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Abstract

My hypothesis is that Book 4, as with the whole Mahābhārata, was created by an author who draws upon written materials from the Greco-Roman world (though of course not only upon those sources). In particular, Book 4 bears such striking parallels to the Omphale and Heracles story that we can infer the author of the former had access to written versions of the latter. I suggest criteria to test this hypothesis, some focusing on the story itself and others on the author’s working methodology. I briefly develop the existence of a whole common draft, i.e., a shared overall plot skeleton between the two stories, some remarks on the author’s process of adapting stories and characters from one work to another (stories, characters…), the possibility of interpreting the presence of otherwise bizarre elements as a consequence of the borrowing and adaptation, and the high density of direct literal borrowings of words and expressions. By understanding the author’s use of the Greco-Roman materials, we can better grasp a substantial part of the structure and contents of the Book. Such a degree of borrowing strongly indicates the need for any analysis of these works to take into account the multicultural world in which they were generated, such as post-Ovid 1st century, CE. These findings have implications for the validity of the received text, too.
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1. Introduction

In this paper I define some methodological questions on Book 4 of the Mahābhārata (Mbh). My position on this issue has been presented in different papers
and seminars, and I have recently finished a book defining it more precisely.\(^1\) In my view, Book 4, as with the whole Mbh, was created by an author, perhaps with a team, drawing upon written materials from the Greco-Roman world (though obviously not only on those sources). In the case of this Book, I argue that the author borrows heavily from the Omphale and Heracles story, while drawing to a lesser extent on other materials, most of them centered on Heracles, as a secondary component.

Existing information on the Omphale and Heracles story is scarce and fragmentary. Developed from the VI/V Century BCE onward, our source material consists of two short abstracts (Apollodorus 2.6.3 and Diodorus Siculus 4.31.5-8), two longer Ovidian texts (the story of Omphale-Heracles-Faunus in *Fasti* 2.303-58, and the complaints of Deianira, Heracles wife, in *Heroides* 9.53ff.), as well as some other short literary sources and iconographical remains. It describes Heracles’s enslavement to Omphale and some adventures under her power: the defeat of the Cercopes, robbers, the burial of Icarus, the killing of Syleus, an abusive master, and of a dangerous serpent, and finally the defeat of an invading people, the Itoni.

Mbh Book 4 is also relatively short and compact: 1824 verses in the Poona Critical Edition on one side, and eight/nine pages of textual references on the other. Thus, both components of the comparison are short and well defined, which makes feasible a systematic treatment of the evidence.

The basic assumptions underpinning my work are quite orthodox: a) with enough evidence it is possible to prove that a given text draws upon another text, b) a sufficient degree of complexity in shared components between texts eliminates the possibility of simple oral borrowing, and c) the direction of the borrowing can be also defined with enough evidence at hand. I suggest eleven criteria to prove the presence of borrowing. The most important are the first two, founded on what I call the “Principle of improbability”: a given complexity of narrative components unmistakably define a story amongst all the literally infinite number of potential factors and combinations in the vast ocean of all possible stories. Accordingly, if we have two stories sufficient similar in both (1) quality/quantity, and (2) density of congruous textual components, we can conclude that one of the two must be the product of a borrowing, and borrowing from a written text. (3) A third argument refers more specifically to the improbability of

---

\(^1\) See, in particular, Wulff Alonso 2018 and *forthcoming* a and b; I am using here materials from the three publications.
mere coincidence of shared bizarre or fanciful elements, e.g. an otherwise virile hero becoming a transvestite hero during a year of thralldom.

The following eight criteria deal with the working methodology of the borrowing process, to probe (4) literal or textual borrowing – the presence of similar words or expressions. Less obvious, but no less interesting is how the author deals with key narrative components like stories and characters, including to probe (5) organization of a narrative along the lines of another text (I call it the “litmus test of the essential identity of two given stories”); (6) use of a given work/author in a given section; (7) use of different works/authors in a given section; (8) use of a specific borrowed text in different places of the borrowing work. Something similar could be said of characters: (9) use of a character in the construction of another character; (10) use of different components of a character for the construction of several characters; (11) use of several characters for the construction of one character.

Finally, three additional criteria concern the direction of the borrowing once the borrowing between two texts has been accepted: (12) cultural coherence/incoherence of a common component, e.g. touching a corpse; (13) the obvious component of which is older; and, finally, (14) historical, logical and methodological plausibility.

I am dealing with just some of those arguments.

2. A Shared Plot Skeleton

For self-explanatory reasons, I will begin with (5) the “litmus test of the essential identity of two given stories,” a shared draft or skeleton. The cursive text to the left shows the common components in both stories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Components</th>
<th>Omphale-Heracles Story</th>
<th>Mahābhārata Book 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. 12 years wandering because of a relative, king and enemy.</strong></td>
<td>Heracles had to accomplish twelve labors all over the world under his relative Eurystheus’s power. They take twelve years in Apollodorus 2.4.12.</td>
<td>For twelve years the Pāṇḍavas (and Draupadī) had to live outside their country and suffer hardships and dangers in the wild (Mbh 2.67.9-12; 2.68.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. After those 12 years, one year of thralldom in a royal court, anonymous.</strong></td>
<td>After those 12 years, Heracles is sold into temporary serfdom, to Queen Omphale (Apollodorus 2.6.3) and spends one year (Sophocles, Trachiniae 69-70; 252-3) as an anonymous slave.</td>
<td>Next, the Pāṇḍavas must spend one year incognito, hidden, anonymous, and remain undiscovered by their enemies; they live in Virāṭa’s royal court (Mbh 2.67.9-12; 3.298.15-19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Components</td>
<td>Omphale-Heracles Story</td>
<td>Mahābhārata Book 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Madness as a cause.</td>
<td>Apollodorus 2.6.2 writes that Heracles, going mad, threw his host Iphitus from the walls of Tiryns. He must pay for it.</td>
<td>The root of the problem lies in a fault of Yudhiṣṭhira in a moment of madness in the sākhā at Hāṣṭinapura (Mbh 2.53ff.; see in particular 2.55.5; 2.60.4-5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The first adventure: a tree and real or potential weapon’s theft.</td>
<td>Heracles first adventure is the defeat of the Cercopes: when he is sleeping under a tree, they try to steal his arms; they speak about their mother (Apollodorus 2.6.3; Diodorus 4.31.7; Suidas, s.v. Kerkopes; Zenobius 5.10; Tzetzes, Schol. Lycophron 91).</td>
<td>In the first adventure they hide their arms in a tree, to avoid stealing (Mbh 4.5.9-29b). (See 5 for their mother’s mention).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The hero(es) find(s) a corpse and perform(s) its last rites, making the corpse prominent.</td>
<td>After that, Apollodorus 2.6.3 writes that he finds Icarus’ corpse and buries it, calling the island with his name.</td>
<td>They find a corpse, put it in the tree to further avoid the stealing of their arms by its far-reaching stench, say the corpse is their mother’s and that they are doing so following their family last rites (Mbh 4.5.28-29).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The hero/one of the heroes is a voracious eater who cooks.</td>
<td>He is presented as a voracious eater in general and in the Omphale’s episode, and even cooking in the devastated palace of Syleus (See Athenaeus, Deiphinosophistae 10.411c; Brommer 1984: 34).</td>
<td>Bhima works as the cook of the palace (Mbh 4.7) and is always depicted as a voracious eater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The hero/one of the heroes is a transvestite who dance and plays music living among maidens in a palace.</td>
<td>The hero/Heracles is described, in iconography and texts, dressed as a woman, dancing and drunk, playing music and in a Dionysian context (Boardman 1994; Seneca, Hercules Furens 469-70; Statius, Thebaid 10.649). He lives among maidens in Omphale’s palace (See Ovid, Heroides 9.73 for example).</td>
<td>Arjuna is a eunuch, dressed as a woman, and teaches dancing and song to a princess, Virāta’s daughter, and her maidens (Mbh 4.10.1; 4.10.10ab).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Components</td>
<td>Omphale-Heracles Story</td>
<td>Mahābhārata Book 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. The longest and more substantial story before the end / the end-fight centers on a nocturnal attempt of raping of a wife/partner of the hero, avoided by him, after the villain touches him in the darkness instead of her.</strong></td>
<td>The longest adventure under Omphale we have is described by Ovidio, <em>Fasti</em> 2.303-55: a nocturnal attempt of Faunus, who sees Omphale and Heracles entering a cave; at night Faunus surreptitiously enters the cave, looks for her in the darkness, touches Heracles instead of touching her, and the hero throws him to the floor.</td>
<td>The most important adventure before the end fight is the attempt by general Kīcaka to possess Draupadi (Mbh. 4.13-23). Kīcaka tries to seduce and rape her; but she talks to Bhima and prepares her vengeance. He enters at night a dancing-hall where she had told him to meet, he looks for her in the darkness but touches Bhima instead of her. There is a fight and Bhima kills him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. The wife of the hero complains about her situation and her husband’s behavior, referring to his guilt and shameful situation during that year, contrasting it with his past glories and announcing, or menacing with, her suicide.</strong></td>
<td>Heracles’ wife, Deianira, embodies the tragic side of the ambiguous Heracles and Omphale adventure in Ovid, <em>Heroïdes</em> 9.53 ff.. The Ovidian text is a letter of Deianira to her husband enumerating grievances, lamenting her marriage, his feminization... at the end of the text Deianira asks herself why she hesitates to die and announces that she will kill herself. See <em>Heroïdes</em> 9.13-15; 57-66; 73-80; 146; 148; 163-8 ...</td>
<td>Before Kīcaka’s killing, Draupadī has to convince her husband Bhima, against her other husband Yudhiṣṭhira’s orders, to kill her offender (Mbh. 4.16-4.21.6). Draupadī embodies all the time the tragic side of this ambiguous adventure, enumerates grievances, laments her marriage to Yudhiṣṭhira, contrasts his and her other husbands position now and in the past, laments Arjuna’s feminization, and asks herself for her reasons to carry on living, finally threatening with committing suicide. See for example, Mbh. 4.17.15-28; 4.18.15-16; 4.18.9-33; 4.17.3-6; 4.19.28; 4.20.33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. The last adventure entails the defeat by the hero(es) of a cattle raiding attack, including plundering.</strong></td>
<td>The last adventure is the defeat by Heracles of a neighbor people, the Itoni, who invade the kingdom in a cattle expedition; he defeats them and takes and plunders their city (Diodorus 4.31.7).</td>
<td>The last adventure is the defeat by the Pāṇḍavas of two attacks by neighboring peoples (Mbh. 4.24-62), who invade the kingdom in a cattle expedition. Arjuna alone defeats the second army, takes their plunder; and takes some vestments from the fallen enemies for her mistress too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have just selected some of the more strikingly reminiscent components. At the same time, I have not developed the many sub-borrowings from the two Ovidian sources for obvious space limitations. One of them, however, can be a good example. When Ovid has Deianira recounting Heracles’s humiliations (see 2.9), he presents the hero before his mistress Omphale, frightened by her threats while working with wool, because he makes errors with his strong hands (Ovid, *Heroides* 9.73-80). The author of MBh Book 4 has Draupadī telling Bhīma that she is afraid of Virāṭa for she prepares with her now callused hands the sandalwood unguent that pleases him, and she always wonders if she has prepared it well (Mbh 4.19.22-25).

Neither I have included here other uses of the secondary stories under Omphale. For example, the long sections of the arrival of four of the Pāṇḍavas to Virāṭa’s palace and their acceptance present the scene from the perspective of viewers, Virāṭa, and his courtiers: Virāṭa sees them with admiration, does not believe they are servants, and says that they look more as superiors -kings, warriors… (Mbh 4.6; 4.7; 4.9; 4.10). The fragments of Euripides’ *Syleus* commented by Philo of Alessandria (*Every Good Man is Free*, 98-104) show exactly the same components by describing Heracles in the moment prior to being bought by Syleus.

### 3. The Process of Adaptation

Though I cannot delve here in the whole brilliant process of V.’s adaptation, let me just remark some points which could help us to connect the two sides of the
The author integrates two unrelated exiles of 12 + 1 years from Heracles's stories in Books 3 and 4 respectively as embodiments of one exile. He transmutes Heracles anonymity into a condition: if the Pāṇḍavas were to be discovered during the last year, they would have to repeat the whole thirteen-year period. He has not just one main character but six, first, the five Pāṇḍava brothers and, second, Draupadī, who is not more an absent wife, but a present one, bringing with her all the consequences of the sabhā of Hāstinapura's offences and, ultimately, of the global destruction plan underlying the whole work. In that way, her monologue becomes a dialogue with Bhīma, though essentially remaining a monologue, full now of the new tragic implications of her presence and thralldom. By imagining, so to speak, Draupadī as a Deianira participating in Heracles thralldom in a palace, the author makes of her a perfect receptacle for projecting a wholly reconstructed Faunus and Omphale story and Deianira's monologue inside it, before the cattle-raiding attack that points to the end of the story.

From this vantage, we can understand better V.'s work (see criteria 6-11 above). He may concentrate traits of various Greco-Roman characters into one of his characters: e.g. Omphale's (see above 2.8) and Deianira's (2.9) roles are concentrated into Draupadī, who also receives, as her husbands, more general components from Heracles, beginning with, obviously, the one-year thralldom (2.2). He may distribute traits or actions of a given Greco-Roman character among different characters, for instance, he projects Heracles' traits particularly into Bhīma and Arjuna (see 2.6; 2.7; 2.8; 2.10). Parallely, he may make things easier, importing components of just one Greco-Roman character into one of his characters, Faunus into Kīcaka (see 2.8). Or he can adapt settings: a dark cave into a dark dancing hall (see 2.8).

Concurrently, he may take and transmute scenes: a scene depicting an attempt to steal the hero's weapons in connection with a tree becomes a scene in which the heroes try to prevent the theft of their weapons making use of a tree. Or Faunus isolated nocturnal attempted rape becomes Kīcaka's systematic sexual harassment and abuse. Note that in this case, he may use two different Ovidian works (Fasti and Heroides) besides, of course, previous components as the sabhā of Hāstinapura's offences, which are in a sense re-enacted in a scene preceding Kīcaka's killing.

He may duplicate scenes: the invasion of the Itoni and their defeat by Heracles becomes two invasions, highlighting the, until that point, feminized Arjuna, who receives the key implications of the transvestite Heracles's last fight,
which leads to his main role in the wedding, again parallelizing Heracles gender and status recovery.

4. Explaining the Bizarre

The Virāṭa Parvan has been traditionally considered a strange book. We can see that a meaningful part of the most outstanding odd or bizarre components derive from the borrowing of Heracles-Omphale and its adaptations, including Arjuna degraded to the condition of eunuch teaching music and dance (see criteria 3 and 12 above).

Even the bizarre fake burial of a mother of brothers is understandable as the product of V.'s invention with the help of the allusions of the Cercopes brothers to their mother plus Icarus's corpse in the context of his transmuting of the tree scene. However, that fake burial of their "mother" entails the touching and handling of a corpse by Nakula. The author refers to its pollution implications later through Prince Uttara's reluctance to recover the weapons hidden in the tree when Arjuna asks him to do it for his fight against the cattle raiding Kuravas (Mbh 4.38.9-11). Characteristically, there is no contradiction in the case of Icarus's burial by Heracles. It is a typical example of a (cultural) inconsistency created by a borrowing and not present in the original.

Why does the author portray king Virāṭa having Bhīma fighting beasts in the seraglio? Draupadī says to Bhīma that she suffers when she sees him fighting against beasts in the seraglio (Mbh 4.18.1-2). Note that we have in Draupadī's words three basic components: a) A wife's words: b) she suffers because her husband fights against animals c) while she is in a house. We have a clear parallel in Deianira's words. a) Deianira states that b) she suffers knowing of Heracles's fights with beasts and monsters, and c) she says this while at home (Ovid, Heroides 9.33-42, see 35: domus). The improbability of independent invention in such a context is reinforced by another component: d) an immediate connection to rumors that make her unhappy. Deinaira associates those fears with rumours about his death or not death: “Unhappy I strive after the murmurs of uncertain fame” (Ovid, Heroides 9.41), while Draupadī's suffering is directly associated with Queen Sudeśṭā's gossip when she sees that suffering (Mbh 4.18.2cd-8). When the author transfers the suffering wife from her far home to the place where the thralldom takes place, he translates the fight with animals to her new home and, as a collateral effect, we get the odd fighting in the seraglio.
5. Direct Literal Borrowing

Usually the author does not directly take texts – similar words, metaphors or expressions – and translate them from Greek or Latin into Sanskrit (see criterion 5). However, in Book 4 we have one of the few exceptions.

We know Ovid, *Fasti* 2.303-358 describes a nocturnal attempted rape by Faunus and that *Mbh* 4.13-23 recounts Kīcaka's attempt (see 2.8). V.'s story displays many uses of these over fifty Ovidian verses, and part of them literal. I am just choosing some of the examples directly related to the theme's core: a would-be rapist entering a dark place to rape a woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Borrowing</th>
<th>Omphale-Heracles Story</th>
<th>Mahābhārata Book 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Immediately before the villain enters the scene, there is a reference to the night; in both cases it can be found in the previous verse.</strong></td>
<td>The scene takes place in a dark grove at night, <em>noctis erat medium</em> (Ovid, <em>Fasti</em> 2.331), when Faunus enters the cave (Ovid, <em>Fasti</em> 2.332).</td>
<td>We are told that Bhima arrives first and, “hidden in the night” (Van Buitenen trans.), waits in the dancehall (<em>Mbh</em> 4.21.38ab: <em>bhīmo 'tha prathamams gatvā rātrau channa upāvīṣat</em>) for Kīcaka’s immediate entrance in <em>Mbh</em> 4.21.39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. An additional allusion to darkness upon entering.</strong></td>
<td>When Faunus finally enters there is a new allusion to darkness: <em>rosricula per tenebras Faunus ad antra venit</em> (Ovid, <em>Fasti</em> 2.332): “Faunus enters the dewy cave through the dark”.</td>
<td>Kīcaka enters “the large chamber, which was covered by dense darkness” (Van Buitenen trans.): <em>praviśya ca sa tad veśma tamanāśa sāṃvrtam mahat</em> (<em>Mbh</em> 4.21.40cd). Note the parallel structures: Faunus/Sa (he, Kīcaka, just mentioned in <em>Mbh</em> 4.21.39a), <em>venit/praviśya, ad antra/veśma, roscida (antra)/mahat (veśma), per tenebras/tamasā sāṃvrtam</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Expectations upon entering of the would-be rapist: a specific term for “hopes”, “expectations”.</strong></td>
<td>Faunus enters the cave (Ovid, <em>Fasti</em> 2.333-34) <em>utque videt comites somno vinoque solutos, spem capit in dominis esse soporis idem</em>. “and when he saw the attendants in drunken slumber sunk, he conceived a hope (<em>spes</em>) that their masters might be as sound asleep” (Frazer trans.)</td>
<td>Kīcaka arrives at the dancehall, with the hope, desire or expectation (<em>āśā</em>) of meeting her (<em>Mbh</em> 4.21.39cd: <em>tāṃ velāṃ nartanāgāre pāncālisamgamāśayā</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Borrowing</td>
<td>Omphale-Heracles Story</td>
<td>Mahābhārata Book 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The would-be rapist is referred to with a derogatory term before touching the man on the couch.</td>
<td>Faunus enters looking for her couch, guiding himself with his hands; he is now referred to as the “adulterer” (adulter: Fasti 2.335), though he is referred to by his name, Faunus, just three verses before (2.332). After he touches the lion skin and recoils, he touches the next couch (lectus) and thinks Omphale is there (Fasti 2.344).</td>
<td>Kicaka enters the dancehall with his mind on the tryst, trying to find Draupadi in the darkness. Now referred to as sudurmatih (villain, wicked-minded) (Mbh 4.21.41d), and sūta -though by name just before in Mbh 4.21.39a-, Kicaka touches (parāmś) Bhīma, his death in fact, who sits/lies on the couch (śayana), believing he is Draupadi (Mbh 4.21.42ab).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The hero on a couch, the would-be rapist approaches and gets an erection.</td>
<td>Just after touching where he thought was Omphale, Faunus climbs in and reclines on the near side of the other couch. Right before he pulls up Heracles’s tunic and finding the hairy leg of the hero, we are told that et tumidum cornu durius inguen erat: “his swollen cock harder than horn” (Frazer trans., Ovid, Fasti 2.346).</td>
<td>Bhīma was on the coach when Kicaka, desire-crazed, came closer with his rational mind, or mind and soul, drunk because of his erection (harṣa): Mbh 4.21.43a-c upasamgamyā caivainām kicakāḥ kāmamohitah harṣanmathitac-it-tātmā...; harṣa: “erection” (Monier-Williams, Dictionary: erection and pleasure; Böhtlingk, Roth, Sanskrit Wörterbuch, Freude... Geschlechtige Erregung, Geilheit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Touching hair, the beginning of the fight and one of them is thrown on the floor.</td>
<td>“And meanwhile pulling up the bottom edge of the garment; there he met legs that bristled with thick rough hair (horrebant densis aspera crura pilis). Before he could go further...” (Frazer trans.), Heracles shoves Faunus and he falls off the couch (Ovid, Fasti 2.347-50).</td>
<td>Kicaka touches Bhīma on the couch instead of Draupadi, Bhīma grabs his “garlanded and fragrant/scented hair,” and the fight begins (Mbh 4.21.47e-f). (bhīmo jagrāha keēṣu mālyavatsu sugandhiṣu). There is a short fight and “the powerful Kicaka threw him on the floor onto his knees” (Van Buitenen trans., Mbh 4.21.50ab). When Kicaka’s relatives see his corpse, the hair of their bodies stands on end (Mbh 4.22.2a-b: sarve samhrṣṭaromānāḥ sam-trastāḥ preksya kicakam).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Conclusions

The main aim of this paper is to present some methodological instruments to prove the use of the Omphale and Heracles story by the author of Mbh Book 4, as well as his own working method. By understanding his adaptations of Greco-Roman materials, we understand also a substantial part of the structure and contents of the Book.
At the same time, the author is a supreme narrator and adapter, and the sophistication of his work remarks the need of realizing the Book and the whole Mbh as the creative narrative it is. Needless to say, his use of Greco-Roman materials is always superseded by his interests and perspectives, and by his artistic and ideological aims, and does not preclude the use of other sources or his own creativity.

Nevertheless, his borrowings are so meaningful and global that it could perhaps be considered as a kind of filter to detect and analyze before further analysis. Thus, it is debatable that we can now understand Book 4 as a kind of projection of a Holī as analyzed by Van Buitenen (1981: 20-21). It is even more obvious that it is not a kind of play of trifuncionalist intellectuals in which the disguises of the Pāṇḍavas would reveal the functional structure of the group and the hierarchy of a trifunctional system that they would represent (Dumézil 1986: 89-94). Neither is transvestitism a product of ideological conundrums related to Arjuna’s role during a period of dīkṣā, a “consecration,” prior to that war considered as a vast sacrifice ending the Kaliyuga and full of pralaya connotations, nor the tree is there because it is part of those processes (Biardeau 1981). And if we accept an avatāra component (Goldman 1995), we have to do it after realizing that the story inherits the old Greco-Roman theme of the dangerous temporal power of the inferior over the superior.

Needless to say, none of this excludes the need of exploring the richness of the text in meanings, as demonstrated by Hildtebeitel (2011), for example. A filter, by definition, is not a plug.

Such a degree of borrowing situates any analysis in the need of grasping the multicultural world in which it took place, after Ovid and, most probably during the I Century CE, in other words, during the first globalization of the Eurasian continent, and in the need of accepting its impact on the subcontinent. In my opinion if this systematic presence of Greco-Roman components is a surprise, it is just because new trends in the ways of understanding cultural exchange and cultural studies are being set aside and evidence just denied or locked deep inside the individual disciplines in spite of art, the implications of trade, astrology, architecture, and literary texts. The political implications of defending isolationism are clear and patent enough today in the subcontinent. To defend the existence of contact between the subcontinent and the Mediterranean world and the borrowing and re-elaboration of cultural materials is not a colonialist attitude. In this context, easy analyses and classifications are condemned to deserve Sanjay Subrahmanian’s remark that “It is as if we impover-
ished drinkers of wine from Saint-Emilion and Lalande-de Pomerol were constantly asked to declare our preferences between Coca-Cola and Pepsi” (2013: 77).

Finally, let me finish with two notes. The textual connections between Ovid and the Critical edition imply that we can probe the validity of at least these parts of the received text. Second, the author, or a member of his presumed team, reads Latin.
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