THE YUKTIĐĪPIKĀ ON THE SĀMKBHYAKĀRIKĀ

Corrections and Emendations in the Text.¹

BY

DR. V. RAGHAVAN

The Yuktidīpikā, a commentary on the Sāmkhya Kārikās of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, had long remained in obscurity in a manuscript in the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, a Birch-bark original from Kashmir purchased by Buhler, until Mr. Pulinabehari Chakravartti published it in 1938 in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series. The publication revealed a valuable work of an obviously significant antiquity and demonstrated also the fact that the age of discoveries of rare texts had not come to an end. Despite the fact that the work has been in print for a considerable time now, it is yet somewhat unfortunately obscure, for very few have written on it; I know of only four scholars who have so far written on it, the late Prof. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri who took note of the work and its striking interpretations in the third edition of the Sāmkhya Kārikās with Translation, Notes and Introduction, brought out by him for the Madras University, a Hindi writer, Prof. Frauwallner of Vienna in Vol.I of his History of Indian Philosophy in German and Prof. Satkari Mookerji himself who has been associated with the publication of this work from Calcutta. The editor himself promised to

¹. Paper read at the 18th All-India Oriental Conference, Annamalai University, 1955.
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publish an Introduction to the text. Prof. Satkari Mookerji, both in his Foreword to the edition and elsewhere, has drawn our attention to the importance of this work, its early date, which he puts as the 6th century A.D., and the light which the work throws on early Sāṁkhya thought and history.

The Yuktidīpikā is indeed a precious discovery. We know from Paramārtha that in early Sāṁkhya there were as many as eighteen schools. Unfortunately, not only the texts of the early Ācāryas of the School, Kapila, Āsuri, Pañcaśikha, Vārṣagāṇya, Jaigisavaya, and Vindhyavāsin have been lost, but even early commentaries on the text of the only surviving compendium of this school, the Sāṁkhya Kārikās of Īśvarakṛṣṇa have not come down. The Yuktidīpikā on the Sāṁkhya Kārikās is thus valuable to us not only as an old gloss on the Kārikās, but as the source of our knowledge of some hitherto unknown Sāṁkhya teachers and their views, and the hitherto unknown views of some early Sāṁkhya authorities whom we have known to some extent already. In fact, it is from here that we learn of a wide variety of views held by early writers within the framework of the Sāṁkhya tenets, a variety of views on even such fundamental concepts as the Prakṛti which some held to be as many as the Puruṣas. Here is also to be seen an author who was in live contact with Buddhist
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1. This was issued under the title *Origin and Development of the Sāṁkhya System of Thought*, No. 30 of the *Calcutta Oriental Series* 1952, a copy of which I could secure only recently after writing this paper.

2. On one of the early exegetists and his dubious service to Sāṁkhya, see my Note ‘Madhava, an early unfaithful exponent of the Sāṁkhya’ in the *Sarupa Bharati*. 
writers and their works. In all these respects the Yuktidipikā is a work requiring a detailed study and exposition.

I have recently had occasion to teach the text line by line and my examination showed that the first important thing to be done in respect of this text is to purify it of its numerous corruptions. As the editor has said, his edition is based on the single Poona manuscript, which is corrupt and defective, there being several gaps also. In his Preface, the editor states that there is another manuscript of the work in the Research Department of Kashmir but that he could not consult it as at that time the Research Department of Kashmir had begun to print it in their Series. I pursued this matter and examined all the manuscripts of the Kashmir Research Department which were brought to the National Archives in New Delhi. I succeeded in laying my hands on the manuscript materials with which the Kashmir Department had started their edition; there was also a galley proof of a portion in the beginning of the text. But on scrutiny it turned out that the basis of the Kashmir Department’s endeavour to bring the Yuktidipikā to light was not an independent manuscript but only a transcript from the same B.O.R.I. original on which the Calcutta publication is based. In the numerous catalogues and lists of manuscripts in my possession for the New Catalogus Catalogorum work, I have not so far found any manuscript of the Yuktidipikā; nor have I found a manuscript of it in the 20,000 manuscripts in European libraries which I surveyed recently.

In the absence of fresh manuscript help, we have to apply ourselves more intensely to the present text
as given to us by Mr. Pulinabehari Chakravartti. The style of the author of the Yuktidipikā is old, and it requires some effort to establish a method of interpreting it, and to disentangle the prima facie view points and his own conclusions. In a study of this text stage by stage, the first stage, of course, is to see how far one can, by legitimate methods, improve the text itself.

A careful and intensive study of the text would enable one to eliminate the many errors in the lines; there are places which, though apparently correct, have not yielded any meaning yet, and other places where I have not been able yet to remove the query mark left by the perplexed editor. I shall now offer a series of such corrections and emendations which I have so far effected in the text. In a further instalment, I might tackle the remaining difficult passages, and then go to the more interesting subjects of the thinkers and views cited and the light thrown by the Yuktidipikā on early Sāmkhya thought. It may be noted from many of the instances cited below that, owing to the style of the author, there has been large scale misunderstanding about a thing being affirmed or denied and consequently about the presence or absence of the negative particle; and strangely sometimes, a superfluous 'Na' is added, not realising that it neutralises the negative statement that follows.

1. From the Preface to the Editor's Origin and Development of the Sāmkhya System of Thought, it is to be gathered that a revised edition of the text of the Yuktidipikā with corrections is under preparation and that some corrections have already been incorporated in the passages cited in the Origin and Development.

2. The Editor's Origin and Development includes a treatment of this subject.
Mokṣa is good because it has been praised in the Vedas.

Here - केवलु and the suggestion वास्तवम् are both wrong. Just as at the other end, in Pradhāna, the state of being the cause (Prakṛti) has its end, i.e. there is no further cause beyond it, even so in Prithivi etc. the 16 Vikāras, the state of being Vikāra has its end, i.e. there are no further Vikṛtis beyond them, and they form not the Prakṛtis of anything. This is further elucidated by the next line, where see especially the use of यथा-तथा. Hence the text should read here: -प्रचेतसमयवते तेषु (i.e. प्रविष्टेविद्)

Here what is stated is that the means and process of inference are rendered incomplete and imperfect because of the overpowering preponderance of Tamas;
hence 'Trikālāṅgam' here should be 'Vikālāṅgam' तत्कालान्तरमात्रे बिकलान्तर- प्रतिवङ्किते. cf. also the expression in line 7 above तमःप्रक्षिपामथ्यंतर् प्रमाणवेकृत्येष- प्रति:।

This should read अस्त्त्वि व्याप्रादितु. The reference here is to one imagining a thing like the tiger even when it is not there, purely by force of a past experience and mental obsession.

फलस्य अर्थांतरभावः

अध्यवसायः प्रह्णे पुनः

The correct punctuation of this is कि तत्त्वः? ओऽनावरिश्चेत्रे प्रह्णः।

As it is, this sentence opening with 'Yuktam' and ending with 'Ayuktam' is self-contradictory and does not follow from the foregoing lines. The critic here is interested in pointing out the insufficiency of these three Pramāṇas particularly in respect of things
not directly in contact. Hence the sentence should read:

The latter part of this may be read as ग्रामयम्-तसंबन्धे विबधकै। Otherwise it will be difficult to construe the line.

It is Kṣepa, not Ākṣepa. See also below line 15 प्रासांक्रिणा क्षेपपौड़े कुत्या।

Here the text should be पर्ययनुयोगो नाति प्रयोजनम्।

Read देवव्यञ्जन एत्यस्य.

This should go into one word-प्रयोजनोऽवयम्।

It should be साम्यवर्तवेष्य here.

The hyphen is to be removed; the two are two separate words.

It should obviously be अपवये-अप्रायत्;
Here again, the obvious correction needed is अच्छारितवादः.

Here the first word should be either अष्टमत् or अष्टमता.

‘Bhinnaḥ’ here should be अभिवः. It is the Pūrvapaksin here arguing that S'abda is not different from Anumāna.

Here the comma after वेदितेते is to go; and more important than this: च तदा is a corruption for न तथा; a contrast is made here between Vyutpanna S'abdas like Candra and Yādṛcchā S'abdas like दित्था.

This is to be completely removed.

The suggested emendation तन्मात्र is wrong; स्मात्र is alright.

The word ‘अतत्र’ should be अस्ततः.

अनुपलब्धिकारणेचः.
Here the queried word अभाव should, I think, be अभ्यासवः; and after असत् कामेष्ठ, there should be a fullstop.

The discussion is about Asatkārya-vāda; the pūrvapakṣin has argued that the effect was non-existent, as otherwise the agent’s effort was not called for; the Sāmkhya replies that the causal machinery, agent etc. is still necessary as there is transformation Pariṇāma etc., of the same old material into something different. The purvapakṣin does not accept such a view of Pariṇāma as bringing about just a different form of existence, for what happens is that Pariṇāma removes the old thing and brings about a new thing; hence the correct word here is परिणामादिनिश्चितिभिमावः.

The query is to be removed.
The fullstop should be removed.

Here is the correct word; the sentence stops there. Then should be and refers to the Pratibandhaka, the hindrance to the appearance of the Kārṣya. See also line 27.

This should read वदि तावद सतः

Read जाति बिबि उमथ etc.

The passage requires corrections at three places: बिबि बिबि लिथिते Rūpa should be Rūpa and form a single word with what follows. Sati should be Asati and Hetutve which is uncouth should be Hetau tu.

This is an Anuṣṭubh line quoted from a Buddhist work.

One of the two negative particles here should go.
Here Avināśam must be Vināśam and the query after ‘Na’ within brackets should go.
- चेत्त, नियममेतात. It is not adarśana; cf. also p. 69, line 2

The fullstop is at the wrong place; it should be after Anucchedaḥ, which may have it or a semicolon should be प्रस्तुतः.

Read प्रकाशाने

Here Guṇabheda should be Guṇābheda.

वा बसत: appears more sensible here.

Here अपरित्याया: should be really परित्याया:. The sense is ‘if you want to avoid the flaw of mutual mixture of characteristics in the Guṇas, you will have to give up altogether the concept of Guṇa.

It should be तत्ति न व्यक्ती etc.

Read कार्यं चेत्त व्यक्तम्

Read here. Aprasiddheḥ.
It should be Follow the trend in the succeeding lines; the discussion is that because the effect is not seen, the Sakti cannot be said to have been lost.

17 न च प्रहलादेनाद् in the same discussion should be, for the same reason, प्रहलादेनाद्.

29 कौशल्यादेव (?) The query may be removed.

79 21 तद्वस्तित भाषयनुष्कं Read - भाष - cf. line 23 below.

80 18 अथवा विख्यामाना Read-अविख्यामाना

81 11 निवारित- " - निवारित

85 22 प्रयोजन-अनुपप्पते: " प्रयोजन-" " प्रयोजन-"

87 24 विष्णुवति " विष्णुवति

89 7 तद्वस्तित भाषयनुष्कं " तद्वस्तित भाषयनुष्कं " अत्तरामासायादै

90 14 पूर्णां " पूर्णां " पूर्णां " पूर्णां " पूर्णां

16 पलाशं पलाशादू " पलाशं पलाशादू " पलाशं पलाशादू " पलाशं पलाशादू " पलाशं पलाशादू " पलाशं पलाशादू " पलाशं पलाशादू

17 अप्रस्यत etc. (in Samāsa) " अप्रस्यत etc. (in Samāsa) " अप्रस्यत etc. (in Samāsa) " अप्रस्यत etc. (in Samāsa)

95 16,17 चेतनेमयः; चेतनं here should be अचेतनेमयः; अचेतनम्

21 एकाकारस्यादयः एकाकार: हपादयः

96 13 Anuśtubh स्मृते दे Read स्मृते दे

97 18 प्रक्ष्यविकारसमामायः - विकारविमायः

26 साधविति Read साधविति

27 किक्षिततः " " न किक्षिततः।
The query and full-stop after this word are to be removed.

Read पुर्वाधिपतिद्विद्र

Read विग्रहितरम्

Remove full-stop after the word.

Read वामनादेव

Remove न here which is wrong.

After this, the comma should be a fullstop.

Correct this into अत्तादित्विद्र

पुर्वाधिपतिद्विद्र न विग्रहितरम्
The 'Na' is necessary here.

Remove न

Comma after प्राणामपेश्यते to be replaced by full-stop; query after क्यामाने to be removed, as also the fullstop after that.

The fullstop after हि to be removed.

Separate अपेशा। शाक्त्तत्वः: is a separate word.

बदं: पुर्वाधि गुणे:

गनेषः - The Buddhist critic of Sāmkhya.
नाटिय चैकटा/at the end of the anuṣṭabh

Anuvrtta: तद्वृत्तमृ अनेकान्‌तात्
- सनातकुंडलावप्याधिकरण
तत्तत्वविशेषाद्यार्थः

- अनुद्वानांम्
नारम्भः:

- विवर्तकः

- विवर्तकः

- अविवर्तकः

एवमहाप्रेरकविवर्तकः... is a separate sentence.

सत्त्वायः
गुणप्रदूषितां ति समम्‌... च... च खड़ लोके कामकाण्यपुष्पकयः-
माण्यम्‌

एक्षः

कीतः नात्तत्व कुटिलीः

अर्थान्तरनुदि:

Before this the addition of उच्चरः seems necessary.

Remove fullstop.

It should be न स्तुः

बाथीयः: रश्यः

Remove the vertical and horizontal strokes; and put a fullstop after वुद्धः

(To be continued)