

The Mahābhārata in the East and in the West

From A. Holtzmann

Vol. IV - 1895

Second Part

**The Mahābhārata
in the West**

Translated from German by Gilles Schaufelberger

Chapter 17

Aperçu sur la littérature

English, German, French and American scholars have looked in the different parts of the epic, and in its relation with the rest of the Indian literature; but it is only since 1883 we have at our disposal a work dedicated to the *Mahābhārata*, written by a Danish scholar, Sören Sörensen.

1. England has opened up the road into the Sanskrit literature's studies, and particularly into *Mahābhārata*'s. It is a young merchant, **Charles Wilkins**, who first gave a translation of the *Bhagavadgītā* in 1785, opening thus the literature on the *Mahābhārata*. A translation of the episode of *Amṛtamanthana*, from the *Ādiparvan*, followed. An other episode from the same, *Śakuntalā*; followed in 1794 and 1795. In the *annals of Oriental-literature*, London, came out in 1820 and 1821 an anonymous translation of the beginning of the *Ādiparvan*, ending however with the *Paulomāparvan*, and not including the table of contents; this translation was also ascribed to Charles Wilkins, as in Gildemeister, *bibl. Sanscr.*, p. 133: “*interpres fuit Ch. Wilkins*”; but H.H. Wilson in his *Essays*, ed. R. Reinhold Rost, T. I, p. 289, says more cautiously: “*rendered into English, it is believed, by Sir Charles Wilkins*”. In any case, from the introduction (dated Benares, 4th October 1784, the postscript 3rd December 1784) of the Governor General of India, the famous Warren Hastings, we know that Wilkins was working on a translation of the *Mahābhārata*, “*of which he has at this time translated more than a third*”. This translation, to the point it was achieved, was sent at Calcutta to Warren Hastings (see his postscript), but what may have become of it, I have no idea.

– **Horace Hayman Wilson** (1786 - 1860) has given in 1840 his *Viṣṇupurāṇa*'s translation, in which the cross-references and the parallels with the *Mahābhārata* are so plenty that the work may claim to deserve a place in the literature about it, particularly in the new edition prepared by Fitzedward Hall, richly enhanced by its own appendices (London, I 1864; II 1865; III 1866; IV 1868; V 1870; Index 1877). Translated from the *Mahābhārata*), the ethnographical parts of the book VI,

topographical lists from the Mahābhārata are given here, pp. 179-196; by Hall, pp. 139-190. Wilson wrote the introduction (pp. 3-13) to the *Selection from the Mahābhārata* of **Francis Johnson**, London and Hertford 1842, where he gives a short table of contents of the whole work. The notes on the passages chosen by Johnson are also from Wilson. This introduction is given in the *Essays*, ed. Reinhold Rost I, London 1864, pp. 277-290. Similarly, on the pages 290-341, three studies in verse of three *Mahābhārata*'s passages which had come out in 1824 and 1825 in the *Quarterly Oriental Magazine*, Calcutta, II 1824, pp. 249-257; III 1825, pp. 134-144; IV 1825, pp. 141-150; *Kṛṣṇā's svayaṃvara*, and The test of the pupils, in the first, then the fighting scenes of the battle's first days in the book IV, all that with important explanatory notes. Interesting also, a short essay of Wilson, *Notes on the Sabhāparvan of the Mahābhārata, illustrative of some ancient usages and articles of traffic of the Hindus*, in *Journal of the Asiatic Royal Society*, XIII, 1842, pp. 137-145. This minor works of the marvellous scholar are important concerning the epic's ancient story and geography. I don't know what have happened with his *Mahābhārata*'s translations and with the informations he gave of its content (see *Essays*, I, p. 6 and Goldstücker, *Hindu epic poetry*, p. 7).

– The works of the scholar **John Muir**, dead 7th Mars 1882 at Edimbourg, are of great importance to understand the *Mahābhārata*. Admittedly he never wrote in extenso on our epic, but we find in his work plenty of passages from all the nineteen books, translated, explained and compared with parallel passages from other fields of the Indian literature's history. Nobody, if he seriously wants to work on the *Mahābhārata*, should ignore John Muir's work; everybody can learn from its scrupulous developments. His judgment is always to be taken into account. Preferably, he contents himself with a methodical exposé and, with a modest moderation, goes further than his reader, anxious to learn and nearly ready to trust him, would have liked. Muir's main work is the five volumes of his *Original Sanskrit texts on the origin and the history of the people of India*, London, I 1858; II 1860; III 1861; IV 1863 ; V 1872; second edition, I 1868; II 1871; III 1868; IV 1873; and third, I 1889. They have about 335 passages from the *Mahābhārata* only, given in the transliterated Sanskrit text with translation and commentaries. Let us point out some printing errors in these quotations from the *Mahābhārata*¹... Naturally, I give this insignificant detail only for sparing the John Muir's reader every trouble, because I know from experience how it is difficult to locate a quotation from the *Mahābhārata* when its references are wrong. To the many extracts from the *Mahābhārata* John Muir gave us in the five volumes, it has to be added his selection of quotations with a religious, moral and political content, he has partly written down in *Indian Antiquary*, (Bombay, V 1876, pp. 152-154; 311-313; 340-342; VII 1878, pp. 137-139; 203-207; 292; 308; VIII 1879, pp. 86-87; 152; 204-205; 321; 338-339; IX 1880, pp. 29; 52; 87;

¹ NoT: There follows a series of corrections, of the kind: "instead of xxx, read yyy", mainly about the references to verses, which seem to be of scarce interest here.

141-142; X 1881, pp. 90-93) and partly in his own works. The latter, most often little notebooks of but few pages, were gathered together and edited with many new appendices in the *Metrical translations from Sanskrit writers*, London 1879; a supplement (with neither origin nor date, probably London 1881) came out with the title: *Further metrical translation with prose versions from the Mahābhārata* (58 pages, with a translation of the *Sāvitrī* episode). In his introduction to the *Metrical translations* (as also in his introduction to the *Religious and moral sentiments*, a former work which has been completely included in this later one and used as a basis for it), John Muir mentions the various attempts to highlight Christian ideas in the *Mahābhārata*, as Lorinser has done about the *Bhagavadgītā*, and he explains, p. 37, that “*there is no reason for resorting to the supposition that Christian doctrines may have modified any considerable number of its (the epos) ideas*”. An important article from the John Muir’s pen came out in the *Indian Antiquary*, Bombay, V 1876, p. 311, *Kṛṣṇa opinion on unfair fighting*, in which he collects all the passages where *Kṛṣṇa* advises to use in fighting ruse and treachery. But all Muir’s works concern only some problems related to the *Mahābhārata*; they don’t deal with the work itself.

– Our famous compatriot, **Max Müller**, in Oxford, deals also with our epic only in passing, see his *History of the ancient Sanskrit literature*, London 1859, pp. 36-48, in which he distinguishes between the ancient warlike epic and the new version, wholly revised by the brahmans, and also *India, what can it teach us*, London 1883, in which he says some words about the *Mahābhārata*, pp. 354-355. In the first of these works, he makes the important comment that the epic would be post-Vedic, but that the epic poetry would be as old as the Aryan people, and already existing at the time of Vedism (p. 40).

– An other Oxford Professor, **Monier Williams**, who has given the *Nala*’s episode in 1860, published in 1863 in London his work, *Indian epic poetry, being the substance of lectures recently given at Oxford*, with a complete analysis of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and of the main story of the *Mahābhārata*. Once out of print, the content of this book has been re-worked into a other one, *Indian wisdom or examples of the religious, philosophical and ethical doctrines of the Hindus*, London, 1875; 1875; 1876; 1893. The author mentions the Indian epic, pp. 309-337 and 415-448, the *Mahābhārata* in particular, pp.371-414, and also the *Bhagavadgītā*, pp. 134-154. The summary of the *Mahābhārata*’s main story in the chapter about the epic poetry is a bit terse, shorter but more fluent in the one about Indian wisdom. But it is not enough to inform us on the epic’s content. Statements like this one about *Duruyodhana*, *Indian wisdom*, p. 383: “*(he) is painted in the darkest colours ... (he) is a visible type of the evil principle in the human nature*”, show how much the author keeps close to the rails of tradition. It is naturally the point of view of the revised epic, but the related facts belie completely this judgment. Nevertheless, you have to admit that Monier-Williams’ work is full of pertinent remarks and that he takes from the rest of Sanskrit literature noteworthy connections.

– **J. Talboys Wheeler**, *The history of India*, in its volume I, *the Vedic times and the Mahābhārata*, London 1867, deals almost exclusively with our epic, pp. 41 à 521, and he returns occasionally to it in the rest of his work, II 1869; III 1874; IV 1876. In the first volume, he gives in seventeen chapters, bearing the titles he gave them, the detailed content of the whole poem: *family tradition of the house of Bharata – early feuds at Hastināpura – first exile of the Pāṇḍavas – reign of the Pāṇḍavas in the Khāṇḍavaprastha – the rājasūya or the royal sacrifice of Yudhiṣṭhira – the gambling match at Hastināpura, – and so on*); at each chapter's beginning, takes place a short discussion, a kind of paraphrase and comment about what will follow, going with critical remarks. In conclusion, four *episodes in the Mahābhārata*. The only flaw of this book is that Wheeler is not a sanskritist, and that he has built his work, not from the source itself, the *Mahābhārata*, but from translations of the same. Nathanael Halhed, has written, alone or calling in outside help, we don't know, an English translation from a Persian one which was - or is still - in the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta, in nine volumes. It doesn't seem to have been complete - “*a manuscript translation of the more important portions of the Mahābhārata*“ - says Wheeler in his preface to the first volume. Rājendralāla Mitra has given an account of this manuscript in a work I couldn't obtain: *Note on a manuscript English translation of the Mahābhārata, belonging to the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Calcutta 1868, taken from *proceedings of the As. Soc. of Bengal*, Januar 1868. This Calcutta's manuscript is the only source for which he asked for advice an Indian scholar, Baboo Obenash Chunder Ghose - so is he named in the first volume's preface - and that explains the many errors and misunderstandings of his work. The Persian translation as well as the English one present, on top of their omissions, many additions unrelated to the *Mahābhārata*, taken by Weber as belonging to the old epic. Shortly before his death, *Duryodhana* was presented the heads of the five *Kṛṣṇā's* sons and he was said that they were their fathers'; for joy, the dying king threw these skulls to the ground, but understood at the youthful softness of their constitution he had been deceived. Of all this story, told in detail by Wheeler, p. 531, our *Mahābhārata* doesn't says a word, but the tale is important as a proof of the ever-increasing hate toward *Duryodhana*. This translation doesn't tell the story of *Śakuntalā* according to the *Ādiparvan*, but to *Kālidāsa's* drama, and it is the way Wheeler tells it in the chapter *family traditions of the house of Bharata*, not being conscious of the connection. Further on, the description of king *Yudhiṣṭhira's* horse's sacrifice, pp. 377-433, has nothing to do with the related *Aśvamedhaparvan*, but comes from the *Jaiminibhārata*, cf. Weber *Ind. Streifen* II, p. 392; Goldstücker *Hindu epic poetry*, 1868, p. 9. From the four episodes Wheeler reports at the end of his work, two belong to the *Mahābhārata*, those of *Devāyanī* from the *Ādiparvan* and of *Nala* from the *Vanaparvan*. But the stories of *Candrahāsa* and of *Viṣayā* are based on the *Jaiminibhārata* again, cf. Weber, *Ind. Streifen*, II, p. 393; Goldstücker *Hindu epic poetry*, 1868, p. 9. Concerning the stories coming from Krishna circles, Wheeler himself admits they don't have been taken out of the *Mahābhārata*; cf. A. Weber

über Kṛṣṇa's Geburtsfest (on Kṛṣṇa's birth-day festival), p. 315. So can be explained the many errors of this outline, including the floating spelling of the names. Wheeler is all but a reliable guide in the *Mahābhārata*, and he can't be that because his sources are not reliable. But his judgment is sound, specially on the connection between the authentic passages and the subsequently added ones, and his many remarks about the country and its inhabitants, coming from his own experience, are admirable. His efforts are praiseworthy, his work in-depth and well balanced has given what it could give under the circumstances, but his information is never to be taken for gospel truth without checking, as far as the *Mahābhārata* is concerned. The *Tales from Indian history* of the same author, London 1881, fifth édition Calcutta and London 1890, IV, p. 159, n. 3366), a work for young people, contains tales from the *Mahābhārata*.

– From the pen of the learned sanskritist **Theodor Goldstücker**, dead in 1872, we have an very important essay, *Hindu epic poetry, the Mahābhārata*, issued first in the *Westminster Review*, London, April 1868; re-issued Calcutta 1868 (46 pages); and then in the *Literary remains of late Professor Theodor Goldstücker*, 2 vol., London 1879, Vol. II. There, he gives first a brief outline of the material collected until then to explain and make a critical study of the texts, and he values the works of Christian Lassen, John Muir, Monier Williams, Hyppolyte Fauche and Talboys Wheeler; then, pp. 9-27, he gives a brief summary of the *Mahābhārata's* main story; it is drawn from the source itself and shows the deep familiarity of the author with his subject. In page 14 only, he associates erroneously the mond's line with *Atri*. An other mistake, when both *Hastināpura* (p. 15) and *Khaṇḍavaprastha* (p. 18) are Delhi: the first one is on the Ganges (Lassen I, p. 158), the second is also called *Indraprastha*, what is still today, according to Wilson, *Essays* I, p. 281, the name of a Delhi's district. The most important part of Goldstücker's essay is the third, pp. 27-46, where he shows that very ancient models were present in the epic next to others quite modern, “*in which a state of Hindu society is pictured that is anterior to the code of Manu*”, p. 44. The second volume of Goldstücker posthumous work gives also (II) the reprint of one of his articles on the *Mahābhārata*, included in the *Chamber's Cyclopaedia*; here also, he says how he is convinced that the epic is the product of two times very far the one from the other. Goldstücker had planned a complete translation of the *Mahābhārata*, but only a leaflet to announce it was issued in Paris in 1845, cf. A. Weber, *Ind. Streifen*, II, p. 410.

– I did not acquaint myself with the works of **Charles Stone**, mentioned in the proceedings of the Royal Historic Society, new ed., II, pp. 272-292, London 1885; *Historical suggestions in the ancient Hindu epic, the Mahābhārata*, named by Klatt (in Kuhns Lit. Bl. III Bibliographie, 1829) nor with those of **B.G. Bruce**, *The Mahābhārata*, in the journal *Harvard Monthly*, July 1887, p. 185 (Müller Bibl. II, p. 725).

– The meticulous works of **Ralph Thomas Hotchkin Griffith** are more to be considered as literature's works, like *Specimens of old Indian poetry translated*

into English verse, London 1852, as also the *Pativrata-māhāmya* and the various collections of **Edwin Arnold**: *Indian poetry*, London 1884; 1885; 1886, *Indian idylls*, London and Boston 1883; 1889, *Bhagavadgītā or the celestial song*, London et Boston 1885, which are all included in *Poetical works*, in six volumes, London 1885. I have found a mention of an Arnold's manuscript, *How the Mahābhārata begins*, London 1882, in the Journ. Roy. As. Soc., new ed., tome XIV.

– The fresh and stimulating work of **Romesh Chunder Dutt**: *History of civilization in ancient India*, vol. I, Calcutta 1889, deals with the *Mahābhārata*, pp. 180-200. He considers the five *Pāṇḍava* as mythical representatives of the different virtues, p. 187; *Kṛṣṇa* symbolizes the alliance of the *Pāñcāla* with a warlike people, p. 188; the whole story of the five brother and their wife is but an allegory, p. 194.

– As they were written in English, the *Contributions to the history of the Mahābhārata* of **G. Bühler** et **J. Kirste**, Vienna 1892 (Sitzungsberichte der Akad. phil. hist. Cl., vol. 127, n° 12). will be placed here. Kirste compares the *Mahābhārata* with passages from *Kshemendra*, and comes to the conclusion that in the time of the author (1050 A.D.), the ordering and the appearance of the epic were on all the important points similar to the actual version. Bühler held for plausible that, immediately after the beginning of our era, a *Mahābhārata* has already existed in the form of a code of laws. As the Indian scholars, the authors of the *Contributions* try to place the time of the actual version's shaping as high as possible. The *Mahābhārata's* riddle may be approached in two different ways I will call in short the internal and the external. The internal method tries to explain the epic from the inside itself, distinguishing the more ancient passages from the more recent, and comparing the ones with the others. Those who prefer the external method look for evidences in all the literature's fields and in the inscriptions from the north and the south of India as well as from Indochina, and estimate by their real or alleged age the appearance the epic presented in their time. It is very important that the external method be also taken; but if the necessary supports, and by that the preliminary studies, are missing, there is still to remember that a chronological assessment in the field of Indian literature must not be wrong on the pretext that it doesn't agree with results obtained otherwise, results themselves supported by more or less convincing and solid combinations; that a skittle falls, the others wobble, as Whitney says. The *Mahābhārata* itself must have suffered many changes and revisions; it would have been unlikely that its extracts be free of the same lot. It is as difficult, from the actual Ulfila's text, to draw a certain conclusion about the form the original Greek manuscript presented to the translator, as to conclude from an extract about the form the epic presented in the time of its writer. as well as the translation above, the extract here changes with, and after, the original text. We would like the dating for *Śaṃkara* to be indisputable, but yet we don't know if the many works that use his name are really his, or even if there was a one and only *Śaṃkara*. I can hardly believe in the Indochinese inscriptions of the VIth A.D., that show the *Mahābhārata* such as we know it today, and even less in their authenticity. I take these inscriptions,

as well as the *Pāṇḍava*'s ones in Portugeses' time, for Brahmanic jokes. Seeing how, still in our time, the *R̥g Veda*'s era is placed for some closest to the classical literature, or at least to the epic one, and for others pushed back to a distant antiquity, we have to consider that all the evaluations of this kind for the epic are but provisionally convincing. It is only in this sense that I have expressed my suppositions ,I, pp. 151 and 194, concerning the time of the two revisions, and I don't see in them the "Endresultat" (final result) of my "Forschungen" (research) , Bühler, in *Anzeiger des phil. hist. Classe* 1892, N°15, printed separately, p. 4, suppositions that were more aimed at explaining the internal process by which the ancient heroic poems have taken their actual form. The transformation, mentioned in the first part of this work, of the ancient epic into a code of laws, or better, as I will say it more exactly now, its purely external association with a pre-existing *dharmasāstra*, that contains the basis of our *Śantiparvan*; it was ascribed to *Vyāsa*, but that I would ascribe to the first Brahmanic revision rather than to the second Puranic one; I will discuss it no more in the chapter 16, § 9, but in the chapter 15, between the § 9 and 10. Concerning the external chronology of the epic, some century more or less would not much matter for. me

2. In Germany, if we don't take into account an older anonymous work, *Sammlung asiatischer Originalschriften* (Collection of original asiatic texts)², Vol., I, Zürich 1791, which could have contained translations from our epic, the literature about the *Mahābhārata* begins with the famous work of **Friedrich Schlegel** (1772-1829), *Über die Sprache und Weisheit des Indier* (On Indian language and wisdom), Heidelberg 1808, which contains translations of some passages of the *Bhagavadgītā* and of *Śakuntalā*'s episode, and gives also, p. 284, a short notice on the *Mahābhārata*. This work have been highly stimulating as well for the study of Sanskrit's language and literature as for the study of the ancient epic. This crucial work was reissued under the title *Über Sprache und Weisheit des Indier, und vermischte kritische Schrifte* (On Indian language and wisdom, with a review of various writings), Bonn 1877. A french translation from A. Masure, *Essai sur la langue et la philosophie des temps primitifs* (Essay on the primitive times' language and philosophy), was published, Paris 1837.

– **Franz Bopp** (1791-1867) paved the way in all directions for the study of *Mahābhārata*; in his *Coniugationssystem des Sanskritsprache* (Conjugation system of the Sanskrit language), Francfort, 1816, he gives already a translation of *Hiḍimba*'s episode from the *Ādiparvan*; Then the edition (from 1819 on) and the translation (from 1838 on) of *Nala*'s episode and some others less important, taken from the *Ādiparvan*: *Hiḍimba* again, *Klage des Brahmanen* (Complaint of the brahmins), *Sunda und Upasunda*, and from the *Vanaparvan*: *Reise des Arjuna in dem Himmel*

² NoT: The translation into English of the works' titles are from me, without prejudice of the titles under which they could have been published in English.

des Indra (Arjuna's journey to Indra's heaven), *Rückkehr des Arjuna* (Arjuna's return), *Raub der Draupadī*, (Abduction of *Draupadī*) *Manu und der Fish* (Manu and the fish), *Sāvitrī*, in the second part of the work, Bopp used in his famous works the grammatical and lexical fruits of these episodes, and also of others ones taken from almost all *Mahābhārata*'s books; the lexicographical matter in his *glossarium Sanscritum*, Berlin 1830; 1847, the grammatical one in the various editions of his *Sanskrit-Sprachlehre* (Lessons on Sanskrit language), from 1827 on, and his *vergleichenden Grammatik* (Comparative grammar), from 1833 on. In 1829 already, Franz Bopp has expressed the first principles of the *Mahābhārata* internal criticism in *Sündflut* (The Flood), intr. p. 25; the parts of the epic are not of the same time, some of them are later additions, and many of them also date back long before the compilation and the writing of the epic. In the same manner, he is at the origin of the work's external criticism, comparing all the documents he could lay his hand on; in 1819 already, he included in the first *Nala*'s edition, by way of comparison, all the Indian notes, particularly those of *Nīlakaṇṭha*. By these detailed studies, Bopp opened up in Germany, under the most favourable auspices, an in-depth and scholarly research on the *Mahābhārata*, and it is not his fault if he has found on the way he has gone over only few to imitate him.

– **August Wilhelm von Schlegel** (1767-1845) finds here his place due to his subtle comments about Bopp's *Nala*, *Indische Bibliothek*, I, Bonn 1823, p. 97 (the note in question has already been published in 1820), and his edition of the *Bhagavadgītā*. But, as we know, his interest was mainly about the second Indian epic, the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

– On the contrary, his disciple and friend, **Christian Lassen** (1800-1876), brought a lot to the *Mahābhārata*. In his diploma work, *commentatio de Pentapotamia Indica*, Bonn 1827, he turned already to the way to which he was going to remain subsequently true and owe his most brilliant successes: a geographical and ethnical research based on a precise knowledge and a wise assessment of the ancient literature. In his first work, Lassen mentions the Penjab and gives an important passage related to it, taken from the *Karṇaparvan*, in the original text (from an ancient Parisian manuscript in Bengali hand) with a translation in Latin and notes. Linked to that, the *Beiträge zur Kunde des Indischen Altertums aus dem Mahābhārata: Allgemeines über das Mahābhārata* (Contributions to the knowledge of the ancient India, taken from the *Mahābhārata*; généralités about the *Mahābhārata*) *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, I, Göttingen 1837, and *die altindischen Völker* (The ancient Indian people), *ibid*, pp. 341-354, II, Göttingen and Bonn 1839, pp. 21-70: III, Göttingen and Bonn 1840, pp. 183-217. In particular, the passage of the *Sabhāparvan* telling the conquest of the earth in the four directions (*Digvijaya*) is included and partially translated and annotated. These works, increased by many others, mostly new, lead to Lassen's masterwork, the *Indischen Altertumskunde* (The Indian antiquities), I, Bonn 1847; II, Bonn 1852; III, Leipzig 1858; IV, Leipzig 1861, second ed. I, Leipzig 1867; II, Leipzig 1873. This work gives, if only for the

Mahābhārata, a lot of information about the geographical and ethnological situations. How much we owe to Lassen, it becomes clear when we remember that no help could be found from the Indian scholars; for them, geography and ethnography have no sense. A.W. von Schlegel remarks quite rightly that *in rebus geographicis plerumque a scholiastis frustra auxilium expectatur*. In the ethnographic lists of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, not only the comments leave us unsatisfied, but the manuscripts deal carelessly with these passages; they differ from the others, “widely and irreconcilably: the subject is one of little interest in native estimation”, H.H. Wilson, *Vishn. Pur.*, ed. Hall, II p. 190. Wheeler, *History of India*, I, p. 62, reports: “as far as the Pandits, I have found men who may be almost said to have the whole of the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa* by heart, and yet, with the exception of a few prominent places they are utterly ignorant of the geography. I once put a few questions of the kind to a very learned Pandit through a third party, and his reply was most significant: I am sixty years of age, he said, and I was never asked for such information”. Oppert, in the two volumes of the *Lists of Sanskrit manuscripts*, records a pile of handwritings, but when he tries and classifies them scientifically by categories, II, 675, under the title *Geographie (bhūgolaśāstra)*, he can place but a few ones. Wilson, *Vish. Pur.*, II, pp. 139-140, mentions some Sanskrit geographical treatises, but adds they are “not common and modern”. About the *Raghuvamśa*, 6, 34, *Mahākāla*, Stenzler notes: *Mallinātha solita sua in rebus geographicis brevitate solummodo dicit, ita appellari locum aliquem*. Concerning the commentators, specially for the *Mahābhārata*, *Nilakaṇṭha* makes only very few poor remarks; I don’t know the others. I don’t know either what is the connection with the *Commentare über die Geographie des Mahābhārata* (Comments on *Mahābhārata*’s geography), written around the end of the XVth century on Paulatsya king’s orders and mentioned by Adelung, *bibl. Sanskrita*, Petersburg 1837, p. 209, n. 4. In this connection, we can say that preliminary studies are completely missing, what places the geographer and the ethnographer of the ancient India in a very different situation as the grammarian, for example; we are all the more surprised by Lassen’s diligence and sagacity; from the ancient Greek and Roman texts to the contemporary travel reports, he has compared many sources and collected the scattered notes coming from Indian antiquities and particularly from the *Mahābhārata*. That is but one facet of Lassen’s work: he gives a detailed account of the epic itself, I, pp. 576-599, and presents its content in two chapters, *die Vorgeschichte der Pāṇḍava* (the former history of the *Pāṇḍava*), I, pp. 733-773, and *die Geschichte der Pāṇḍava* (The history of the *Pāṇḍava*), I, pp. 773-857, sometimes in a very detailed way and sometimes in brief; To that is added in appendix, pp. 19-20, a comparison of the two lunar dynasties which are in the *Ādiparvan*, as well between themselves as with the elements contained in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. What Lassen says about the *Mahābhārata*’s consistency doesn’t give the impression of a carefully matured view, and he has to be followed with the greatest caution. As A. Holzman will note, *Untersuchungen über das Niebelungslied* (Research on Niebelung’s Lied), p. 193, he has an inexplicable

preference for what is called the *Bhāratasūtra*, a late and very poor summary of the whole epic, I, 61, 6 à 53 = 2236 à 2282, which presents some detailed stories on Bhīma's boyhood, but passes amazingly quickly over what is the epic's very heart, the account of the great battle; more than three quarters of this summary relates to the first book, all the rest is dealt with in a few words. This contrived work is for Lassen "*die älteste einfache Fassung*" (the oldest simple version), I, p. 840, "*die Grundlage, auf welcher das massenhafte Gebäude des späteren grossen Gedichtes aufgeführt worden ist*" (the foundations on which the massive structure of the later poem was built), I, p. 1003, a view that will be neither taken up nor accepted by any researchers. Because of this unfounded opinion, Lassen has quite completely neglected the most important books of the epic, those that deals with the great battle, *Bhīṣma, Karṇa, Śalya, Saṃvata*; According to him, this battle has "*für die altindische Geschichte gar keine Wichtigkeit*" (absolutely no importance concerning the ancient India's history), I, p. 842, and, like the *Bhāratasūtra*, he hardly mentions it. If only he had come across the much older and important table of contents of the book I, 1, 150-218 = 148-216, that really highlights the epic's important moments ! More unfortunate still, two other mistakes. Lassen claims that our epic has been revised to the benefit of the *Pāṇḍava*'s party, I, p. 774: "*die Darstellung ist durchgreifend zu Gunsten des siegenden Geschlechts, zum Unglimpfe der besiegten Vorgänger verändert worden und nur durch diese Umarbeitung hindurch ist es möglich, ihrer wahre Geschichte heruszufinden und herauszustellen*" (The presentation has been completely revised to the benefit of the victorious line, without regard for their defeated predecessors, and only by passing this revision, it will be possible to find again and restore the true story); p. 783: "*woraus man vermuthen darf, dass es ursprünglich Erzählungen gab, in welchen er (Duryodhana) in einem andern Licht erschien, als in der jetzt im Interesse der Pāṇḍava umgearbeiteten Darstellung*" (from what it can be assumed that there were original tales in which he (*Duryodhana*) appeared in an other light as in the actual version revised to the benefit of the *Pāṇḍava*); p. 827: "*da die ganze Sage zu Gunsten der Pāṇḍava umgestaltet worden ist*" (as the whole story has been revised to the benefit of the *Pāṇḍava*); p. 828: "*Uebersetzung der alten Sage zu Gunsten der Pāṇḍava*" (revision of the old story to the benefit of the *Pāṇḍava*). This suggestion is correct in my opinion, but it has been already set out in 1846 by my uncle Adolf Holtzmann, *Indische Sagen*, 2nd part, Karlsruhe 1846, intr. p. 7: "*Wer sich nur einigermaßen über die Oberfläche des Mahābhārata in den Kern einarbeitet, der muss erkennen, dass nach dem ursprünglichen Plane Recht und Tugend auf der Seite des Duryodhana sind, der im Kampfe gegen Ueberzahl und Hinterlist mit Ehre unterliegt. Aber die spätere Auffassung sucht die Söhne des Pāṇḍu, und vor allen den Kṛṣṇa, den Anrather und Erfinder aller schlechter Ränke, von aller Schuld zu reinigen, sie als Vorbilder aller Tugenden zu verherrlichen und dagegen den Duryodhana und seine Freunde mit Vorwürfen zu überhäufen*" (who, in a way, reaches beyond the surface the very heart of the *Mahābhārata*, has got to admit that

according to the original outline, right and virtue were on the side of *Duryodhana*, who fought with honour the numerical superiority and the deceit. But the later version tries to clear *Pāṇḍu's* sons, and above all *Kṛṣṇa*, the counsellor and finder of all the intrigues, of all misdemeanour, to honour them as examples of all the virtues, and, on the contrary, to overburden *Duryodhana* and his friends with criticisms). Below, there is a very important passage for the *Mahābhārata's* internal criticism, I, 1, 52 = 52, in which three different wordings of the epic are listed: the first begins with *Āstika*, the second with *Manu*, the third with the king *Uparicara* or *Vasu*. This passage, unquestionably misunderstood by Lassen although he has been correctly translated by Wilkins, *Ann. Or. Lit.* 1820, p. 69, is properly explained by Adolf Holtzmann, *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Persischen Keilinschriften* (Contribution to the explanation of Persian cunéiforms), Karlsruhe 1845, pp. 141-144; Lassen then takes over this explanation as if it were his own cf. also I, p. 589, n. 1; II, p. 495 pp.: *Ich habe die drei Anfänge des in Rede stehenden Epos nachgewiesen* (I have highlighted the three beginnings of the epic in question). But Adolf Holzmann says, *Untersuchungen über das Niebelungenslied*, Stuttgart 1854, p. 193, n.: “*Nachdem ich in der Vorrede meiner Kuruinge es ausgesprochen habe, dass das Mahābhārata von diesem partheiischen Standpunkte aus umgearbeitet sei, hat Herr Lassen diese Entdeckung ebenfalls gemacht - wenn man aber mit Erstaunen sehen will, bis zu welcher Unbefangenheit man es in dieser Industrie durch langjährige Uebung bringen kann, so vergleiche man meine Beiträge zur Erklärung der Keilschriften p. 141 mit Lassen Altertumskunde II, p 494 ff*“ (After I have declared in my *Kuruinge* preface that the *Mahābhārata* had been revised in a partisan way, Mr Lassen has also made the same discovery - but if we compare my *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Persischen Keilinschriften* (op. cit.), p. 141, with Lassen's *Altertums* (op. cit.), II, p. 494 pp.), we will see to our surprise with what kind of ingenuousness such things can be brought in our trade after long years of practice). Thus Lassen is refused in a decisive way the priority to the two most important and the most productive suggestions of the *Mahābhārata's* internal criticism. His other hypothesis have enjoyed a limited approbation. *Kṛṣṇā's* marriage is, in his opinion, I, p. 790, the symbolic representation of an alliance between the *Pāṇḍava* and the *Pañcāla*; the critics have “*die erkünstelte Verbindung der fünf Pāṇḍava mit einer einzige Frau aufgehoben*” (abolished the artificial affair between the five *Pāṇḍava* with one woman only), p. 793. Only Dutt agrees on this point, *Civilization in ancient India*, p. 194, but Goldstücker *Hindi epic poetry*, p. 34, is violently against this Lassen's expression; for him, the marriage is “*a historical reality*”, p. 35, “*a real piece of history*“, p. 36, “*a real event*“, p. 38, and he gives detailed proofs. The poet, ot the one wha has revsed the work, would never have credited the so highly valued *Pāṇḍava* with such a breach of morals, if he hasn't been influenced “*by the general belief in a tradition, which he could not have invented*“ (by the general belief in a tradition he couldn't have invented)), as H.H. Wilson writes, *Essays*, I, p. 340, note. Moreover, according to Lassen, I, p. 791, the five *Pāṇḍava* aren't originally brothers,

but the representatives at a given moment of successive situations and states of the *Pāṇḍava*; Thus *Bhīmasena* would be a descendant of *Yudhiṣṭhira*, I, 809. But that is a quite dubious hypothesis. That the different cultural stages, the migrations, and so on, of a people may be illustrated by brothers, that is unbelievable. A saga could well represent the development's stages of a culture as fathers, sons, uncles, nearly like the names of Sem's descendants till Abraham mean for Knobel, *Commentar zur Genesis* (Comments to the Genesis), steps on the long journey the Jewish people has covered during its peregrinations, but no legend can personify successive situations or development as brothers. That the five *Pāṇḍava* are contemporary is proved by their brotherhood and their shared marriage. In short, Lassen's suppositions and hypothesis, as far as the *Mahābhārata* is concerned, could "*schwerlich vor der Kritik halten können!*" (hold with difficulty before the critics), A. Weber, *Ind. Stud.* I, p. 230. We must also observe that out of the several hundred of quotations given by Lassen from the *Mahābhārata*, many present printing errors³... These remarks are naturally minor and only made for sparing trouble to the users of the *Indischer Altertumskunde*. And yet the Lassen's work will still be essential for a long time for all those who look into the *Mahābhārata*. But what he says about the epic as a whole has found more admirers than followers and we are rather willing to put aside this indigestible and badly assimilated passage. *Ne ratio Lassensii nomina et fabulas explicandi mihi probari potest, imprimis conclusiones ex nominibus hominum ductae et explicatio quae dicitur allegorica*, says Sörensen, *Om Mahābhārata Stilling i den Indiske literatur* (On the place of the *Mahābhārata* in Indian literature),, p. 359. Cf. also Hopkins, *Ruling caste*, p. 59.

– The works of **Peter von Bohlen**, *Das alte Indien* (Ancient India), Königsberg 1830, II, pp. 345-374 and of **Theodor Benfey** (1809-1881), *Indien*, in the *Encyclopädie* of Ersch et Gruber, Leipzig 1840, pp. 277-281, are interesting because they gather together the knowledge until now acquired on the *Mahābhārata*. Benfey's translation and commentaries of the *Pañcatantra*, two volumes, Leipzig 1859, are important because he quotes many passages of the epic as a comparison. That Bentley, by his incredible culture and his short essays to explain the *Mahābhārata*, has helped much, it isn't questioned; I can only regret he mentions our epic always in passing, never in extenso.

– My uncle, **Adolf Holzmann** (1810-1870), began his works on the *Mahābhārata* with the publication of an episode of the *Udyogaparvan*; the *Indravijaya*, Karlsruhe 1841; he gives in appendix the corresponding passages in the various *Purāṇa*. There followed three little volumes, *Indische Sagen* (Indian tales), Karlsruhe, I 1845 (also with the title *Sāvitrī nebst andern kleineren Indischen Sagen* (Sāvitrī and other little Indian tales) II 1846, III 1847, second ed. in two volumes (containing also a passage from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but the story of *Aṣṭāvakra* removed

³ NoT: There follows a series of corrections, of the kind: "instead of xxx, read yyy" which seem to be of scarce interest here.

from it), Stuttgart 1854. As the verses aren't numbered in the second edition, I'll quote the *Indische Sagen* from the first. The first and the third volumes translate episodes from the *Mahābhārata*; the stories of *Āstika* and the snakes' sacrifice, of *Janamejaya*, of the birth of *Bhīṣma*, of *Yayāti* are taken out of the *Ādiparvan*; out of the third book, the episodes of *Nala*, *Sāvitrī*, *Aṣṭāvakra*, *Uśinara*, *Ṛṣyaśṛṅga*, of *Cyavana* and *Sukanyā*, of *Vṛtra*'s death and of the coming down of the Ganges. Out of the *Udyogparvan* are coming the stories of *Nahuṣa* and of *Guṇakeśī*, out of the *Śalyaparvan*, the story of *Rohinī*. The second volume gives only a tale, *die Kuruinge*; it is an audacious tentative in 2622 short verses to peel from its sheath the main story of the *Mahābhārata*, not in its actual form, but in its original one. In a short preface, the guiding principles of the transformation are given: the revision, regardless of its countless additions, has made of *Kṛṣṇa* and his friends models of virtue and belittled as much as possible *Duryodhana* and *Karṇa*.; concerning the mythology, it has put aside the ancient gods and placed in the foreground the new ones, *Śiva* and *Viṣṇu*. That, on top of that, the old epic begins with the dice game and ends with *Duryodhana*'s death, whereas the first adventures of the *Pāṇḍava* and their ancestor are only incidentally inserted; that there is only one dice game, and not two as in the actual version; that, for fairness, *Duryodhana* has commuted the slavery of *Kṛṣṇā* in exile for the five brothers; that the *Pāṇḍava* haven't fulfilled their fourteen years; that *Kṛṣṇa* has pressed for the war and shortened the peace talks; that the war length was set to eighteen days only later and that, in order to come to this length, the whole *Droṇa*'s book was inserted; that *Bhīṣma*, *Droṇa*, *Karṇa* et *Duryodhana*, par la ruse de *Kṛṣṇa*, by *Kṛṣṇa*'s cunning, have fallen only in unfair fightings; that *Bhīṣma* has really been killed by *Arjuna* and was thus unable to deliver before his death all the *Śāntiparvan* and all the *Ānuśāsanaparvan*; all these important suggestions are mentioned partly in the introduction of the *Indischen Sagen*, partly in the tale itself. That the end of the *Pāṇḍava* and of *Kṛṣṇa* has been the same in the ancient epic than in the *Kuruinge*, I can't assert it for certain, for we don't have here, as for the other suggestions, any information that would have been saved through the revision. However, the Indian heroic poetry, as the Greek or the Germanic one, has made a clean sweep of the ancient heroes' generations; Should the five *Pāṇḍava* and their friend *Kṛṣṇa* have died in one night by the hands of the only *Aśvatthāman*, nobody can tell; according to the *Aśvamedhaparvan*, one can assume *Arjuna* was killed by one of his own sons (cf. my *Arjuna*, p. 57). an mistake occurred in V, 417: the king *Citrāṅgada* fell fighting *Tulya*, the king of the *Gandharva*; such a *Tulya* has been mentioned nowhere; *Nilakaṇṭha* explains the word *tulyanāman* by "of the same name as" and probably *Citrāṅgada*, the name of a *Gandharva*, by *Citrāṅgadā*, the name of an *Apsaras*: as I see also in the *Petersburger Wörterbuch* (dictionary of St Petersburg), the *Śabdakalpadruma* quotes a *Gandharva* named *Citrāṅgada*, out of the *Mahābhārata*. Concerning Holtzmann's theory on Indian epic, his essay *Vyāsa und Homer*, in the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachenkunde*, I 1852, p.483, is important as well as some passages of his later writings: *Zur Erklärung des Persischen*

Keilschriften, (To explain the Persian cuneiforms), Karlsruhe 1845, pp. 85, 141; *Untersuchungen über das Niebelungenlied* (Research on the Niebelungen Lied), Stuttgart 1854, pp. 162-165; 168; 192-203; *Germanische Altertümer nach Tacitus* (Germanic antiquities according to Tacite), Germania, edited by Alfred Holder, Leipzig 1873, pp. 220; 210; *Deutsche Mythologie* (German mythologie), edited by Alfred Holder, Leipzig 1874, pp. 17-18; 50; 57; 62; 199-200; *Die ältere Edda, übersetzt und erklärt* (The more ancient Edda translated and explained), edited by Alfred Holder, pp. 584-586; 601.

– **Otto von Böhtlingk** and **Rudolf Roth**, have given in every field a fresh impetus to the Sanskrit's study by their *Sanskritwörterbuch* (Sanskrit dictionary), Petersbourg 1855-1875.; for the *Mahābhārata*, beside Böhtlingk, Albrecht Weber and his students have been particularly active. The first parts of this great work didn't take much our epic into account; besides the *Bhagavadgītā*, the episodes given by Bopp have been used; but in every issued part, new passages from the epic were made use of, and in the last two volumes, the work could serve as a dictionary specially dedicated to the *Mahābhārata*. The epic is much better taken into account in the *Sanskritwörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung* (Concise Sanskrit dictionary), Petersbourg 1879-1899. The edition of Böhtlingk's *Sanskritchrestomathie* (Sanskrit Chrestomathy), Petersbourg 1845, presents *Nala*, the second edition, Petersbourg 1877, a new extract from the *Ādiparvan*, and one from the *Vanaparvan*, both of them provided with short notes. We have already talked about the *Indischen Sprüche* (Indian maxims), Petersbourg I 1863; II 1864; III 1865, second ed. I 1870; II 1872; III 1873, very important for our epic as well as about the appendix *Mélanges asiatiques* (Asiatic miscellany), VII Petersbourg 1876, pp. 659-667 and the second appendix, *ibid.*, VIII Petersbourg 1877, pp. 203-249⁴.

– **Albrecht Weber** in Berlin is a remarkable connoisseur of the *Mahābhārata*. Among his many works, there are but few where he doesn't mention our ancient epic. Of course he doesn't talk much about the *Mahābhārata* in a direct and detailed way. But he does, most closely, in *Indischen Literaturgeschichte* (History of Indian literature), Berlin 1852, second ed. 1876, where he deals very briefly in eight pages with the epic's predecessors, as they are mentioned in the *Brāhmaṇa*, and the *Upaniṣad*, the *itihāsapurāṇa*, the *kāvya*, *sarpavidyā*, *devajanavidyā*, *gāthā*, and with the verifiable references to the epic among the Vedic literature, then among the grammarians and among the Greeks. For an historical basis, he supposes, p. 204 of the second ed., a fighting in Hindustan between Aryans, "geführt als die Einwohner bereits unterworfen und brahmanisiert waren" (held when the inhabitants were already subdued and brahmanized). The work would have been designed for the warrior's caste and inserted with all the lessons considered beneficial for it. That the *Yavana* are mentioned as taking part in the great war leads the author to place the

⁴ NoT: There follows a series of corrections about the maxims which seem to be of scarce interest here

epic's date at a time from after Alexander, "geraume Zeit nach Alexander" (a long time after Alexander), *Indische Streifen*, III, p. 478; the date in which the epic was established can't be determined; by my reckoning, it should probably be placed some centuries later. The end of the article presents some remark about the *Mahābhārata* in Java, about the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Jaiminibhārata*; briefer still, an lecture's extract, dealing with the *Mahābhārata*, published in the *Indischen Skizzen* (Indian sketches), Berlin 1857, pp. 35-38; it deals with the date of the epic, its content will later be included in the *Literaturgeschichte*. On top of that, we find occasional informations on the *Mahābhārata* in Weber, but in very great number, and very rich. The *Indische Streifen*, I, Berlin 1868; II, Berlin 1869; III, Leipzig 1879, deal respectively with the works of Muir, Wheeler, Fauche, and here, as in his other article, the references to the *Mahābhārata* are many⁵ ...

– The *Kataloge der königlichen Bibliothek* (Catalogues de la Bibliothèque Royale), Berlin, I 1883; II, 1886, 1888, are very important for their extracts from *Mahābhārata*'s manuscripts and their remarks on the commentators. Among the articles of the Königlich-Akademie (Royal Academy), some are significant by their occasional remarks on the *Mahābhārata*; specially the essay *über das Rāmāyaṇa* (On the *Rāmāyaṇa*), 1870, which gathers and comments the passages and isolated verses dealing with *Rāma*, and the article *über Kṛṣṇa's Geburtsfest* (On the birthday celebration of *Kṛṣṇa*), (*Kṛṣṇajanmāṣṭamī*), in which Weber deals, from page 310 to page 324, with the points common to *Kṛṣṇa*'s saga and the tissue of Christian legends. On this occasion, the *Śvetadvīpa* passage from the *Śantiparvan* is discussed in detail. The last contributions to the session reports of the *Akademie*, *Episches im Vedischen Ritual*, (Epic in the Vedic ritual) 1891; *Ueber des Vājapeya* (On the *Vājapeya*), 1892; *Ueber Bāhlī und Bāhlīka* (On *Bāhlī* and *Bāhlīka*), 1892, are important for the *Mahābhārata*, specially the first one.

– Weber's articles in the *Indischen Studien* (Indian studies) never deal directly with the *Mahābhārata*, but many of them refer indirectly to the epic; they are particularly important for the comparison of this one with the rest of the Indian literature. In this way, the article *Zwei Sagen des Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (Two legends from the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*), I, Berlin 1850, quotes many passages from the epic and brings many important comparisons between Vedic and epic literature, specially concerning the kings and peoples' names mentioned in both of them. The *Analyse der in Anquetil du Perron's Uebersetzung enthaltenen Upaniṣad*, (Analysis of *Upaniṣad* translation contained in Anquetil du Perron) Berlin 1853, I, pp. 247-302; II, pp. 1-111 et 170-236, presents many important similar passages taken from the *Mahābhārata*. Other articles taken out from the second volume are also significant for our epic: *Die Griechischen Nachrichten von dem Indischen Homer nebst Aphorismen über den Griechischen und den christlichen Einfluss auf Indien*

⁵ NoT: There follows a series of lexical or grammatical remarks which seem to be of scarce interest here

(Information on the Greeks of the Indian Homer, with aphorisms on the Greek and Christian influence in India), pp. 161-169, and the paragraph, very important for the internal criticism of the *Mahābhārata*, on *Pāṇḍu und die Pāṇḍava* (*Pāṇḍu* and the *Pāṇḍava*), appearing in the appendices, pp. 402-404. The third volume, Berlin 1855, gives pp. 161-169 and pp. 402-404 in the appendices, the article *über den Zusammenhang Indischer Fabeln mit Griechischen* (Similarities between Indian and Greek fables), is important for us by the collection and the comparison of the fables and of the mythical material appearing in the *Mahābhārata*. Concerning the connection between epic literature and grammatical works, we find remarkable information in the articles on *Patañjali* in the third volume, Leipzig 1873. It seems to me that Weber grants too little importance, in antiquity and in significance, to the Indian epic. It is true that the *Mahābhārata* has been established long after the *Veda*, but, because of that, the warriors' epic poetry could be as old as the priests' religious one. All the way, Weber considers that the epic is post-Vedic, and he hopes that its form be restored to its "*Vedische Ursprünge*" (Vedic origins), what is hardly possible. As historical basis, he supposes a real fighting that would have been held in India by the Aryans (*Litteraturgeschichte*, p. 204). The legend would be in connection with the *Kurukṣetra* (*Ind. Streifen*, II, p. 74). It is also possible that the story of a much older fighting has been later located in the *Kurukṣetra*; the legends travel with the peoples: the Javanese show the site of the great battle on their island. "Les compilateurs des vieilles traditions ne se sont fait aucun scrupule de déplacer la scène des événements anciens, pour la reporter au milieu des pays qui leur étaient le mieux connus" (the compiler of old traditions had no scruples about moving the site of ancient events and transferring it in the middle of countries they knew better), Burnouf, *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, III, intr. p. 28. According to Weber, the epic depicts only a weak "*Schattenrisse*" (sketch), he places it far behind "*die alttümliche Gestalt der Sagen, wie sie in den Brāhmaṇa vorliegt*" (the ancient form of the tale, such as it appears in the *Brāhmaṇa*), *Ind. Stud.*, I, p. 162, the epic's heroes are only "*Entwicklungen des Göttermythe*", (developments of the gods' myth) (*ibid.*, I, p. 415). For me, the epic is very ancient, the *Veda* a world in itself, as Max Müller says, *Anc. Lit.*, P. 53, and between the two traditions, the Vedic and the epic one, the link is very slight, late and external. On one of Weber's favourite themes, concerning possible traces of Christianity in the *Mahābhārata*, as on everything concerning the religious nature, cf. for example; *Ind. Stud.* (op. cit.), II, pp. 399-400, *Kṛṣṇa Geburtsfest* (op. cit.), pp. 310-324; I would like to point out that the *Mahābhārata* at least gives me the impression to let itself be understood in all its parts with no need of Christian influences (cf. Goldstücker, HEP, p. 45 and C.P. Thiele, *Christus und Kṛṣṇa*, in *Theologischen Zeitschrift* Leyde 1877, p. 63).

– The *Geschichte des alten Indiens* (History of ancient India), of **Samuel Lefman**, 1890, first part, 1880, deals in detail with the *Mahābhārata*, pp. 168-170, talks about this epic with a sequence independent of Lassen, gives a complete outline of its content (pp. 181-319; 337-339; 357-358; 371-373; 394-399, and then

about the “*Ausbreitung und Entwicklung der Arier im epischen Zeitalter*” (Territorial expansion and development of the Aryans at epic times), pp. 320-400. He admits also that “*die (brahmanische) Bearbeitung der Sage der Dhṛtarāṣṭra-Söhne und ihren Anhang in möglichst ungünstigen, die Pāṇḍu-Söhne dagegen in möglichst günstigen Lichte darzustellen sucht*” (the (brahmanic) revision of the saga tries and shows *Dhṛtarāṣṭra*’s sons and their partisans under the most unfavourable light, and on the contrary, the *Pāṇḍu*’s sons under the most favourable one). However, a more exact criticism of the epic isn’t part of the work’s plan or intentions.

– The articles of **Hermann Oldenberg**, *Das altindische ākhyāna*, (The ākhyāna in ancient India), 1883; *Ueber ākhyāna-Hymnen im R̥gvda*, (On the ākhyāna-hymns in the *R̥gveda*), 1885, ZDMG 37, pp. 54-86; 39, pp. 52-90, in which he follows the traces of the epic poetry in the Vedic period, are important for our epic: he claims that “*die sichere Technik des Erzählers, die mit Zuverlässigkeit auf eine lange Vergangenheit epischer Produktion schliessen lässt*” (the unquestionable technique of the poet in Vedic period, with which the *Mahābhārata* is imbued, let conclude in a way to a long past of epic production, ZDMG 37, p. 72, and shows passages of epic poetry in some hymns of the *Veda*, in the conventional, metrically as well as poetically exactly established form, for the dialogues and the tale’s important points, the representation of the interwoven myth being left to the poet. The result of his research, that the so called Vedic period possesses an epic poetry developed with fixed technical forms, is important and completely indisputable. Oldenberg’s article also *Ueber das geographische Verhältniss der vedischen und der buddhistischen Cultur*, (On the geographical relations between the Vedic culture and the Buddhist one), in his *Buddha*, Berlin 1881, pp. 399-418, gives a precious contribution to the knowledge of the ethnical relations in the *Mahābhārata*.

– **Alfred Ludwig** in Prague, in the six volumes of his noteworthy work on the *Veda*, has thrown on the *Mahābhārata* many new lights, particularly in the volume III, Prague, 1878. The *Register* in six volumes, in which the *Mahābhārata* is often quoted and taken for reference, is to be mentioned. Three little writings are particularly related to the *Mahābhārata*. Among the treatises of the Böhmisches Gesellschaft des Wissenschaften, Prague 1884, the treatise *Ueber das Verhältniss des mythischen Elementes zu der historischen Grundlage des Mahābhārata*, (On the relations of the mythical element with the historical basis of the *Mahābhārata*) was published, in which the epic is considered mainly from a Vedic point of view, and in comparison with the same, but in my opinion, its autonomy isn’t not enough highlighted. Ludwig says justifiably that the name of this work, *Bharata*, would be very old and specific to the epic from its origin on; he adds that it would come from the people *Bharata*, which their enemies, the *Kuru*, have fought and to which they have taken the *Kurukṣetra*. That is the Vedic point of view; in the late epic representation, mentioned by Ludwig, *Kuru* is a descendant of *Bharata*, and the *Kuru* are considered as a subfamily, a branch of the *Bharata*. The “*Fabel von Vyāsa’s Vaterschaft (zu Dhṛtarāṣṭra und Pāṇḍu)*” (the fable of *Vyāsa*’s fatherhood of

Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu) has been described quite rightly as “*abgeschmakt*” (absurd), p. 7, a “*später Gedanke*” (late thought), coming from the desire to include *Pāṇḍava*’s family into the *Kaurava*’s dynasty: “*in einer älteren Form der Erzählung kann nur Bhīṣma die Rolle Vyāsa’s gespielt haben*” (in an older form of the story, only *Bhīṣma* could have played the *Vyāsa*’s role), p. 8. The epic was revised to the benefit of the *Pāṇḍava*, who were absolutely not members of the ancient dynasty, p. 11. But I can’t agree with the author when he declares that the two main protagonists of the epic and its two most significant historical personalities, that is *Karṇa* and *Kṛṣṇa*, are persons who “*ein offenbar mythisches Gepräge tragen*” (have an obvious mythical mark) and “*deren absolute Notwendigkeit für die epische Handlung keineswegs einleuchtet*” (and whose absolute necessity for the epic’s action isn’t obvious), p. 14. But, concerning *Karṇa* at least, Ludwig admits in his latest work (see below) that he “*wohl eine historische Persönlichkeit sein dürfte*” could be, after all, an historical character), and in p. 5, he speaks about a historical *Kṛṣṇa*.

– That the Indians should have meant to symbolize in the fighting of the five brothers with *Duryodhana*, the five seasons’ one with the sixth, the winter, p. 14, is for me an incomprehensible idea and that *Kṛṣṇa* should have been originally the father of the five *Pāṇḍava* is for Ludwig “*eigentlich unabweisbar*” (a truth which can’t be pushed aside), p. 14, and for me, an impossibility.

– A second Ludwig’s article, *Ironie im Mahābhārata und im R̥gveda, in Festgruss an Otto von Böthlingk* (Irony in the *Mahābhārata* and the *R̥gveda*), in homage to Otto von Böthlingk), Stuttgart 1888, pp. 82-87, gathers examples of expression which are ironic according to him. Of course, irony is a vein of the ancient epic. When the giant *Ghaṭotkaca* throws in *Duryodhana*’s chariot the head of *Alambuṣa* he has just killed, with these words: “one shouldn’t appear before a prince with empty hands”, VII, 174, 13 = 7886, it is for sure bloody irony. During the slaughter’s night, the tired warriors sleep, drunk of victory and wine, and a great silence reigns all over the *Pāṇḍava*’s camp. And all of them die by *Aśvatthāman*’s sword and his companions’; the terrible noise which goes with this act of revenge is described in a very expressive way. The three heroes leave finally the camp, and the poet observes coldly that it has become as quiet as when *Aśvatthāman* has entered it, X, 8, 146 = 464. That is an ironic remark, saved from the ancient version. But when *Mātali* is surprised that *Arjuna* can’t hold onto the flashing chariot without staggering, what even *Indra* couldn’t do, III, 168, 39 = 12030; when *Aśvatthāman* says he want to avenge his father’s death, even if, by punishment, he would have to be born again as a worm, X, 5, 27 = 202; when *Bhīmasena* declares he would gladly go to hell if only he is victorious, IX, 59, 11 = 3319; when *Aśvatthāman*’s victory is credited to *Śiva*, X, 17, 6 = 765; when, instead of “he falls in the fighting by the hands of the enemy” it is said: “he becomes *Indra*’s guest”, article above, p. 48: these expressions and others aren’t to be considered as ironic, because they are said with seriousness, sometimes even with a bitter one.

– The Ludwig’s latest work, *Ueber das Rāmāyaṇa und die Beziehungen desselben zum Mahābhārata* (On the *Rāmāyaṇa* and its connections with the *Mahābhārata*), Prague 1894 (read in March 1894 and printed in the second Jahresberichte des wissenschaftlichen Vereins für Volkskunde und Linguistik, in Prag) contains many wonders, and I regret I can’t yet use it here. When Ludwig shows itself inclined to admit the historial personality of *Karṇa*, pp. 3 at the bottom; 4 in the middle; 17 at the bottom: when he makes the connection between *Duryodhana* and his party and *Śiva*, p. 6; when he explains that originally the *Pāṇḍava* weren’t part of the lunar dynasty, p. 15; when he places *Parikṣit* and *Janamejaya* before the time of the war, p. 18; when he notes that the cases in which the *Pāṇḍava* contravene to the conventional war’s laws are in greater number than the opposite ones, p. 29; and particularly when he declares that the ancient *Mahābhārata* is “*eine Dichtung von unerreichter Grossartigkeit*” (a poem of unrivalled greatness), p. 34. and considers it to be “*eine des grössten Schöpfungen aller Zeiten*” (one of the greatest creation of all the times), *Myth. El.*, p. 17; cf. tome I above, p. 69, that corresponds to what I maintain in my work ...⁶ In top of that, I must add that Ludwig, p. 32, considers the *Rāmopakhyāna*’s episode as older than *Rāmāyaṇa*, and bases this point of view on very convincing reasons.

– On the *Mahābhārata*, the author of these lines has published the following works: *Agni*, Strassbourg 1878; *Arjuna*, Strassbourg 1879; in the ZDMG, the articles on *Indra*, 32, pp. 290-340, 1878; *Apsaras*, 33, pp. 631-644, 1879; *Agastya*, 34, pp; 589-596, 1880; *Brahman*, 38, pp. 167-234, 1884. On top of that, a syllabus *Ueber das alte Indische Epos* (On the ancient Indian epic), Durlach 1881 (cf. August Barth in la Revue Critique, Paris 1883, pp. 2-3) and an article *Ueber das Mahābhārata* (On the *Mahābhārata*), in the literary supplement to the *Karlsruher Zeitung* 1881, n° 9-11. Then: *Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata* (Grammatical comments taken from the *Mahābhārata*), Leipzig 1884 and the *Berichte über die Calcuttaer Uebersetzung* (Report on the Calcutta’s translation) in the *Literaturblatt* of Ernst Kuhn and in ZDMG, cf above III, 111.

3. In France, the epic was first mentioned in the *Traduction de la Bhagavadgītā* (*Bhagavadgītā*’s translation) of **J.P. Parraud**, London and Paris, 1787, which however isn’t based on the original, but on Wilkins, and in the *Mythologie des indous*, 2 volumes, Rudolstadt and Paris 1809, based, according to the title, on authentic manuscripts brought back from India by the **Colonel de Polier**, and revised by the Chanoinesse de Polier. There can be found a short table of contents of the *MBh*, which is taken up by Galanos in his *Balabhārata*, Intr. pp. 25-27. After these forerunners, the literature about the epic as such begins with **Simon Alexandre Langlois** (1788-1854) who, in 1827, in his *Monuments littéraires de l’Inde* (Indian literary masterpieces), Paris, gives some specimens of the *Harivaṃśa*;

⁶ NoT: There follows a gramatical remark, which seems to be of scarce interest here

the complete translation, with scrupulous notes, follows in Paris, 1834-1835. Despite some mistakes, this work as a whole is praiseworthy and its index, accurately drawn, is very useful. Langlois makes of *Kṛṣṇa* a historical character in the Mémoires de l'Institut de France 16, 2 Paris 1846, pp. 211-235.

– The Sanskrit Professor at the Collège de France, **Théodore Pavie**, translated in 1839 some extracts from the books I and IV in Journal Asiatique, third set VII, and the first section of book X in *ibid.* X, 1840 et XI, 1841; These translations are gathered together in *Fragments du Mahābhārata* (*Mahābhārata's* passages), Paris 1844, increased by other episodes from the books I and III. Pavie published an article: *les Pāṇḍavas; études sur l'Inde ancienne et moderne* (The *Pāṇḍavas*; studies on ancient and modern India), in Revue des Deux Mondes, Paris 1857, Avril, pp. 808-836; Juin, pp. 535-562; we find also in the nr. IV of *Études*, 1858: *Kṛṣṇa, ses aventures et ses adorateurs* (*Kṛṣṇa*, his adventures and his worshippers), vol. XIII, pp. 48-69. In the preface of *Kṛṣṇa et sa doctrine* (*Kṛṣṇa* and his doctrine), Paris 1852, he declares himself against the hypothesis of Christian influences on *Kṛṣṇa's* cult in India.

– **Eugène Burnouf**, in his rich prefaces of the first, 1840, and the third, 1847, volume of his *Bhāgavatapurāṇa's* translation, gives many informations on Indian epic poetry, particularly on the *Mahābhārata*. Beside the Vedic poetry, and from this time on, we find the epic one, which reports the feats of the heroes and the gods, I, 10, 19; it has been carried out by the warriors, specially by the chariot drivers, good at mythology, I, 14, 51.

– In 1849 and 1851, **Félix Nève** gives a commentary on the Indian Flood in *Annales de la philosophie chrétienne*, and declares it is not Indian, but was imported from the West. On the women's position in ancient India, he writes: “Des portraits de femmes dans la poésie épique de l'Inde” (Women's portraits in Indian epic poetry), Bruxelles 1858 (and before that, in the magazine *Correspondant*, 1843 and above all 1844, Paris). On top of that, “*Des éléments étrangers du mythe et du culte de Kṛṣṇa*” (Outside elements of *Kṛṣṇa's* myth and cult), Paris 1876, and “L'épopée sanskrite (The Sanskrit epic)” in *Les époques littéraires de l'Inde*, Bruxelles 1883, pp. 69-182, a supplement to the named above portraits, paying a particular attention to the *Mahābhārata*. Cf. Ernst Kuhn in *Literaturblatt*, II, pp. 35-37

– Since 1848, **Philippe Edouard Foucaux** published in *Journal Asiatique* and in *Revue de l'Orient* translations of *Mahābhārata's* passages, which he gathered and completed: “Le *Mahābhārata*, onze épisodes tirés de ce poème épique” (The *Mahābhārata*, eleven episodes taken out of this epic poem), Paris 1862; the books *Strī* and *Mahāprasthānika* are translated in their entirety as well as considerable passages from the *Ādi* and the *Vanaparvan*. In the introduction, he gives a short outline of the whole epic's content, pp. 7-19. Cf. Weber, *Ind. Strfn.* II, pp. 263-265.

– **Karl Schöbel** published an article at the Université Catholique XVI, 1853: “La légende des *Pāṇḍava* d'après le *Mahābhārata*” (The *Pāṇḍava's* legend according

to the *Mahābhārata*), separate ed., Paris 1853, which gives, after some preliminary comments, a short outline of the main story.

– I have no knowledge of “Études sur l’épopée indienne” (Studies on the Indian epic) of **Adolphe Pietet**, Paris 1856.

– **A. Sadou** gave the translation of some passages of the books I et III, based on Johnson’s *Selection*, op. cit., and added to it Wilson’s notes in *Fragments du Mahābhārata*, Paris 1858

– De **F.G. Eichhoff** was published in Paris 1960: *Poésie héroïque des Indiens comparée à l’épopée Grecque et Romaine* (Indian heroic poetry compared with Greek and Roman epic). He brought two tables of contents of the epic and gave a commentary on it, pp. 190-222; he took episodes from it and translated them partially, *Nala*, pp. 238-253; *Sāvitrī*, pp. 253-275; *Manu et le déluge* (Manu and the Flood, pp. 72-75; *Le barattement de l’océan* (The ocean churning), pp. 77-78; *L’apothéose de Yudhiṣṭhira dans les derniers livres* (*Yudhiṣṭhira’s apotheosis in the last books*) pp.244-299. Some passages have been given in the original text and beautifully translated into Latin hexameters, pp. 377-3887... The main purpose of this author, as shown by his title, was to gather and compare similar passages in the classical antiquity. A former work of the same author, *Légendes indiennes sur la vie future* (Indian tales on the life to come), Lyon 1853, gave a translation of book XVIII.

– **Hippolyte Fauche** began a complete translation of the *Mahābhārata* in ten volumes, and led it all the way to the end of the eighth book: death put an end to this bold enterprise. *Le Mahābhārata, traduit complètement pour la première fois du Sanscrit en Français* (The *Mahābhārata* translated for the first time from Sanskrit into French), Paris, I, 1863; II 1864; III 1865; IV 1865; V 1866; VI 1867; VII 1867; VIII 1868; IX 1869; X 1870, is based on the Calcutta’s edition; from the sixth volume only, he consulted the Bombay’s edition and Nīlakaṇṭha’s comments. Fauche worked with an unceasing energy, but also with a great haste; once, in book III, he made the translation of the verse 10481 follow the one of the verse 10448, without noticing he was in a completely different story. His zeal deserves our gratitude, and we are delighted that “*la bagatelle, souvent fort insignifiante, d’un bout de ruban rouge*” (the triviality, often very insignificant of a piece of red ribbon⁸) has not escaped to him: on the title page of volume VIII, he can call himself Chevalier de la Légion d’Honneur. But that this translation be inadequate and erroneous, nobody has doubts about that; cf. Weber, *Ind Strfn.* II, pp. 408-415, where he gives a short list of glaring mistakes in volume VI; Then Hauvette-Besnault in *Journal Asiatique* 1867 (separate ed., Paris 1867, 34 pages) corrects many mistakes in the three first volumes, and refers for the fourth to the critics, that I couldn’t obtain, of M.E. Teza, in

⁷ NdT: there follows a listing of errors, which seems to be of scarce interest here.

⁸ NoT: the “red ribbon” is the badge of the Legion of Honour, a French much prized decoration.

Ateneo Italiano, 21 January 1866, Florence; and Theodor Goldstücker, *Hindu epic poetry*, pp. 5-7, notices the translation's inaccuracy, but in addition, he dispenses justice to this "*auteur méritoire, dont l'enthousiasme et le zèle ne peuvent être assez loués*" (praiseworthy author whose enthusiasm and zeal will never be praised enough).

– I couldn't personally consult **Émile Wattier's** translation of the *Mausalaparvan*, Paris, or the work of **A. Philibert Soupé**, *Études sur la littérature sanskrite* (Studies on Sanskrit literature), Paris 1877; the second of the seven sections which make up this work is devoted to the *Mahābhārata*.

– An other work I couldn't consult is the **A. Roussel**, *Étude sur le Mahābhārata* (Study on the *Mahābhārata*), Louvain, Museon X 1891, pp. 331-345; 412-418; 575-588, and, of the same *Les idées religieuses du Mahābhārata* (Religious ideas in the *Mahābhārata*), Museon XII 1893, pp. 263-272; 295-307.

4. I don't know much about the Italian literature on the *Mahābhārata*. It begins, as far as I know, with **Pietro Giuseppe Maggi**, *Due episodi Indiani* (Two Indian episodes), Milan 1847, in which the five first chapters of the *Nala* episode are translated and explained. Other works on *Nala* et *Sāvitrī* have been already named above.

– **Angelo de Gubernatis** turned the orientalist's attention to the *Mahābhārata*, as well by the more incentive than constructive articles in his *Piccola enciclopedia indiana* (Small Indian encyclopedia), Turin 1867 (articles *Mahābhārata*, *Kuru*, *Vyāsa*, and so on) as by his two works: *Fonti vediche dell'epopea* (Vedic sources of the epic), Florence 1867, in which, to tell the truth, he sees in the epics heroes only transformations of the Vedic gods and in which he mentions quite exclusively the *Veda* and the epic only in passing, and *Studi sull'epopea indiana* (Studies on the Indian epic), Florence 1868, a collection and a development of works previously published in *Rivista Orientale*. For the theatre, he wrote the story of *Nala* and *Damayantī: Il re Nala; trilogia drammatica* (The king *Nala*; a dramatic trilogy), Florence 1869; Turin 1870, The second part has been translated into German, Hambourg 1870; it has to be pointed out that the translator has embellished its substance by additions and freely composed themes.

– Countess **Dora d'Isria** (Princess Ghika), dead in 1888, turned also her scientific interests to the Indian epic. Her article, presented to the Société Archéologique d'Athènes, *Les études indiennes dans l'Italie Septentrionale, le Mahābhārata* (Indian studies in northern Italy, the *Mahābhārata*) was issued in the newspaper *La Grèce*, and independently in Athen 1870, then in an improved form (the French edition showed many printing mistakes): *Il Mahābhārata, il re Nala e gli studi indiani in Italia* (The *Mahābhārata*, the king *Nala* and the Indian studies in Italy), Florence 1870. This lively and clever article turned the attention of the Italian cultural world to the epic poetry. I couldn't consult another similar essay, *L'epopea*

dell'India,; il Mahābhārata (The Indian epic; the Mahābhārata) in Antologia nuova, December 1876.

5. Denmark can claim enlightened connoisseurs of the ancient epic with **Niels Ludwig Westergaard** and **Vigo Faustböll**, but who content themselves with telling occasionally its subject. On the other hand, the first work that really deals with the Mahābhārata was written by a Danish, **Sören Sörensen**, *Om Mahābhārata Stilling i den Indiske litteratur* (On the place of the Mahābhārata in Indian literature), Copenhagen 1883 (cf. A.H. Edgren in Deutschen Litteratur Zeitung, Berlin, 15 March 1884, p. 390). In appendix, a noting down of the different ways to read the Copenhagen manuscript. This work, this *collatio* apart, is written in Danish, but the *Summarium* in Latin, pp. 355-383, which is thus the only accessible to me. After an outline of the epic's content, pp. 19-50, Sörensen delivers an important judgment; that the Mahābhārata, in its oldest form, is a conscious artistic creation owed to an only poet, that the tale "*mire tragicum spirare*", that the ancient poem isn't born by chance from elements and snatches of different origins, but "*aperte vestigia artis magis minusve sibi consciae prae se ferre*". I can hardly imagine how an attentive reader of the first eleven books couldn't agree completely with him on that. Similarly, I agree completely with him when he says he looks for the poet, not "*in casis eremitarum*", but "*in aulis regum*", §32; the author could be a rhapsode, member of the royal court: "*auctorem putaverim ipsum rhapsodum (sūta) fuisse, in aula versantem, cuius tota vita carminibus audiendis et tractandis dedita fuit*", § 47. Similarly the following propositions are irrefutable; that the author hasn't made his work by his own imagination, but has based it on the "*fabulae populares*" (that he has had in front of him an extensive epic literature); further that the original poem is very different of the one we actually know, that couldn't have been the work of an only author; that the greatest part of the actual Mahābhārata is made of later additions; that, for example, the length of the war was increased to eighteen days only later, and that the old poem, except for some lines of the twelfth book, ended with the content of the eleventh; that the third book is, to a large extent, an addition; and so on. On the other hand, some other Sörensen's opinions make me wonder, as for example when he considers the death of *Abhimanyu* and the *Bhagavadgītā* as later additions, while I would plead, for these two passages, in favour of an ancient and authentic core. The "*versus longi*", i.e. the verses written in *anuṣṭubh* metre, are dubious for Sörensen since the beginning, "*quod per se suspiciomem habet*", p. 339, although many of the most beautiful and the most necessary passages are written in this metre (I think of *Karṇa's* death). Where the passages written in long verses can't be avoided, Sörensen thinks that "*antiquiores çlokos loco movisse*", p. 373. But maybe the old poet has already alternated *śloka* and *triṣṭubh*, as his predecessors, the *ākhyana* poets, the verses and the prose, according to Oldenberg. For my part, I consider these long verses as a sign rather of authenticity than of addition.

– Sörensen devotes the greatest part of his work to research on the later or more recent age of the different epic's parts His discussion about the mentions to the epic in other works of the ancient Indian literature and among the Greeks, are important. When he notices, in his preface, my hypothesis of a biased revision the *Mahābhārata* would have suffered, he couldn't agree, yet he himself supposes for example that the ancient poetry would have been warlike whereas the actual is brahmanic, or that the ancient epic's gods have been chased away by *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva*; The only question is to know if such changes and other ones, which alter the whole nature of the poem, could be thought without a conscious intention of the poet; I don't think so. In conclusion, I can't curb the wish that the author could, not only continue his work, but also make it more accessible by a translation in a more spread and better known language as Danish, a work which is until now, out Germany, the most significant contribution offered to the knowledge and the criticism of the *Mahābhārata*.

6. It is possible to give an account of what has been done for the *Mahābhārata* in the rest of Europa. We have named above the works of the Swedish **Bergstett**, **Kellgren**, **Olbers**, about *Nala* and *Sāvitrī*; similarly the few representatives of Russia, Poland and Bohemia have been introduced. The king *Nala*, whose story would have been worked on by one of the most famous Russian poet, Wassili Shukovski, made its entrance in Warsaw in 1885, in Moscow in 1886, in Prague in 1852, in Budapest in 1885, as well as *Draupadī* in Granada in 1861 and *Sāvitrī* in Rotterdam in 1870. Concerning Ungary, the first volume of **Százac's**, *A virágirodalom nagy eposzai*, Budapest 1881, presents the *Mahābhārata*. Holland has of course zealous sanskritists, bur concerning the *Mahābhārata*, I can name only the cautious exposé of **K.P. Thiele** in Leydener Theologischen Zeitschrift. He presents, for example for the year 1880, in *Letterkundig overzicht*, pp. 1-24, the following works: Muir, *Metrical translations*; Goldstücker, *Literary remains*; my works on *Agni* and *Arjuna*. In the year 1877, volume 11, pp. 63-82, the treatise *Christus en Kṛṣṇa* (Christ and *Kṛṣṇa*).

– An article on the *Mahābhārata*, written in Bohemian language by **J. Zapaty**, Böhmisches Museum 1892, Vol. 66, pp. 47-65; 318-333; 496-514, has been taken up in *Orientalischen Bibliographie* (Oriental Bibliography), VI, p..26, n. 585 et p. 198, n. 3813.

– Greece is represented only by **Galanos**, dead in 1833, but in a remarkable way.

7. In North America, **William Dwight Whitney** (1827-1894) has creaed for the Sanskrit studies a sure and promising place; as it is the case, for example, for theology or geology, the time is long gone for oriental philology when

in Germany, the news coming from America were leafed through and placed “ad acta”. A precise and tirelessly active connoisseur of the *Mahābhārata*, is the Professor **Eduard W. Hopkins** at Bryn Mawr near Philadelphia. His related articles are: *On the professed quotations from Manu found in the Mahābhārata*, cf. proceedings October 1883, pp.19-20; printed in Journal of American Oriental Society 1885, XI 2, pp. 240-275; *On the warrior caste in India*, cf. proceedings May 1886, p. 15; *Lexicographical notes from the Mahābhārata*, *ibid.* p. 36; *Observations on the condition of Hindu women according to the Mahābhārata*, cf proceedings October 1886, p. 14 and Journal 13, pp. 136-138; *On the vyūha or battle order of the Mahābhārata*, proceedings May 1887, p. 41; *On fire-arms in ancient India*, *ibid.*, p. 44; *On Professor Bühler’s Manu*, *ibid.*, p. 48, with new similar passages taken from the *Mahābhārata*; *On proverb-literature*, proceedings October 1887, p. 26; *Inquiry into the conditions of civilization in the Hindu Middle Age from th point of view of the ruling power or warrior-caste*, proceedings October 1887, p. 8, completing the essay presented in May 1886 to the Oriental Society; *Quantitative variations in the Bombay and Calcutta texts of the Mahābhārata*, proceedings October 1888, pp. 4-6. On top of that, the voluminous work: *The social and military position of the ruling caste in ancient India, as represented by the Sanskrit epics; with an appendix on the status of women*, in the thirteenth volume du Journal of American Oriental Society, New Haven 1888, pp. 57-376. An more: *Interpretation of Mahābhārata*, III, 42, 5, proceedings October 1889, p. 161. As we can see, Hopkins dealt mainly with concrete aspects of the *Mahābhārata*, an undertaking deserving gratitude, for we still lack totally of resources in this field.

– From Canada, a fresh and pleasantly written little essay is to be noticed, *The Mahābhārata, a paper read before the Hamilton Association* by **H.B. Witton**, Hamilton 1887.