that decides; nirṇaya is the settlement it achieves. Kauṭilya decides by structure — the king is the summit on which all depends; Suśruta by mechanism — vāta drains the deepest tissues; Caraka, in Ātreya's reply to Maitreya, by a point-by-point answer whose logic anticipates the controlled comparison. A settlement is not mere assertion when every reason of the prior view is answered; uttarapakṣa and nirṇaya are act and fruit of one operation; and a settlement that states its limits is firm within them, while the śāstra grows by new disputes. The conclusion of every good paper is an uttarapakṣa.

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. Gautama. *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.41, with Vātsyāyana's *Bhāṣya*. E-text as used on sanskritmanthan.in.

8. Caraka. *Caraka Saṃhitā*, Sūtrasthāna 10 (*mahācatuṣpāda*) and 26.84, with Cakrapāṇidatta's *Āyurvedadīpikā*.
9. Kauṭilya. *Arthaśāstra* 8.1.

How to cite. Mantha Srinivasu. 2026. "उत्तरपक्षः · निर्णयः — The Decisive Reply: the Conclusion." *तन्त्रयुक्तिविमर्शः · Tantrayukti Studies*, TY-2026/26. Sanskrit Manthan, 16 Nov 2026. https://sanskritmanthan.in/a/ty-26-uttarapaksha
Author: ORCID 0000-0002-8834-3782 · Google Scholar
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23947955
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.