

# THE ADYAR LIBRARY BULLETIN

Vol. 42

1978

## Editorial Board:

V. RAGHAVAN  
K. KUNJUNNI RAJA  
A. G. KRISHNA WARRIER  
RADHA BURNIER

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
J. DUNCAN M. DERRETT <i>Some Features of Public Law in Smṛti Sources</i>	.. 1
RICHARD SALOMON <i>The Three Cursed Rivers of the East, and their Significance for the Historical Geography of Ancient India</i>	.. 32
MĀDHAV DESHPANDE <i>Pāṇinian Grammarians on Dialectal Variation</i>	.. 61
SUBHASH ANAND <i>A Controversial Verse in the Gītā</i>	.. 115
ARVIND SHARMA <i>On Cakṣus in the Gītā</i>	.. 127
RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA <i>Is it Justified to read Garimā in the List of the Eight Siddhi-s?</i>	131
ASHOK AKLUṢKAR <i>The Number of Kārikā-s in Trikāṇḍī Book II</i>	.. 142
II TEXTS AND STUDIES	
<i>Kumāratantra</i> translated by K. V. ZVELEBIL	.. 169
<i>Sāmānya Vedānta Upaniṣad-s</i> translated by A. G. KRISHNA WARRIER <i>Annapūrṇopaniṣad</i>	.. 223
<i>Ārṣaprayogasādhutvanirūpanam</i> edited by K. KUNJUNNI RAJA	.. 275

being told what those possessed of the eye of knowledge see—it is not apparent either that he possesses that eye or sees as they do. Moreover, the *jñānacakṣus* can apparently be developed through *yoga* but the *divyacakṣus* can only be the gift of God to man. When imparting the gift of divine vision to Arjuna, Kṛṣṇa says that ‘since thou canst not see me with this thine own eye, I give thee an eye divine’<sup>1</sup> and later on explains that what he has been shown ‘none save thee has ever seen’<sup>2</sup> which would presumably mean that those who possessed the *jñānacakṣus* have not seen it either.

Later on, too, Kṛṣṇa asserts that

‘Not . . . in the world of men can I in such a form Be seen by any other than thee, hero of the Kurus.’<sup>3</sup>

It is clear, therefore that the word *cakṣus* is used both in the sense of normal and paranormal vision in the *Bhagavadgītā* and that within this broad division subtler semantic differentiations are also possible.

<sup>1</sup> W. Douglas P. Hill, *The Bhagavadgītā* (Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 159.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p. 165. It is notable though that although Kṛṣṇa mentions that this form of his cannot be seen by Veda, *yajña*, *ādhyayana*, *dāna*, and *tapas* (*Bhagavadgītā*, 11. 48) or by Veda, *tapas*, *dāna*, *ijyā* (*ibid.*, 11. 53), *jñāna* does not seem to be included in the list, at least directly.

<sup>3</sup> Franklin Edgerton, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

## IS IT JUSTIFIED TO READ GARIMĀ\* IN THE LIST OF THE EIGHT SIDDHI-S?

ALL schools of Yoga unanimously speak of a group of eight supernormal powers (*aṣṭasiddhi-s*). Since the first *siddhi* of this group is *aṇimā*,<sup>1</sup> the group is called *aṇimādi*; vide the *Yogasūtra* 3. 45 (*tato ’ṇimādi-prādurbhāvaḥ*). This group is referred to in almost all the schools of Yoga and in other systems of philosophy; vide *Netra-tantra* 1. 29; *Bindu Yoga*, p. 55; Vātsyāyana on *Nyāyasūtra* 4. 1. 21.

The names of these *siddhi-s* are: (1) *aṇimā*, (2) *laghimā*, (3) *mahimā*, (4) *prāpti*, (5) *prākāmya*, (6) *īsitva* or *īsitā*, (7) *vaśitva* or *vaśitā*, and (8) *yatṛakāmā-vasāyitā*<sup>2</sup> or *yatṛakāmāvasāyitva*.

\* *garimā*, *aṇimā*, *mahimā* and *laghimā* are to be read in their stem (*prātipadika*) forms as *gariman*, *aṇiman*, *mahiman* and *laghiman*.

<sup>1</sup> Though *aṇimā* means the quality of being *aṇu*, *aṇorbhāvaḥ*, yet it is used here in the sense of ‘the power through which one attains this quality’, *kāraṇe kāryopacārād aṇimety ucyate* (*Jayamaṅgalā* on *Sām. Kā.* 23). This principle of *upacāra* (supposed identification founded on resemblance) is to be applied to some of the other names of *siddhi-s* also. The real nature of *aṇimā*, etc. will be shown in this paper afterwards.

<sup>2</sup> For a list of the eight *siddhi-s*: vide *Vyāsaśāstra* 3. 45; *Vāyupurāṇa* 13.4-5; *Līṅgapurāṇa* I.88.16-23; *Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* 40.29-30; *Sīvapurāṇa* II.1.11.45-47; *Bhāgavata* XI.15.10-17; *Amarakośa* I.1.36;

There are a good number of works that read *garimā* (stem *gariman*) in the group of the eight *siddhi-s*.<sup>1</sup> Though the word grammatically means 'the quality of being *guru*,' heavy,<sup>2</sup> according to the aforesaid principle it would mean the power through which one can grow heavy (*garimā gurubhāvah, yato gurur bhavati*) or can acquire as much weight as is desired.

To keep up the traditional number eight, some scholars who are in favour of reading *garimā* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group, do not read *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* (vide the *Mañiprabhā, Candrikā*, etc.). Others include *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* under *vaśitva* (vide Nāgoji's commentary). Some (e.g. Vaṃśīdhara on the *Sāṃ. Kā. 23*) again combine *īśitva* with *vaśitva* and speak of either *īśitva* or *vaśitva*. A few scholars mention *vaśitva* and

etc. There are variations in names in these texts. Nārāyaṇa in his comm. on the *Yogasūtra* quotes a verse similar to the *Amarakośa* verse, the last foot being *vaśitvaṃ cāṣṭamaṃ smṛtam*.

<sup>1</sup> Vide the *Nāgojivṛtti, Mañiprabhā* and *Candrikā* on *Yogasūtra* 3. 45. Some modern exponents of the *Yogasūtra*, (e.g. M. N. Dwivedi) mention *garimā* as one of the *siddhi-s* while dealing with this *sūtra*. Some editions of the *Tattvakaumudī* on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (23) also read *garimā*. Dr. S. N. Shastri and R. Phukan in their English commentaries on the *Sāṃ. Kā.* speak of *garimā*.

<sup>2</sup> *Garimā gurutvam* (Nāgoji and Bhoja on *YS* (3. 45); *meruod gurutvam garimā* (*Mañiprabhā, Yogasudhākara* on *YS* 3. 45); *garimā gurutvapṛāptiḥ* (*Candrikā* on *YS* 3. 45); *paramāṇusamāngasya samuddharaṇakarmani, gaurave merutulyatvaṃ garimānaṃ vidur budhāḥ. (Mānasollāsa* of Sureśvara, 10. 12); *laghutarasyaṅpi tūlādeḥ parvatādivad gurubhāvah* (*Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* on *YS* 3. 45).

*yatrakāmāvasāyitva* along with *garimā*, though they discard *īśitva*.<sup>1</sup>

The difference of opinion in enumerating these *siddhi-s* was noticed by Dr. Sovani. He observes: *Garimā* is one of the *aiśvarya-s* according to Vācaspati. Gauḍa and *Jayamaṅgalā* place *kāmāvasāyitva* in its place and Māthara mentions both, raising the number to nine<sup>2</sup> (*A Critical Study of the Sāṃkhya System*, p. 32).

We have also observed that two or three texts dealing with *siddhi-s* numbering eight mention *garimā* along with the eight traditional names, thus making the number nine (vide the *Mātharavṛtti* and the *Yuktidīpikā* on *Sāṃ. Kā. 23*). In such cases the reading of *garimā* must be taken as spurious. It is the carelessness or ignorance of the editor that seems to give rise to such erroneous readings.

Now we are going to show that *garimā* cannot be reasonably held as a supernormal power coming under the *aṣṭasiddhi* group. We have not the slightest doubt that though *garimā* in the aforesaid sense may be considered (by some) as having the character of a *siddhi*, yet

<sup>1</sup> The *Liṅgapurāṇa* in its list of the eight *siddhi-s* mentions *garimā* and does not read *mahimā*. Most probably it is a printing mistake or an editorial error.

<sup>2</sup> The present writer is of the opinion that Vācaspati did not mention *garimā*. Dr. Haradatta Sharma (vide his notes on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 23) is wrong in holding that *Jayamaṅgalā* and Gauḍa mention nine kinds of *aiśvarya-s* (i.e. *garimā* along with the eight traditional *siddhi-s*) for the word *garimā* is absent in the list of the *siddhi-s* in these two commentaries. Some editors read *garimā* in the commentary by Gauḍapāda, which is wrong, for Gauḍapāda has not explained it like other *siddhi-s*.

it has no place in the traditional list of the *aṣṭasiddhi-s* since there is no need to mention it in this group. Moreover we will presently show that *garimā* cannot be held as a counterpart of *laghimā*, one of the eight *siddhi-s*. Since the original character of these *siddhi-s* does not seem to have been properly understood by some of the scholars of a later age there arose a wrong notion regarding *garimā* as a *siddhi* belonging to the *aṣṭasiddhi* group.

We are stating here the arguments<sup>1</sup> advanced by the scholars who are in favour of reading *garimā* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group:

(1) It is argued that since both *aṇimā* and *mahimā* (denoting two opposite but correlated aspects of a particular kind of *parimāṇa*, magnitude)<sup>2</sup> are read in this group, *garimā* must be read with *laghimā* so that appropriateness would be preserved. As *aṇu* and *mahat* denote a particular kind of magnitude, namely size, so *laghu* and *guru* denote another kind of magnitude, namely weight.

<sup>1</sup> These arguments are not found in any well-known text, but are stated by my learned friends who are in favour of reading *garimā* in this group.

<sup>2</sup> That *aṇu* and *mahat* are expressive of these senses is proved by the well-known question, 'Is the Manas *aṇu* or *mahat* so far as its magnitude (*parimāṇa*) is concerned?' Expressions like *aṇor aṇīyān mahato mahīyān* (*Svet. Up.*, 3.20) may be considered in this connection. We may recall here the doctrine of the Vaiśeṣika-s that magnitude is of four kinds, namely *aṇu* (small), *mahat* (large), *hrasva* (short) and *dīrgha* (long). These four adjectival terms stand for substantives, i.e. for smallness, etc. (vide *Dīpikā* on *Tarka-saṃgarha*, sec. 25).

(2) Some are of opinion that *īśitva* and *vaśitva* cannot be regarded as two distinct *siddhi-s*, since the power known as *īśitva* (capability to govern or command) is essentially the same as *vaśitva* (capability of winning, subjugating, overcoming or subduing others). *Vaśitva* may even be regarded as the result of *īśitva* and consequently it comes under *īśitva*. Now, to preserve the traditional number eight, one more *siddhi* requires to be added and this requirement is fulfilled by including *garimā* in the traditional list of the eight *siddhi-s*. It is *garimā* only that can rightly be included in the list, for it is in consonance with *laghimā* (both denoting two correlated aspects of *parimāṇa*).

(3) The upholders of *garimā* further state that *garimā* has been regarded as one of the eight *siddhi-s* not only by some exponents of the Pātañjala school as shown above but by other schools also<sup>1</sup> (vide *Prapañcasāra*, a work of high authority, 19. 62).

Let us now examine the validity of these arguments. It is wrong to hold that *īśitva* and *vaśitva* comprise one and the same *siddhi*, as their characteristics are different. *Vaśitva* implies absence of dependence, while *īśitva* implies a highly powerful agency and supremacy (vide *Vyāsaśāstra* 3. 45).<sup>2</sup> Moreover commentators remark

<sup>1</sup> The Viraśaiva school mentions *garimā* as one of the eight *siddhi-s* (M. R. Sakhare: Introduction to the *Līngadhāraṇacandrīkā*, p. 628). Vide also Bhāskara's comm. on the *Saundaryalaharī*, the *Vivekamārtāṇḍa* of the Nātha school (verse 152) and Avalon's introduction to the *Mahānirvāṇatantra* (p. 146).

<sup>2</sup> Devala (quoted in *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, p. 216) observes: *apratihatam aiśvaryam īśitvam | īśitvena daivatāny api atīsete | ātmavaśyatā vaśitvam |*

that *vaśitva* arises as the result of the *saṃyama* on the *sūkṣma* aspect of the *bhūta-s*, while *īśitva* arises as a result of the *saṃyama* on their *anvaya* aspect.

In spite of such essential differences, if *īśitva* and *vaśitva* could be regarded as one and the same *siddhi*, one can easily consider *aṇimā* and *laghimā* as comprising one *siddhi* both possessing the nature of *alpatva* (the quality of being smaller in quantity). Likewise *prāpti* and *prākāmya* may be considered as one *siddhi*, for 'freedom of will' exists in both these *siddhi-s* as their essential characteristic.

There arises a technical difficulty if *garimā* is read in the place of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*, the eighth *siddhi*, which is said to be the result of *saṃyama* practised on the *arthavattva* form of the *bhūta-s*. It would be wrong to hold that so subtle a *saṃyama* as this gives rise to *garimā* which is the power to render a thing more weighty or heavy. There is no direct connection between the *arthavattva* aspect of the elements (*bhūta-s*) and weight or heaviness.

The aforesaid view that *garimā* must be read with *laghimā* in order to preserve appropriateness seems to be based on a wrong notion of the nature of these *siddhi-s*. If the import of the words *aṇimā*, *laghimā* and *mahimā* are understood properly it would appear that

*Jayamaṅgalā* (Sāṃ. Kā. 23) remarks: *īśitvaṃ prabhutā yena sthāvarā-dīni bhūtāni saṃdeśakāriṇi bhavanti | vaśitvaṃ vaśitā yena svatantraścarati |* See also the definitions of these two as given in the *Bhāgavata*: *śaktipreṛaṇam īśitā* (exerting influence on all, XI. 15. 4) and *guṇeṣvasaṅgo vaśitā* (non-attachment to the *guṇa-s*, XI. 15. 5).

there is no necessity to read *garimā* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group. According to us *aṇimā* and *mahimā* do not stand for the two powers for acquiring two contrary (but correlated) aspects of a particular quality (i.e. *parimāṇa*) as is wrongly understood by the upholders of *garimā*. As *aṇimā* has no expectancy for *mahimā* (as is going to be explained) so *laghimā* has no expectancy for *garimā*.

According to us *aṇimā* means the power to achieve *sūkṣmatā*, which is not the same as *kṣudra-parimāṇa* (magnitude having less dimension).<sup>1</sup> If a piece of wood becomes shorter in size in comparison with another piece of wood, the former does not become *sūkṣma* in comparison with the latter. *Sūkṣmatā* is not to be understood in terms of size or dimension.

From the definitions of *aṇimā*<sup>2</sup> it appears that *aṇimā* is the name of that power by which one becomes able to penetrate or enter all kinds of things or becomes able to bring oneself to any place of any kind by assuming a *sūkṣma*, subtle (i.e. a suitable) form. This power is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *aṇutvaṃ caiśāṃ saukṣmya-paricchedau na paramāṇutulyatvam* (*Sārīrakabhāṣya* II. 4. 7; see also II. 4. 13).

<sup>2</sup> *aṇur iti | sūkṣmādapi sūkṣmo bhavati icchātaḥ | tena aṇimnā sarvām anuṇvāśati vajraṃ api | tathā sarvasyādṛśyo bhavati |* (*Vivaraṇa* on *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* 3. 45); *sūkṣmāt sūkṣmatvam aṇimā* (*Skandapurāṇa*, Kumārikā, 53. 118); *sūkṣmāt sūkṣmatamo aṇiyān* (*Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa* 40. 31); *aṇimā aṇutvaṃ yena guṇena sūkṣmo bhūtvā vicarati* (*Jayamaṅgalā* on *Sāṃ. Kā.* 23); *khaśarīratvam aṇimā, aṇubhāvāt sūkṣmānyapi āviśati* (*Devala* quoted in *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, p. 216); *trailokye sarvabhūtānāṃ duṣṣprāpaṃ samudāhṛtam | tat tasya bhavati prāpyaṃ prathamam yoginām balaṃ |* (*Līṅgapurāṇa* I. 88. 16-17).

chiefly used to render the body subtle so that a yogin can enter any kind of thing of any magnitude. To make the body smaller in size is only a gross aspect of *aṇimā*.

The process (i.e. practising *saṃyama* on the *sthūla* aspect of the *bhūta-s*) by which one can acquire *aṇimā siddhi* also points to the aforesaid character of *aṇimā*. *Bhāgavata* XI. 15. 10 remarks that an *upāsaka* (i.e. a person practising devout meditation) whose *citta* has become engrossed in the *tanmātra-s* attains to *aṇimā*. According to the Sāṃkhya view it is wrong to hold that the *tanmātra-s* are smaller than the *bhūta-s* so far as their size is concerned.

*Mahimā*<sup>1</sup> is the power to cover or pervade all. This *siddhi* is chiefly used to render a body more big or bulky or to make a small thing highly extensive. The external result of this *siddhi* is the acquirement of respect from those beings who become amazed as a result of beholding high magnitude, extension or vastness. Vāmana's expanding of his body is an example of this *siddhi*. Thus it is clear that *mahimā* is not the opposite of *aṇimā*.

<sup>1</sup> *mahimā mahān bhavati, ākāśam api vyāpnoti* (*Vivaraṇa* 3. 45); *śarīramahattvaṃ mahimā | mahattvāt sarvaśarīrāṇi āvṛṇoti* | (Devala quoted in *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, p. 216); *mahaty ātman mayi pare yathāsamsthāṃ mano dadhat* | (*Bhāg. P.* XI. 15. 11); *mahimāśeṣapūjyavāt* | (*Mārk. P.* 40. 31; *Skanda P.*, Kumārikā 55. 119); *mahimā mahattvaṃ yena bhuvaneṣu dharmādīprāptiḥ* | (*Jayamaṅgalā* on *Sām. Kā.* 23); *trailokye sarvabhūtānāṃ mahimā caiva vanditam | mahattvaṃ cāpi loke 'smin ṛtīyo yoga ucyate* | (*Līnga. P.* I. 88. 18-19).

*Laghimā*<sup>1</sup> is the power which enables a Yogin to do an act with less exertion or with much ease. It renders activity more powerful and intense by destroying inertia so that the action is performed in less time. It is wrong to understand *laghimā* as the power by which one can reduce one's weight only. 'Assuming a less weighty body' is, however, one of the results of *laghimā*. Sometimes heaviness may become a helping factor for doing an act more easily. The Vedāntic view of *līlākāivalya* as the cause of creation (*BS*, II. 1. 33) seems to be an illustration of this *siddhi*.

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that there is no correlation between *laghimā* and *garimā* and that *laghimā* has no expectancy for *garimā*. Had *laghimā* meant the power of acquiring less weight, then only it would have been justified to include *garimā* (the power of acquiring greater weight) in the list of the eight *siddhi-s*, it being the counterpart of *laghimā*. It should also be borne in mind that to make a thing more heavy or light is the result of one and the same power with two different kinds of functions. It is logically

<sup>1</sup> *laghimā laghuḥ, laghubhyastūlādibhyo 'pi laghutaro bhavati | tena nīrālambanaḥ sarvato gantum paryāpnoti* | (*Vivaraṇa* on *Vyāśabhāṣya* 3. 45); *śighratvāt laghimā smṛtaḥ* | (*Skanda. P.*, Kumārikā 55. 118); *laghimā laghutvaṃ yena vāyuvat laghutaro bhavati* | (*Jayamaṅgalā* on *Sām. Kā.* 23); *śarīrāśugāmitvaṃ laghimā tena atidūrasthān api kṣaṇena āśādayati* | (Devala quoted in *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, p. 216); *śighratvaṃ laghimā guṇaḥ* (*Mark. P.* 29. 31); *laṅghanaṃ plavanaṃ loke rūpam asya sadā bhavet, śighratvaṃ sarvabhūteṣu dvitīyaṃ tu padaṃ smṛtam* (*Līnga. P.* I. 88. 17-18); *kālasūkṣmātmātāṃ yogī laghimānam avāpnyāt* (*Bhāg. P.* XI. 15. 12).

wrong to postulate the existence of two distinct powers for making a thing heavier or lighter.

It should be noted that the main field of these three powers is the body of the Yogin himself; i.e. it is the body made up of the five *bhūta-s* which is rendered *laghu*, *mahat* and *aṇu*. The other five *siddhi-s* of this group, namely *prāpti*, etc. belong to the field of organs.

As to the view that the power of acquiring more weight or becoming heavier must be taken to be a supernormal power and as such *garimā* must be given a suitable place in the *siddhi-s*, we reply that there is not the slightest doubt that *garimā* is a supernormal power. We only assert that it is not included in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group. It may be reasonably stated that the power of becoming weighty may, in some cases, be associated with the power of becoming extensive or vast.

There are strong grounds that prohibit us from including *garimā* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group. These eight powers are said to come into existence if *saṃyama* is practised on the five *rūpa-s* of the *bhūta-s* (vide *YS* 3. 44). A particular *saṃyama* gives rise to a particular *siddhi* or *siddhi-s* (vide the commentaries on *YS* 3. 45). If we include *garimā* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group we have to know what type of *saṃyama* on the *bhūta-s* gives rise to it. The extant works on Yoga are totally silent on this point and we are unable to refer to the *saṃyama* on any form of the *bhūta-s* that may give rise to *garimā*. Moreover if we want to place *garimā* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group, we have either to leave out one of the *siddhi-s* of this group or to combine any two *siddhi-s* into one

so that the eightfoldness of the group will not be disturbed. We have already shown that neither the leaving out nor the combining of the *siddhi-s* is free of fault.

It appears that the followers of some Tāntric schools included *garimā* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group taking it to be the counterpart of *laghimā* for the reasons stated above and afterwards the exponents of other systems followed this view blindly or ignorantly. As the eight definite names of the *siddhi-s* of the *aṣṭasiddhi* group caused difficulty, the upholders of *garimā* tried to solve it by reading the names of the eight *siddhi-s* in different ways (as shown above).