

told that the young monk Uttara, Revata's upatthāka, accepted the presents refused by his master, and went over to the party of the Vajjian monks. He was, on account of that, dismissed by the Thera. It is now also easily intelligible how the word *sissona* could be interpolated.

In 5. 61, I think the comma must be put after *āsi*, so that *yato tu so patthesi mokkham* forms a connecting sentence.

A more important passage is 5. 169–70. Here the punctuation in the text of my edition is really misleading. The correct translation is: "The nephew of the king, the renowned Aggibrahmā, was the husband of the king's daughter Saṅghamittā; her and his son was named Sumana. He (i.e. Aggibrahmā) also, having obtained the king's permission, was ordained together with the sub-king." A comma must be put after *sāmiko*, and a full stop after *nāmato* (5. 170*b*). According to the text, as punctuated in my edition, one might refer the pronoun *so* in 170*c* to Sumana and not to Aggibrahmā, which would be nonsense.

WILLI. GEIGER.

---

#### THE TRANSLATION OF THE TERM "BHAGAVAN"

The contribution on this topic by Dr. G. A. Grierson in JRAS., January, 1910, pp. 159–62, is a good attempt made to approach the sense of the term Bhagavān (or Bhagavat), and then to find the nearest English word for it.

The term Bhagavān is an ancient one, which may be found in the Upaniṣads, and traceable further back to the Vedic deity Bhaga. And according to a grammatical rule, "vat" can take the place of "mat", so that Bhagamān becomes Bhagavān.

The intention of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, VI, v. 69 ff., is to

explain the ancient Mantra, the *Dvādaśīkṣarī*, containing both the terms Bhagavān and Vāsudēva, the latter being traceable to the Viṣṇu-Gāyatrī of the *Nārāyaṇam* in the Taittirīya Upaniṣad. In this explanation the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa takes up *Bhagavān* first and then *Vāsudēva*. *Bhagavān*, according to the definition contained in the verse 79—

*Jñāna-śakti-balaīśvarya- vīrya-tējāmsy aśēṣatah |*  
*Bhagavac-chabda-vācyāni vinā hēyair guṇādibhiḥ ||*

is "He who is full of auspicious qualities and devoid of inauspicious ones". That this conception of God is not a later one, enunciated by the Bhāgavata school, but is the oldest Vaidic conception, may be learnt from what is called the *Ubhaya-līngī-'dhikarāṇa* in the Brahma-Sūtras, extending over III, ii, 11, beginning *Na sthānatō'pi*, to III, ii, 25. The word cannot therefore mean merely "blissful", qualified subjectively (JRAS., 1910, p. 160), or merely "holy", for either of these terms give but a part connotation of the word. "Blessed" would be better, if it may be understood as an abbreviation for "blessed-qualified". The word "Adorable" only draws out the root-sense, but completely ignores the contents of the definition as given in the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, verse 79 (*supra*). Parenthetically, the words "used in worship" on p. 161 ought to be "used for others than Bhagavān for mere courtesy". I would therefore suggest the following terms with which to translate Bhagavān: "Blessed," "Excellent," "Best," "Perfect," "Glorious," and perhaps "Lord". I would leave to my English friends to weigh the different connotations these several terms carry in their lexicon, and choose the best.

Referring to the term *Vāsudēva*, it is often confounded with the son of Vasudēva (Kṛṣṇa), but read the several connotations of it in the *Sahasra-nāma-bhāṣya*. Similarly, *Kṛṣṇāya Dēvakī-putrāya*, of Chāndōgya-Upaniṣad, III, xvii, 6, is by some confounded with Kṛṣṇa, the son of

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-GRIHAM, 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).