THE YUKTIDIPHIKA ON THE
SAMKHYAKARIKA: CORRECTIONS AND
EMENDATIONS IN THE TEXT

BY

Dr. V. RAGHAVAN

In Volume XII of this Journal (1954-5), Sanskrit Section,
I dealt with the textual problems of this important commentary
on the Sāmkhya Kārikās and offered a number of corrections and
emendations in the text presented by P. B. Chakravarti on the
basis of its single manuscript. That paper was to be continued
and in the present contribution, I place before students of this
work another series of corrections and emendations that have
suggested themselves to me during my further study of the text.
Apart from passages which are corrupt, there are also those that
are very cryptic and obscure, whose anvaya is difficult and which
consequently require proper construction. In the following notes
I have therefore included such passages also, and offered ex-
planations for them.

P. 1 शास्त्रीयमन्दिरुपुरा: This is corrupt. The meaning required
Verse 1 by the rhetoric of the verse is that the
elephant of Sāmkhya-dialectics pulls down
the Sallaki groves, viz. the imbeciles of
other schools.

P. 1 विकारपुष्पा: This may be read as विकारिपुष्पा:। This
Verse 6 reference is to schools which hold the
Puruṣa to be affected.

P. 2 अत्ते नानायतिसिद्धे There is no Nanatva that is established
Verse 13 in the course of the text; on the other
hand, the verse will make sense if it says
that this text is good enough to know from
it the manifold topics. Hence, we may
emend this as अति नानायतिसिद्धे।

P. 3 महत्तालाद्य: is correct but obscure and requires expla-
Line 1 nation. The context is the elucidation of

VR—1
‘Śītra’ as a brief indicative statement, in which much that is left out has to be understood from other contexts. This is illustrated by two Karikās 16 and 15, where Avyakta is proved by Inference and only two avayavas of the syllogism are expressly mentioned; the important limb of Illustration, Drṣṭānta, is not mentioned in the context but has to be understood. Now it is this Illustration that the gloss mentions in the word सूक्ष्मकलाययः. ‘Mūla’ and ‘Śakala’ illustrate respectively संदर्भ व्यक्तिमान and समन्वयात्. This can be checked up by the comments of Yuktidipikā on Karikā 15, pp. 75, 77.

1. ‘यद् परिमिते तयस सत सत उत्सतिर्दंशः।
तद् मूल-अहंकुर-पर्य-नाल एते.’

2. ‘यथा यादास्य सुदृढ्युतिदयति, तत्तदास्तिति,
तद् यथा-वन्दनादिसि, शाक्यादयः।’

See also p. 46 under Karikā 6: एवं शाक्यादिनां तन्त्राशोकत्वम् च वन्दनादिपूर्वकविषेषे: एते.

In the same line, after the above noted word, we read ‘अत्यन्तस्माभिभित्ता अपवषीक्रते’ Here ‘atra antaram’ makes no sense; we may read either अथ अन्तरम् or अथ अन्तःताम्. The former would fit better. The comma at the end of this should be a full stop.

The two ‘अथवा-स्त’ refer to two other explanations of the name Śūtra; the first is based on the same etymological explanation from ‘Śūcana’, but the form of Śūcana meant here is different; it refers to the inwardly withdrawn nature of the recluse-teacher and hence the absolute brevity with which he just indicates his ideas. The next explanation is couched in a confusing expression; what is meant
here is that Sūtra is so called because it conforms to the definition of Sūtra as set forth in the verse अव्याख्यात् etc. and as can be illustrated by or verified from verse 8, तीर्थाचदतुपमति: (विभिन्न:) etc.

P. 6 
Line 6 from bottom

This should be तन्त्रान्तरम् in genitive, for it goes with—कर्मणामहतीनामस्यतत्स्य श्रेयसः स्वात्।

P. 7 
Line 4

This obscure bit refers to what has been said before in line two, viz. the student possessing further requisite endowments, viz. Matimatvā, Mimāmsakatvā, Arthitvā and Abhyupagatatvā.

P. 7 
Line 5

‘हल्लेवमादिना वचन- May be read as ‘हल्लेवमादिना वचनेन प्रति- प्रतिपद्योलमथेः’ पाण्डुलिपिः।

’’’ mahādīvāgra: The sentence may be ended here and a daṇḍa may be inserted to show the end.

P. 10 
Line 4

End the sentence with अभ्युपस्म्यतेः। न श्रुणानाम् Start the next pakṣa न गुणानाम् etc.

P. 10 
Line 25

The word अत at the beginning of the Kārikā is no part of it; it should be taken with तथा भोक्तर्।

P. 11 Line 22

From अव्याख्यात् खान up to नविफ्यतित in line 24 it is an amplification of the pakṣa “अभिचारवेदिनि वेदः।

’’’ बिन्दुशास्त्रपाठी Read बिन्दुशास्त्रपाठी व बिन्दुवेद ए किंवद् etc. After बिन्दुवेद प्रयोजनमयति remove daṇḍa and put comina.

P. 12 Line 2 

Read तत्सिद्धे य Read तत्सिद्धे

Line 10 सवामु-निवासाः etc. Remove dash in between.

P. 13 
Lines 9-10

There is no relevance for Samsāra here; the point discussed is the ‘upasarjana’ in
a compound; hence the correct word is 
समावत्, not संवात्

P. 15 विषिष्टियःपङ्जुक- Here उपयुक्तम: तैः संवेष्यते in Singular 
Lines 14-15 मानात् (सते:) would be better in view of the Singular 
संवेष्यते

P. 15 उपयुक्तमानं May be read in Masculine 'मानः' to 
Line 15 accord with the Masculine in lines 
14, 15, 16.

P. 15 Line 27 Read this as इद्वास्पद्वमीतीनामेष योलि: स 
पायमाद् | 

P. 16 केदारेष्ति After this put a daṇḍa, as the sentence 
Line 13 ends here.

P. 16 Last but one line The printed text reads:

इष्टे दुल्खं वर्तेत दश्वरं; किमस्बनभिमेत हि वायुम् 
शेषः।

As it is, the latter sentence either means 
little or means the opposite. What is 
intended to be said is that the text men-
tions the अनुश्रविका remedy being like the 
द्रष्टा one; this is an elliptic expression 
requiring to be completed; this completing 
part (वक्याशेषा) is that the 'अनुश्रविका' 
is as useless as the 'द्रष्टा.' So 'किम्' 
cannot go with the sentence giving the 
Vākyāśeṣa. It is to be taken as a separate 
sentence, asking a question 'किम?'

The sentence would then read (in trans-
lation): (The अनुश्रविका) is like the द्रष्टा; 
What? (that is, how or in what respect is 
it like the द्रष्टा or what is the nature 
of the predication intended by 'is' in 
respect of which it is like the द्रष्टा—
दश्वरं; किम्? असावनभिमेत इव्यथः:)

P. 17  Last but one line:—हिंसा यथेष्ठ हिति | Read this as हिंसायथेष्ठ हिति  
Otherwise it would mean just the opposite of what is intended in the argument.

P. 18  शुचिभूवादि— | Read the two words separately शुचिभूवादि
Line 6  प्रवृत्तेऽयतः: | प्रवृत्तेऽयतः:

P. 19  सामाजातीयें ‘Apratiyoginam’ here should be ‘Prati-
Line 2  चाप्रापीयोगितं yoganam.’

P. 20  Line 19  बहुवक्ष्यनां Read बहुवक्ष्यनां।

P. 21  Line 19  सचयाशाहंतां Read सचयाशाहं ताम्।

P. 23  देवतापामपिरि— | As it is, the line is corrupt. Either there
Line 19  मिताय साध्ये should be a ‘न’ before दोषाभावः or तद्र्-
| भावमण्डलम् should read वहःभावमण्डलम्।
| दोषाभावः:

P. 24  स द्वारेष्वरेऽ | Read स द्वारेष्वाभिवर्षादृ।
Line 5  भावितवादृ

P. 25  संयोगनिहितान्तरि— | It should be संयोगनिमित्त मात्र.
Lines 2-3  हन्नवग्रहाव |

P. 26  यथा वहन्ती | Read यथवहन्ती; Āvahanti is the word here.
Line 16

P. 26  वपेक्षा वा | This is meaningless; the line can be
Line 18  construed if this is read as अम्पे के वा।

P. 26  Last Line  Put a stroke after खप्पायारामात्मेऽसत्।
| Then द्वाराच्छिन्नात्मिकके is a fresh sentence.

P. 27  संसर्गायपस्तः | This is obviously corrupt. Read this
Line 7  खामाश्चाब्यान्तिर्मात्र | thus: संसर्गायपस्तः खामाश्चाब्यान्तिर्मात्र विवाहस्त

P. 27  समुच्योः | After this, put a semicolon and after
Line 9  समुच्यिक्यान्तः a comma. आक्रियाभाष्यम् means
that the Knowledge of the significance of all enjoined acts mentioned by Śruti, applies to the case of those who are ineligible to perform them actually.

P. 27 Line 22  न्यायोजः Read न्यायोजः

P. 31 Line 4  Change the punctuation and read thus : आह—न हेतुवपदेशाद्वस्यमभ्रेमदेश्व खात्।

P. 32 Line 18  Before ‘तुझ्यां’ here, the word आह may be inserted to show the पुर्वपक्षः.

P. 34  किंचिनान्तः—कार- For sense, this requires a ‘न’ at the begining. Therefore read न किंचिनान्तः and put a semicolon after this.

P. 36 Line 3  Correct similar printing mistake : तथा—मवसारः—स्त्रायमवसारः

P. 37  तत्र प्रतिवर्त्तितविशेषमपेश्वते | This should be तत्र प्रतिवर्तिति : (or प्रतिवर्तित) बक्तविशेषमपेश्वते. After this तथाय from next line is to be brought here and the further matter read thus : तथाय—तद्धर्षोष्य—मद्दशार्धोष्यमिति।

P. 44 Line 14  अनुसारविष्णू | Read अनुसारविष्णू

,, Line 22  बाराहमणाधित→ Read बाराहमणाधित→
P. 38 Line 5 Remove dash after तद्व यथा

P. 39 Line 20 अप्रतिपचि: Correct into अप्रतिपिति:

P. 40 बिद्मध्यवसाय- Lines 23-4 प्रमाणाविचित: प्रमाणात प्रमाणात फल- फलं अंशितमिति।

P. 41 Line 7 अधुनानमकः: Read अधुनाने प्रमः:

P. 41 Line 18 तेन किंचिद् प्रतीयते must be तेन किंचिद् प्रतीयते

P. 43 Line 12 न, तद्हीर्द Remove comma.
Line 13 किं तद्हीर् अध्यवसाय etc. Put a question mark after ‘तर्ही’ and read किं तद्ही? अध्यवसाय etc.

P. 44 न शेषापि ... Meaning and connection in context Lines 3-4 जलं संबंध्यतीस्य: obscure.
Line 4 तस्य शेषत्ति is wrong. It should be तस्य पुरुषवत्.

Line 23 व्यापारः-कांग-पूज- This is confusing; the first अनुपलभम् may अचक्कः-प्रस्तुतीत्याम- उपलभ्य: and the second उपलभ्यम् may तपोपकावः- अनुपलंभम्: | Also कथवल may be खण्डादीनानात्मकतम्: अक्खज्ञः.

Line 24 नेच्छा एवं: Read नेच्छाद्व एवं: |

P. 46 Line 3 अथवा आलोचनायिन्ति आत: आत: here should be आत: for whose definition see line 2 above.

Line 15 तत्त्व पुनमेतात्त्विद्ध: Read it as तत्त्व गुणमेतात्त्विद्ध: |

P. 47 अष्टसंधा (!) The query mark is not necessary; it is correct as it stands.
Line 12 ग्यायोऽयेन Read ग्यायोऽयेन which qualifies लक्ष्येन.
P. 50. line 16 तत्स्तीति
22 अनुमाननिदेशायत्

P. 52. 26 यो विषयः
" वचोन्नतरणागि कायंन्
28 अन्यान्तरं
P. 53 23 दातिलब्धायः
26 आदेश
P. 54. 4 एतापरिपुस्न्यापरारः
20 पक
23 यथार्थः
" अभिमाणेन
" अन्यायेन
25 तत्तासि

Last line
27 यथार्थः
अन्यान्तरं

P. 55. 2 ऐतिहासिक-कारणान्तरतः
21 उपयोगः—न वीतावीत etc. " उपयोगः—न; वीतावीत etc.
23 अन्यायेनार्थिनिन्दिः
P. 56. 2 तदनुपरिस्थिति
5 प्रथाने न विश्वासः
सहस्रां च etc.
P. 58. 13 माल्याल्यः गन्धेन etc. Remove danda after lata and put it after gandhena.
25 आचार्यविषया प्रथायाद्
27 न तदस्ति
P. 58. 23 अन्यायेनार्थिनिन्दिः
25 आचार्यविषया प्रथायाद्
27 न तदस्ति
Put a comma after this.

After this, add प्राणेशु which is necessary.