Mahabharata and the Greeks: An Archeological View

by Potluri Rao In Seattle ©2018 (CC BY 4.0)

The current version of Indian history has no scientific basis. It was based on the false assumption that the fictional Sanskrit stories invented by the Greeks in Kashmir were true stories of divine origin. Geological facts, DNA samples, and the geography of Hindu languages reject the Sanskrit rubbish as non-verifiable and nonsensical statements. Truth emerges only when hypotheses are rejected with verifiable facts.

Hindus (DNA F) lived only in Peninsular India for over 60,000 years. They were highly advanced logic-based cultures of peace-loving, compassionate people who lived as one giant family and helped each other. Sindhus (DNA R1a) were Eastern Europeans who moved from Bactria to the Indus River in Pakistan only 4,000 years ago. They were warmongering cultures, constantly at war to kill each other. In the Sanskrit rubbish Sindhus were falsely portrayed as Hindus. The Sanskrit epic Mahabharata was a fictional story of Sindhus killing each other; it had nothing to do with Hindus (F).

Grandhika was the language of Hindus. All the Hindu books on logic and culture were written in Grandhika. Sanskrit was a synthetic language invented by the Greeks to deliberately destroy Hindu logic and culture. It was a mixture of only Grandhika and an Avestan dialect of Persians. It was a bastardized version of Grandhika.

Kanishka (200 CE) invented temple gods and idolatry to rob people in Persia, Pakistan, and India. He invented Sanskrit. He employed some delusional, unethical, and immoral Avestans to trash all Grandhika literature of Hindus to Sanskrit rubbish.

The following are excerpts from a book written by Professor Washburn Hopkins of Yale University.

THE GREAT EPIC OF INDIA
Its Character and Origin

BY
E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, M.A., PH.D.
Professor of Sanskrit at Yale University

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNFR'S SONS
LONDON: EDWARD ARNOLD
1902

CHAPTER SIX (page 386)

DATE OF THE EPIC

That the complete Mahabharata, for the most part as we have it today, cannot be later than the fourth or fifth century of our era, follows from the fact, brought out first by Professor Bhandarkar and then by Professor Buhler, that it is referred to as a Smirti in inscriptions dated not much later than this, while by the fifth century at least it was about as long as it is now.

But we may go further back and say with comparative certainty that, with the exception of the parts latest added, the introduction to the first book and the last book, even the pseudo-epic was completed as early as 200 A. D.

For the Roman denarius is known to the Harivamca, and the Harivamca is known to the first part of the first book and to the last book (implied also in the twelfth book); hence such parts of these books as recognize the Harivamca must be later than the introduction of Roman coins into the country (100-200 A. D.); but though coins are mentioned over and over, nowhere, even in the twelfth and thirteenth books, is the denarius alluded to.

The time of the whole Mahabharata generally speaking may then be from 200-400 A. D. This, however, takes into account neither subsequent additions, such as we know to have been made in later times, nor the various recastings in verbal form, which may safely be assumed to have occurred at the hands of successive copyists.

For the terminus a quo, the external evidence in regard to the Pandu-Epic, Mahabharata, though scanty, is valuable. It shows us first that the Mahabharata is not recognized in any Sanskrit literary work till after the end of the Brahmana period, and only in the latest Sutras, where it is an evident intrusion into the text.

For the Grhya Sutras belong to the close of the Sutra period, and here the words Bharata and Mahabharata occur in a list of authors and works as substitutes for the earlier mention of Itihasa and Purana in the same place, so recent a substitution in fact that some even of the latest of these Sutras still retain Itihasa and Purana. But when the words do actually occur they are plainly additions to the earlier list.

Again, it is one thing to say that Panini knew a Pandu Mahabharata, but quite another to say that his epic was our recent epic. The Pandu-Epic as we have it represents a period subsequent not only to Buddhism 500 B. C., but to the Greek invasion 300 B. C.

But no evidence has yet been brought forward to show conclusively that Panini lived before the third century B. C.

The Greeks are described as a western people (northwestern, with Kambojas), famous as fighters, wearing especially fine metal armor, and their overthrow is alluded to. The allies engaged in the epic battles are not only native princes but also Greek kings and Persians, who come out of the West to the war.

A further well-known indication of Greek influence is given by the fact that the Ksudrakas and Malavas were united into one nation or the first time by the invasion of Alexander, and that they appear thus united under the combined name Ksudlrakamalavas in the epic, ii, 52, 15.

It is clear from this that, while the Greeks were familiar, the Romans were as yet but a name. Further, the distinct prophecy that “Scythians, Greeks, and Bactrians will rule unrighteously in the evil age to come” (Kali-age), which occurs in iii, 188, 35, is too clear a statement to be ignored or explained away.

Such allusions as these can mean only this: the Pandu-Epic, in its present form, was composed after the Greek invasion.

Putting these facts together with those gleaned from other works than the epic itself, we may tentatively assume as approximate dates of the whole work in its different stages: Bharata (Kuru) lays, perhaps combined into one, but with no evidence of an epic before 400 B. C.

Certain are these four facts:

1, That the Pandu-Epic as we have it, or even without the masses of didactic material, was composed or compiled after the Greek invasion;
2, That this epic only secondarily developed its present masses of didactic material;
3, That it did not become a specially religious propaganda of Krishnaism (in the accepted sense of that sect of Vaisnavas) till the first century B. C.;
4, That the epic was practically completed by 200 A. D.