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. 135: “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; Kṛṣṇa’s svayamvara, 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 Mahābhārata1... 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 Note: 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 Nalā’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 principe 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 Yuddhiṣṭhira* – *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 King'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 Šakuntalā 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 *Yuddhiṣṭhira*’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 *Candrāḥāsa* 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 od the Mahābhārata’s main story; it is drawn from the source tself 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 Hastinināpura (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.


– 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 allience of the Pāṇcāla 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 literarure’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 agrees with results obtained otherwise, results themselves supported by more or less convincing and solid combinations; that a skittle falls, the others wobble, as Whithey 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 Śāmkara 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 Śāmkara. 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 Rg 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 dharmaśāstra, that contains the basis of our Śāntiparvan; 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.

2. In Germany, if we don’t take into account an older anonymous work, Sammlung asiatischer Originalschriften (Collection of original asiatic texts), 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 Bhagavadgitā and of Śakuntala’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 Hidimba’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: Hidimba again, Klage des Brahmanen (Complaint of the brahmans), 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 Draupadi, (Abduction of Draupadi) Manu und der Fish (Manu and the fish), Sāvitrī, in th 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, particular those of Nilakantha. 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 Bhagavadjītā. But, as we know, his interest was mainly about the second Indian epic, the Rāmāyana.

– 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 Karpaparvan, 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 this passages; they differ the ones 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 the Pandits, I have found men who may be almost said to have the whole of the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyana by heart, and yet, with the exception of a few proeminent 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 (bhūgolasāstra), 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, iti apellari locum aliquem. Concerning the commentators, specially for the Mahābhārata, Nilakaṭṭha 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, Petersbourg 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 have 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 consisteny 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, Karna, Śalya, Sauptika; 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 à 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 Unglücke der besiegten Vorgänger verändert worden und nur durch diese Umarbeitung hindurch ist es möglich, ihrer wahre Geschichte heruzufinden 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: “Ueberarbeitung 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 Āstīka, 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 cuneiforms), 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 Kururinge 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 Kurunge 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. Kṛṣṇa’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 enzige 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, of the one who has revised 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 \textit{Pāṇḍava}; Thus \textbf{Bhima}sena would be a descendant of \textit{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, \textit{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 \textit{Pāṇḍava} are contemporary is proved by their brotherhood and their shared marriage. In short, Lassen’s suppositions and hypothesis, as far as the \textit{Mahābhārata} is concerned, could “\textit{schwerlich vor der Kritik halten können}!” (hold with difficulty before the critics), A. Weber, \textit{Ind. Stud.} I, p. 230. We must also observe that out of the several hundred of quotations given by Lassen from the \textit{Mahābhārata}, many present printing errors... These remarks are naturally minor and only made for sparing trouble to the users of the \textit{Indischer Altertumskunde}. And yet the Lassen’s work will still be essential for a long time for all those who look into the \textit{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. \textit{Ne ratio Lassensii nomina et fabulas explicandi mihi probari potest, imprimis conclusiones ex nominibus hominum ductae et explicatio quae dicitur allegorica}, says Sörensen, \textit{Om Mahābhārata Stilling i den Indiske litteratur} (On the place of the \textit{Mahābhārata} in Indian literature),, p. 359. Cf. also Hopkins, \textit{Ruling caste}, p. 59.

- The works of \textbf{Peter von Bohlen}, \textit{Das alte Indien} (Ancient India), Königsberg 1830, II, pp. 345-374 and of \textbf{Theodor Benfey} (1809-1881), \textit{Indien}, in the \textit{Encyclopädie} of Ersch et Gruber, Leipzig i840, pp. 277-281, are interesting because they gather together the knowledge until now acquired on the \textit{Mahābhārata}. Benfrey’s translation and commentaries of the \textit{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 \textit{Mahābhārata}, has helped much , it isn’t questioned; I can only regret he mentions our epic always in passing, never in extenso.

- My uncle, \textbf{Adolf Holzmann} (1810-1870), began his works on the \textit{Mahābhārata} with the publication of an episode of the \textit{Udyogaparvan}; the \textit{Indrajīva}, Karlsruhe 1841; he gives in appendix the corresponding passages in the various \textit{Purāṇa}. There followed three little volumes, \textit{Indische Sagen} (Indian tales) , Karlsruhe, I 1845 (also with the title \textit{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 \textit{Rāmāyaṇa}, but the story od \textit{Aśṭavakra} removed
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, Śāvitrī, Aṣṭāväkra, Uśinara, Rṣyaśṛṅga, 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 Rohini. 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 Kṛṣṇa 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 Duryodhna, par la ruse de Kṛṣṇa, by Kṛṣṇa’s cunning, have fallen only in unfait fightings; that Bhīṣma has really been killed by Arjuna and was thus unable to deliver before his death all the Śantiparvan and all the Anuśāsanaparvan; 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 Āśvamedhaparvan, one can assume Arjuna was killed by one of his own sons (cf. my Arjuna, p. 57), an mistake occured in V, 417: the king Citrāṅgada fell fighting Tulya, the king of the Gandharva; such a Tulya has been mentionned 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 Šabdakalpadruma 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
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 passager 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 nw extract from the Adiparvan, 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. 203-249.

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 kāvyā, 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” (hold 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

\[\text{NoT: There follows a series of corrections about the maxims which seem to be of scarce interest here} \]
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 *Harivāṃśa* and the *Jaiminībhārata*; 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, Wheer, Fauche, and here, as in his other article, the references to the *Mahābhārata* are many.

– 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 Königlichen 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 Ṣvetadvīpa passage from the Ṣantiparvan is discussed in detail. The last contributions to the session reports of the Akademie, *Episches im Védischen Ritual*, (Epic in the Vedic ritual) 1891; *Ueber des Vājepeya* (On the Vājepeya), 1892; *Ueber Bāhli und Bāhlika* (On Bāhli and Bāhlika), 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 comparaison 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 Übersetzung 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 Grieschischen Nachrichten von dem Indischen Homer nebst Aphorismen über den Griechischen und den christlichen Einfluss auf Indien* 5

5 NoT: There follows a series of lexical or gramatical remarks which seem to be of scarce interest here
Informations on the Greeks of the Indian Homer, with aphorisms on the Grek 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 Grieschischen (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 informations in the articles on Patañjali in the third volume, Leipzig 1873. It seems to me that Weber grants to little imporance, in antiquity and in signification, 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 Ursprüinge” (Vedic origins), what is hardly possible. As historical basis, he supposes a real fighting that would have been hold 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 au 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 scrupules about moving the site of ancient events and transfering 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 altertümliche Gestalt der Sagen, wie sie in den Brähmaṇa 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 independant of Lassen, gives a complete outline of its content (pp. 181-319; 337-339; 357-358; 371-373; 394-399, ant talks 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 Dhrtrarastra-Söhne und ihren Anhang in möglichst ungünstigen, die Pându-Söhne dagegen in möglichst günstigen Lichte darzustellen sucht” (the (brahmanic) revision of the saga tries and shows Dhrtrarastra’s sons and their partisans under the most unfavourable light, and on the contrary, the Pându’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 äkhyäna*, (The äkhyäna in ancient India), 1883; *Ueber äkhyäna-Hymnen im Ṛgveda*, (On the äkhyäna-hymns in the Ṛgveda), 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 Mahabhårata 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 knowlege of the ethnical relations in the Mahabhärata.

– Alfred Ludwig in Prague, in the six volumes of his noteworthy work on the Veda, has thrown on the Mahabhärata many new lights, particularly in the volume III, Prague, 1878. The Register in six volums, in which the Mahabhärata. is often quoted and taken for reference, is to be mentioned. Three little writings are particularly related to the Mahabhärata. Among the treatises of the Böhmischen Gesellschaft des Wissenschaften, Prague 1884, the treatise *Ueber das Verhältniss des mythischen Elementes zu der historischen Grundlage des Mahabhärata*, (On the relations of the mythical element with the historical basis of the Mahabhara) 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 is 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 Vyäsas Vaterschaft (zu Dhrtrarastra und Pându) (the fable of Vyäsas fatherhood of
Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Pāṇḍu has been described quite rightly as “abgeschmäkt” (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 Vysa’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. Bur, 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 Rigveda, in Festgruss an Otto von Böthlingk (Ironic in the Mahābhārata and the Rigveda), in hommage 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 Ghraṭkaca throws in Duryodhana’s chariot the head of Alambuṣa hz 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 whithout 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 Aśvatthāan’s victory is credited to Śiva, X, 17, 6 = 765; when, instead of “he falls in the fighting by the hands of the enemey” 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 Parīkṣit 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 Rāmopakhyaṇa’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), 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 (Bhagavadgīta’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 authentics 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 Harivamśa;

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 translation 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 Pândavas; études sur l’Inde ancienne et moderne* (The Pândavas; 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 sanskrité (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. Strīn.* 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 sory.

- 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. Eichoff 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. 377-388. 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 ion the Calcutta’s edition; from the sixth volume only, he consulted the Bombay’s edition and Nîlakaṇṭha’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, whithout 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 ribbon) has not escaped to him: on the title page of volum 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 th 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 Honneur, 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 sanskrit* (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. Others works on *Nala* et *Sāvitrī* have been already named above.

- Angelo de Gubernatis turned the orientalists 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 *Studii 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 *Damayanti*: *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 a improved form (the French edition showed many printing mistakes): *Il Mahābhārata, il re Nala e gli studii 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 an other similar essay, *L’épopée*
5. Denmark can claim enlightened connoisseurs of the ancient epic with Niels Ludwig Westergaard and Vigo Fauböll, but who content themselves with telling occasionally its subject. On the other hand, the first work that really deals with the Mahâbhârata was written by a Danish, Sören Sörensen, *Om Mahâbhârata Stilling i den Indiske litteratur* (On the place of the Mahâbhârata 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 Mahâbhârata, 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 praes 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 compleely 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 rhapsodium (sûta) 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 Mahâbhârata in 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 Sôrensen’s opinions make me wonder, as for example when he considers the death of Abhimanyu and the Bhagavadgîtâ 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 *anuśṭubh* metre, are dubious for Sörensen since the beginning, “*quod per se suspiciomem habet*”, p. 339, although many or the most beautiful and the most necessary passages are written in this metre (I think of Karna’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 *sloka* and *triśṭubh*, 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 Szárac’s, *A virágirodalám nagy eposzai*, Budapest 1881, presents the *Mahābhārata*. Holland has of course zealous sanskritists, but 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 Krśṇa* (Christ and *Krśṇa*).


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

7. In North America, William Dwight Whitney (1827-1894) has created 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 the 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 dealed 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.