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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 jñānacaksus can apparently be developed through yoga but the divyacaksus 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’\(^1\) and later on explains that what he has been shown ‘none save thee has ever seen’\(^2\) which would presumably mean that those who possessed the jñānacaksus 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.’\(^3\)

It is clear, therefore that the word caksus 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.

---


\(^2\) ibid., p. 165. It is notable though that although Kṛṣṇa mentions that this form of his cannot be seen by Veda, yajña, adhyayana, dāna, and tapas (Bhagavadgītā, 11.48) or by Veda, tapas, dāna, iīyā (ibid., 11.53), jñāna does not seem to be included in the list, at least directly.

\(^3\) 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 (aśtasiddhi-s). Since the first siddhi of this group is animā,\(^1\) the group is called anīmadī; vide the Yogasūtra 3. 45 (tato ‘nimādipādurbhāvah). 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) animā, (2) laghima, (3) mahimā, (4) prāpti, (5) prākāma, (6) iśīṭva or iśīṭa, (7) vaśīṭva or vaśītā, and (8) yatrakāma-vasāyīta\(^2\) or yatrakāma-vasāyītva.

*garimā, animā, mahimā and laghimā are to be read in their stem (priitipadika) forms as gariman, anīman, mahiman and laghiman.

\(^1\) Though animā means the quality of being aṣu, aṉorbhāvah, yet it is used here in the sense of ‘the power through which one attains this quality’, karaṇe kārṣṣopacārāṁ anīmety ucyate (Jayamahgalā on Śām. 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 animā, etc. will be shown in this paper afterwards.

\(^2\) For a list of the eight siddhi-s: vide Vyāsabhyāsa 3. 45; Vāyu-purāṇa 13.4-5; Līṅgapurāṇa I.88.16-23; Mārkaṇḍeypurāṇa 40.29-30; Śivapurāṇa II.11.45-47; Bhāgavata XI.15.10-17; Amarakośa I.1.36;
There are a good number of works that read garimā (stem garimān) in the group of the eight siddhi-s.\(^1\) Though the word grammatically means 'the quality of being guru,' heavy,\(^2\) according to the aforesaid principle it would mean the power through which one can grow heavy (garimā gurubhāvaḥ, 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 Maṇiprabhā, Candrikā, etc.). Others include yatrakāmāvasāyitva under vaśītva (vide Nāgoji’s commentary). Some (e.g. Vāṃśidhara on the Śāṃś. Kā. 23) again combine iśītva with vaśītva and speak of either iśītva or vaśītva. A few scholars mention vaśītva and etc. There are variations in names in these texts. Nārāyana in his comm. on the Yogasūtra quotes a verse similar to the Amarakośa verse, the last foot being vaśītvaṃ cāṣṭamaṃ smṛtya.

\(^1\) Vide the Nāgojiyoṭṭi, Maṇiprabhā 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 Tatvakauṃudī on the Śāṃśhya-kārikā (23) also read garimā. Dr. S. N. Shastri and R. Phukan in their English commentaries on the Śāṃś. Kā. speak of garimā.

\(^2\) Garimā gurutvaṃ (Nāgoji and Bhoja on YS 3. 45); meruvad gurutvaṃ garimā (Maṇiprabhā, Yogasuddhākara on YS 3. 45); garimā gurutvapraṇīthā (Candrikā on YS 3. 45); paramārjasamāṅgasva samuddharāṇakarmani, gaurave merutulyaṃ garimānaṃ vidur budhāḥ. (Mānasollāsa of Suresvara, 10. 12); laghutarasyāpi talādeḥ parvatādvad gurubhāvaḥ (Yogasiddhāntacandrikā on YS 3. 45).

The difference of opinion in enumerating these siddhi-s was noticed by Dr. Sovani. He observes: Garimā is one of the aśvarya-s according to Vācaspati. Gauḍā and Jayamangalā place kāmāvasāyitva in its place and Māṭhara mentions both, raising the number to nine\(^a\) (A Critical Study of the Śāṃśhya 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 Māṭhara yoṭṭī and the Yuktidipikā on Śāṃś. 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

\(^1\) The Lingapurāṇa 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.

\(^2\) The present writer is of the opinion that Vācaspati did not mention garimā. Dr. Haradatta Sharma (vide his notes on the Śāṃśhya-kārikā 23) is wrong in holding that Jayamangalā and Gauḍā mention nine kinds of aśvarya-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 \textit{aśtasiddhi-s} since there is no need to mention it in this group. Moreover we will presently show that \textit{garimā} cannot be held as a counterpart of \textit{laghima}, one of the eight \textit{siddhi-s}. Since the original character of these \textit{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 \textit{garimā} as a \textit{siddhi} belonging to the \textit{aśtasiddhi} group.

We are stating here the arguments\footnote{These arguments are not found in any well-known text, but are stated by my learned friends who are in favour of reading \textit{garimā} in the \textit{aśtasiddhi} group.} advanced by the scholars who are in favour of reading \textit{garimā} in the \textit{aśtasiddhi} group:

(1) It is argued that since both \textit{anīmā} and \textit{mahimā} (denoting two opposite but correlated aspects of a particular kind of \textit{parimāṇa}, magnitude)\footnote{That \textit{aṇu} and \textit{mahat} are expressive of these senses is proved by the well-known question, ‘Is the Manas \textit{aṇu} or \textit{mahat} so far as its magnitude (\textit{parimāṇa}) is concerned?’ Expressions like \textit{aṇor aṇīydn mahato mahiyan} (\textit{Svet. Up.}, 3.20) may be considered in this connection. We may recall here the doctrine of the \text{Vaiśeṣika-s} that magnitude is of four kinds, namely \textit{aṇu} (small), \textit{mahat} (large), \textit{hrasva} (short) and \textit{diṭhga} (long). These four adjectival terms stand for substantives, i.e. for smallness, etc. (vide \textit{Dīpikā} on \textit{Tarkasaṅgarga}, sec. 25).} are read in this group, \textit{garimā} must be read with \textit{laghima} so that appropriateness would be preserved. As \textit{aṇu} and \textit{mahat} denote a particular kind of magnitude, namely size, so \textit{laghu} and \textit{guru} denote another kind of magnitude, namely weight.

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

(3) The upholders of \textit{garimā} further state that \textit{garimā} has been regarded as one of the eight \textit{siddhi-s} not only by some exponents of the \text{Pātañjala school as shown above but by other schools also}\footnote{The \text{Viraśaiva} school mentions \textit{garimā} as one of the eight \textit{siddhi-s} (M. R. Sakhare: \textit{Introduction to the \text{Lingadhrāṇacandrika}}, p. 628). Vide also Bhāskara's comm. on the \text{Saundaryalalhari}, the \text{Vivekamārtanda} of the \text{Nātha school (verse 152) and Avalon's introduction to the \text{Mahānirvāṇatantra} (p. 146).} (vide \textit{Prapancasāra}, a work of high authority, 19. 62).

Let us now examine the validity of these arguments. It is wrong to hold that \textit{iśitva} and \textit{vaśitva} comprise one and the same \textit{siddhi}, as their characteristics are different. \textit{Vaśitva} implies absence of dependence, while \textit{iśitva} implies a highly powerful agency and supremacy (vide \textit{Vyāsabhāṣya} 3. 45).\footnote{Devala (quoted in \textit{Mokṣakandga}, p. 216) observes: \textit{apratihatam aśvaryaṃ iśitvam | iśitvena daivatāny api atiṣete | ātmavāyataṃ vaśitvam |} Moreover commentators remark
that \textit{vaśīto} arises as the result of the \textit{sanyāma} on the \textit{sūkṣma} aspect of the \textit{bhūta-s}, while \textit{iśīto} arises as a result of the \textit{sanyāma} on their \textit{anvaya} aspect.

In spite of such essential differences, if \textit{iśīto} and \textit{vaśīto} could be regarded as one and the same \textit{siddhi}, one can easily consider \textit{aṇīmā} and \textit{laghīmā} as comprising one \textit{siddhi} both possessing the nature of \textit{alpātva} (the quality of being smaller in quantity). Likewise \textit{prāpti} and \textit{priikāmya} may be considered as one \textit{siddhi}, for ‘freedom of will’ exists in both these \textit{siddhi-s} as their essential characteristic.

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

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

\textit{Jayamaṅgalā (Sāṃ. Kā. 23) remarks: \textit{iśītoḥ prabhutatya yena sthāvaram dīni bhūtāni samdeśakārīpy bhavanti | vaśītoḥ vaśītoḥ yena sva−vīntuscarati |} See also the definitions of these two as given in the \textit{Bhāgavata: saktipraṣāṇam īśītā (exerting influence on all, XI. 15. 4) and guṇeṣevasaṅgo vaśītā (non-attachment to the guṇa-s, XI. 15. 5).
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 anima. The process (i.e. practising sañyama on the sthūla aspect of the bhūta-s) by which one can acquire anima siddhi also points to the aforesaid character of anima. 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 anima. According to the Śāmkhya view it is wrong to hold that the tanmātra-s are smaller than the bhūta-s so far as their size is concerned.

Mahimā 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 anima.

1 mahimā mahān bhavati, ākāśam api vyāpnoti (Vivaraṇa 3. 45); saṁrāmahattvam mahimāḥ mahattvāt sarvaśāśrāṇi āśryōti | (Devala quoted in Mokṣakāñḍa, p. 216); mahaty ātman mayi pari yathāsambhāma mano dadhat | (Bhāg. P. XI. 15. 11); mahimāśaśāśrāṇi āśryōti | (Mārk. P. 40. 31; Skanda P., Kumārikā 55. 119); mahimā mahattvām yena bhūnaṇaḥ dharmādi-prāptiḥ | (Jayamaṇgalā on Śaṅk. Kā. 23); triākhye sarvaśāśrāṇaḥ mahimā caiva vanditam | mahattvām cāpi loke 'smin tṛīyo yoga ucyate | (Linga. P. I. 88. 18-19).

Laghimā 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 līlākaivalya 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
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 anu. 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 samyāma is practised on the five rūpa-s of the bhūta-s (vide TS 3. 44). A particular samyāma gives rise to a particular siddhi or siddhi-s (vide the commentaries on TS 3. 45). If we include garimā in the aṣṭasiddhi group we have to know what type of samyāma 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 samyāma 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.