

MAHABHARATA

A CRITICISM

BY

V VAIDYA, M A, LLB,

Honorary Fellow of the University of Bombay

BOOKS BY THE AUTHOR

1. Mahabharata a Criticism
2. Riddle of the Ramayana
3. Epic India
4. History of Medieval Hindu India
 Vol. I Harsha and Later Kings
 Vol. II Early History of Rajputs
 Vol. III Downfall of Hindu India
5. History of Sanskrit Literature
6. Mahabharata Abridged
7. Ramayana Abridged

A J COMBRIDGE & CO
BOMBAY

1905

CHAPTER I

THE THREE EDITIONS OF THE WORK

THAT the Mahabharata in its present form is the second amplification of an originally much smaller work, nobody can consistently deny. We have the authority of the Mahabharata itself for the statement that Vyasa, the author of the original work, taught it to five pupils, one of whom was Vaishampayana. Vaishampayana recited the poem before king Janmejaya at the time of the Sarpa-satra (serpent sacrifice), performed by him.

Now in the Mahabharata, as we have it, there are several questions asked by Janmejaya, and Vaishampayana gives suitable answers. How can these questions and answers have formed part of the original epic composed by Vyasa? We must hold that Vaishampayana, or some one who heard the recitation and the dialogue, amplified the original work then, again, this amplified Bharata was recited by Sauti before Shaunaka at his twelve years' sacrifice, and certain questions are asked by Shaunaka and answered by Sauti. These cannot have formed part either of the original work or the amplified edition of Vaishampayana. We are, therefore, compelled to admit that Sauti, or some one else who heard his recitation, amplified the original work a second time.

These three editions, if we may so call them, can further be proved by various other statements still preserved in the Mahabharata itself, either by oversight or owing to absence of motive to expunge them.

We have thus the statement that the work is supposed to have three beginnings. Some believe, it is said, that the Mahabharata begins with Uparichara, others with Astika, and others still with the word Manu. Different lengths are also assigned to the work, and different divisions are also mentioned, and even different names can be easily discovered. We shall see how these different names, divisions and lengths can well be explained on the theory that there were two amplifications of the original work.

The Original Work

The original epic was probably in its nature a history and not a didactic work. It is specially called an Itihasa or history, and the name which Vyasa gave to this history was Jaya or "Triumph."

The very first invocation verse contains a mention of this name “Tato jayamudirayet.” We have the same name again given to the work in the last Parva also. The length of this historical poem of Vyasa cannot be ascertained with any exactness, though it is probable that it must have been a long one even then, considering the ambitious scheme of the author, the importance and the grandeur of the events described, and the facility with which Anushtub shlokas can be composed by a gifted author.

MacDonell remarks that the length of the original poem of Vyasa is mentioned as 8,800 shlokas. This is in our opinion not true, and for this remark, perhaps, a foot-note in Weber is responsible. This figure is given in the Mahabharata, as the number of Kuta shlokas or riddles, of which we shall have to speak hereafter, and not as the number of shlokas in the original Mahabharata itself.

It is mentioned in the Mahabharata that the industrious Krishnadwaipayana or Vyasa composed his poem in three years, working day and night. It would be natural to expect that Vyasa would begin his work with an account of himself, and the idea that Bharata really begins with Uparichara seems very justifiable indeed.

In the chapter preceding the 63rd Chapter which begins with “Rajoparicharo nama,” a praise of the Mahabharata and some facts about its composition are given by Vaishampayana which clearly shows that these 62 chapters in the Adi Parva are later additions made by either Vaishampayana or Sauti. This does not mean that the work subsequent to Chapter 62 is in the words of Vyasa himself. For, it seems probable that the whole has been so overhauled that it is impossible now to point to any portion of the succeeding work as the composition of the original author himself.

The Second Edition

We now come to the second edition, the edition of Vaishampayana, who, as has been stated before, was Vyasa’s own pupil and was taught the Bharata along with four others: Sumantu, Jaimini, Pada, and Shuka the son of Vyasa.

There is a statement in the Bharata itself that each one of these five pupils published a different edition of the Bharata. This is an express authority for us to hold that Vaishampayana almost recast the whole, and brought out his own version. That version is the only one now preserved to us, though we have one doubtful Ashvamedha Parva under the name of Jaimini. It seems, however, probable that five different versions were really extant in the days of Ashwalayana who has enumerated all these five Rishis as Bharatacharyas or the editors of Bharata. This also shows that Vaishampayana and his

co-pupils' works first came to be called Bharata.

The extent of Vaishampayana's Bharata appears to have been 24,000 verses, for, there is a shloka in the Mahabharata that Vyasa composed Bharata Samhita (this word is important) of that extent, and that work without its Upakhyanas is called Bharata. In this Bharata there was a summary chapter at the beginning, covering 150 shlokas, in which the number of chapters and the Parvas were also mentioned.

Vaishampayana would naturally begin his version with an account of Janmjaya, and the Sarpa-satra, where he recited his poem, and thus we have the second beginning assigned to the Mahabharata, with the Astikopakhyana.

The Third Edition

We lastly come to the third edition of Sauti. That Sauti did recast or elaborate the work of Vaishampayana can be proved from his own lips "Know ye, Rishis," says he, "I have recited the Bharata in one hundred thousand shlokas, Vaishampayana being the first reciter in this human world." This is a clear admission by Sauti of having recited the work of Vaishampayana in one lac of shlokas.

The chapters which precede the Astika story cannot have formed part of Vaishampayana's book, and thus we have the third beginning assigned to the Mahabharata, with the word Manu, as properly applicable to Sauti's edition. This edition has come down to us nearly in the form which Sauti gave to it.

For anticipating the modern idea of an edition, Sauti has added to his work a preface, an introduction and a table of contents. It thus assumed almost a fixed form. The present Mahabharata, in fact, contains about a thousand less shlokas than the number given by Sauti (96,836, see Appendix. No x), though additional shlokas and chapters are found here and there. The commentator generally notices the excess, if any, at the end of a Parva, and strangely enough, ascribes it to the mistake of writers. Such shlokas and chapters in excess are chiefly to be found in the Adi and the Drona Parvas.

In addition to the preface in which Sauti gives the occasion when, and the place where this recast Mahabharata was recited, Sauti gives us an introduction, giving a summary, as it were, of the long story by the mouth of Dhritarashtra. The 69 shlokas, all beginning with "Yadashrausham," to be found in the first chapter, cannot have formed part of the original introduction, and being in long metre, are evidently an addition made by Sauti. This is, however, a very ingenious way of summarising a story from the mouth of one of the actors themselves. There was a short summary of the Bharata given by

Vaishampayana, as has already been remarked, but that chapter was only in 150 shlokas, while the present chapter exceeds by many shlokas, and this is a further proof of the whole chapter having nearly been recast by Sauti.

Sauti probably gave the work the name of Mahabharata first. Bharata and Mahabharata are names separately mentioned by Ashwalayana, and we are not stretching our guess too far when we assign the name of Bharata to the work of Vaishampayana, and appropriate the latter name to Sauti's voluminous edition. For, Sauti himself has said that the name Mahabharata was given to the work owing to its greatness and its weight. Weber again has pointed out that the name Mahabharata occurs in Panini, but with an entirely different signification (a great Bharata warrior). As Panini mentions, Yudhishtira and other names familiar to the Bharata story, we have another proof in support of the idea that the name Mahabharata, as applied to the poem, had no existence in the days of Panini.

Sauti adopted a new division for this now bulky poem, and divided it into 18 Parvas. Another division is mentioned in the Mahabharata itself, which has the same name of Parva, though the number is greater.

It is impossible that these two divisions could have been made at one and the same time, and by one and the same author, for, in that case, the greater and smaller divisions would certainly have been called by different names. For example, if a work is divided into books, the subdivisions of the latter cannot be called by the same name of books, but will have to be styled chapters or sections. We should, at least, expect that the word "smaller" would be attached to the subdivisions. This clearly shows that Vaishampayana's work was not divided into 18 Parvas, but into a large number of smaller divisions, which were called Parvas by him. Sauti adopted a larger and more suitable division, but retained the same name of Parva. We have thus sometimes the absurdity of a sub-Parva having the same name the big Parva, there is a Sauptika Parva under the big Sauptika Parva, a Sabha Parva under the bigger Sabha Parva. These Parvas are again subdivided into Adhyayas or chapters. Vyasa's original work was presumably divided into Parvas and Adhyayas also, but the number of Parvas was most likely less than 100, the number assigned to Vaishampayana's edition. As usual, we have strong confirmation of this view in the Mahabharata itself.

In Chapter II, Adi Parva, where the hundred Parvas are given, we are told that the Harivamsha is a Khila Parva, a Parva borrowed from another place. The Harivamsha, it follows, did not form part of Vyasa's work, and was brought in by Vaishampayana. No doubt, the story of the Mahabharata war does not look complete without a Parva giving the life and exploits of Shri Krishna, in the same way as the story of the Ramayana

would not have been complete without an account of Ravara's life and exploits, and the Harivamsha stands to the Bharata in the same relation as the Uttarkanda stands to the Ramayana. Harivamsha, contrary to the Uttarakanda, however, is usually left out of the Mahabharata, which stands by itself and ends as if nothing is to follow it. The hundred Parvas of Vaishampayana, still retained in the Mahabharata, are given in the appendix.

The number of Parvas, as they are enumerated in the Adi Parva, certainly exceeds one hundred, and this is itself sufficient to show that the Bharata of Vaishampayana was amplified by Sauti. These hundred Parvas Sauti put together in 18, as he himself admits. For, he says, "these hundred Parvas" were composed by Vysa, but thereafter Lomaharshani, the son of Suta, recited 18 Parvas only in the Naimisharanya.

To summarise the above, the present Mahabharata is, as it were, a redaction of Vyasa's historical poem called "Triumph" edited by Vaishampayana as Bharata, and reprinted or reissued by Sauti, with notes and additions, and with an introduction and a table of contents prefixed to it. We shall now pass on to discuss whether these reputed authors were real beings.

CHAPTER II

VYASA, VAISHAMPAYANA AND SAUTI

THE author of the original epic is generally believed to be Vyasa, whose personality is, doubted by many. Now we have already seen that the final redaction was made by Sauti, and not by Vyasa. There is, moreover, no reason why a general tradition should not be believed if it is not absurd or impossible in itself, or is not disproved by contradictory cogent arguments. Vyasa is believed to have arranged the Vedas, and not the Mahabharata.

That there was really a Rishi by name Vyasa Parasharya we find from the Black Yajun Kathaka. What part he took in the events of the Mahabharata, and when he lived, we shall discuss later on. But there is no reason to doubt that he wrote a history of the war between the Kurus and the Panchalas from personal knowledge. The work evidently bears the impress of a narration by one who had an intimate acquaintance with the events it describes. Characters and people are described with a vivacity and truthfulness which can only belong to the evidence of an eye-witness. Names, such as Srinjayas, are often mentioned without any introduction or description, much in the way of a contemporary narrator who is never struck with the necessity of such an introduction or

description.

It is generally admitted that the actors in the Mahabharata strike us as real living beings. This is so, it will be admitted, because there is a nucleus in the poem which is the composition of one who knows, and not of one who imagines. Nay you sometimes come across statements of facts and sentiments which, like fossils not yet obliterated, give a clue to a real bygone age.

In short, we think, that there is ample ground to believe that there was an original author, who wrote from personal knowledge, and that there is no harm in believing that that author was Vyasa Parasharya.

Vaishampayana is represented as a pupil of Vyasa. Looking to the tradition that he recited his poem before Janmejaya, the great-grandson of Arjuna, Vyasa's contemporary, this relation does not seem impossible. That he was a real person may also be granted from the fact that his name is mentioned as an Acharya of Bharata by Ashwalayana.

The evidence of language also is very important in this connection. Although the language of the whole Mahabharata strikes us as old, and differs distinctly from classical Sanskrit, within the Mahabharata itself there are certain portions the language of which looks more ancient than that of others. It is deep, sonorous and weighty in its very simplicity. Its grammar and construction are archaic. It strikes us as the language of an adept using a spoken tongue.

We may instance the Bhagavad Gita, which, if not the composition of Vyasa, must, at least, be that of Vaishampayana, whose date, from the evidence of language, must not have been very distant from the date of the Upanishads.

We now come to Sauti, the last reciter of Mahabharata. His personality is not so clear as that of Vishampayana or Vyasa. He is sometimes styled in the Mahabharata itself as Suta only, and not the son of Suta. His name is given as Ugrashrava, the son of Lomaharshana. He is sometimes styled a Puranik, a reciter of Puranas. Strangely enough, in the Mahabharata there are two places where he is said to have come to Shaunak. In the very beginning of the poem we are told (the first sentence of the Mahabharata in prose) that Sauti Ugrashrava, son of Lomahaishana, came to Shaunak. Kulapati while he was engaged in a twelve years' sacrifice being asked whence he came, he said he came from the Sarpa-satra (serpent sacrifice) of Janmejaya where he heard various stories from the Mahabharata, composed by Vyasa and related by Vaisham-

payana, and then he first went to see Kurukshetra or Syamanta Panchaka where the great battle was fought. At the beginning of Chapter IV, Adi Parva, we have the same sentence in prose again, and the story begins as if the previous 3 Adhyayas were not there. Shaunak here does not ask Sauti whence he came, but says “Your father learned the whole Purana formerly Have you learned the same? if so, tell us the legend of the family of Bhrigus.” Hereafter come the words “Suta uwacha, and not Sauti uwacha.” This does not make Suta a contemporary of Vaishampayana, but represents him merely as one who has studied the Puranas.

The commentator has seen the absurdity of these two beginnings, of Chapter I and of Chapter IV; and gives the usual explanation based on the supposition of two Sutas belonging to different Kalpas. Perhaps, there were actually two persons who laboured at the recasting of the Mahabharata into its present voluminous form, and they may have been related to each other as father and son. They were Puraniks or persons whose occupation it is to recite the Puranas. The commentator represents them as Brahmins, though the word Suta means a person born of a Brahmana woman from a Kshatriya. Probably the Sutas by caste followed the occupation of learning the Puranas or old stories by heart, and like the Bhatas of the present day rose in the estimation of the people Sauti and his father were generally helped by their Puranik lore when recasting the Bharata into its present shape. When this recasting took place and with what purpose, we shall presently see.

CHAPTER III

WHEN AND WHY THE BHARATA WAS RECAST

WEBER observes “The first evidence of the existence of an epic with the contents of the Mahabharata comes to us from Rhetor Dion Chrysostom who flourished in the second half of the first century A D. Since Megasthenes says nothing of this epic, it is not an improbable hypothesis that its origin is to be placed between Megasthenes and Chrysostom.”

Weber, the only blemish of whose deep and really wonderful research is a kind of bias, has here forgotten that we have not the work of Megasthenes before us. That most

valuable book has been lost. It is only from fragments of it quoted by others that we get some information about India as it was in 300 B C. But even these fragments mention, as observed by Weber himself, a Heracles and a Pandia, who can be identified as Krishna and his sister.

It thus appears clear that the Pandava legend was well known even in the days of Megasthenes (we shall return to this topic in the second book). It cannot, therefore, be believed with Weber that the origin of the Mahabharata is to be placed between 300 B C and 50 A D. This is a very short period indeed for its birth as well as for its growth to such an enormous volume.

It seems, however, probable that the last recasting of the Mahabharata by Sauti into its present shape took place between these dates. We have, on the one hand, the direct evidence of Dion Chrysostom that the Mahabharata, with its one lac of verses, was well known even in the south of India in 50 A D.

Various arguments, on the other hand, can be adduced to prove that the Mahabharata in its present shape cannot be placed earlier than 300 B C. The first and the foremost among them is the fact that the Yavanas are frequently mentioned in the Mahabharata as a very powerful people.

The Indians came into contact with the Yavanas or the Greeks, for the first time, in the days of Alexander, and their connection lasted from that time to about the beginning of the Christian Era. They often defeated the Indians in battle, though they were eventually driven out of India. The following shloka (one amongst many) shows how the Mahabharata looked upon the Yavanas admiringly

Na shahsaka vashi kartum yam Pandurapi vuyavan
Sarjunena vasham nito rajasidhyavanadhipah

“The king of the Yavanas, whom even the powerful Pandu could not subdue, was reduced to subjection by Arjuna.”

Again we have the mention of a Nagna Kshapanaka (naked Jain) in the Paushya Akhvana in the Adi Parva. The origin of Jainism is usually believed to have been laid by Mahabira about 500 BC, about the same time as Buddhism.

The Mahabharata does not directly refer to Buddhism or to any of its votaries. But this is not an argument to put it before Buddhism. Discussions and discourses in the nature of Buddhistic controversies are hinted at in the Mokshadharma section of the Shanti

Parva. Buddhism and Jainism had assumed an offensive appearance, and were threatening to be powerful rivals of the orthodox Aryan religion, and it may be assumed that, while no direct mention is made of Buddha or his tenets, the recasting of the Bharata was due to this very growing evil.

At that time Brahmin teachers probably thought it necessary to bring together en masse all the floating materials, for the preaching of their religion, into one focus, and hence we have the spectacle of a vast didactic work raised on the foundation of the legend of the Bharata war.

Here we find the clue to the fact that the Mahabharata is constantly preaching Dharma and the sanctity of its exponents. Dharma and its preachers, the Brahmanas, appear to have been in danger, and adherence to Dharma and obedience to Brahmanas is constantly insisted upon throughout the Mahabharata. This is, in our opinion, the most probable reason why we find an epic, the Baharata of Vaishampayana or Vyasa, turned into a Dharma Grantha, a Smriti as it is believed to be, a vast didactic work embracing all the departments of the Aryan religion and morals as they were in the days of Megasthenes.

It may, perhaps, be urged that the shlokas containing a reference to the Yavanas and the Shakas may have been introduced after 300 B C, while the rest of the poem may have been reconstructed at an earlier date.

If any confirmation, however, of what has been urged above, is needed, the state of society, religion and knowledge, depicted generally in the Mahabharata, corresponds very closely with what has been described about India by Megasthenes. We find the castes almost exclusive, flesh-eating, though still practiced, going out of fashion, Shiva and Vishnu-worship fully established. The geographical knowledge of the whole country had been acquired, and the Mahabharata locates the people of India much in the same way in which Greek geographers have located them.

Curiously enough, a people who cover themselves with their ears, are mentioned in the Mahabharata, and this absurdity of nature is spoken of and believed in by Megasthenes. Grammar, Logic and Vedanta were already formulated and studied. We shall discuss this subject in detail in a separate book, but it is sufficient here to remark that the present Mahabharata discloses a state of things which cannot have been earlier than the days of Megasthenes.

Astronomy furnishes us with still more definite data in this connection. In fact, the progress in the development of astronomical knowledge, disclosed by the Mahabharata,

shows us the different stages through which the work must have passed.

We have thus in the Mahabharata the Nakshatras or constellations beginning with Krittikas, a system which must have been introduced thousands of years ago (as we shall show later on) and which reminds us of the time when Vyasa must have composed the original epic.

We have again a reference to the time when the winter solstice took place in Dhanishtha, as mentioned in the Vedanga Jyotisha, whose date Dixit calculates on this basis at about 1400 B C. We have further still a reference to the time when the winter solstice fell in Shravana, and the Nakshatras were counted as beginning with that constellation. This new arrangement is mentioned as having been introduced by Vishwamitra, “who created another world of his own, and made the Nakshatras begin with Shravana,” Adi Parva, Chapter 71. The same beginning is referred to in the Ashwamedha Parva, Chapter 44. This must have been the case according to Dixit’s calculation about 450 B C. The receding of the winter solstice is due, as those who are conversant with astronomy are well aware, to the Precession of the Equinoxes, and furnishes with very reliable data in fixing the limits, if not an actual date.

The present Mahabharata thus, which contains a reference to the Shravana beginning of the Nakshatras, cannot be earlier than 450 B C (*see* Dixit’s History of Indian Astronomy, p 14). Dixit’s very valuable work called “The History of Indian Astronomy,” referred to herein, has unfortunately not yet been translated into English. Dixit’s deep researches in this subject, and his conclusions, are generally unbiased and worthy of respectful consideration. In one point, however, he seems to have been misled, and we have to refer to it because it is relevant to the inquiry now before us.

It is admitted by all, and by Dixit also, that the Mahabharata, as it is at present, makes no mention whatever of the Rashis (the division of the ecliptic into twelve houses) and of the Varas (week days). Dixit believes that the Rashis were invented by Indian astronomers about 425 B C (p 139, Dixit’s work). It seems, however, very probable that Dixit has wrongly assigned this date to this event in order that it may not be possible to contend that the Rashis were borrowed from the Greeks, with whom India came into contact in 323 B C, for the first time, and whose connection with this country lasted for about three centuries.

How far Indian astronomy is indebted to the Greeks, is a subject on which much has been written on both sides. This much cannot, however, be denied that Indian astronomy derived a fresh impetus and received a new direction from its contact with Greek astronomy. All the Siddhantas, which give methods for calculating the exact

positions of the planets, date subsequent to 300 B C, as Dixit himself has admitted.

Now these methods are based on the division of the ecliptic into Rashis and degrees, and not on the division of the ecliptic into Nakshatras hitherto prevalent in India. The conclusion is thus very strong that the Rashis must have been borrowed from the Greeks. Dixit in denying this conclusion relies on two arguments chiefly (P 515-16). He says that the Rashis have Sanskrit names, and secondly, that as Aries or Mesha is made to begin with the constellation Ashwini, this connection must have been established, according to his calculation, about 471 B C. Now Dixit has forgotten to notice the fact that the Sanskrit names of the Rashis are the exact equivalents of their Greek names. The figures (the Ram, the Bull, &c) which are supposed to be formed by the constellations (Ashwini, &c) are all imaginary ones, a fact also admitted by Dixit himself.

How can it be possible, then, that two nations independently imagined the same figures? The names of the Rashis, though in Sanskrit, to our mind are an argument in favour of their Greek origin rather than against it. Nay, Greek names of the Rashis were known to the Indian astronomers and are often used by them as equivalent of the Sanskrit names.

The other argument also is not of any avail. The only thing that it proves, is that the Rashis cannot have been introduced in India earlier than 475 B C. But they may have been and were actually introduced later. For, no Indian astronomer has taken the first point of Aries as coincident with Batarius, the first star in the Ashwini constellation. On the contrary, the Surya Siddhanta gives the first point of Aries at eight degrees behind this star. Taking 72 years as the period taken by the equinoxes to recede one degree, this shows that the Surya Siddhanta speaks of a time about 576 years later, 100 A D. There is even now a difference of opinion among the Indian astronomers of about four degrees with regard to the exact position of this first point.

We can only say that the Rashis were introduced into India when the Vernal equinox was somewhere between the Ashwini and the Rewati stars, a very wide period extending from 475 B C to about 100 A D. It seems, however, very probable that the Rashis were Introduced in India about 200 B C, the date Dixit assigns to the oldest Indian Siddhanta (now lost of course) which uses them. We have some further evidence to show that the Rashis were introduced about this time and not about 450 B C.

The old method of referring to time by the position of the moon among the constellations which we see in use even in the Mahabharata as it is, is also used by the Buddhistic scriptures, the Tripitakas. So far as we have gone through them there is no mention of the Rashis in any of them. The same time honoured Nakshatras are used for

calculating time, and the conclusion forces itself upon our mind that the Rashis were not in vogue in India in the days of Ashoka or at the latest in the first council of Buddhism where these Tripitakas were formulated.

It seems therefore certain that the Rashis were borrowed by us about 200 B C from the Greeks who had invaded India long ago and whose connection was already threatening to be permanent. As the present Mahabharata mentions the Yavanas admiringly, but does not anywhere mention the Rashis, one is justified in holding that it was recast into its present shape some time between 300 and 200 B C.

We cannot leave this subject without discussing one more reference in the Mahabharata of an astronomical character. In the Saraswati Akhyana in the Gada Parva a Vriddha or old Garga is mentioned, who, having purified his soul by austerities on the banks of the Saraswati, obtained knowledge of time and also its march of the cross motions of planets and of good and evil omens. Now an astronomer by name Garga Parashara is spoken of by Panini whose date is generally fixed at about 500 B C. But since this Garga is called Vriddha or old, it might be supposed that a younger Garga had come into fame at the time when the Mahabharata was recast. The date of this Garga some fix at 145 B C from a reference in this work to the investment of Saketa by the Greeks under Menander.

If this is so, then the recasting of the Mahabharata would appear to have taken place at about 140 B C, or at the latest before 100 B C. Garga's work, it seems, makes no mention of the Rashis, and the introduction of the Rashis must also be brought down to about after this date.

If we take all the evidence heretofore detailed into consideration we may conclude generally that the Mahabharata assumed its present form between three to one hundred B C.

CHAPTER IV

HOW THE MAHABHARATA ATTAINED TO ITS PRESENT BULK

HAVING so far discussed when and why the Mahabharata was extended, we shall now proceed to discuss how it attained to its present bulk. An inquiry of this kind must necessarily be a task both difficult and delicate. Strong proof cannot be expected on a

subject like this, and the suggestion that a particular chapter or story in the Mahabharata is a subsequent addition would always be distasteful and exasperating to the ear of a Hindu. But I think a criticism on the great epic cannot well be complete without an inquiry of this kind, and certain well-defined inferences naturally suggest themselves to one who studies the epic carefully—inferences which though not capable of being substantiated by irrefutable proof have still the probabilities in their favour. We shall therefore proceed to state such inferences in this chapter.

Legendary Store

The first and the foremost reason by which the Mahabharata appears to have been extended is the ambition of Sauti, the last editor, to make it an all-embracing repository of legendary lore. In fact, he begins the Mahabharata with the assertion “Whatever is to be found here will be found elsewhere and what is not here will not be found elsewhere too.”

It thus seems probable that all the floating smaller legends (or Akhyanas) and historical stories (or Itihasas) which existed independently of the Bharata were brought in by Sauti so that they might not be lost or that they might be found together. It was as if a collection of old Aryan legends in a slightly modified form made for the purpose of invigorating the current cries of Aryanism, confronted as it was by Buddhism which was not slow in developing a legendary store of its own by fashioning older legends to suit its doctrines.

It does not appear, however, nor is contended that the Akhyanas and Upakhyanas, thus brought in, were all new inventions of the imagination. On the contrary it is very probable that they were older national legends which had independent existence in the form of Gathas, Itihasas and Puranas.

They were nevertheless interpolations in the Mahabharata, —that is to say, they did not form part of the original Bharata of Vaishampayana or Vyasa, and their interpolated nature can well be discerned as one reads the epic.

In fact, the Mahabharata itself states that the Bharata was in 24,000 verses originally and that Bharata meant the Mahabharata without the accessory legends (Upakhyanas). Nobody has found, nor has it been anywhere stated, which these Upakhyanas are, and which are the original 24,000 shlokas. Such a statement can only be explained on the admission that there was a Bharata of 24,000 shlokas before the Upakhyanas were added by some person later on. We shall now give some glaring examples of these subsequently added Upakhyanas.

A very typical instance of this kind of interpolation in the Saraswati Upakhyana is the Gadaparva. Herein is given an account of the Saraswati river, its rise, the tracts it flows through, the Tirthas or holy places on its banks, and their glory. It is undoubted that this is not an imaginary account and that it is an old legend perhaps as old as when the Saraswati was an actual river and not an imaginary bed as it now is. But all the same it is an interpolation here which does not fit in.

The story of the war has reached its highest interest, the fates of the contending parties, after all the terrible loss of life, is still trembling in the balance and is about to be decided by the uncertain result of a duel between Duryodhana and Bhima, two great athletes. Balrama arrives from his pilgrimage and is hailed by both parties and asked to be a spectator. Janmejaya interrupts the story at this point and asks what were the Tirthas which Balrama visited and what was their greatness, and there is thus a digression of many chapters and many hundreds of shlokas. One is almost exasperated at this inopportune digression, and it is certainly a very unpoetic one, of which neither Vyasa nor Vaishampayana would have been capable.

The Saraswati Upakhyana has on the face of it been clumsily interpolated by Sauti, who took advantage of the mere mention of the name of the Yatra from which Balrama had returned to introduce it. Nay, there is even an independent proof of its being an interpolation. It is in this Adhyaya that many personages, whose date must be supposed to be later than that of Vyasa or Vaishampayana, such as Vriddha Garga or Shakalya and others are mentioned.

Another instance of the same sort, though less glaring, is that of the Ramopakhyana in the Vana Parva. Draupadi's being carried away by Jayadratha, and being subsequently rescued and brought back, affords Sauti an occasion to introduce the story of Rama. The Upakhyana is an extensive one, perhaps the longest in the whole Mahabharata. It strikes the reader, however, as an abstract of another work which must have existed prior to it. The story is no doubt given in the words of Sauti himself whose language has a charm of its own. But that it is an interpolation is very probable from its very length. For no sensible author would give in his own work an extensive abstract of the work of another extending over 750 shlokas.

Of Knowledge

Sauti not only intended to make the Mahabharata a depository of learning, but also of knowledge. An instance of this is afforded by the Jambukhanda and the Bhukhanda sections in the Bheeshmaparva. The author is about to begin an account of the actual

fighting in the great war, and Dhritarashtra most unpoetically asks Sanjaya the question what is the earth for which so many people are about to fight and what is its extent, and we have a geographical treatise, as it were, interpolated giving the geography of the whole world and of the Jambudwipa particularly.

The description given of the universe is the usual orthodox one, perhaps prevalent in India from many centuries. But that it is an interpolation here may easily be gathered from the break in the context. At the end of Chapter 12 of the Bheeshmaparva where the Bhumikhanda ends, we have Dhritarashtra and Sanjaya talking to each other. The next chapter begins as follows: "Thereafter Sanjaya, having returned from the battlefield after seeing everything with his own eyes, told Dhritarashtra that Bheeshma was dead." This chapter should properly have been the beginning of the Bheeshmaparva and if not the first, it should at least have been the second. For it is nowhere stated when Sanjaya went to the battlefield and when this dialogue between Sanjaya and Dhritarashtra about the extent of the world took place.

Another similar instance, though not so clear, is where Narada in the beginning of the Sabhaparva asks Yudhishtira how he governs his kingdom. Here we have the whole science of political government, as it was then understood, given in the form of questions. Here we have a picture of a well governed kingdom as it was conceived about the time of Alexander's conquest. For this science cannot have attained to such a perfection as is depicted in this chapter in days so old as the Mahabharata war.

Of Moral and Religious Teaching

That the Mahabharata was made a vehicle of moral and religious instruction is so apparent that it hardly requires any proof. In fact, the work has almost lost its character as an epic poem and has become, and has always been acknowledged, as a Smriti and a Dharma Shastra.

Native writers and authors of treatises, so old as the Brahma Sutra, quote passages from the Bharata with the feeling of reverence due to a Dharma Shastra. The leaven which has thus been introduced is so general and so extensive that it is difficult to point out to any particular section as an interpolation. The Shantiparva and the Anushasanaparva have probably been added to, to a very great extent with this object, though it is not possible to say that these Parvas are entirely new additions made about the time of the last recasting of the Bharata about 200 B C. For certain portions of these Parvas are indeed very old as we shall have occasion to show hereafter, and it is probable that these did form part of the original Bharata.

The additions made can, however, never be regretted, for here we have a vast collection of old stories, doctrines and rituals, which enables us to determine the social, moral and religious condition of the Aryas 2,000 years ago and earlier, we shall make an attempt of this kind in a subsequent book which will contain one of the most interesting inquiries undertaken in this book.

Repetition

The second fruitful source of extension is repetition. Repetition may sometimes be useful for the purpose of impressing a subject on the reader's mind, but it must be acknowledged as a repetition.

In the Mahabharata, however, we find the same story repeated twice and even thrice without any reason or acknowledgment. The repetition grates on the ear and the reader is puzzled to know why the story has been repeated and whether the author was himself aware of it. This repetition can be seen over the whole length of the work and sometimes without long intervals. Innumerable instances can be cited, but we content ourselves here with a few of them which are most striking.

In the Adi Parva we have the story of Astika twice given, the second only after a few chapters after the first. The second is more detailed than the first. It seems as if Sauti was not satisfied with the meager relation of Vaishampayana and gave the story over again with many additions, but often using the same shlokas. The story of Kashyapa and Takshaka is also repeated, as also that of Yayati and of Pandu killing a Rishi in the guise of a deer. In the Vanaparva the Tirthas are twice enumerated, the second time with greater detail than the first.

Unfortunately India was not as extensively known in the days of Vaishampayana as in the days of Sauti, and the latter probably found it necessary to make a second enumeration of the holy places in India. These and other instances of repetition made, often with very little intervals, are sometimes explained away by Janmejaya asking for greater details of the same subject or story.

The 16 kings' legend is, on the other hand, an instance of repetition made at places widely separated from each other. The legend is first told, as far as we can remember, in the Drona Parva after the death of Abhimanyu, by Vyasa to Yudhishtira to console him for the sad loss he had suffered. And the same legend is told over again in the Shanti Parva by Krishna to Yudhishtira for the purpose of inducing him to lessen his grief and to enjoy the fruit of his success in war. And it is strange to see that Yudhishtira has forgotten (it is likely he may have) the story. For he asks Krishna who was Srinjaya's

son and how he had died. Narada, who first told the legend to Srinjaya to console him for the death of his son and whose narration both Vyasa and Krishna had given second-hand, now comes forward and tells Yudhishtira who Srinjaya was, and how he lost and regained his son. In short, the repetition made is extremely awkward and can only take place in a vast work like the Mahabharata. The legend all the same is a very fine one, and probably very old. It is perhaps copied after the Shata-patha Brahman, Kanda 13, where a list is given of the famous kings of old who performed the Ashwamedha sacrifices. Two or three of these kings are the same and the shlokas in their eulogy are also almost identical.

Imitation

The third head under which additions may be put is imitation. This is, in fact, another phase of repetition. An episode is imagined and added resembling one already existing. It is, in fact, the same feeling as has led to the composition of the many “Messengers” in imitation of the beautiful little poem of Kalidasa, called the “Cloud Messenger.” Very many additions can be recognised as made under this impulse.

The most striking example of this is the Yaksha-prashna episode at the end of the Vana Parva. Nakul goes to drink of a pond in the jungle which is under the enchantment of a Yaksha, and drinking the water against his caution dies. Each of the remaining brothers goes in search of him, and with the exception of Yudhishtira dies similarly.

Yudhishtira alone does not drink the water, and after satisfactorily answering one hundred questions put by the Yaksha succeed in propitiating him, and the Yaksha is pleased to restore life to his brothers. The episode, one suspects, resembles the Nahusha episode already given in Chapter 195 in which Yudhishtira similarly rescues his brothers from difficulty.

The Yaksha-prashna episode can be proved to be an addition subsequently made, by independent considerations. For it is strange that Sahadeo, Arjuna and Bhima should each drink the water without caring to see what had happened to his predecessor, and in spite of the warning given each time by the Yaksha. It looks absurd that even the predecessor’s death should not have sufficed to prove the truth of the Yaksha’s warning.

The questions put are, moreover, like riddles, and do not look as belonging to a great author. Further than this, there is a break in the context at this Akhyana. In this episode, which is the last in the Vanaparva, the Yaksha directs Yudhishtira to pass his days of concealment in Virata’s city. And yet we find in the beginning of the next Parva that Dharma is at a loss to see where to go and live incognito.

Again, at the end of the Yaksha-prashna episode Dharma dismisses all the Brahmans, and only the five brothers with Draupadi and Dhaumya remain ready to dive into obscurity. And yet in the beginning of the Virataparva the Brahmans are still there and they have yet to be dismissed.

These considerations would lead us to think that the story would properly run on if the Yaksha-prashna episode had not been there, in other words it has been added subsequently.

Another instance of this kind, though not quite so clear, is that of the Anu Gita. This is an episode in the Ashwamedhaparva and is fashioned after the Gita as is implied in the very name of it. Arjuna, after all the toils of the war are over, asks Shri Krishna to give him the same instructions as he had given him at the beginning of the war. Shri Krishna says that he could not rise to the same inspiration again, but would tell him what some one else had told another, and thus comes in the Anu Gita. It is naturally and admittedly not what the Gita is and preaches no new doctrine. It is probably a second-rate imitation of the Gita, and has perhaps been subsequently added.

Poetical Embellishment

The desire for poetical embellishment has also led in a potent manner to the extension of the Mahabharata. It is natural that Sauti should have taken the advantage of every opportunity that offered itself to exhibit his poetical powers.

Battles, natural sceneries and lamentations are the chief objects of a poet's delineation. The descriptions of battles' in the Mahabharata are generally florid and so extended that they are often tedious. Natural sceneries have also been described with fullness, especially in the Vanaparva. The Striparva appears to have almost been recast. The scene, where Ghandhari having been given supernatural vision in the manner which is so usual in the Mahabharata, describes the battlefield, and the widows of fallen heroes lamenting over their dead bodies, is probably an entirely new addition.

That Ghandhari should have been chosen as the person through whose mouth these lamentations are uttered, is itself quite undramatic, and Vyasa or Vaishampayana would not have committed such an error.

Moreover, the description and lamentations are somewhat sensual in taste, much in the fashion of later Sanskrit poets, the well-known shloka "Ayam sa rasanotkarshi," &c , being found here. Further, it is improbable that these bereaved women would have been

allowed to roam over the battlefield, covered as it must have been by indistinguishable masses of bones of men and animals, and it is also improbable that dead bodies could have been capable of identification as they were allowed to lie on the battle field for many days, exposed to hungry beasts and birds of prey. How, for instance, can Abhimanyu's face be still fresh and shining as it is being kissed by his young wife? The whole scene is improbable, undramatic and unbecoming.

A similar attempt may be discerned in the Virataparva where scenes and female beauties are described with much more elaboration than elsewhere. But the scenes are here also undramatic as they do not bear out and develop the characters as they are conceived. For example, Uttara who a little while ago was a timid boy, as soon as Arjuna discloses himself, becomes a brave man and a poet too. His description of the bows of the five brothers as they are taken down from the tree where they are concealed, is very beautiful indeed, and two of the shlokas are very fine riddles also.

Here we may conveniently treat of the Kuta or riddle shlokas. They appear to have been introduced by Sauti under the same impulse, the desire to exhibit poetical powers. It is affirmed in the beginning of the Mahabharata that there are 8,800 Kuta shlokas in all throughout the whole work, which gives one shloka for every 12. It appears therefore probable that this number has been exaggerated. In the appendix are given as many Kuta shlokas as we could find out while reading the work.

Some of these shlokas are really very ingenious and the two shlokas in which Uttara describes two bows may be taken as the best examples of them. The riddle lies generally in the use of a word which has two meanings, the most obvious of them occurring throwing the reader first and thus throwing him off the scent.

The worst example of such Kuta shlokas, perhaps an interpolation of even a later date than Sauti, is to be found in the Karna Parva, Chapter 90. The shloka No 40 is a long metred (Shardul-vikridita) shloka and uses the word "Gau" with its many meanings many times.

Anticipation

Anticipation or suggestion of events is a poetical art which authors are fond of using, and the Mahabharata is not without examples of it. The last editor Sauti has made several additions with this object. We have an instance of this in the Stri Parva where Gandhari is made to curse Shri Krishna for not having prevented the terrible slaughter shown by the state of the battlefield, that he too and his race would fight among themselves and slaughter one another. This scene in the Striparva, as we have already

seen, is wholly an interpolation. Similarly before the beginning of the fight, Dharma Raja goes to each one of the commanders on the opposite side and asks him how he could kill him, whereon each one anticipates the manner in which he was subsequently killed. Now this is very probably an interpolation, it is derogatory to the character of not only Yudhishtira but also to that of these great commanders, for it represents them as traitors.

Moreover it is ludicrous to represent Yudhishtira asking openly so imbecile a question. To Shalya Yudhishtira is made to say that he should make the Tejobhanga of Karna (dis-spirit him) when he would be asked to act as a charioteer to him. This is carrying the *Bija sowing* or poetical anticipation to an absurd length. Could anybody have then predicted that Shalya would be asked by Karna to drive his chariot on the battlefield, and even if it were so probable, would anybody have thought that mere discouragement of Karna would have assisted the cause of Yudhishtira? Even as the Mahabharata is, Shalya is not represented as acting so meanly. On the contrary he does his self-imposed duty most faithfully and protects and assists Karna whenever necessary.

Explanation

The last category under which additions appear to have been made is explanation of extraordinary conduct. Lapse of thousands of years between the events and the last recasting of the Mahabharata made it necessary that certain actions should be explained away and Sauti appears to have added chapters here and there for this purpose.

The most palpable addition under this head is the chapter wherein Vyasa seeks to explain to Drupada how it is that the five Pandavas may marry a single woman. The Pandavas are alleged to be all Indras (which is itself inconsistent with the idea stated elsewhere in the Mahabharata that Ariuna alone was Indra) and when Drupada is not satisfied even then, the usual device, the gift of supernatural vision is adopted and Drupada sees that they are all Indras.

Bhima's drinking warm blood from the throat of Dusshasana is also sought to be explained away in the Striparva, Chapter 15, where it is suggested that he only made a feint of drinking the blood but did not actually do it in fulfillment of his vow.

Vyasa's Appearance now and then

Vyasa's frequent appearance on the scene, of course by his supernatural powers, appears to have been arranged for the purpose of such explanation. He also often comes to warn, to advise and to console actors without apparent necessity or result.

For instance, at the time of Duryodhana's birth Vyasa appears on the scene and warns Dhritarashtra of the evils of which he would be the cause and advises him without success to throw him into the Ganges.

So again when the war is about to begin Vyasa appears before Dhritarashtra and tells him what evil omens are happening and how the war would be a dreadful one. Here are introduced a fresh (many having been already mentioned in the Udyogaparva) number of evil omens and inauspicious conjunctions of planets which are probably imaginary and which have created a confusion of which we shall have to speak later on.

The appearance of Vyasa is generally of no avail and the march of events is in no way hindered without it.

Such are the principal heads under which additions appear to have been made by Sauti in recasting the Mahabharata. It is by no means suggested that the list is exhaustive or that the examples cited are the only examples of them. Two examples only have been given under each head so that the subject may not be tedious to the reader who is not supposed to have read the Mahabharata. It would be tiresome to the general reader, to give here an exhaustive list of such chapters and episodes as appear to have been added at the time of the last recasting of the Bharata, and we give in the Appendix a note in which this subject has been discussed in detail.

Notwithstanding the additions thus made it must be said to the credit of Sauti that he has succeeded in moulding a work of such an enormous extent into a harmonious and consistent whole. It is only rarely, that we come across discrepancies, contradictions or breaks in the context. In fact they are rarer in the Mahabharata than in the Ramayana.

In two places, however, Sauti has betrayed himself hopelessly. In the Bhishma Parva, where Yudhishtira asks Shalya to discourage Karna, an episode which we have already shown to be an addition, he is made to say "Carry out your promise made in Udyoga," by which is presumably meant the Udyogaparva. Now it is absurd to represent an actor giving a reference to a division of the drama or epic itself. Similarly Kunti in the Ashwamedha Parva, Chapter 66, requests Shri Krishna to carry out his promise made in "Aishika" (a previous Parva), to resuscitate the child of Uttara if born dead. How Sauti could have put these references to the Parvas of the epic in the mouth of the actors it is difficult to explain, except on the supposition that the enormous length of the epic made it pardonable even for the actors to give references to its divisions.

APPENDIX

NOTE IV

The additions subsequently made to the Bharata.

In this note we intend to give all the chapters or Adhyayas which appear to us to have been subsequently added to the Bharata of Vaisharnpayana by Sauti.

ADI PARVA

1. The Paushya legend is evidently a subsequent addition as it is entirely irrelevant. It has no connection with the Mahabharata story and is only linked to it at the end. But the connection breaks off again (Chap 3).
2. The Paulomi Akhyana is also irrelevant. This is introduced by the coming of Suta to Shaunaka and begins as if nothing had been written before this. The story is an Arabian Night story and is intended to glorify the obedience of Kshatriyas to Rishis (Chap 4-12).
3. The Astika story is repeated. All these Akhysnas are inferior in composition. The shlokas beginning with "Tadagata jvalitam" describing the battle of gods and the demons are irrelevant and not very poetical. Similarly, the description of the sea when Vinata and Kadru came to it and crossed it is out of place. The Stutis of Indra and Surya are of the hackneyed kind identifying everything with the God praised. The way in which these stories are knit together is in the fashion of the Arabian Nights being usually introduced by a casual mention or haphazard question (Chap 13-58).
4. The story of Kashyapa and Takshaka and of Parikshita's death is repeated.
5. The Amshavatara is a subsequent addition; each actor in the great scene is described as the incarnation of some god or demon. The details here given some-times contradict what is stated in other places (Chap 59-66, 75-85).
6. The story of Yayati is repeated.
7. The "Uttara Yayati Akhyana" is a subsequent addition and is unconnected with the principal story. It is also given in long metred shlokas. It gives the tenets of Hinduism, however, in short pithy language and is well worth studying (Chap 86-93).

8. The chapter in prose giving the genealogy of the Pandavas is followed by another in verse. The latter is an interpolation as has been shown in the book (Chap 93).
9. The story of “Ani Mandavya” is repeated (Chap 107-108).
10. Vyasa’s appearance on the scene and advice to Dhritarashtra to throw away his son is a subsequent addition for reasons mentioned in the body of the book (Chap 158).
11. The names of Dhritarashtra’s sons are twice repeated (Chap 115-116).
12. The story of Pandu killing a deer is twice repeated, the shloka “Sarvabhutahite kale” being also repeated (Chap 118).
13. The appearance of gods in the heavens and the Akashavani vouchsafed every time is probably a subsequent addition. The poet finds an opportunity to display his power of enumerating the gods and other divine beings.
14. The birth of Kripa and Drona is wonderful. Rishis emitting semen at the sight of beautiful Apsaras and the semen germinating in some way into men is the usual Pauranic account of great men’s birth (Chap 130).
15. The stories of Hidimba and Baka are like children’s stories and very probably interpolations (Chap 154-166).
16. The story of Drona and Drupada is repeated again.
17. The story of the king of Gandharvas playing in the Ganges water is an interpolation. Here we have the usual artifice adopted, the gift of divine sight to Arjuna.
18. The Gandharva and Arjuna sitting together after a fight and telling stories of Tapati and Vishwamitra is almost comical and the Akhyanas are added here uncongenially (Chap 172-175).
19. The stories of Vasishtha and Kalmashapada and Bhargava and Aurva are quite out of place. They are tedious and almost trying in the march of the proper story (Chap 177-184).

20. The story which Vyasa relates to Drupada explaining why Draupadi can have many husbands is a subsequent addition as has already been shown (Chap 198-199).

21. The story of Sundopsaunda is a typical Pauranic story Asuras inflated by the obtainment of a boon from Shiva destroy themselves (Chap 211-214).

SABHA PARVA

1. The Rishis mentioned in the Yudhishtira Sabha are repeated in the Brahma Sabha (Chap 11-12).

2. The story of the game at dice is repeated. The repetition is explained by Janemejaya asking for greater details of the event. The same shlokas are often used (Chap 73-80).

VANA PARVA

1. The Tirthas are repeated as already shown (Chap 82-84).

2. The story of Agastya and his drinking up the sea is perhaps out of place here (Chap 103-104).

3. The conversation in Chapters 132-134 is philosophical and tough for the commentator even. The whole conversation consists of shlokas which may be looked upon as riddles and the commentator has himself composed Stragdhara shlokas to explain the meaning of each.

4. The story of Yavakrita is not charming and the language also not good (Chap 135-138).

5. The story of Varaha incarnation is entirely unconnected as no Tirtha suggests it. The language also is not good (Chap 142).

6. The story of Bhima meeting Hanuman is not probable as Bhima already knows who Maruti is. It is perhaps a later addition (Chap 147-150).

7. Maruti's description of the four Yugas and again of the Ashramas is entirely irrelevant.

8. The story of Bhima trespassing into Gandha-madana and killing Mani at Draupadi's request is a repetition. Kubera chides Bhima in a manner which should lead him again to fight rather than submit. Bhima is represented as acting foolishly and here, too submissively (Chap 146,160-162).
9. Markandeya's coming and telling different stories is probably a later addition. The object is the extolling of Brahmanas and the glorification of Krishna as an incarnation of the supreme deity. We find here verse mixed with prose which seems to have been introduced here as a variety. The story of Shyena. and Kapota is repeated (Chap 182-231).
10. The story of Kumara's birth is different from that given in the Puranas and in Kalidasa's well-known poem called Kumarsambhava. He is represented here as the son of Agni (Chap 222-225).
11. The conversation between Satyabhama and Draupadi is puerile. The picture which the latter draws of a good wife is that of a humble woman who washes the household pots and clothes, and not that of a queen (Chap 231-234).
12. The story of Duryodhana being bound and earned away by Chitraratha is a later addition. It seems absurd for Indra to wish for Duryodhana's being taken to him bodily (Chap 241).
13. The subsequent story of Duryodhana sitting for Prayopaveshana, fasting until death, and his being carried by a Kritya to Patala is an absurdity (Chap 250).
14. Durvasa's going to the Pandavas to tease is again an absurd story subsequently added. Durvasa cannot be supposed to have descended so low (Chap 261).
- 15 The story of Karna's Kundalas being taken away by Indra is repeated here. The story has already been told in the Adiparva, and Janmejaya ought to have known it, yet Janmejaya asks questions here as if he knew nothing. Again, if Karna is deprived of his Kundalas at this time and from thence called Karna, he should not have been called Karna up to this time which we do not find to be the case (Chap 299-309).
16. The Yakshaparashna episode, as has already been stated in the body, is an interpolation (Chap 312).

VIRATA PARVA

1. Uttara's running away from the chariot and then becoming an exceptional charioteer and a poet, has already been commentated upon. The Virataparva is the most poetical of all the parvas and the story is well diversified, but there are very few separate Akhyanas in it (Chap 42-43-45).

UDYOGA PARVA

1. Shalya's promise has been commentated on in the body of the book as absurd and unpoetical (Chap 7).

2. The story of Shakrajaya is a repetition of Vrittra-vadha related in the Vanaparva. Nahusha's story is also related in short (Chap 8-9).

3. Vidura Niti is a good teaching for all times. But it is somewhat out of place (Chap 32-39).

4. The dialogue between Sanatsujata and Dhritarashtra is too philosophical to suit a character like that of Dhritarashtra (Chap 40-45).

5. The Chapter 48 of 109 shlokas is a tiresome addition. Arjuna did not say anything of the kind to Sanjaya, who yet gives a lengthy message as from him in long metre.

6. The whole dialogue is unskillfully extended. The question by Yudhishtira is out of place.

7. Chapter 59 is clearly a later addition. Sanjaya is not before represented as speaking to Krishna and Arjuna in private. Moreover Krishna was not young then but old as stated in the Sabhaparva.

8. The Rishis Kanva and Narada coming to exhort Duryodhana and relating several stories is an improbable interruption of the natural march of the story.

9. Krishna's taking Karna with him and offering him empire after disclosing to him who he is, is unnatural as it lowers Krishna's character, and how could Sanjaya have known it when both Krishna and Karna kept it a secret?

10. Unfavourable astronomical conjunctions and other bad omens are here added as has already been stated.

11. The message sent with Uluka is unnecessarily lengthy. The message actually delivered by him is, however, good and pointed. The replies given by the several Pandavas are again twice repeated (Chap 159-163).

BHISHMA PARVA

1. The appearance of Vyasa and his proposal to give eyes to Dhritarashtra is a subsequent interpolation. “The Bhumi-khanda” is also an interpolation as already observed (Chap 12).

2. The praise of Devi appears also to be a later addition.

3. Chapters 65 and 66 are probably subsequent additions in praise of Krishna and the support of the Vaishnava sect, for after all this it is strange that Duryodhana remains firm.

4. In the beginning of Chapter 69 we have “Duryodhana Uvacha” which is probably a mistake for “Bhishma Uvacha.”

5. Krishna’s giving up the reins of Arjuna’s chariot horses and running to kill Bhishma—a fine scene—is twice repeated (Chap 107-108). The proposal to go and ask Bhishma how he should be killed, is also an absurdity already commented upon.

DRONA PARVA

1. This Parva seems to be more elaborate than the preceding ones and seems to have been entirely recast. The similes follow one upon another as in the modern Purana. There is a long metred shloka (Shardula-vikridita) at the end of Chapter 7 which is strange. Again Dhritarashtra says that Drona had studied the four Vedas and the fifth Akhyana, by which is meant usually the Bharata. How could he when Bharata had no existence in his days? Dronaparva is also more imaginary and mythical.

2. The long-metred shlokas in this Parva are diversified. The consolation of Subhadra and her lamentations are probably interpolations, the same shlokas as those uttered by Arjuna being used (Chap 77).

3. So also is the chapter where Arjuna in a dream is taken to Shiva (Chap 80).
4. Similarly the next chapter where the splendour of Dharma's royal functions of bathing, etc, are described. This is clearly shown by the fact that the next chapter begins with Dhritarashtra's question "what happened the next day?" The next day had already dawned and Sanjaya had already told Dhritarashtra what Arjuna and Krishna had done (Chap 84).
5. Dhritarashtra says "I do not hear today the same noise as usual in the houses of Saindhava." This shows that he was in camp or even if he was in Gajapura it is not every day that Sanjaya told him of the battle. It was only after Drona's death that he came to him and told him what had happened (Chap 85).
6. The story of the fight between Satyaki and Bhurishrava is a later addition. Probably Bhima was in Satyaki's chariot. When did he leave it? The spectacle of two men discharioting each other is strange. So also their fighting like gladiators with naked arms in the midst of a raging battle, and what was Arjuna doing all the while? (Chap 142-143).
7. There is much of pure hyperbole in the account of Bhima's throwing away the chariot of Drona bodily 7 times with his hands.
8. The chapters relating the second fight between Drona and Ghatotkacha is a later addition probably. They revile each other and yet Drona does not refer to his previous defeat by him. Secondly, Ghatotkacha brought with him one Akshaunhini but he is not said in the beginning to have brought one with him. Thirdly, he is said to have destroyed 8 and subsequently 7 Akshauhini, which is impossible.
9. The appearance of Vyasa at the end of Chapter 184 is unnecessary and useless.
10. The commentator admits at the end that the number of shlokas in this Parva is more than the one given by Sauti and attributes the fact to the mistake of writers. How can the number increase by the fault of writers? Interpolation is clearly admitted here.

KARNA PARVA

1. The story of Shankar killing Tripura is repeated and very closely to the previous story which appears at the end of the Dronaparva (Chap 34).

2. The absurdity of Duryodhana telling the story, for stories should properly be told by elders, is explained in the poem “I heard this story when a Brahman related it to my father.”
3. Repetition and lengthening of scenes is a bad feature of Sauti’s composition.
4. In the midst of bragging, Karna remembers two curses pronounced upon him by a Brahmin which is absurd. These are probably later additions.
5. The mixed fight described in Chapters 55 to 63 is a tiresome extension of the same story. The speech of Yudhishtira is also very long.
6. The scene between Yudhishtira and Arjuna, the former upbraiding the latter for nothing, and saying “accursed be thy bow” and the latter drawing his sword to kill him, is inconsistent with the character of both and not at all appropriate and pleasing. The solution given by Krishna is also not worthy of his teaching (Chap 68).

SHALYA PARVA

1. Shalya’s fighting with Bhima is impossible as he had already been removed from battle senseless (Chap 16).
2. Sanjaya’s telling Dhritarashtra about Yuyutsu coming to Vidura and staying with him for the night, is absurd. How could Sanjaya know it? Vidura was with Dhritarashtra. In one place Sanjaya says “Dhrishtadyumna seized Sanjaya” which ought to have been “me” if Sanjaya himself is the relator (Chap 29).

GADA PARVA

1. Janmejaya interrupting Vaishampayana at the very time when the centre of interest is reached and the fight between Bhima and Duryodhana about to begin, for a description of the Saraswati river and the pilgrimage of Balarama has already been commented upon (Chap 35).
2. Krishna’s coming to comfort Dhritarashtra and Gandhari is rather strange. It does not fit in with the story which is still told by Sanjaya. The last sentence of Sanjaya is “He went to Gandhari whose sons were killed.” But Gandhari was not there, she having

been sent away. Sanjaya could not also have seen this as his extraordinary vision had gone. Moreover, when, Krishna appears he sees Dhritarashtra and Gandhari together (Chap 63).

3. The story of the chariot of Arjuna burning to ashes as soon as Krishna got down is absurd. For Krishna got down from the chariot every evening, and where is the beauty of describing Arjuna as destroying the Brahmastra of Drona and Karna by counter Astras?

SAUPTIKA PARVA

1. The propitiation of Shiva by Ashwatthama is a later addition meant to add to the horror and success of his crime (Chap 7).

2. Ashwatthama's going back to Duryodhana to inform him of the slaughter of the innocent is also inconsistent, for the latter had already died at the end of the previous Parva (Chap 9).

3. The greatness of Mahadeva and Linga worship come in at the end of this Parva unnecessarily.

STRI PARVA

1. Repetition of scenes and even of the same shlokas is exemplified in the comforting speeches of Vidura and Sanjaya (Chap 2-4).

2. Vyasa giving sight to Gandhari is a repetition of the same idea. Her description of the battlefield is unpoetical and has already been commented upon (Chap 16-17).

3. The curse of Gandhari to Krishna is an unnecessary foretelling of future events as has already been shown (Chap 25).

SHANTI PARVA

1. Subhadra appears here to have been in Dwaraka while before she was in the camp and was comforted for Abhimanyu's death.

2. There is a deal of repetition in Vyasa's and Arjuna's speeches. The story of the 16 kings is here repeated (Chap 22, 27-29).
3. The story of Syamantapanchaka and Parashurama destroying Kshatriyas is repeated here. It has already appeared in the Adiparva.
4. Yudhishtira asking his brothers about Dharma, Artha and Kama, and Bhima urging him to have beautiful women, etc., is thoroughly out of point and out of place.
5. The stories of Bodhya and Kashyapa and Indra are probably later additions (Chap 178).
6. Chapters 190 and 192 are in prose and in the fashion of modern Shastras. They appear to be later additions.
7. The praise of Vishnu, the creation of the world and the working of the three Gunas are constantly touched.
8. The conversation of Bali and Indra is repeated. Repetition in this Mokshaparva is almost irksome. In Chapter 248, Gunas and the elements are repeated, a thing which has been done perhaps for the 5th time. Shlokas from the Gita frequently recur (Chap 223, 224, 227).
9. The story of Death or Mrityu is repeated (Chap 255, 257).
10. The story of Jajali and Tuladhara is a subsequent addition probably in support of Ahimsa (Chap 260, 263).

ANUSHASANA PARVA

1. The story of Vishwamitra becoming a Brahmin is unnecessarily repeated here (Chap 3-4).
2. The Upamanyu Akhyana and the thousand names of Shiva is a subsequent addition as has already been noted (Chap 17).
3. The next chapter is an abrupt breaking off on the evil disposition of women.

4. The power and sanctity of Brahmins is reiterated. The story of Shibi is told once more. That these stories should come under Dana-dharma is strange. Probably in the original Anushasanaparva the only subject touched was gifts (Chap 32-33).
5. The story of Vishwamitra becoming a Brahmin is told once more in a fanciful form.
6. The origin of gold is told and the story of Kartikeya's birth is repeated. Popularly mercury is believed to have been born of Shiva's semen and not gold (Chap 84, 85, 86).
7. "I wish to know this Oh Brahman in detail" (Chapter 95). Here the word Brahman as addressed to Bhishma is strange.
8. The Uma-Maheshwar Samvada is an interpolation and an absurdity. The hackneyed questions are asked again. A Brahman here is said to have been born and good conduct can only make one a Brahmana in the next life (Chap 140-148).
9. Krishna and Durvasa is the same story as Chyavana and Kaushika related before (Chap 159-160).
10. In the morning prayer, Chapter 166, the rivers are repeated again.

ASHWAMEDHA PARVA

1. There is a repetition of Dharmaraja's grief and his consolation by Vyasa and Krishna (Chap 15).
2. It seems that the story of Uttanka and the Mani has already been told in the Adiparva in another form (Chap 53-58).
3. How could the Earth console Subhadra at the death of Abhimanyu?
4. The chapter in which a nakula despises the horse sacrifice of Yudhishtira is a later addition in defence of Ahimsa (Chap 90).
5. The story that the nakula was under a curse is still a later addition and inconsistent with the previous chapter (Chap 92).

ASHRAMAVASI PARVA

1. Dhritarashtra's advice to Yudhishtira how to govern the kingdom is quite inconsistent with the character of both (Chap 6-7).
2. Narada said confidently that the gods were talking among themselves that he (Dhritarashtra) would go to Kuber Loka. This is rather strange and probably an interpolation (Chap 38-39).
3. The description given of the Pandavas and their wives is quite out of place as Dhritarashtra could not have realised it, for he is not only blind but is now a hermit.
4. The appearance of the dead is an old idea as old as the Bharata. Janmejaya being shown his father is, however, a clear later addition.

MAHAPRASTHANIKI PARVA

1. The story of the Pandavas going west, south and east and seeing Dwaraka submerged is absurd. They could not have walked so long, and the Mahaprasthana, according to the Dharmashastra, is only towards the north-east (See Boudhayana's Dharmashastra) (Chap 1,2,3).

SWARGAROHANA PARVA

1. The soul of each actor in this Epic is said to have returned after death to the deity from which it sprang. This is probably a later idea.
2. The last chapter giving the description of the Parvas is clearly an interpolation. Vaishampayana has gone away and Janmejaya has returned to Gajapura and Suta has told Shaunka the merit of reading Bharata. It is strange that Janmejaya should come again to ask Vaishampayana to give a detail of the Parvas. Moreover, we have here a mention of the Ramayana, the 18 Parvas and the worship of Hari and Krishna.