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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 group\(^1\) (Yogasūtra-s, 3. 45). The original name of this siddhi is yatracāmāvasāyitva or yatracāmāvasāyitā (the difference being in the secondary suffix only), for this very form is found in the Vyāsabhāṣya (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 Sāṃkhya-kārikā (23), namely Māṭhara-vṛtti, the two vṛtti-s closely similar to the Māṭhara-vṛtti recently edited by E.A. Solomon, the bhāṣya by Gauḍapāda and the Yuktidīpikā clearly mention the name as yatracāmāvasāyitva. Most of the printed editions of the Tat-tvakaumudī read this very name (vide the edition with the comm. Purṇimā by M.M. Pañcānana

\(^1\) The eight siddhi-s, according the Vyāsa’s Bhāṣya, are: बुद्धिमान, लघुमान, महत्त्वम्, प्रातिम्, प्राकाम्यम्, विशिल्म् हि-शिल्म् and वज्रकामासाधिलम् [तत्त्वसंकल्पना].

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

It is remarkable to note that the three commentaries on the Vyāsabhāṣya (namely Tatttvavaiśāradī, Vivarāṇa and Yogavārttika) and the commentary by Nāgęśa on the Yogasūtra (ed. by Pt. Abhyankar) unanimously speak (of the name) of the eighth siddhi as yatracāmāvasāyitva.

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 yatracāmānasāyitva in this group; it is more logical to read garimā in this group.

2. Some read the name as kāmāvasāyitva or kāmāvasāya.

3. Some are in favour of including yatracāmānasāyitva either in iśīta or vaśīta.

4. Some take satyasamkalpa or satyasamkalpatā́ as the original name of this siddhi.

5. Some read garimā in this group. These scholars are silent on yatracāmānasāyitva.

Before examining the validity of the views of the

\(^1\) Cf. यत्रकामावसायित्वम् सार्वत्त्वित्त स्त्रियां निर्माणां सप्तवेष्ट्यविश्वसायण। (Yogavārttika, 3. 45).
exponents or commentators, we might give a brief account of the several views.

(i) Bhāvāganēśa (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 avasyayati (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 Animādi group) as satyasamkalpatva, which shows that it included yatrakāmāvasāyitva in prākāmya (vide the definition of yatrakāmāvasāyitva in the Vyasabhāṣya) which is defined by other commentators in a different way.

(iii) The Manirābhā 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 Dakṣināmurtistotra by Śaṅkarācārya).

(iv) The printed reading of the Bhājavarṣṭi (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 vaṣītvā and the construction is such as to include yatrakāmāvasāyitva.

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

(vi) The Pradīpīkā commentary by Baladeva (on YS 3. 45) reads the name as kāmāvasāyitva and remarks that gariman is to be read in the Animādi group and that kāmāvasāyitva is to be discarded as it is not in harmony with taddharmānabhighāta 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 vedītayam as a separate sūtra, numbering it 3. 22; the sentence, in fact, belongs to the Vyasabhāṣya, 3. 21].

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

(ix) The Tattvānībhākara commentary on Tattvākaumudī 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 iṣītṝṇa (i.e., iṣītṝa) must be numbered as the eighth and no number should be given to yatrakāmāvasāyitva.

(x) The Kirpanāvalī commentary by Śvaṁinārāyana (on TK 23) enumerates gariman and mentions kāmāvasāyitva as another name of iṣītṝa.
(xi) Dr. Sūryanārāyaṇa Śāstrin (on Sāṃkhya-kārikā 23) enumerates both gariman and yatrakāmāvasāyitva. He however leaves out iśītuva.

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 aśtasiddhi group of the Yoga school is untenable as has been proved by me in a separate paper. According to us gariman is accepted as one of the members of the aśtasiddhi 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 satyasaṃkalpa 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 Tatwakāmumūdi passage on the siddhi-s (on 23). It is however wrong to tamper with the Tatwakāmumūdi passage as it is directly based on the Vyāsabhāṣya (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 yatrasyaṇgraha (Mahābhārata, 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 satyasaṃkalpa, which is the source of creation.1

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

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

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

(iii) The Brahmaṇa-varna-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 Vyāsabhāṣya passage न न शाक्तोति...तथापूतेत्य 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 *Śiva-purāṇa* (I. 11. 45-47) mentions the aśtasiddhi group and names the eighth siddhi as *sarva-jñatā*. As *Sarva-jñatā* is not identical with *yatracāmāvasāyitva* 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 *yatracāmāvasāyitva* but by the expression ‘*yatracāmāvasāyitva*’ (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 *Mārkandeya-purāṇa* enumerates the traditional list (40. 29-34). The printed reading with a palatal *ṣa* may be a printing error or it may be due to the ignorance of the editor. In the printed text *yattra* is shown as a separate word—evidently a printing mistake.

The *Mārkandeya* verses have been quoted in the *Āvaraṇavārini* commentary on the *Tattvakaumudi* (on *Sām. Kā. 23*). It is worth noticing that in the quoted verses the word *yatracāmāvasāyitva* has a dental *sa*. The commentator, however, accepted the name as *kāmāvasāyitva* as is proved from the *pratika* ‘*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 supernormal power.

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

(f) The explanations of the word *yatracāmāvasāyitva* as afforded by the teachers of Sāmkhya-Yoga school2 throw much light on the nature of this siddhi. Some of the explanations clearly point to the fact that *yattra* 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 *ṣa* and to derive it from the root *ṣiṇ* (‘to lie’) in the sense of remaining or sitting. Bhānuji, the commentator of the

---

1 cf. यज्ञस्नायासमप्रुः यज्ञकामावासायित्वति। (Mārk. 40. 83; the printed reading, however, has a palatal *ṣa*):

यज्ञस्ना तत्र च स्थाने तत्रज्ञावासायित्वति।

(Skanda, Kumaṇikā, 55. 120)

इच्छया तत्त्वेन रूपाणि भवति न भवति च।

यत्र कामावासायित्वं जैसेको सत्त्वस्ये ॥ २२ ॥

शब्दयङ्गि तसो गन्धो भूम्य वैै मन्त्वत्या।

प्रवर्तनेत्युपित्वहेषतातो न भवति यथेच्छया। ॥ २३ ॥

(Līḷāga, I. 88. 22-23)

यज्ञकामावासायित्व। (Bhāgavata, XI. 15. 5)

2 cf. यस्यन्त्र क्रमसङ्गम सत्त्वसंगम गच्छति तद्भवति गच्छति। (Pīravāya on *Vydsabhāṣya*, 3. 45); यस्यन्त्र विषयेभ्य क्रम इच्छा भवति, यस्यन्त्र विषये योगिनो य्यन्तियो भवति (वि. अव्यवसायो भवति) ते विषये स्वीकार्येन अभिन्नसाधित्यं तन्नत्त्वसत्यं। (Bhoja on *YS* 3. 45); यस्यन्त्र विषयेभ्य क्रम इच्छा जायते तत्मिन्त्यसाय अव्यवसायो भवति... (Nāgēśa on *YS*, 3. 45).
Amarakosa, I. 136 however takes the name as kāmāvasāyita with a palatal ̣sä and remarks that a certain teacher (kāścit) reads it with a dental sa. There is no evidence to show that the word was originally spelt with a palatal ̣sä. The farfetched explanations of the names with a palatal ̣sä 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 yatreakmāvasāyita cannot be included in iṣitva or vaśitva or in any other siddhi of the āṣṭasiddhi group. Commentators assert that saṃyama on the sūkṣma aspect of the bhūta-s gives rise to vaśitva and on the anvaya aspect gives rise to iṣitva, while saṃyama on the arthavattva aspect of the bhūta-s gives rise to yatreakmāvasāyita.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 yatreakmāvasāyita in iṣitva or vaśitva.

(i) There is a sharp difference between sarvabhāvadhiṣṭhātvas and yatreakmāvasāyitas. 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 yatreakmāvasāyita has its influence over the field of grāhya and not over the field of grahaṇa or grahitr. Devala says that the field of this siddhi is mūrdhavya (yatreakmāvasāyitvam mūrdhavyaṃ cādhiṣṭhātīti, Mokṣakārṇa, p. 217) which also justifies the above view. Sarvabhāvadhiṣṭhātva,

however, covers the field of grāhya, grahaṇa and grahitr, and, as such, it is greater than yatreakmāvasāyita.

It is also clear that though according to the commentators the essence of yatreakmāvasāyita is satyasamkalpa, yet it is basically different from kriyāphalāśraya (YS 2. 36), which falls under the category of tapaḥsiddhi (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 satyasamkalpatā with prākāmya, a view not accepted by ancient yogin-s. Moreover yatreakmāvasāyita is the result of a particular kind of saṃyama, while no saṃyama is required to acquire kriyāphalāśraya. A careful reader should note that as yama, niyama, āsana and pratyāhāra do not require any saṃyama, they have been read, not in the third pāda of the Togasūtra (where siddhi-s based on saṃyama have been enumerated), but in the second pāda.

1 Yatreakmāvasāyita has been rendered by Pargiter as ‘self-mortification’ (Märk. Tr., ch. 40). Evidently it is wrong.