



Editorial Board:

RADHA BURNIER
K. KUNJUNNI RAJA
A. G. KRISHNA WARRIER
A. A. RAMANATHAN
K. V. SARMA

CONTENTS

	PAGE
K. V. SARMA <i>Spread of Vedic Culture in Ancient South India</i>	... 1
K. KUNJUNNI RAJA <i>Anandavardhana and Abhinavagupta: A Contrastive Study</i>	... 15
(MISS) JAYA CHEMBURKAR <i>A Study of Pañcaprakṛti-s, Amśa-s and Kalā-s of Śakti in the Devi-Bhāgavata</i>	... 25
N. V. P. UNITHIRI <i>A Note on the Anumāna chapters in Mānameyodaya and Nītitattvāvīrbhāva</i>	... 36
RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA <i>Wrong Views about the name and nature of the Eighth Siddhi of the Aṇimādi group</i>	... 48
G. PANDURANGA BHATTA <i>A Note on Rules and Conventions connected with Dice-Play</i>	... 58
ARVIND SARMA <i>A Note on the use of the word Hṛṣīkeśa in the Bhagavadgītā</i>	... 67
II TEXTS & STUDIES	
<i>Nītidviṣaṣṭikā of Sundarapāṇḍya</i> edited with translation by S. JAYASREE	... 73

RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

WRONG VIEWS ABOUT THE NAME AND NATURE OF THE EIGHTH SIDDHI OF THE ANIMĀDI GROUP

In the works on Sāṃkhya and Yoga we find some difference of opinion about the name and nature of the eighth *siddhi* of the *Animādi* group¹ (*Yogasūtra-s*, 3. 45). The original name of this *siddhi* is *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* or *yatrakāmāvasāyitā* (the difference being in the secondary suffix only), for this very form is found in the *Vyāsbhāṣya* (*YS* 3. 45) and in the sayings of the Sāṃkhya teacher Devala (quoted in *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, pp. 216-17). We may safely take these two texts as the oldest and most authoritative among the available treatises on Sāṃkhya and Yoga. The commentaries on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (23), namely *Mātharavṛtti*, the two *vṛtti-s* closely similar to the *Mātharavṛtti* recently edited by E. A. Solomon, the *bhāṣya* by Gauḍapāda and the *Yuktidīpikā* clearly mention the name as *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. Most of the printed editions of the *Tattvakaumudī* read this very name (*vide* the edition with the comm. *Pūrṇimā* by M. M. Pañcānana

¹The eight *siddhi-s*, according to the Vyāsa's *Bhāṣya*, are: अणिमा, लघिमा, महिमा, प्राप्तिः, प्राकाम्यम्, वशित्वम्, ईशित्वम् and यत्रकामावसायित्वम् [सत्यसंकल्पना] ।

Tarkaratna). Moreover, it was observed by Vijñāna-bhikṣu that this very name occurs in the *Purāṇa-s* also (*Yogavārttika*, 3. 45).¹ The word *yatrakāmāvasāya* may, however, be taken as a synonym of this *siddhi* as it is used in the *Vyāsbhāṣya* (3. 45). As *medhāvitva* or *dhanitva* is the same as *medhā* or *dhana*, *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* is the same as *yatrakāmāvasāya*.

It is remarkable to note that the three commentaries on the *Vyāsbhāṣya* (namely *Tattvavaiśārādī*, *Vivaraṇa* and *Yogavārttika*) and the commentary by Nāgeśa on the *Yogasūtra* (ed. by Pt. Abhyankar) unanimously speak (of the name) of the eighth *siddhi* as *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*.

It appears that on account of the obscurity of this word some wrong views have come into existence during later times:

(1) Some hold that it is illogical to enumerate *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* in this group; it is more logical to read *gariman* in this group.

(2) Some read the name as *kāmāvasāyitva* or *kāmāvasāya*.

(3) Some are in favour of including *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* either in *īśitva* or *vaśitva*.

(4) Some take *satyasamkalpa* or *satyasamkalpatā* as the original name of this *siddhi*.

(5) Some read *gariman* in this group. These scholars are silent on *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*.

Before examining the validity of the views of the

¹Cf. यत्रकामावसायित्वमिति तान्त्रिकी परिभाषा पुराणेष्वप्येवमवगमात् । (*Yogavārttika*, 3. 45).

exponents or commentators, we might give a brief account of the several views.

(i) Bhāvāgaṇeśa (on *YS* 3. 45) thinks that the original name of the eighth *siddhi* is *satyasamkalpatā* which is alluded to in the *Bhāgavata* passage *yatkāmas tad avasyati* (XI. 15. 5). The same view is found in the *Candrikā* commentary of Anantadeva.

(ii) The *Yogasudhākara* commentary by Sadāśivendra (on *YS* 3. 45) enumerates *gariman* and leaves out *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. Curiously enough it defines *prākāmya* (one of the *siddhi*-s of the *Aṇimādi* group) as *satyasamkalpatva*, which shows that it included *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* in *prākāmya* (vide the definition of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* in the *Vyāsabhāṣya*) which is defined by other commentators in a different way.

(iii) The *Maṇiprabhā* commentary by Rāmānanda (on *YS* 3. 45) mentions *gariman* and leaves out *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. The same view is found in the English exposition by M.N. Dwivedi and also in the *bhāṣya* by Jñānānanda which quotes a verse to this effect. (The verse is *Mānasollāsa*, 10. 8-9 which is a commentary by Sureśvara on the *Dakṣiṇāmūrtistotra* by Śaṅkarācārya).

(iv) The printed reading of the *Bhojavṛtti* (on *YS* 3. 45) is not clear. From the readings of some editions it appears that Bhoja does not read *prāpti* as a distinct *siddhi* but includes it under *laghiman* and mentions *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* as the eighth *siddhi*. In some editions, Bhoja seems to mention *gariman* instead of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. He explains *vaśitva* and the construction is such as to include *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*.

(v) The *Bhāṣya* by Svāminārāyaṇa (on *YS* 3. 45) mentions the name of the eighth *siddhi* as *kāmāvasāyitva* and explains it as *satyasamkalpatā*.

(vi) The *Pradīpikā* commentary by Baladeva (on *YS* 3. 45) reads the name as *kāmāvasāyitva* and remarks that *gariman* is to be read in the *Aṇimādi* group and that *kāmāvasāyitva* is to be discarded as it is not in harmony with *taddharmānabhigāta* used in this *sūtra*.

(vii) It is a pity that J.R. Ballantyne and Govinda Sastri Deva did not mention *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. They failed to notice the loss of one name in the group of the eight *siddhi*-s (vide their Eng. exposition on *YS* 3. 46). [The reference number varies as these scholars took the sentence *etena śabdādyantardhānam veditavyam* as a separate *sūtra*, numbering it 3. 22; the sentence, in fact, belongs to the *Vyāsabhāṣya*, 3. 21].

(viii) According to the commentary by Kṛṣṇanātha (on *Tattvakaumudī* 23), the name of the eighth *siddhi* is *kāmāvasāyitva* which is explained as *satyasamkalpatā*.

(ix) The *Tattvavibhākara* commentary on *Tattvakaumudī* 23 enumerates *gariman* and mentions *kāmāvasāyitva* also. It is clear that it does not include *kāmāvasāyitva* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group but regards it as a distinct *siddhi*. The printed reading of the relevant passages of this commentary seems to be slightly corrupt. The *siddhi* called *īśitṛtva* (i.e., *īśitva*) must be numbered as the eighth and no number should be given to *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*.

(x) The *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary by Svāminārāyaṇa (on *TK* 23) enumerates *gariman* and mentions *kāmāvasāyitva* as another name of *īśitva*.

(xi) Dr. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrin (on *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 23) enumerates both *gariman* and *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. He however leaves out *īśitva*.

Now we might show the invalidity of the views as shown above. Our arguments are as under:

(a) At first it should be noted that the inclusion of *gariman* in the *aṣṭasiddhi* group of the Yoga school is untenable as has been proved by me in a separate paper.¹ According to us *gariman* is accepted as one of the members of the *aṣṭasiddhi* group by the non-Sāṃkhya-Yoga systems.

(b) The word *kāmāvasāyitva* cannot be taken as a variant of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. According to us, if *yatra* is taken out from *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*, the word (i.e., *kāmāvasāyitva*) would fail to denote the sense of a supernormal power. The inclusion of *yatra* (meaning 'wherever, anywhere') is indispensable to denote a power which consists in *satyasamkalpa* and which gives rise to creation. *Kāmāvasāya* is impotent to convey the sense of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* or *yatrakāmāvasāya*.

(c) Those who take the word *yatra* as a separate word cannot reasonably reply to the question: What is the relevance in using the word *yatra* (in the sense of *yasmin*) after mentioning the names of seven *siddhi*-s. Observing this difficulty, some deliberately read *yacca* (i.e. *yat ca*) (in the place of *yatra*) in the *Tattoakaumudī* passage on the *siddhi*-s (on 23). It is however wrong to

¹ Vide the paper: 'Is it justified to read *gariman* in the list of the eight *siddhis*?'

tamper with the *Tattoakaumudī* passage as it is directly based on the *Vyāsbhāṣya* (3. 45) which undoubtedly mentions *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*.

(d) It appears that later commentators failed to know the significance of the name *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. They may have looked at the compound word as awkward. They forgot the existence of such words as *yatrasāyamgraha* (*Mahābhāratā*, *Ādi.* 13. 12; *Vana.* 12. 11), *yatrāstamitaśāyin* and the like. Fortunately some commentators admirably brought the sense of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* to light and clearly showed the significance of the word *yatra*. The explanations afforded by the commentators show why this *siddhi* is said to be identical with *satyasamkalpa*, which is the source of creation.¹

(e) The Purāṇic passages also speak of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* as is shown here in brief.

(i) The *Līṅgapurāṇa* (I. 88. 16-22) mentions and defines the names of the *siddhi*-s as found in the *Vyāsbhāṣya*. The printed edition, however, reads *yatra* as a separate word (Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara's ed.) which is due to ignorance or printing mistake.

(ii) The *Kumārikākhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa* mentions the traditional list (55. 117-118; *yatra* has, however, been printed as a separate word; Vaṅg. ed.).

(iii) The *Brahmavivarta-purāṇa* (I. 6. 18) contains the traditional list but mentions the name of the eighth *siddhi* as *sarvakāmāvasāyitā*. It appears that being unable

¹ Vide the *Vyāsbhāṣya* passage न च शक्तोऽपि...तथाभूतेषु संकल्पात् । (3. 45), which clearly shows that *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* is the power of creating a *brahmāṇḍa*.

to understand the significance of *yatra* the author (this *purāṇa* belongs to a very late period) has used the word *sarva* in place of *yatra*.

(iv) The *Śivapurāṇa* (I. 11. 45-47) mentions the *aṣṭasiddhi* group and names the eighth *siddhi* as *sarvajñatva*. As *Sarvajñatva* is not identical with *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* it appears that the obscurity of the word led the author of this *Purāṇa* (which is one of the later *purāṇa*-s) to use this word.

(v) The *Bhāgavata* contains the traditional list (XI.15. 4-5) but it does not mention the eighth *siddhi* by the name *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* but by the expression 'yatrakāmas tad avasyati' (XI. 15. 5). That this expression points to the traditional name is beyond doubt. It also shows the process of attaining this power which is Vaiṣṇavaite in nature and is different from that of the Yoga school (XI. 15. 17).

(vi) The *Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa* enumerates the traditional list (40. 29-34). The printed reading with a palatal *śam* may be a printing error or it may be due to the ignorance of the editor. In the printed text *yatra* is shown as a separate word—evidently a printing mistake.

The *Mārkaṇḍeya* verses have been quoted in the *Āvaranavārīnī* commentary on the *Tattvakaumudī* (on *Sām. Kā. 23*). It is worth noticing that in the quoted verses the word *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* has a dental *sa*. The commentator, however, accepted the name as *kāmāvasāyitva* as is proved from the *pratīka* 'kāmāvasāyitvam iti', and also from the explanation of the word as given here. We have already stated that the word

kāmāvasāyitva does not clearly bear the sense of super-normal power.

It is unfortunate that the printed readings of the *Purāṇic* definitions¹ of this *siddhi* seem to be more or less corrupt. A study of these definitions reveal that *yatra* is to be taken as a part of the nomenclature of the *siddhi*.

(f) The explanations of the word *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* as afforded by the teachers of *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* school² throw much light on the nature of this *siddhi*. Some of the explanations clearly point to the fact that *yatra* is to be taken as a part of the name.

(g) The foregoing discussion clearly shows that it is wrong to spell the word with a palatal *śa* and to derive it from the root *śīṇ* ('to lie') in the sense of remaining or sitting. *Bhānuji*, the commentator of the

¹ cf. यत्रेच्छास्थानमप्युक्तं यत्रकामावसायिता । (*Mārka. 40. 83*; the printed reading, however, has a palatal *śa*):

यत्रेच्छा तत्र च स्थानं तत्रकामावसायिता ।

(*Skanda, Kumārikā, 55. 120*)

इच्छया तस्य रूपाणि भवन्ति न भवन्ति च ।

यत्र कामावसायित्वं त्रैलोके सचराचरे ॥ २२ ॥

शब्दस्पर्शं रसो गन्धो रूपं चैव मनस्तथा ।

प्रवर्तन्तेऽस्य चेच्छातो न भवन्ति यथेच्छया ॥ २३ ॥

(*Līṅga, I. 88. 22-23*)

यत्कामस्तदवस्यति । (*Bhāgavata, XI. 15. 5*)

² cf. यस्मिन् कामस्तत्रैव तदवसानं गच्छति तदन्तं गच्छति । (*Vivaraṇa* on *Vyāsabhāṣya, 3. 45*); यस्मिन् विषयेऽस्य काम इच्छा भवति, यस्मिन् विषये योगिनो व्यवसायो भवति (*v.l.* अध्यवसायो भवति) तं विषयं स्वीकारक्रमेण अभिलाषसमाप्तिपर्यन्तं नयन्तीत्यर्थः । (*Bhoja* on *YS 3. 45*); यस्मिन् विषयेऽस्य काम इच्छा जायते तस्मिन्नेवास्य अध्यवसायो भवति । . . . (*Nāgeśa* on *YS, 3. 45*).

Amarakośa, I. 136 however takes the name as *kāmāvasāyita* with a palatal *śa* and remarks that a certain teacher (*kaścit*) reads it with a dental *śa*. There is no evidence to show that the word was originally spelt with a palatal *śa*. The farfetched explanations of the names with a palatal *śa* clearly point to the fact that that form of the word came into existence in a later age.

(h) There are strong grounds to hold that *yatra-kāmāvasāyitva* cannot be included in *īśitva* or *vaśitva* or in any other *siddhi* of the *aṣṭasiddhi* group. Commentators assert that *saṃnyama* on the *sūkṣma* aspect of the *bhūta-s* gives rise to *vaśitva* and on the *anvaya* aspect gives rise to *īśitva*, while *saṃnyama* on the *arthavattva* aspect of the *bhūta-s* gives rise to *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*.¹ As the *anvaya* aspect is higher than the *sūkṣma* aspect and the *arthavattva* aspect is higher than the *anvaya* aspect it would be wrong to include *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* in *īśitva* or *vaśitva*.

(i) There is a sharp difference between *sarva-bhāvādhiṣṭhātrtva* and *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*. The latter is said to be associated with the *bhūta-prakṛti-s* which are the same as the *tanmātrā-s* as these are said to be the *prakṛti* (material cause) of the *bhūta-s*. This shows that *yatra-kāmāvasāyitva* has its influence over the field of *grāhya* and not over the field of *grahana* or *grahītr*. Devala says that the field of this *siddhi* is *mūrtadravya* (*yatrakāmāvasāyitvena mūrtadravyam cādhiṣṭhātīti*, *Mokṣakāṇḍa*, p. 217) which also justifies the above view. *Sarvabhāvādhiṣṭhātrtva*,

¹ *Yatrakāmāvasāyitva* has been rendered by Pargiter as 'self-mortification' (*Mārk. Tr.*, ch. 40). Evidently it is wrong.

however, covers the field of *grāhya*, *grahana* and *grahītr*, and, as such, it is greater than *yatrakāmāvasāyitva*.

It is also clear that though according to the commentators the essence of *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* is *sātyasaṃkalpa*, yet it is basically different from *kriyāphalāśrayatva* (*YS* 2. 36), which falls under the category of *tapāsiddhi* (*YS* 4. 1) and has nothing to do with the material cause of the *bhūta-s*. Nārāyaṇa in his commentary on the *YS* 3. 45 identifies *saṃnyasaṃkalpatā* with *prākāmya*, a view not accepted by ancient yogin-s. Moreover *yatrakāmāvasāyitva* is the result of a particular kind of *saṃnyama*, while no *saṃnyama* is required to acquire *kriyāphalāśrayatva*. A careful reader should note that as *yama*, *niyama*, *āsana* and *pratyāhāra* do not require any *saṃnyama*, they have been read, not in the third *pāda* of the *Yoga-sūtra* (where *siddhi-s* based on *saṃnyama* have been enumerated), but in the second *pāda*.