

Vasudēva.<sup>1</sup> Śrī Madhvācārya, in his commentary on this Upaniṣad, explains this clearly. There is also a Kṛṣṇa again in the *Nārāyaṇam* of the Taittirīya - Upaniṣad. This is, again, not to be confounded with Kṛṣṇa, the son of Vasudēva.

A. GOVINDĀCĀRYA SVĀMI.

VEDA-GRHAM, MYSORE (S. INDIA).

February 7, 1910.

### THE TRANSLATION OF THE TERM "BHAGAVAT"

Dr. George A. Grierson has an interesting note on the correct rendering of the term "Bhagavat" as understood by the Bhāgavatas. He suggests that it should be rendered by "ADORABLE" to express the full connotation of the term. Certainly many would think that it is a fairly accurate rendering. But the present writer is of opinion that if we are to be still more accurate we must find out some word which would cover its full signification, and which would do full justice to its history. Such a rendering would convey all the ideas which underlie its employment in the whole range of Sanskrit literature.

As Dr. Grierson has very lucidly set forth in his highly interesting paper, "The Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India," at the Congress of Religions, Oxford, September, 1908 (*Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 1909, pp. 115-26), on the authority of Drs. Bhandarkar, Garbe, and Barnett, the Bhāgavata sect has a very old alliance with the Sāṅkhya-yoga philosophy, and has therefore borrowed many important philosophical ideas from that old school of philosophy, which originated in the Upaniṣads and prevailed in the Purāṇas. Much of the phraseology of the Bhāgavata philosophy is identical with that in the Sāṅkhya-yoga system. We shall see that the term "Bhagavat" was also primarily a term belonging to

<sup>1</sup> Vide p. 3, Dr. Grierson's "Nārāyaṇyam" (*Indian Antiquary*, 1909).

the Yoga Śāstra. In the Bhāṣya on the *Yogasūtra*, iii, 45, we find the expression न च शक्तोऽपि पदार्थविपर्यासं करोति । कस्मात् । अन्यस्य यत्र कामावसायिनः पूर्वसिद्धस्य तथा भूतेषु संकल्पात् । (Bālarāma's ed. of the *Yogadarśana*, p. 259, ll. 3-6). Now Vācaspatimiśra does not paraphrase यत्र कामावसायिनः, but paraphrases पूर्वसिद्धस्य by तत्र भगवतः परमेश्वरस्य (Bālarāma's ed., p. 259, l. 18). This gives us a clue to the original sense of the term "Bhagavat".<sup>1</sup>

That Vācaspatimiśra has very accurately rendered the term *siddha* by "Bhagavat", and that his rendering has the approval of the Bhāgavatas, is shown by the two important stanzas from the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*—

ऐश्वर्यस्य समग्रस्य वीर्यस्य यशसः श्रियः ।

ज्ञानवैराग्ययोश्चैव षष्ठां भग इतीङ्गना ॥ (vi, 5, 74)

and

ज्ञानशक्तिबलैश्वर्यवीर्यतेजांस्यशेषतः ।

भगवच्छब्दवाच्यानि विना हेयैर्गुणादिभिः ॥ (vi, 5, 79).

The gist of the conception of "Bhagavat" by the Bhāgavatas can be therefore briefly expressed by स्वभावत एव निरस्तनिखिलदोषगन्धं समस्तकल्याणगुणात्मकम्, as it has been happily phrased by Rāmānuja in his *Srībhāṣya* on the first sūtra of the Vedānta (p. 102, l. 6, Abhyānkaraśāstrin's ed. of the *Catussūtrī*). Rāmānuja is never tired of repeating this and several similar terms when speaking of Brāhman. The long epithets that are found to qualify परं ब्रह्म पुरुषोत्तमो नारायणः like श्रियः पतिः निखिलहेयप्रत्यनीककल्याणैकतानानन्तज्ञानानन्दैकस्वरूपः स्वाभाविकानवधिकातिशयज्ञानबलैश्वर्यवीर्यशक्तितेजःप्रभृत्यसंख्यिककल्याणगुणगणमहोदधिः, and so forth, at the beginning of Rāmānuja's commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā*, is nothing but an amplification of the same idea. Hence, if we are to indicate in one word the idea of "Bhagavat" in the light of Yoga and Bhāgavata philosophy about the Supreme Being, we cannot do better

<sup>1</sup> But the other editions at least read तत्र भवतः, not तत्र भगवतः.—Ed.

than render it by "PERFECT". This word does, I think, accurately express the idea as conveyed by the Yoga equivalent सिद्ध and by the Bhāgavata expression स्वभावत एव निरस्तनिखिलदोषगन्धं समस्तकल्याणगुणात्मकम् ।

The etymology of the word "Bhagavat" points to the same conclusion. *Bhaga* is derived from *bhaj*, "to divide," "to distribute," and therefore means "a share", "what falls to one's lot". That *bhaga* means "merit" or "quality" can be seen from the word *subhaga*, meaning "beautiful".<sup>1</sup> If we understand the possessive मनुष्य in the sense of प्राशस्त्य, then "Bhagavat" would mean "one endowed with praiseworthy qualities or attributes". "Bhagavat" can therefore easily mean "endowed with all good attributes (and nothing else)". In short, it can mean "a perfect being", which is also the sense of *siddha*.

In the Upaniṣads we find the word used as an epithet or a term of address to a spiritual teacher, e.g. भृगुर्वै वारुणिवरुणं पितरमुपससार । अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्मेति । (*Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, *Bhṛguvallī*), or to great adepts in spiritual science, e.g. अथ हैनं यजमान उवाच भगवन्तं वा अहं विविदिषाणीत्युषस्तिरस्मि चाक्रायण इति होवाच ॥ (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, i, 11, first passage). The rendering "perfect" can well fit in here.

It will not be uninteresting to note the uses of this word by Vācaspati, the author of the *Yogabhāṣya*, and his commentator, held in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* to be an authority in the *Yogadarśana*. I have noted down the pages and lines of the excellent edition of the *Yogabhāṣya* by Udāsina Bālarāma. In the following I should be supposed to refer to Vācaspati's commentary as having its own numbering of lines independent of the numbering of the lines in the *Yogabhāṣya*.

"Bhagavat" is an epithet of Patañjali in Vācaspati on i, 1 (p. 3, l. 1); ii, 46 (p. 185, l. 12). In Vācaspati on ii, 13

<sup>1</sup> This seems questionable.—Ed.

(p. 128, l. 2) it qualifies the Yogabhāṣyakāra. In Vācaspati on iv, 30 (p. 314, l. 4) it qualifies Akṣapāda or Gotama, the expounder of the Nyāya philosophy. In Vācaspati on ii, 35 (p. 180, l. 8) and on ii, 36 (p. 180, l. 5) it qualifies *yogī* understood. In Vācaspati on iii, 51 (p. 266, l. 7) and on iv, 22 (p. 306, l. 14) "Bhagavat" qualifies चरमदेहजीवन्मुक्त योगिन, i.e. "a *yogin* who is living like a mortal apparently, although really emancipated, and who is wearing his last body". In Vācaspati on ii, 15 (p. 133, l. 5) "Bhagavat" qualifies the author of the *Gītā*, who is called योगेश्वर in the last stanza of the *Bhagavadgītā*, otherwise styled *Yogaśāstra*. In Vācaspati on i, 24 (p. 56, l. 11; p. 57, l. 3; p. 58, l. 10), on i, 26 (p. 63, l. 1), on i, 27 (p. 64, l. 11), on i, 38 (p. 83, l. 12), on iii, 1 (p. 194, l. 12), on iii, 6 (p. 197, l. 7), and on iii, 45 (p. 259, l. 12), "Bhagavat" is an epithet of ईश्वर or "God". The *Yogabhāṣya* always uses ईश्वर for God (see i, 24; i, 26; i, 27, etc.), and only in commenting on iii, 45 has it used the word पूर्वसिद्ध as an equivalent to God.

From Vācaspati's use of the term "Bhagavat" it appears that it is possible to trace the history of the word. First it was used of great spiritual teachers and inquirers, as we find in the Upaniṣad. Then it came to be used as an epithet to those persons who had acquired spiritual powers. Then it came to be used of the emancipated souls, and then of God. The last sense is seen clearly in the use of the term for Buddha, the great teacher of Buddhist faith. "Bhagavat" has come to be used as equivalent for Buddha, and this shows that the rendering "Perfect" suits very well here also, for Buddha means "the enlightened one". It is quite true that in the Bhāgavata scriptures "Bhagavat" can very well be translated by "Adorable", but then that rendering would be good in that limited sphere alone, while "Perfect" is applicable everywhere. "Adorability" is only a corollary to the idea of "Perfection". It can easily be seen that this idea of

perfection is in the case of God the main idea in Yoga and Bhāgavata scriptures, if we compare the Yoga ideas of God as given in the *Yogabhāṣya* on the Sūtras, i, 24–8, and as expressed very concisely by the term पूर्वसिद्ध in भाष्य on iii, 45 (p. 259), with the ideas about God at the opening of Rāmānuja's *Bhāṣya* on the *Gītā*. This cumulative evidence makes it quite clear that “Bhagavat” means “Perfect” even according to the Bhāgavatas, who are followers of Bhagavat (= Kṛṣṇa) called योगेश्वर at the end of the *Gītā* itself.

V. V. SOVANI, M.A.

MEERUT COLLEGE.

March 31, 1910.

#### MAHISMATI, THE KAVERI, AND MAHESWAR

A few remarks may be offered in support of Dr. Fleet's article on Mahishamaṇḍala and Māhishmati (p. 425 *ante*).

In the earliest times Māhishmati was the capital of a vigorous kingdom, comprising a large stretch of the Narbadā valley, and continued to be so till the great battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas.<sup>1</sup> At some later period it fell under and within Avanti, as shown by the passage cited by Dr. Fleet (p. 447) from the Dīgha-Nikāya and the statement in the late Tirtha-yātrā-parvan that the Narmadā was among the Avantis.<sup>2</sup> Its absorption into Avanti would have lowered its position, and no doubt led to its extinction; thus it is not mentioned (as far as I know) in the Narmadā-māhātmyas in the Purāṇas. Such was its position in Kālidāsa's time, and his description of it and its king in the Raghuvamśa, which Dr. Fleet quotes (p. 444), shows incidentally that in portraying ancient times he did not follow the political geography of his day, but threw his mind back into ancient conditions with very considerable antiquarian knowledge.

<sup>1</sup> The authorities are cited at pp. 35–6 *ante*, and JRAS., 1908, p. 313.

<sup>2</sup> MBh., iii, 89, 8354–5.