

REMARKS ON THE PRINCETON TRANSLATION
OF VĀLMĪKI RĀMĀYAṆA
ESP. ON VOL. III BY SH. I. POLLOCK

§ 1. *The Critical Edition is based upon the Southern Recension;
critique*

The VRā. mss. can be divided into two recensions, the SR and the NR, the latter can be sub-divided into three sub-recensions: NW, W, NE; (henceforward 'Ne rec.' means NE sub-recension). Through comparison of the recensions the Crit.Ed. has discerned the later interpolations, on the whole in a reasonable manner; these have been relegated to the critical apparatus or one of the appendices.

As the base of the text the SR has been chosen on the ground that it should be more original because it contains more grammatically irregular forms than the NR. In Northern these forms should have been polished off: the polishing theory. This theory is untenable (Van Daalen 1980, 27 ff.). Further, I have tried to show that Vālmīki hardly ever used irregular forms, and that, consequently, that rec. which contains least of them, viz. the NR, ought to have been taken as a base for a critical edition. Whether a reconstruction of the original text is feasible in face of the often wide divergence of the recensions and mss., is another question. However, if one tries, one should select the best recension (Van Daalen 1980; for a survey see 1989; cf. 1986).

Pollock (1991, 313 n. ad 3,45,5) states that he has tried to show that my claims cannot be sustained, referring to Pollock 1984, 82-93.

This is simply not true, for he does not take issue with my observations and arguments there, for “a detailed discussion” referring to Goldman’s review of Van Daalen 1980: *Journal of Asian Studies*, 41 (1981), 874-877 (Pollock’s own reference JAS 42 (1982), 209-210 is incorrect).

Again, this is not true. Goldman did not discuss the issues at stake, he did not even mention my observations and arguments (Van Daalen 1986, n. 18-19).

§ 2. *General critical remarks*

Before paying attention to Pollock’s defence of the alleged superiority of the SR in § 3 some objectionable practices will be mentioned and a major difference of opinion (the (non-)assumption of an archetype) will be discussed. It would seem that I am criticizing Pollock only. However, he is the spokesman of the Princeton translators, offering the theoretical base for their view that the Crit.Ed. was right in holding the SR to be the superior recension, in Goldman 1984. So the latter, editor-in-chief, must be held responsible too for what Pollock writes.

1. Pollock does not discuss all the relevant secondary literature; for instance, Brockington 1984 is mentioned, but is not discussed.

2. He sometimes does not even mention the relevant secondary literature; for instance that on the longer verses or on the assumption of an archetype, the most surprising example being an article on the relation of the VRā. and the *Rāmopakhyāna* by Van Nooten, one of the Princeton translators, in IT 8/9 (1980/81), 293-305; see further sub 3.

3. Pollock repeats antique arguments without mentioning the authors who have refuted them already:

- The SR is said (1984, 89 n. 21) to be more akin to the *Rāmopakhyāna* than the NR, an argument of Ruben, on which see Van Daalen 1980, 49-56 and the article by Van Nooten just mentioned.
- The commentators are said to have been helpful in preserving the

conservative state of the SR (1984,86 n. 10). This is nonsense: the commentators appear many centuries after the split into the recensions and they did not know each other's recensions. So they are testimonia for their own recensions only and are pretty useless when one wants to reconstruct the original text; see Van Daalen 1980,17 ff.

4. Pollock (1991,18) even digs up an antique argument which was rightly forgotten: that of Ruben on Rāma's alleged divinity, see below § 4 (end).

5. Pollock (1984,88) does not recognize an archetype; see also 1991, 350 f., where he hesitates to regard one of the two versions of Kabandha's story at the beginning of 3,67 as secondary, because both the SR and the NR contain both versions, which "thus *ex hypothesi* revert to the monumental poem of Vālmiki" (on this passage see Van Daalen 1980,163 f.; 193; in my opinion 3,67, 2-6 is an early interpolation, not to be ascribed to the Poet's text).

The assumption of an archetype in a transmission that has been partly oral is not self-evident. Nevertheless I agree with Ruben on his conclusion that an archetype must once have existed; maybe the latter is right when he thinks that some mss. may have survived the emergence of the archetype (1936,56 and 60 resp.).

Pollock accepts the Crit.Ed.'s method of eliminating later interpolations, and he ascribes the text-kernel thus obtained to the Poet. However, layers are discernable therein. The bulk of it may be ascribed to the Poet himself, but there are passages, layers, that are later, 'secondary'. In contradistinction to the later interpolations, which occur in a number of mss. only, these secondary, unoriginal, passages can be regarded as early interpolations, although they are present in the text-kernel. This kernel is the frame of reference. One might invent some other term, but what one does in fact is practising higher criticism while regarding the reconstructed text-kernel as a reconstructed archetype.

Pollock (1991,18 f.) speaks disparagingly about "higher criticism" (quotation marks his), with some vague accusations of arbitrariness.

ness. He might have a case, if every scholar cherished his own interpolations. What I have observed, however, is that, in a number of case, the self-same passages are recognized as early interpolations by different scholars using different methods, see Van Daalen 1980,11; 189 ff.; 1989,29 f. This cannot be due to chance. There are layers in the text-kernel.

Because Pollock does not recognize layers, he is forced to accept the longer verses as original, trying to turn their defect (they are often out of step with the context) into a virtue, whereas this defect is precisely the argument to regard them as secondary.

Pollock made his disparagingly remark on higher criticism in the context of his attempted proof that Rāma was divine in the original VRā. *sarga* 6,105, wherein the gods call Rāma a god, is genuine according to him, whereas other scholars think it is not; (on this *sarga* see below § 4).

§ 3. *Pollock's arguments for regarding the Southern Recension as superior; critique*

3.1. Pollock's arguments

Pollock (1984,85 ff.) tries to prove the superiority of the SR, not with the aid of the polishing theory, which is said to be no longer tenable because the NR, too, has irregular forms, but with the aid of a glossing theory. The NR should have made a lot of arbitrary changes on the one hand, but on the other hand it should have glossed the text of the SR, because people in North India were in need of some simpler Sanskrit.

The SR is said to be more conservative because «in the South the religious significance imputed to the text lent it an almost scriptural status, insulating it to a greater extent from alteration». The commentators are thought to have been helpful in this preservation (1984,86 n. 10).

The SR is called “archaic” a number of times.

3.2. Critique

3.2.1. The Southern Recension is not archaic

The grammatically irregular forms are not archaic, as Boehtlingk

observed already, ZDMG 43 (1889),53; cf. Van Daalen 1974,13; 1980,23 f.

Instances of a rambling syntax are not archaic; they are a feature of the speech of the less well-educated and the negligent, and of foreigners. Such a feature is observable anywhere any time.

As for the vocabulary I see no archaisms in the SR. Pollock assumes in quite a number of cases a “unique sense” of a word in the SR (and the NR should have glossed the text by adopting a more current word, see below § 6). However, anything like a substitution of words with a Vedic meaning by more modern words is not observable.

The claim of the SR being archaic has not been substantiated and is baseless.

3,2.2. Commentators have not preserved the original text

On this antique argument see § 2.3

3,2.3. What do we know of the religious significance of the text?

Pollock speaks of «the religious significance imputed to the text ... (which insulated) it to a greater extent from alteration»; this argument would look impressive if, in the first millennium of our era, Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* had had the same impact as Tulsīdās's *Rāmāyaṇa* and that of the Vaiṣṇavite commentators, centuries after 1000 AD. To be more precise: what do we know of any Rāma devotion that would lend a “religious significance” to any *Rāmāyaṇa* between the sixth c. AD (or earlier), when the split into a NR and a SR already existed (cf. Van Daalen 1980, 18), and 1000, 1100, 1200 AD? The statement about the “religious significance” is too loose, due, I am afraid, to a failure to see development and change, due to a tendency of seeing India as part of the ‘East that never changes’, of regarding something that existed in 1400 AD as having existed ever before.

And even if this “religious significance” could be made plausible, it is not relevant to the problem of *Rāmāyaṇa* textual criticism: there is no valid argument for holding the SR to be the superior recension. For Pollock's glossing theory is unacceptable; I am afraid ‘silly’ is a better term.

3,2.4.1. The glossing theory is unacceptable

In another publication (1992) I have tried to show that the glossing theory is baseless. For one thing, there is no discussion of how to discern glosses from arbitrary changes, or in other words, I fail to see why the alleged instances should be glosses at all (cf. Van Daalen 1986,411 f.). Moreover, when we examine the seven instances obviously regarded as representative (six out of the seven mentioned in 1984,86 n. 11 were already mentioned in Pollock 1979), we see that four of them occur in a context that has arguably been altered in the SR, that two cases cannot be glosses at all, and that one case is an instance of a variant reading on which no theory can be based. Finally, such a glossing is unlikely to have occurred. Look at the simplest case: there is a reading of the SR and an alleged gloss in the NR. Remember the glossing process is said to have lasted for centuries. For one transmitter citing the text from memory while glossing it at the same time would not do. We would be back at square one, the theory of Schlegel criticized by Jacobi (by the way, the Crit.Ed. is back to square one, ascribing to Jacobi the theory he criticized, see Van Daalen 1992). So the process is said to have lasted for centuries. This means that somewhere some time a bard glossed a phrase and that his gloss caught on in such a way as to spread across the whole of North India during the centuries. Is this likely? And if it could be admitted in a single case, is it likely to have occurred on such a scale as to allow us to posit a wholesale glossing of the text?

Must we assume a tendency to uniformity amidst the tendency of divergence we must ascribe partly to oral transmission?

This theory is a means of destroying the evidence of the mss., the only certainty we have. Wherever the mss. agree on a reading, it must be ascribed to their archetype. So if the NR agrees on one, it is the original Northern reading; it may be right or wrong when compared with the relevant reading of the SR (in my opinion it will be in most cases be right, but that is not now at issue), but do not say: the unanimity of the NR was not always there, it is the result of a secondary process towards uniformity.

3,2.4.2. Alleged glosses in VRā. III

When I look at the instances adduced of so-called glosses in VRā. III, I see no reason to alter my opinion.

On the contrary: when I read the note ad 3,15,11: «‘Mornings’ *divasāḥ*: we must either read *pratyūṣāḥ* with NE mss. for the *divasāḥ* of the Crit.Ed. (...), or interpret that NE variant as a gloss on the reading of the crit. ed. (as I have done) and understand it in the sense of ‘daybreaks’. Neither solution is very attractive ...» and further when I read the note 3,26,6: «‘so’ *tena*: note the glossarial variants of the NR for this adverbial signification (*evam*)», then I wonder how long people will be duped by this kind of silly theories.

VRā. III, 23, 3 ff.

The note ad 3,23,3b reads: «‘of mass destruction’ *sarvabhūtāpahāriṇaḥ*: the variants of the NR confirm this meaning for the compound....». So the NR variants for *pāda* b are regarded as a gloss on the SR. Here below I shall show that there are a lot of changes in the SR up to *śloka* 12 of this *sarga*. If this is correct, it is highly unlikely that we have to do with a NR gloss at 3b.

In *pāda* d the Crit.Ed. reads *°rākṣasān* where the NR reads *mānuṣān*. The malicious question here is, of course, is this a gloss? It is not, of course: *Mānuṣān* is more likely to be the original reading than *°rākṣasān*. The *rākṣasa* Khara is on the march against Rāma, *sarga* 3,21. There are ominous portents, 3,22. Rāma sees these portents that pose a threat to all creatures, but limit their threat to the *rākṣasas* according to the SR and the Crit.Ed., or to men according to the NR. All his arrows are smoldering, 3,23,5. He says: We are in danger and our lives are in jeopardy, 23,6. 23,7: «There will be a great clash of arms. The constant twitching of my arm tells me so». ‘Twitching’: *sphuramāṇo*, wrong voice; the NE has ‘right arm’ (auspicious!) and *sphurati*, correct voice. 23,8: «But your face looks bright and clear, ... brother. This means victory is at hand for us, and defeat for our enemy». ‘Men’ at 23,3 is more likely the original reading: the threat is against men, but not against any man, but against Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa themselves, 23,6. However, there is an auspicious omen at 8, and in NE already at 7, which makes sense. The NE reading is the correct one, also because of the correct voice of *sphur-*. At 8 *jaya-* and *vijaya-*, ‘victory’ and ‘defeat’ are n. instead of m. in 12/15 S + 2/4 W and the Crit.Ed. NE has the correct gender. We shall

pursue this episode a bit further. Rāma says that a wise man should be prepared against any misfortune before it arrives and he orders his brother to bring Sītā to a safe place. 12 ab: *pratikūlitum icchāmi na hi vākyaṃ idaṃ tvayā*, which Pollock translates: «I do not want you to question this command of mine»; his note ad locum reads: «... The infinitive has a definite passive aspect, a rare usage (though cf. 5,33,59)». This is not the whole story, however. Both at 5,33,59 (in the SR, not in the NR!) and here we see an instance of a construction which does not exist in Skt.: an *accusativus cum infinitivo*: see Speijer (1886) 1968,307 n. 3; Van Daalen 1974,319. Speijer, l.c., points out that *pratikūlitum* is an incorrect infinitive form (for *pratikūlayitum*), that the text is corrupt, and that the right reading is *pratikūlitam* (read by three N mss. plus one S ms.).

(At 3,8,21 Sītā says: ... *hantuṃ rākṣasān ... na kāmāye*, which does not mean «I don't want to kill r.», but which must mean: «I don't want the r. to be killed», another corruption of the SR).

So in the passage 3,23,3d - 12b we see a number of corruptions in the SR. It is unlikely, therefore, that the NR reading in *pāda* 3b is a "gloss" on the reading of the SR.

§ 4. Rāma's alleged divinity

Pollock (1991,15-54) tries to prove Rāma's divinity; notice that Goldman does not agree with him on this point.

For over more than a century, European scholars hold that Rāma is human in the original *Rāmāyaṇa*, that is to say the *Rāmāyaṇa* of round about 400 BC, when VRā. I and VII did not exist yet. What the commentators have to say on this subject is not relevant, because there is a time gap between them and the original *Rāmāyaṇa* of at least 1500 years. Pollock's copious quotations from them may be interesting from the point of view of the history of Hinduism of pre-modern times, they cannot shed light on the question at issue, for we are concerned with the original text, not with their expanded version.

Pollock argues that Rāma acts as a king and is seen as one during his exile and that he, therefore, may be claimed to be as divine as any other Indian king (1991,43 ff.): this blurs the issue. As Pollock himself remarks, divinity is cheap in India, brahmins and husbands are

divine too. This is not the kind of divinity we are concerned with in this case. The creature needed to kill Rāvaṇa

Pollock's main argument is the miraculous creatures that are needed to kill a cosmic evil-doer, owing to the boon of near-invulnerability they had received. A case in point is the Man-Lion, who had to kill someone who could not be killed by gods, *gandharvas* and so on, men. Because in this case (and in other cases as well) a miraculous creature was needed, the being that slew Rāvaṇa must have been greater than a man, too - this is at least the argument. What should be remembered, however, is that Rāvaṇa could be killed by a man only. So, if the poet had presented Rāma as being greater than man, he would have run into narrative difficulties.

- Pollock, 1991,27, points to 6,82,24 ff. and 6,99,8 ff. where *rākṣasīs* think Rāma is Viṣṇu or one of the other gods. What the other characters think in times of distress is not that important. (Cf. Brockington 1984,219).
- In interpolations the divinity of Rāma and his brothers come to the fore; the references will be mentioned below.
- In the constituted text there are two places which are of interest in this respect: 6,47,104; 115 (where Lakṣmaṇa remembers he is part of Viṣṇu) and 6,105,5 ff. (the gods call Rāma a god).

As to 6,47 I cannot add anything to the higher criticism of predecessors. As to 6,105 it should be observed that it is part of the passage describing Sītā's Fire Ordeal, another late passage according to predecessors. In this case I have offered an additional argument for its lateness: we see a cluster of irregular forms that are transmitted by (almost) all the mss. in this passage. There is a correlation between late passages and clusters of best-attested irregular forms. See Van Daalen 1980,189 ff. and 11 f. resp.; cf. 1992 (appendix); Brockington 1984,329; 343; 345.

Vālmīki depicted Rāma as a man (cf. Pollock 1991,25 f.) and I see no reason to believe that he was more than man in the original *Rāmāyaṇa*.

4.1. Three dubious translations

There are three dubious translations in Pollock 1991 in order to prove Rāma's divinity:

3,54,14 *daivatasamyuktaḥ*: 'his divine powers', though Pollock admits that the phrase is "unusual". The variant *devarasamyuktaḥ* 'accompanied by his brother-in-law' is the correct reading.

3,66,11 *devaprabhāva*- need not be 'who has the power of a god', it may be a *bahuvrīhi* with a simile built-in: 'who has powers like those of a god'.

At 3,62,19 even Govindarāja does not see a reference to Rāma's divinity; in order to do so one must regard the third *ca* in a *śloka* line as a particle conjunctive between this and the preceding *śloka*, and take the first two *ca*-s in the sense of 'both ... and' a wholly unnatural construction: *divyaṃ ca mānuṣaṃ caivam ātmanaś ca parākramam / ikṣvākuvrṣabhāveḥ sya yatasva dviṣatāṃ vadhe //*, Lakṣmaṇa is speaking: «Be aware of your powers, which are as much divine as human, ... direct your efforts to slaying those who have shown their hatred of you», instead of: «Have regard for the celestial and human and (be aware of) your own powers, etc.».

4.2. An argument by Ruben

Pollock 1991,18 repeats an argument «made by Walter Ruben more than fifty years ago (though wholly ignored thereafter)» and rightly so, I would say. Pollock manages to translate Ruben's argument while deleting any reference to the archetype. Ruben's argument runs as follows (1936,63).

The *sarga* of VRā. I that speaks of Viṣṇu's human incarnations belongs to the archetype. It seems spurious, because in Book II-VI Viṣṇu's incarnation as a man is almost never mentioned. However, in this form the argument does not hold water, for all the interpolations in VRā. II-VI which do not speak of Rāma as being Viṣṇu are certainly later than the archetype, whereas in Book I Viṣṇu's incarnation is described at length. When in spite of this Rāma's divinity is not mentioned in the later interpolations of VRā. II-VI, then one obviously did not want to speak of Rāma's equation with Viṣṇu. This equation, therefore, *may* be very old and may have occurred in the original text.

Owing to the profuse use of commas in written German one cannot be sure whether the relative clause «which do not speak of Rāma, etc.» is meant to be restrictive or not. Furthermore I do not understand

the argument about the archetype and the original text - in this respect my translation is incomplete -.

This *argumentum ex silentio* is nonsense, because there is no silence: there are later interpolations that speak of Rāma's divinity, see Van Daalen 1980,290 n. 74; Brockington 1984,14-15; 212 n. 31; 219-223.

Ruben already could have known this, if he had read Muir.

§ 5. Corruptions in the Southern Recension admitted by Pollock

Pollock admits that there are corruptions in the SR. In VRā. III he follows the NR or mss. thereof at 10,24; 11,15; 13,35; 29,16 cd/17 ab (order); 42,7; 48,11; 55,5; 58,33; cf. note ad 65,5. In a number of cases he follows the SR, though he admits that the NR or mss. thereof offer a more attractive reading: 5,21; 8,9; 8,22; 11,14; 15,10; 18,2; 18,5; 47,28. In these cases one should follow the NR and in many other cases as well (or rather one should start from the NR).

Because Pollock admits that the SR, too, is corrupt at places, he is enabled to be eclectic. Of course, eclecticism is unavoidable, but the questions that must be raised are: is not the SR far more corrupt than the NR? and is not the NE rec. a better approach to the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki?

Anyhow, the result is a smooth-running translation, but not always of the Crit.Ed.'s SR text, but of that of the NR.

§ 6. Objectionable translations

Another factor which contributes to this smooth translation is the ascription of a "unique" of "unattested" sense to quite a number of words. This may be done with the aid of the glossing theory: a word which makes no sense in the SR is given the meaning of a good word in the NR. The unwary reader of this translation may think the text of the SR is quite acceptable, until he reads the notes.

Of course, theoretically Pollock's position is impeccable, that is to say, if the theory were sound, if the SR had preserved the text better than the NR and if the glossing theory were acceptable. However, it is not. There is no valid argument for holding the SR to be superior to

the NR. All these “unique” and “unattested” senses run the risk of having been wrung out of textual corruptions.

So I greatly distrust these unique senses. I object to Pollock’s translations of some particles; moreover I do not believe that there is a *perfectum de conatu*, an inchoative perfect and a present with perfective sense. For the tenses see the notes ad 3,24,7; 3,25 and 68,18 resp. The instances of an inchoative perfect, or perfect with a future sense, include those of *kṛta-*, after an order or request. However, here the order or wish is represented politely or subserviently as already done or fulfilled, cf. Hopkins, BSOS 6,377. For the rest we have to do with corruptions in the SR or with the author of a long verse who is out of step with the progress of the narrative.

Tathaiva is said to mean ‘and yet’ or ‘but’ at 3,62,8. The hundred sons of Vasiṣṭha are born on one day, *tathaiva ... punar hatam*. Pollock remarks that there is nowhere a statement that the sons were killed the very day they were born, and that is why he translates ‘but’. However, the sons are killed on one day, VRā. 1,58,19: *adya*, and that is exactly the same way they were born: on one day.

3,58,23, *kiṃ dhāvasi priye nūnaṃ dṛṣṭāsi kamalekṣaṇe / vṛkṣeṇācchādyā cātmānaṃ kiṃ māṃ na pratibhāṣase //*, is translated: «Why are you running away, my lotus-eyed love? I’m sure I saw you hiding behind that tree. Why won’t you speak to me?». The note reads: «‘hiding’ *ācchādyā ca*: although I leave it untranslated, I understand the particle *ca* as functioning concessively (with respect to *pāda* b, ‘I saw you, though you are hiding’)». Lovers of irregularities in the *Rāmāyaṇa* will have approvingly noticed that Pollock construes the gerund with the subject of a passive sentence. I for one do not believe in irregularities and I translate: «Why are you running far away (reading the NR *dūram* for *nūnam*)? I have seen you ...! but why don’t you answer me hiding behind a tree?».

At 3,19,14 also *ca* is said to be concessive, but it means simply ‘and’: «Ascetic practice ... is difficult to perform, *and* that is why we do not utter a curse, *bhakṣyamānāś*, although devoured by *rākṣasas*». *Ca* is put after the participle instead of after *tena*; the participle has the concessive force.

At 11,25 *prathamam* means ‘first’ not ‘finally’; at 11,8 *tattvam* does not mean ‘what one should do, what is proper’; if one feels that that is

the sense required, one should follow the NR: *kāryam*. At 14,28 *vaśī* does not mean 'gladly', neither does it at 2,10,1. If one feels *vaśī* does not fit into the context, one should follow the/a reading of the NR. At 24,10 *tithiṣu* does not mean 'on a moonless night'; Pollock translates a commentator, instead of the text. One has to choose either the NW or the NE reading. And so on, for the list is far from exhaustive.

§ 7. *The quality of the Northern Recension*

Through Pollock's notes I have found quite a lot of places where the NR offers arguably better readings than the SR. It has been long since known that the NE is "*glatter*" (Lüders, repeated by Ruben) than the SR, that its syntax is more regular, that it has fewer obscure words and fewer irregularities. As long as there is a polishing theory or a glossing theory it makes no sense to show that at a particular place the NR is better, for the silly theory is such that better means "polished", and so unoriginal; better is worse! see Van Daalen 1980,42.

One of the reviewers of my book has called this statement "curious", and I agree!

§ 8. *Śloka 3,61,12 and the Rule of Two*

Notwithstanding what was just said I shall discuss one instance. 3,61,12 reads: *yena rājan hṛtā sītā tam anveṣitum arhasi / maddvitīyo dhanuṣpāṇiḥ sahāyaiḥ paramarṣibhiḥ //*, «What you must do, your majesty, is search for the one who carried off Sītā, with me at your side, your bow in hand, and the supreme seers to help us». Pollock states in the note *ad locum* that «the reference (to the seers) remains puzzling: the seers will neither help nor even accompany Rāma».

In Van Daalen 1980,249 the verse is listed: in the SR + N 1 it has three qualified items, to wit: *tam* + relative clause; the subject of *asi*, 'you' + two adjectives; the seers + the appositive adjunct *sahāyaiḥ*. The verse as it stands in the Crit.Ed. exhibits a transgression of the Rule of Two which says that, apart from regular exceptions, there are no more than two qualified items in a *śloka* of Vālmīki. If the rule is violated in a verse, that verse is most probably not of Vālmīki's hand

(see o.c., 251 ff.). The NR reads in *pāda* d *vyavasāyasahāyavān*, and so there are only two qualified items and the absentee *ṛṣis* are not present here.

The Crit.Ed. did not succeed in offering us an acceptable text, owing to its preference of the SR and, consequently, a translation of it is not a translation of Vālmīki's poem. Since not all Indologists read Italian or French, an English translation of Gorresio's text is a desideratum.

Bibliography

BROCKINGTON, J.L.

1984: *Righteous Rāma – the evolution of an epic*, Delhi-Bombay-Calcutta-Madras, OUP.

VAN DAALEN, L.A.

1974: "Die Textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇas und die Kritische Edition (Baroda 1960-)", ZDMG, Supplement II, p. 313-320.

1980: *Vālmīki's Sanskrit*, Leiden.

1986: "Two notes on Rāmāyaṇa textual criticism", ALB 50,402-417.

1989: "Is Vālmīki's Sanskrit a specimen of Vernacular Sanskrit?", WZKS 33,25-43.

1992: "On the allegedly superior quality of the Southern Recension of Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa; the glossing theory", to be published in WZKS 36.

POLLOCK, SH.I.

1979: "Text-critical observations on Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa", *Ludwick Sternbach Felicitation Volume*, Lucknow.

1984: "The Rāmāyaṇa, text and the Critical Edition", p. 82-83 in: R.P. Goldman, *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki, ..., vol. I Bālakāṇḍa, Introduction and translation*, Princeton NJ.

1991: *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmīki, ..., vol. III Aranyakāṇḍa, Introduction, translation and annotation*, Princeton NJ.

RUBEN, W.

1936: *Studien zur Textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇa*, Stuttgart.

SPEIJER, J.S.

1968 (1886): *Sanskrit Syntax*, reprint Kyoto.