

Robert N. Minor
University of Kansas*

Two immediate conclusions result from a survey of the secondary literature on the Bhagavad-gītā. The first is that there is a plethora of articles and monographs by scholars and others on all matters of the book. The number of translations alone makes it the most translated text in the world, next to the Christian Bible. A second conclusion to which one comes is that in the current state of Gītā scholarship the trend is that most often the authors of these secondary works have not read, or at least have not indicated that they have read, previous work on the same subject.¹ In introductory matters, on questions of authorship, date, and the Gītā's genuineness as a part of the Mahābhārata, the great epic in which it is found, most often conclusions are asserted by authors without a marshalling of evidence or lack of it to support such decisions. There is currently no place to which one may turn which summarizes the current state of scholarship on these matters, and this may be why many others are writing without a firm foundation.

The purpose of this study is to summarize the current state of Gītā scholarship in matters of introduction and to suggest conclusions on the basis of previous work and the current, but slim, evidence. The difficulty of this and the low probability of resulting conclusions are hereby acknowledged. As S.K. De said about the attempt to date the Gītā, "by nature of the problem it is almost an impossibility."²

The Gītā and the Mahabharata

The most obvious fact about the Gītā is its current location as chapters twenty-three through forty of the sixth of eighteen books of the critical edition of the Mahābhārata the great Indian epic whose process of production is regularly dated from 400 B.C. to 400 A.D. This huge work which is three and one-half times as long as the Christian Bible, is a repository of tales, excurses, sectarian works, and didactic treatises, and has thus been rightly called "the collective possession of generations of bards." ³ The Epic itself tells its readers that it was produced by a gradual process (Mbh. 1.1.62-3). Van Buitenen has reconstructed its growth in four phases from the initial Bhārata of 24,000 verses to the complete Epic of 100,000. There was, first, expansion from within; second, mythologization of its characters and plots; third, brahmanization of the Epic through the addition of didactic matters; fourth, addition, even after the Epic was in written form, of new books. ⁴ As many have pointed out, it is not for nothing that the Mahābhārata says of itself: "Whatever is here, on Dharma, on Profit, on Pleasure, and on Liberation, that is found elsewhere. But what is not here is nowhere else." (1.56.34).

The first question over which scholars disagree, then, is how the Gītā fits into this process of epic production. They have suggested that it is an original part of the Epic, or that it was added later or that it was an earlier book worked into the Epic. These theories are seldom supported by sustained argument, possibly because the evidence is slim and many problems are insurmountable.

The most popular theory is that the Gītā was not originally a part of the Mahābhārata, but was added to it, either as a later book added into the text or an earlier book in existence at the time of the compilation of

the Epic and incorporated into it. The first reason, and the most persuasive to these scholars it seems, is the incredibility of the Gītā's sermon-dialogue at such a juncture in the Epic's story. The whole Epic has been leading up to a battle that is about to take place, a battle which it pictures as involving the whole world. The two sides in the battle are actually two sides of one family, the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas, which have been feuding about the question of sovereignty over their ancestors' territory. Finally Yudhiṣṭhira, the king of the Pāṇḍavas, the heros of the Epic, is challenged to a game of dice upon which the whole kingdom is wagered. The loser is to remain in exile for thirteen years. Yudhiṣṭhira, the rightful heir of the kingdom, loses to duryodhana, the leader of the evil half of the family who has been plotting and acting to eliminate the Pāṇḍavas. As a result the Pāṇḍavas remain in exile for thirteen years. Upon returning to claim their kingdom, they are rebuffed by Duryodhana and, that being the last straw, war is inevitable. Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva is chosen to be the counsellor of the Pāṇḍavas and the war is about to begin. It will rage for eighteen days and in it the Kauravas will be slain, Kṛṣṇa's kin will commit suicide in a drunken brawl, and most of the Pāṇḍavas will be eliminated. However, right before the battle is to begin, and actually even after the arrows have begun to fly (Gītā 1.20), with the armies lined up for the fight, Arjuna, who previously enthusiastically supported the battle, realizing again that those on the other side are also relatives and teachers, loses his resolve. With Arjuna and Kṛṣṇa at the center of the battlefield, the Gītā's private dialogue goes on for eighteen chapters while the armies wait. This fact has been too much for many scholars.

One must immediately note, however, that this ought to be less a

problem for those who are not concerned to show that the Mahābhārata is actually recounting historical events. ⁵ There is no a priori reason why an original writer could not have included such a didactic work at this point in the Epic story, depending upon his purposes. As an epic tale, rather than a "historically true" account, the objection carries little weight. K.N. Upadhyaya who accepts the genuineness of the Gītā so argues. Throughout the Mahābhārata, "the author is uniformly eager to elaborate the principles of dharma whenever and wherever he finds an opportunity to do so." Thus, what better place to emphasize these teachings than at, "this critical juncture of the commencement of the great war when, to add poignancy to the situation, Arjuna is placed against his own friends and relatives, elders and teacher." ⁶ At this moment the issue of dharma, of his duty as a member of the warrior class, is highlighted and the Mahābhārata's point is emphatically brought home. Upadhyaya rightly points out that behind the Mahābhārata is the active life of the soldier, the kṣatriya class, whose duty it was to maintain the order of society, especially by enforcing the class, varṇa, structure. The Epic is centered around battlefields and royal courts, not the sacrificial altars and Vedic schools of the earlier Vedic literature.

Similarly Telang argued that the feelings which dominate Arjuna and give rise to the Gītā are most consistent with both the Gītā and the whole Mahābhārata. ⁷ The entire Epic leads up to the battle and the very predicament which results in Arjuna having to fight his own kin. Arjuna's weakness of attitude (Gītā 1.26-2.3) is poetically consistent. He does not want to kill his kin, but he must because it is his duty. His failure of nerve is based upon an attached attitude, attached to the results of duty done, an attitude which the Gītā will reject throughout

its argument.

Alone, then, this argument does not support the later edition of the Gītā to the Epic. The Mahābhārata has regular didactic portions, as Zaehner notes in his assertion of the Gītā's genuineness.⁸ Almost all of books twelve and thirteen as well as major portions of books three and five contain such sections. The very regularity of such material might be taken by some as an argument for the Gītā's original place in the Mahābhārata.

It is important to note with S.C. Roy, however, that these didactic treatises are not consistent in their teachings on all matters and that their very spirit does not always blend with that of the non-didactic portions of the Mahābhārata.⁹ With the Gītā the difference is most striking for the Gītā's teaching as a whole is not completely consistent with either the larger epic or the other didactic works. Thus, though Kṛṣṇa is proclaimed Lord of Lords in the Gītā, this is soon forgotten in the remainder of the Epic, and in most of the remainder and the earlier portions Kṛṣṇa is a hero and prince who, e.g., first flees in terror with the other Vṛṣṇis from Jarāsadhā or is out-manuevered in battle, or commits various treacherous deeds. In these passages he is clearly not the highest god as he is in the Gītā, though in what appears to be a later passage he is also said to be a descent of the god Viṣṇu. Arjuna in Gītā 11.41-42 (cf. 18.73) in response to the vision of Kṛṣṇa as the All in All, Lord of Lords, All-Consuming God, and Divine Yogin, asks forgiveness for rashly thinking of Kṛṣṇa as his comrade, calling him "Kṛṣṇa, Yadava, Companion," and for treating him disrespectfully or as the object of sport. Yet soon this is all forgotten and Kṛṣṇa is seen as Arjuna's friend and comrade, his "buddy" again.

There are in all sixteen so-called gītās in the Mahābhārata which we are calling didactic treatises.¹⁰ In book fourteen, the Aśvamedhika-parvan, is found an example, the Anugītā, or "Gītā Summarized." It has recently been suggested that the claim that it is a retelling of Gītā be taken seriously.¹¹ As an introduction to its teaching Arjuna nonchalantly informs Kṛṣṇa (who he does not remember had shown him the unforgettable vision of himself as the Great Lord of Lords, in the Bhagavad-gītā) that he has forgotten the teachings of Gītā and, thus, must have them repeated. It is clear that the writer of the Gītā never anticipated that Arjuna would forget its teachings of the place of Kṛṣṇa as revealed in Gītā chapter eleven, as Arjuna does regularly in the Mahābhārata. However, in the Anugītā, Kṛṣṇa proceeds to teach Arjuna, after claiming that the previous teachings could not be restated. In doing so he neglects to mention, even in passing,¹² what the Gītā speaks of as its highest teachings (Gītā 9.1ff; 10.1ff.; 11.1; 18.64-68): its teachings about the place of the god Kṛṣṇa and his relationship to the individual soul and the universe, and the response of devotion this is to engender in the devotee. Instead, the Anugītā treats of some matters that are peripheral to the Gītā and, then, emphasizes only one element of the path to liberation stressed by the Gītā, jñāna or "knowledge." Even at this point, however, the Anugītā is silent about that most crucial element of knowledge in the Gītā: knowledge of Kṛṣṇa's divinity and his relationship as Lord of Yoga to the universe. These central absences, also absent from the other gītās in the Mahābhārata, form a crucial argument against the position that the Bhagavad-gītā is an original part of the Epic. Even though the Epic story might lack historical credence, one would expect an author to maintain the same religious stance throughout, especially in what he

claims to be the highest teachings in the Gītā.

Telang also argues that the Gītā lacks a "Brahmanizing" or "sectarian" spirit and, thus, that it belongs to the Epic.¹³ This cannot be an argument for its genuineness in the Mahābhārata for the Epic contains numerous passages which clearly promote the superiority of Viṣṇu or Śiva. It has also been shown that this claim, which is frequently made, lacks evidence when the Gītā is studied historically.¹⁴ But even if this were an argument supported by the data, it would not be an argument for dating the Gītā in the early Mahābhārata because that depends upon the acceptance or rejection of a priori developmental theories, not upon solid evidence which could support assertions that the earliest religious thought and practice in India was non-sectarian.

Upadhyaya argues that the Gītā must be considered genuine because the Mahābhārata refers to the Gītā as a unit in Ādi-parvan 1.2.56; 1.1.124; in Śanti-parvan 12.346.10; 348.8, 53; and in the Anugītā (Aśvamedhika-parvan 14.15.9-]3).¹⁵ This does not show that the Gītā was originally a part of the Epic, but only that these portions of the Mahābhārata are later than the Gita's addition to it. These passages are, in fact, most likely some of the latest additions to the Epic,¹⁶ and must have been written at a time when the Gītā was well-known and held a prestige which caused later authors to try to claim its teachings as their own.

Likewise, Telang and Upadhyaya argue that the use of words, language, versification, and sandhi in the Gītā are comparable to that in the Mahābhārata. Terms such as anta (Gītā 2.16), bhāsa (2.54), and brahman as prakṛiti (14.3), as well as the suffix ha (2.9) are not used by later writers such as Kālidāsa in the senses of the Gītā. Compounds are not numerous and not long as in classical style and there are few involved

syntactical constructions.¹⁷ Sarma has indicated the correctness of this observation with detailed lists of parallels between the Epic and the Gītā which reflect non-standardized forms when compared with classical Sanskrit. He concludes that the Gītā "errs with the Epic and rises with it."¹⁸ It is clear, especially on the basis of metre, that the Gītā does not come from the classical period. Yet, as Roy correctly argued, if this argument is accepted, it proves similarity of origin and not that the Gītā is an original part of the Mahābhārata.¹⁹

Belvalkar, however, has produced the most solid evidence for the theory that the Gītā is a later addition to the Mahābhārata, evidence that supports the contention that the Gītā was added to the Epic in the midst of the process of its production. In Mahābhārata 6.55.34-66, on the third day of the battle that follows the Gītā, Bhīṣma, the general of the Kauravas, has led such a valiant and successful fight that Arjuna and the Pāṇḍavas had begun to retreat. In anger Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna's charioteer who had promised both sides that he would not take part in the actual fighting (5.7.17), rises from the chariot with discus in hand intent upon killing Bhīṣma. Arjuna, however, stops him and persuades him to return to the chariot with the promise that Arjuna and his men would fight more valiantly. They do this and the tide of the battle turns. As a result, Duryodhana, the leader of the Kauravas, complains that Bhīṣma is partial to the Pāṇḍavas and Bhīṣma responds by narrating a sermonic legend known as the Viśvopākhyāna which does not affect the battle in any material sense but which contains a legend of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna as descents, avatars, respectively of Nārāyaṇa, the Supreme Being, and of the divine sage Nāra. On the ninth day of the battle (6.102.24-52) the same events take place with a large number of verbally identical verses describing them, except that

Arjuna's promise to Kṛṣṇa to fight with more resolve does not affect Bhīṣma's mastery of the day.

The repetition of this incident is without apparent purpose and the verbally identical stanzas clearly argue for the one being the copy of the other. Belvalkar has shown that the first portion of the third day's account and the latter portion of the ninth day's account are the earlier productions based on: (1) the locations of lectio facilioris in the text; (2) the preservation in the early portion of the ninth day's account of Kṛṣṇa's divine status by not indicating in it that Bhīṣma wounded Kṛṣṇa; (3) the reference to Arjuna's boastful words on the third day that is found in the ninth day's account; and (4) the change of the earlier portion of the ninth day's account to explain how Arjuna would still be hesitant to fight after the sermon and vision of the Bhagavadgītā. In the earlier portion of the ninth day's account Arjuna also repeats the promise he had made in Gītā 18.73.

Therefore, the Gītā motif was not introduced on the third day but only on the ninth. Belvalkar concludes that the best explanation of these observations is that the Gītā was not a part of the Mahābhārata when the chronologically earlier portion of the narrative of the third day was written but it was when the former portion of the ninth day's account was added. ²⁰

Similarly Belvalkar suggests that Mahābhārata 6.47.2-30, which resembles Gītā 1.2-19, may belong to the pre-Gītā stage of the Epic. Of the forty-nine half-slokas in the former, nineteen correspond in whole or in part to the thirty-six half-slokas in the Gītā passage. ²¹ Van Buitenen seems to agree that the Gītā is most likely the latter of the two since the difficulties in Gītā 1.10 and the corresponding difficulties of Mbh. 6.47.6, its parallel, are best explained in this sequence. ²²

Though more textual studies are needed, and though the evidence is still slim, these cases do provide the best available hard evidence we currently possess, and they show that the Gītā was added somewhere in the middle of the process of Mahābhārata production and was not, therefore, the earliest part of the Epic. Beyond this conclusion one cannot go, for the evidence is too slim.

Roy, however, has argued that "the Gita was originally an Upaniṣad which was later inserted in the Mahabharata by one of its Editors." ²³ His arguments are inconclusive. For example, he argues that the relationship of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna is the same as the teacher-pupil relationship found in the Upaniṣads, but Dvianji identifies the discussion as "the epic and Pauranic form of a dialogue..." ²⁴ One might also argue that there is not one form of discussion in either set of texts. Similarly, Roy argues that the Gītā has been called an Upaniṣad and that its teaching is assigned to an early period as is that of the early Upaniṣads, facts, however, which are true of other types of literature in India, especially later texts. The allusions and quotations from the early Upaniṣads to which he refers also do not argue that the Gītā was an Upaniṣad but that it was familiar with the Upaniṣads and even that they were old enough to have attained prestige by the time of the Gītā's writing. Thus, his attempt to be more specific about the relationship of the Gītā to the Mahābhārata lacks convincing evidence. At this stage of scholarship all one can say with any probability is that the Gītā is an addition to the Epic as a part of its middle strata.

The Authorship of the Bhagavad-gītā

Matters of authorship and date are, of course, intimately related but the evidence bears on the former first. Traditionally the author is said to be the sage Vyāsa, a Vedic seer. His name actually means "editor, compiler," and may symbolize the process of production or a school of poets. In fact, whoever authored the Gītā referred to him as a known authority in Gītā 10.13, and it is, therefore, highly unlikely that he was the author, for such a referent would lose all value without the benefit of time to give Vyāsa an authoritative reputation.

Upadhyaya has recently argued for reconsideration of Vyāsa as author on the basis of allusions to the Gītā in the Vedānta Sūtras which he is said to have authored as well,²⁵ and the reference to "aphoristic verses of brahman," brahma-sūtra-pada, in Gītā 13.4 which he understands as a reference to the Vedānta Sūtras. Most scholars agree that the Vedānta Sūtras refer to the Gītā when quoting smṛti in a number of places.²⁶ However, there is also much agreement that the Gītā reference does not refer to the Vedānta Sūtras but to the Upaniṣads or, with Śankara, to verses about brahman in the Upaniṣads. This makes the most sense because chapter thirteen of the Gītā goes on to allude to and directly quote verses and partial verses from the Upaniṣads and speaks of these texts because they have some repute, which a work by the same author would not yet have. Therefore, the traditional view of authorship recently supported by Upadhyaya is untenable.

Instead of the traditional view many scholars have argued that the Gītā is not the work of one hand but a composite production. Most have asserted this on the basis of diversity of thought in the Gītā and even apparent contradictions, though they have not always offered sustained arguments. Von Humboldt argued that the original Gītā ended with the

eleventh chapter added to which were 18.63-78, due to the differences he saw in chapters 12-18. ²⁷ Weber believed that the poem was a patchwork, ²⁸ and Holtzmann suggested that there were a number of redactions, making it a Viṣṇuite retelling of an original pantheistic or Vedānta poem, because he saw a contradiction between the teaching of an impersonal "world-soul" and a personal-realistic god, Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu. ²⁹ Hopkins, on the grounds of content and metre, believed that it was "a Krishnaite version of an older Vishnuite poem," which was previously a late, non-sectarian upaniṣad. ³⁰ Deussen saw it as a compilation of three equal parts: chapters one to six as an ethical treatise, seven through twelve as a metaphysical treatise, and thirteen through eighteen as a psychological work. It was, he said, a late product of "decadent Upanisadic thought." ³¹ Jacobi believed the original poem included chapter one and 2.1-6, 9-12, 18, 25-27; 18.73, and that these verses were later elaborated upon by scholasts. ³² F. Otto Schrader argued that the original Gītā came to an end at 2.38, and belonged to a "pre-Vaiṣṇavite Mahābhārata." This was later taken by the Bhāgavatas who made it the introduction to the present Gītā. ³³ Rajaram Shastri Bhagwat suggested that the Gītā passed through six stages from an original sixty-verse form to its present text. His arguments were highly subjective. ³⁴ Carpentier found the original Gītā in chapter one and 2.1-11, 31-38, rejecting passages on grounds such as the inappropriateness of its teachings to the class and period in which it was originally composed, which begs the question. He also rejected later chapters because they contain terms not regularly found in the earlier chapters, and because the earlier chapters do not speak of Kṛṣṇa's divinity. ³⁵ Yet only ksetra, "field," of all the terms he lists is not found in chapters two through eleven, but it is also not found outside of chapter thirteen either, for it is a reference to its usage in earlier literature

with a reinterpretation of its meaning by the Gītā. Similarly the names of Kṛṣṇa in the earlier chapters speak of his divinity and many passages imply and clearly state it. ³⁶

Two German scholars, however, are most well-known for their attempts to discern the original Gītā. Richard Garbe argued that the present Gītā consisted of two redactions. The first, which he dated between 100-150 B.C., consisted of the imposition of elements of the Kṛṣṇa cult on a former Sāṅkhya-Yoga treatise. Kṛṣṇa was thereby identified with Viṣṇu and the result was a theistic Sāṅkhya in a popular devotional text. The second redaction was the addition to the text by brahmins in the second century A.D. of passages which reflect the "pantheism" of the later Vedānta school. These attempted to relate Kṛṣṇa the personal god to the impersonal absolute Brahman. ³⁷

The bases of this theory include philological arguments which Belvalkar has shown are inadequate, ³⁸ the belief that the terms sāṅkhya and yoga refer to the early existence of dualistic systems like those found in later Indian thought, and the belief that two incompatible philosophical positions exist in the Gītā, a theistic Sāṅkhya and a monistic Vedānta. Oldenberg criticised Garbe's belief that there existed an older atheistic sāṅkhya, though he posited an older theistic sāṅkhya. ³⁹ Evidence for such a system is lacking but hints of the position are found in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. Edgerton goes so far as to say that: "The very notion of a philosophic 'system' did not exist in India in the time of the early Upaniṣads and the Gītā."⁴⁰ Similarly Oldenberg, Belvalkar, Roy, and Edgerton, argued effectively that the verses rejected by Garbe often destroyed the connection of ideas and led to further confusion in the resulting reconstruction. ⁴¹

Edgerton also criticized Garbe for applying "modern, occidental and rationalistic principles" to the Gītā, principles which cannot be applied to a "Hindu" work. ⁴² Though this objection is not uncommon, it is questionable, for a "Hindu" work can be as rational as any other and must be tested for such rationality in the midst of its milieu before assuming that it is irrational. ⁴³ Edgerton suggests that the Gītā, which all agree is not a systematic presentation of religious thought, is not always consistent. However, even he provides the key which resolves the apparent inconsistencies, giving a consistent reason for their appearance and a consistent explanation of their meaning: the attempt by the Gītā to reconcile diverse doctrines which were in existence at its time with devotional theism. He does not follow this principle through in his interpretation. ⁴⁴ Yet, for philological, and historical reasons alone, Garbe's theory has been rejected by most scholars.

Garbe's student, Rudolf Otto, took the discussion to what Edgerton has said might be called "the reductio ad absurdum of the Garbe school," yet without the expertise of his teacher. ⁴⁵ Garbe believed that the original Gītā, before the third century B.C., was an epic fragment of 133 stanzas without doctrinal passages, which were later insertions. In this early Gītā Kṛṣṇa did not proclaim a path to liberation, but attempted instead to render Arjuna "willing to undertake the special service of the Almighty will of God who decides the fate of battles." ⁴⁶ To summarize, he found at least nine redactions, eight separate treatises added en bloc, and numerous "interpolations." The eighteen different authors he posited included a dualist bhakta, a non-dualist bhakta, a non-dualist philosopher, a mystic bhakta, a follower of theistic sāṅkhya who placed little emphasis upon bhakta, a follower of theistic yoga.

Belvalkar, in a lengthy article, has documented the many errors of textual understanding on the part of Garbe, ⁴⁷ which Edgerton suggests are probably due to heavy reliance upon a poor German translation of the Gītā: "He lacked Garbe's profound knowledge of Sanskrit, and probably did not realize how he manhandled the language". ⁴⁸

A final attempt to determine the strata of redaction was made by R. Morton Smith with his use of statistical counting methods. ⁴⁹ He determined the ratio of declined stems, nominal compounds and particles to lines, and concluded that chapters one through twelve and 18.55-78 are original to the Gītā, chapters thirteen through sixteen are by another author, and chapters seventeen through 18.54 are by a third author. He also suspected other interpolations and some tampering with chapter ten. He found sixteen major differences out of thirty-eight tests between the first and second authors, twenty-one out of thirty-eight between the first and third authors, and fifteen out of thirty-eight between the second and third authors. Smith admitted the inconclusive nature of his findings but felt that these figures substantiated the probability of different authors for the three units.

Smith was working in a relatively early period of statistical study in which there was a lack of theoretical and methodological sophistication in statistical methodology. He promised further results of this method and indicated the tentative nature of his conclusions, but further work has not been located by this author. The approach may have fallen by the wayside for lack of sophistication as well as for the following questions which have not been answered. Are the samples from each author large enough to determine the average ratio for a writer? G.U. Yule, for example, considered that as a basis for statistical study one needs samples of about ten thousand words. ⁵⁰ How should one weight the admitted

similarities between the authors, which are sometimes greater than the differences, against the differences? Since the Gītā is poetry, how might concerns for metre and sound affect the use of participles, particles, and forms? What are the difficulties in doing such studies in the Sanskrit language? A helpful methodological discussion with appropriate argument would be required to answer these questions before proceeding, but these questions remain unanswered. One wonders if their answers would basically involve subjective judgments.

Such attempts at determining strata in the Gītā failing, De Smet has most recently suggested a more specific understanding of the Gītā's author. He understands him to be "a Bhargava Brahmin, most likely from the region of Mathura." This is based upon the reference to Kṛṣṇa as the subduer of Kāṁsa which formed the subject of dramatic representations staged apparently in the Mathura region in about the second century B.C. which is found in Patanjali on Pāṇini iii.1.26. This reflects the popularity of the Vasudeva-Kṛṣṇa cult among the Vṛṣṇis of that region.⁵¹ De Smet pictures the author as one who is taking up "a human hero, Kṛṣṇa, already legendary and revered among the Vṛṣṇis, to make him a teacher of dharmā," and in so doing credits the Gītā's author as constructing most of a new religious position for Kṛṣṇa found in the Bhagavad-gītā.⁵² His suggestion makes much sense, but one wonders whether this places too much of a burden for creative construction on the author of the text, who by all measures was quite gifted. It does not recognize in the nature of the slim evidence that Kṛṣṇa himself is worshipped as a god and that probably supposes a history prior to the Gītā's authorship.⁵³ In any case, either suggestion is quite speculative. However, the highest of the low probability conclusions available may be the Mathuran authorship of the Gītā.

In summary, then in the current state of Gītā studies, there is no solid evidence to show that the Gītā is other than a basic unity. Many have been able to understand the Gītā in terms of a unity, most recently Edgerton, Zaehner, and myself. ⁵⁴ As Edgerton puts it, "There seems to me to be no definite reason for any other assumption." ⁵⁵ There is also, however, no clear evidence which enables one with probability to identify the Gītā's author, but De Smet's suggestion that the Author is most likely from the region of Mathura, where Kṛṣṇa Worship was popular, is quite intriguing even though the evidence is weak.

The Date of the Bhagavad-gītā

If the Mahābhārata was in a process of production from 400 B.C. to 400 A.D., and the Gītā was worked into that process after the earliest strata but early enough that later editors held it in sufficient esteem to refer their teachings back to it, one might pin the Gītā's date to somewhere between 250 B.C. and 100 A.D., but with little supporting hard evidence.

Modern scholars have ranged widely in their suggestions. On the one hand Tilak has dated the Gītā to before 500 B.C., ⁵⁶ Bhandarkar to before the beginning of the fourth century B.C., ⁵⁷ and Radhakrishnan to the third century B.C. ⁵⁸ On the other hand, Lassen dated it to the third century A.D. ⁵⁹ and Lorinser to 500 A.D. ⁶⁰

Lorinser argues for the late date on the basis of what he believes are borrowings from the Christian New Testament. He collected, in the appendix of his work, passages which he believed differed in expression from the New Testament but agreed in meaning, passages which contain a

characteristic expression of the New Testament but with a different application, and passages which agree both in expression and meaning. A study of the similarities adduced, however, does not show that the common elements are unique either to the Gītā or the New Testament as religious issues, nor in context do they actually agree in expression and meaning. For example, two passages which are understood to agree both in expression and meaning are Gītā 9:31 ("No devotee of mine is lost.") and John 3.16 ("whoever believes in him should not perish, but have eternal life.") Even if the claim of both these passages is that the devotee will overcome the finality of death, one might have a difficult time actually finding a religious text which does not make this claim in some sense. But compare the complete verses in each case: Gītā 9.31, "Quickly his self becomes righteous and he goes to eternal peace, Son of Kunti; be sure of this -- no devotee of mine is lost." John 3.16: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whoever believes in him might not perish but have everlasting life." One might compare the meanings of the concepts at each point and find them different, even though the passages are supposed to agree in both expression and meaning. Compare Kṛṣṇa and the Son of God, or "devotee" with "whoever believes in him" in John. Similarly, given the number of ways one could express these concepts, are they identical in expression when one is in the negative, "no devotee", and the other positive, "whoever believes," or again the positive "is lost" with the negative "shall not perish." Such an example is illustrative of the problem with Lorensen's approach. Yet, even if one could agree to his suggestions, evidence is still needed to show the fact and the direction of influence and not merely similarity of statements.

Other attempts to argue for a date of the Gītā have revolved around the use of external evidence in dating, much of which is itself difficult to date with any probability. Upadhyaya's attempt to identify the author of the Gītā with the author of the Vedānta Sūtras, the date of which he accepts as the fifth or fourth centuries B.C., requires much further data in order to first date the Vedānta Sūtras with any precision.⁶¹ If the Sūtras are dated between 200B.C. and 200 A.D., the Gītā would have to be early in that period because of the references to the Gītā as smṛti, in the Vedānta Sūtras. Telang's attempts to place the Gītā in the third century B.C. because that puts it before the "system-making age of Sanskrit philosophy,"⁶² assumes that one knows when this age had begun, and that once it had begun all the literature reflected that fact. It is clear that the Gītā is not a systematic treatise and that it does not refer to other systems of thought as systems, but does that indicate little more than that the Gītā's author did not believe a systematic presentation was the most effective way to influence his audience? Certainly non-systematic works are found in the age of systems, yet it is possible that the fact that the Gītā does not appear to be relating to systematic treatises but only to the Upanisads may call for a date before 700 A.D.

Telang also argued that the Gītā was written prior to the time when the caste system was hereditary, based upon Gītā 4.13; 18.41-44.⁶³ Yet it is debatable whether the system of varṇas to which the Gītā refers was ever not hereditary. Class, varṇa, is based on inborn traits in the verses quoted above and, thus, varṇa and birth are directly related. Likewise, Gītā 9.32 assumes the idea of lower births in the class structure in order to transcend the resulting improbabilities of liberation: "If they take refuge in me even those who may be of evil birth, women,

vaiśyas and sūdras too, even they go to the highest goal." Class is, in fact, hereditary in the Gītā.⁶⁴

External evidence is difficult to judge because of the difficulty of dating comparative material. The first extant commentary is that of Śaṅkara, who dates to the ninth century A.D.⁶⁵ Kālidāsa, who may be dated in the middle of the fifth century A.D., may have allusions to the Gītā in his work.⁶⁶ Similarly, the Vedānta Sūtras as noted above refer to the Gītā, yet their date is difficult to establish. However, the earliest references to the Gītā as a unity are in the later strata of the Mahābhārata itself, such as the Ādi-parvan (1.2.56). Thus, this fact alone compels one to place the Gītā early in the middle strata of the Mahābhārata production, early enough to allow the Gītā to have become prestigious and authoritative to the authors of such later works as the Anugītā. It had to have gained enough recognition for these authors to find it necessary or desirable to relate their teachings as if they were found in the Gītā, in the same way as the Gītā reads its teachings back into the Upaniṣads, which it recognizes as authoritative.

From internal evidence one is able to reconstruct something of the age in which the Gītā was written. However, the problem with such reconstructions is that they aid little in the placement of the text into a period in Indian history. The same texts which are being matched to an age are the texts which historians have used to originally gain information about an age. The procedure is circular. Historians would appear to be assuming the date of a text and using that to learn about an historical period and students of the text might be tempted to use the historians' reconstruction to place the text into an age. Yet, one can conclude something of the period of the Gītā.

First it is clear that the Gītā was familiar with the early Upaniṣads. It quotes from or alludes to at least thirteen of these texts, with knowledge of their diverse teachings, even though it changes the understandings of these texts quoted to support its own religious position. The texts are consciously used to provide support for the Gītā's stance (13.4). Thus, the Gītā must have been composed at a time when the Upaniṣads had gained authority. If they are dated between 600 and 300 B.C., in order to allow time for their attainment of prestige the Gītā is probably no earlier than 200 B.C. Yet, the Gītā was also probably written before all four Vedas were accepted as authoritative for it refers only to three (9.17,20). This again places it early in the Mahābhārata production because the acceptance of the fourth Veda took place before the later strata of the Epic. ⁶⁷

Second, though the Gītā may contain allusions to the teachings preserved in the Buddhist Pali canon, there are no clear allusions to it. R.C. Zaehner has suggested throughout his commentary that certain concepts reflect such influence, ⁶⁸ and Upadhyaya, through recognizing that, "the Gītā does not contain any direct and clear allusions to the Buddha or Buddhism," believes that it does contain, "ideas, words, and expressions which are strikingly suggestive of Buddhism." ⁶⁹ His suggestion that the criticism of those of a "demonic destiny" in 16.8 is an "indirect allusion to the views of Buddhism," in its denunciation of those who reject a personal god and denounce the world as unsubstantial, is difficult to substantiate. Chapter sixteen does not pinpoint a specific school of thought or religious position, but is criticizing all who do not accept the Gītā's teaching, wherever they may fall in the religious-philosophical spectrum. These are atheists who believe that only desire, kāma, is the

cause of the world (18.8), and yet they also sacrifice with wrong motives and not according to prescribed procedures (16.15.17).

Upadhyaya also notes that the Gītā uses terms which are not found in the Upaniṣads but in Buddhist literature and, one might add, the Mahābhārata: nirvāṇa (Gītā 2.72; 5.24,25,26; 6.15), nirvaira (11.55), adveṣṭa karuṇa and maitra (12.13). Finally he notes that certain doctrines taught in the Gītā are presented in sharp contrast to teachings of the Buddhists, probably as attempts to counteract their influence.⁷⁰ Thus the Gītā's strong support of the caste structure (1.40-45; 2.31-33; 4.13; 18.40-48) may be against the threat of the Buddhists who rejected the caste. The Gītā defends the doing of one's duty (3.26,29, etc.) and the importance of work in the world (3.5, 6, 16, 18; 6.3) and it rejects renunciation (3.9; 5.1-12), all of which may be opposed to the order of Buddhist monks necessary to early Buddhists. For the Gītā actions are in fact necessary for the maintenance of the world, the social thread of society (3.10, 24-25), and one must even be cautious about teaching the truth if it will cause someone to cease his active duty (3.26, 29). Upadhyaya concludes that for these reasons one must assume that Buddhist ideas were circulating in the society of the Gītā's time. Though this is quite weak, for the concepts are not distinctively Buddhist, such could support a date for the Gītā after 350 B.C. for the Buddha is usually dated between 563-483 B.C. and "Second Buddhist Council" about 100 years after his death.

Internal evidence also indicates that the age of the Gītā is a period of competing devotional movements. The Gītā recognizes that others worship other gods than Kṛṣṇa, but supports the superiority of Kṛṣṇa (7.20-23; 9.23-25), and speaks of those who oppose Kṛṣṇa (9.11) and

misunderstand his nature (7.24).⁷¹ The Mahābhārata also reflects the clash of sectarian movements.

Finally, the period of the Gītā is one of competing paths to liberation and various dharmas required of those who seek such. The variety includes renunciation (eg. 18.3), devotion to other gods, realization of an impersonal Absolute (6.21-23; 12.1-5), as well as materialistic hedonists (16.5-15) and Vedic ritual (2.42-46; 3.10-14). The types of sacrifice listed in 4.25-30, may suggest a variety of contemporary paths available. It is in many ways, then, a period of ferment and free thinking much like the period reflected in the Pali canon.

The nature of the evidence, therefore, constrains one from placing too great a certainty upon one's conclusions, but the period of the Gītā probably centers around 150-100 B.C. This reflects its knowledge of the early Upaniṣads and its quotations and allusions to them as authoritative, the probably affect of the early buddhist teachings on the Gītā, the fact that it suits a period of religious ferment and competition of paths, and the fact that the Gītā's relationship to the Mahābhārata is probably addition to it in the early middle strata, allowing time for it to gain an importance by the latter strata of the Epic production and before recognition of the four Vedas as authoritative. The evidence is weak, sometimes circumstantial, and the conclusions are fragile and highly speculative. Yet, in order not to remain silent, the date of the Gītā appears to center around 150-100 B.C., give or take 100 years.

One more specific suggestion is that of R. Morton Smith, who believed that the Gītā was composed between 210-200 B.C. on the slim evidence that it mirrors the situation at Pāṭaliputra on the death of Śālīśūka, the bandhu regent in 212 B.C.⁷² However, if the Puranic legends are reliable, Śālīśūka

was willing to kill his own kin and Arjuna was not, yet the evidence is too slim for such precision. The Gītā could mirror many situations, depending upon which elements of the image one selects as one looks in the mirror, and the element which Smith chooses actually best fits the Mahābhārata, where the kin are killed and not the Gītā which pictures Arjuna's reluctance. The Mahābhārata as a whole justifies Śāliśūka. The Gītā is unnecessary.

Tentatively, the Gītā may be dated to 150-100 B.C. with recognition that this is low probability.

The History of the Gītā's Text

The Bhagavad-gītā has been well preserved, with few variant readings and none serious. In contrast, the Mahābhārata as a whole has numerous variants with some quite serious. The number of stanzas in the Gītā is 700 and this number corresponds to that given by Śaṅkara in his ninth-century commentary.

Some concern has been expressed over the number of verses reflected in the Gītā-prasasti in Mahābhārata 6.43.4: "Keśava spoke 620 ślokas, Arjuna fifty-seven, Saṁjāya sixty-seven, and Dhṛtarāṣṭra one; such is the extent of the Gītā." This totals 745 ślokas, and of the extant manuscripts the one with the most verses has only 715. There has been some discussion of this discrepancy and attempts to reconcile the numbers,⁷³ but the passage is clearly a later interpolation and Belvalkar has attempted to explain its inclusion in the Mahābhārata.⁷⁴ There is, therefore, no reason to doubt the extent of the Gītā in the critical edition, which has 700 verses.

Only recently has the history of the text transmission been probed. The critical edition of the Bhīṣma-parvan speaks of a "Northern Recension"

consisting of Śāradā, Kāśmīra, Bengali, and other Devanāgarī manuscripts, and a "Southern Recension" of Telegu, Grantha, and Malayālam versions. The manuscripts of the Śāradā-Kāśmīrī tradition are the best for the Mahābhārata as a whole, including the Bhīṣma-parvan, yet they are late and secondary as far as the Gītā is concerned, a fact which, as van Buitenen points out, may be due to a larger and older apparatus for the Gītā than for the Epic as a whole. 75

F. Otto Schraeder has argued for a Kashmir recension of the Gītā which contains fourteen whole and four half stanzas not found in the "Vulgate" of Śaṅkara's commentary. It also lacks two stanzas of the "Vulgate," places one stanza in a different position, and has variant readings in some 250 of the 700 verses. Schraeder believed this recension was closer to the original Gītā than the "Vulgate." 76

Belvalkar in an extensive study has shown that the variant readings of the Kashmir recension are secondary, and noted that in many places where Schraeder has reconstructed the Kashmir recension, extant Kashmir manuscripts do not agree, but instead support the "Vulgate." 77

Recently van Buitenen has called attention to another set of readings which were accepted by the early commentator Bhāskara, who also knew the "Vulgate." 78 Bhāskara's text, where it is determinable, is probably chronologically older, being distinctly superior in terms of the canons of textual criticism.

Unfortunately, it is fragmentary, but it appears to be a prototype of the so-called Kashmir recension. Thus, from the current state of textual studies of the Gītā, van Buitenen's reconstruction of the textual history sums up the evidence. From the "original" text, two branches have resulted: (1) the "Vulgate" of Śaṅkara; (2) the text of Bhāskara. The Kashmir recension, then, is a further development out of Bhāskara's recension.

Conclusions

Little can be concluded with much probability about introductory matters of Gītā scholarship. However, as best one can determine, the Gītā was added to the Mahābhārata, written in by an editor early in its middle strata at about the same time of its composition, around 150-100 B.C. It is a basic unity whose authorship is unknown, but which became a unit of the Epic which held enough prestige to inspire later contributors to the Epic to claim that the Gītā actually taught what they espoused. This claim has been regularly made since for almost every metaphysical position espoused in India.

Notes

*This investigation was partially funded by a grant from the "General Research Fund" of the University of Kansas.

¹For example almost every secondary monograph argues that karma-yoga is non-attached action. Yet numerous articles on the subject have been written, none of which indicates that the author knew of previous work. These include Richard De Smet, "A Copernican Reversal: The Gitakara's Reformulation of Karma," Philosophy East and West XXVII, No. 7 (January, 1977), 53-63; J.T.F. Jordens, "Bhagavadgita: Karma Exorcised," Millawa-Milla, the Australian Bulletin of Comparative Religion IV (1964), 22-30; K.E. Parthasarathy, "The Philosophy of Niskama Karma in the Bhagvad-Gita," The Aryan Path XXXVIII, No.4 (April, 1967), 160-4; R.K. Garg, "The Gita-Principle of Detached Activism," Prabuddha Bharata LXXIV (July, 1969), 310-14; etc.

²Aspects of Sanskrit Literature (Calcutta: Firma K.L.M. Private Ltd., 1976), 37.

³Edward L. Dimock, et. al.. The Literature of India: An Introduction (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 49.

⁴J.A.B. van Buitenen, The Mahābhārata (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), I, xxiii.

⁵For a discussion of the historicity of the Mahābhārata see S.P. Gupta and K.S. Ramachandran, ed., Mahabharata: Myth and Reality, Differing Views (Delhi: Agam Prakashan, 1976).

⁶K.N. Upadhyaya, Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971), 5. Most of Upadhyaya's arguments follow the work of Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā Rahasya. Translated by Bhalchandra Sitaram Sukthankar, 2 vols. Poona: Lokamanya Tilak Mandir, 1936).

⁷Kashinath Trimbak Telang, The Bhagavadgītā with the Sanatsujātiya and the Anugītā (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965 rpt.), 6.

⁸R.C. Zaehner, The Bhagavadgītā with a Commentary Based on the Original Sources (London: Oxford University Press, 1969), 6-7.

⁹S.C. Roy, The Bhagavad-gītā and Modern Scholarship (London: Luzac and Co., 1941), 83-88.

¹⁰See the list in Parameswara Aiyar, "Imitations of the Bhagavad-gītā and Later Gītā Literature," in The Cultural Heritage of India (2nd ed., Calcutta: The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, 1962), II, 204-5.

¹¹Arvind Sharma, "The Role of the Anugītā in the Understanding of the Bhagavadgītā," Religious Studies XIV, No.2 (June, 1978), 261-7.

¹²Ibid., 264-5

¹³K.T. Telang, The Bhagavadgītā..., 6.

¹⁴Robert N. Minor, "The Gītā's Way as the Only Way," Philosophy East and West XXX, No.3 (June, 1980).

¹⁵K.N. Upadhyaya, Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā, 6-7. Cf. Tilak, Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā Rahasya, 723-4.

¹⁶For example see E. Washburn Hopkins, The Great Epic of India: Its Character and Origin (New York: Scribner's 1902), 193-203.

¹⁷K.N. Upadhyaya, Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā, 7; K.T. Telang, The Bhagavadgītā..., 13.

¹⁸B.N. Krishnamurti Sarma, "The Grammar of the Gītā -- A Vindication," Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute XI, no.3 (July, 1930), 288. This article is a defense of the Gītā against the criticisms of V.K. Rajawade who finds it inferior in comparison with classical Sanskrit style ("Bhagavadgītā from Grammatical and Literary Points of View," in Commemorative Essays Presented to Sir Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1917), 325-338.

¹⁹S.C. Roy, The Bhagavad-gītā and Modern Scholarship, 80. Roy rejects Tilak's examples of similarities (Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā Rahasya, 725-32).

²⁰S.K. Belvalkar, "Some Interesting Problems in Mahābhārata Text Transmission: No.3," Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute XXVI, 106-119. See also S.K. Belvalkar, "The Bhagavad-gītā: A General review of its History and Character," in The Cultural Heritage of India, II, 136-7.

²¹S.K. Belvalkar, The Bhīṣmaparvan. Vol. II in The Mahābhārata (Critical Edition), ed. by Vishnu S. Sukthankar, et. al (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1931), 788.

²²J.A.B. van Buitenen, "A Contribution to the Critical Edition of the Bhagavadgītā" Journal of the American Oriental Society LXXXV, No.1 (March, 1965), 102.

²³The Bhagavadgītā and Modern Scholarship, 141-5.

²⁴P.C. Divanji, "Bhagavadgītā and Bhāgavata Purāṇa as Models for the Yogavāsistha," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay 134-35 (1959-60), 50.

²⁵K.N. Upadhyaya, Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā, 25-6. This was previously argued by Subba Rao in the preface to Index to the Kumbhakona Edition of the Mahābhārata (T.R. Krsnacharyya, 1914). Cf. Tilak, Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā Rānasya, 753-4, for another view.

²⁶On this issue see P.M. Modi, "Brahmasūtrakāra: As Interpreter of the Gita," Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute XXIV, No.1-4 (1968), 139-50.

²⁷"Ueber die unter dem Namen Bhagavadgītā bekannte Episode des Mahābhārata," K. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Abhandlungen (1926), 1-64.

²⁸Albrecht Weber, Indische Studien. Beiträge für die Kunde des indischen Altertums II (Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1853), 394.

²⁹Das Mahābhārata und seine Teile II (Kiel: C.F. Haeseler, 1894), 163-5.

³⁰The Religions of India (Boston: Gin and Co., 1895), 389.

³¹Der Gesang des Heiligen, eine philosophische Episode des Mahābhāratam (1911).

³²"Die Bhagavadgītā," Deutsche Literaturzeitung XLII (December, 1921), 715-24: "Weiteres zum Bhagavadgītā Problem," Deutsche Literaturzeitung XLIII (April, 1922), 266-73: "Über die Einfügung der Bhagavadgītā im Mahābhārata," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft LXXII (1910), 323-27.

³³Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft LXXX (1918), 339-40.

³⁴Vividhājhavistār, No.7 (1906), 273-83.

³⁵"Some Remarks on the Bhagavadgita," The Indian Antiquary LIX (May, 1930), 80.

³⁶Ibid., (June, 1930), 103-5. For other theories see also L.D. Barnett, The Bhagavadgītā (London: J.M. Dent & Co., 1907), 75; and A.B. Keith, The Sāṃkhya System, A History of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy (Calcutta: Association Press, 1918) 33-4.

³⁷Richard Garbe, Die Bhagavadgītā aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt mit einer Einleitung über ihre ursprüngliche Gestalt, ihre Lehren und ihr Alter (1st ed., Leipzig: H. Haessel Verlag, 1905), 13-18.

³⁸S.K. Belvalkar, Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Fellowship Lectures on Vedanta Philosophy (Poona: Bilvankunja Publishing House, 1929), I, 91-101.

³⁹"Bemerkungen zur Bhagavadgītā," Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (1919), 328-38. For a similar critique see E. Lamote, Notes sur la Bhagavadgita (Paris: Geuthner, 1929), 19-35.

⁴⁰Franklin Edgerton, The Bhagavadgītā (I Vol. edition, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944), 108.

⁴¹Oldenberg, "Bemerkungen zur Bhagavadgita," 328-38; S.K. Belvalkar, Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures, 91-101; S.C. Roy, The Bhagavad-Gita and Modern Scholarship, 36-56; and Franklin Edgerton, "On Some Translations and Methods of Interpretation of the Gita," in The Bhagavad Gita or Song of the Blessed One (Chicago: Open Court, 1925), 97-100.

⁴²Franklin Edgerton, "On Some Translations and Interpretations of the Gita," 98.

⁴³A.C. Das goes so far as to say, "It is a travesty of fact to assert that we in India only worship contradictions. It is far less true to assert that the Gita is riddled with contradictions because we find them in its source, that is, the Upanisads." ("Interpretations of the Bhagavadgītā," Calcutta Review Series 3, No. 155 (April, 1960). Other scholars have attempted rational explanations of the "contradictions" in the Gītā: K.V. Apte, "Contradictions in the Bhagavadgītā," Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay. New Series. XXXIX-XL (1964-5), 105-24; and Arvind Sharma, Thresholds in Hindu-Buddhist Studies (Calcutta: Minerva Associates, 1979), 112-133.

⁴⁴For an attempt to do this see Robert N. Minor, Bhagavad-gītā: An Exegetical Commentary (Columbia, Mo.: South Asia Books, forthcoming, 1981).

- 45 Review of "The Original Gītā: The Song of the Supreme Exalted One. By Rudolf Otto. Translated and edited by J.E. Turner," Review of Religion (New York) IV (May, 1940), 448.
- 46 Rudolf Otto, The Original Gītā: The Song of the Supreme Exalted One, translated and edited by J.E. Turner (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1939), 14.
- 47 S.K. Belvalkar, "Miscarriage of Attempted Stratification of the Bhagavadgītā," Journal of the University of Bombay V, No.6 (May, 1937), 63-133.
- 48 Franklin Edgerton, Review of "The Original Gītā..." 448.
- 49 "Statistics of the Bhagavadgita," Journal of the Gaganatha Jha Research Institute XXIV, No. 1-4, (1968), 39-46.
- 50 G.U. Yule, The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary (Cambridge: University Press, 1944), 281.
- 51 "Gita in Time and Beyond Time," in B.R. Kulkarni, The Bhagavad Gita and the Bible (Delhi: Unity Books, 1972), 2.
- 52 Ibid., 28.
- 53 R.G. Bhandarkar, "Allusions to Krishna in Patanjali's Mahābhāshya," The Indian Antiquary III (January, 1874), 14-16.
- 54 Franklin Edgerton, The Bhagavadgītā (Cambridge); R.C. Zaehner, The Bhagavadgītā with Commentary: and Robert N. Minor, Bhagavad-gīta An Exegetical Commentary.
- 55 Franklin Edgerton, The Bhagavadgītā (Cambridge), xi.
- 56 Srīmad Bhagavadgītā Rahasya, 791
- 57 Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems (Varanasi: Indological Book House, 1965 rpt.), 13.
- 58 The Bhagavadgītā with an Introductory Essay, Sanskrit Text, English Translation and Notes (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1948), 14.
- 59 Beitragē zur Kunde des Indischen Alterthums aus dem Mahabharata II, 121.
- 60 Die Bhagavad Gita uebersetzt und erlāutert (Breslau, 1869), appendix.

⁶¹Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā, 22-29

⁶²The Bhagavadgītā with ..., 7.

⁶³Ibid..

⁶⁴See R.W. Stevenson, "Interpretations of the Doctrine of Varna in the Bhagavadgita," Journal of Social Research (Ranchi) XIX, No.1 (March, 1971-76), 85-7.

⁶⁵Srīmadbhagavadgītā. Ānadaḡiri-kṛtatīkāsamvalita-Śāṅkara-bhāṣya-samaveta, ed. by Kāśināth and V.G. Apte (Bombay: Anandasrama Press, 1936) See also Bhagavad Gītā with Commentaries of Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhva and the Glosses of Vedanta Desika and Jayatirtha (Madras: Ananda Press, 1911) or Alladi Mahadeva Sastry, The Bhagavad-gita with the Commentary of Shri Sankaracharya (Madras: V. Ramaswamy Sastrulu and Sons, 1961).

⁶⁶See K.N. Upadhyaya, Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā, 20; and K.T. Telang, The Bhagavadgītā with..., 29.

⁶⁷The Mahābhārata speaks of the "three vedas" (eg. 3.198.23; 12.18.11; 219.14; 262.13; 13.107.145) and people who "know the three Vedas" (6.33.21; 12.65.18; 66.12; 155.9; 13.129.6) as well as the "four Vedas" (12.46.22; 50.32; 3.204.22). The Artharva-veda is referred to in 3.239.20; 1.64.4; 2.11.23; 5.18.5; 12.328.8; etc.

⁶⁸The Bhagavadgītā with a commentary, 125-6, 153, 158, etc.

⁶⁹"The Impact of Early Buddhism on Hindu Thought (with Special Reference to the Bhagavadgītā)," Philosophy East and West XVIII, No.3 (July, 1968), 165.

⁷⁰Ibid., 166-72.

⁷¹Robert N. Minor, "The Gītā's Way as the Only Way."

⁷²"Statistics of the Bhagavadgita," 41.

⁷³See S.N. Tadpatrikar, "The Computation of the Bhagavadgītā," Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute XVIII, 357-60; and F.O. Schrader, "An Implication of the Bhagavadgītā Riddle," New Indian Antiquary I, No.1, 62-68.

⁷⁴"The Bhagavadgītā 'Riddle' Unriddled," Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute XIX, No.4, 335-48.

⁷⁵J.A.B. van Buitenen, "A Contribution to the Critical Edition of the Bhagavadgītā," 101.

⁷⁶The Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavad-gīta (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930).

⁷⁷"The So-Called Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavad-gīta," New Indian Antiquary II, No.4 (July, 1939), 211-51. See also Franklin Edgerton, "Review of F. Otto Schraeder, The Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavadgīta," Journal of the American Oriental Society LII (1932), 68-75.

⁷⁸"A Contribution to the Critical Edition of the Bhagavadgītā," 99-109. On Bhaskara see B.N. Krishnamurti Sarma, "Bhaskara -- a Forgotten Commentator on the Gīta," Indian Historical Quarterly IX (September, 1933), 663-77; J.A.B. van Buitenen, "The Relative Dates of Saṅkara and Bhāskara," The Adyar Library Bulletin XXV (1962), 268-73; and V. Raghavan, "Bhāskara's Gītābhāṣya," Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Sued-und Ostasiens, und Archiv für indische Philosophie.Wien. XII/XIII (1968/69), 281-94.