

But the only authority that I can find for such an use of the word is the traveller Thevenot, who names amongst fishes of the Red Sea "the Chagrin, which is a fish shaped like a sea-dog, and about seven or eight Foot long" (Lovell's English translation, London, 1686, part i, p. 175). It may be observed that Thevenot was well acquainted with artificial "shagreen," which he calls, quite correctly, "the Sagri, which is that we call Chagrine in France," and describes its manufacture in Turkey and Persia (part ii, p. 34). He does not connect or confuse it with his "sea-dog," but it is not clear whether he got the name of that from an Oriental or a Frank. The usual Arabic name of artificial shagreen appears to be *zarghab*, and at least one Red Sea name for a dog-fish is the equivalent *Kalb-al-Bahr*.

The subject seems to be Oriental enough for our Journal, the more so as the state of its terms implies the very ancient use of both genuine and manufactured shagreen in Asia.

W. F. SINCLAIR.

8. THE LATE DR. BÜHLER ON THE GAṆĒḂA LEGEND IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—As I stated in my last letter (above, p. 380), it was the late lamented Dr. Bühler who first pointed out to me the occurrence of the GaṇĒḂa legend in the PracandapāṇḂava Nāṭaka. When my letter was printed, I sent a proof to him, and on March 16 he wrote (how little did I think that it was to be his last letter to me!) that he intended to write a '*ṭikā*' to my remarks on the GaṇĒḂa legend, and that this '*ṭikā*' was to appear in the next (that is, in the present) number of the Journal.

As he (alas!) can no longer speak for himself, I feel it incumbent on me to state here briefly his views about the GaṇĒḂa legend in the Mahābhārata, as they are opposed to those which I expressed in my last letter.

In Dr. Bühler's opinion, Rājaçēkhara must have known the Gaṇēça legend from the Dēvanāgarī text of the Mahābhārata. By speaking explicitly of a *chala* and *praticchala*, Rājaçēkhara tried to make the legend of the Mahābhārata clearer. He replaces *manasā kalpītasya* (of Mahābh., i, 1, 77) by *vṛtaḥ*, and adds *tapōbhīḥ* in order to show that Gaṇēça could not dare to refuse to do Vyāsa's bidding. The word *tapōbhīḥ* may even have been suggested to Rājaçēkhara by the words *tapōviçīṣṭād api* in Mahābh., i, 1, 71.

My hypothesis that Rājaçēkhara may have taken the Gaṇēça legend from some other source requires (Dr. Bühler wrote) a '*sapakṣa*': I should have to show that in other cases, too, Rājaçēkhara inserted legends which do not occur in the Mahābhārata itself. Besides, I ought to have proved that the Gaṇēça legend occurs elsewhere independently of the Mahābhārata.

My appeal to Kṣēmēndra was thought insufficient by Dr. Bühler. For Kṣēmēndra omits even much more 'characteristic' features of the Mahābhārata, which he was obliged to do in trying "to measure the elephant with the closed fist." Kṣēmēndra's work has no other value but that from what he gives we may conclude that it existed about 1050 A.D. in the Kaçmīrian Mahābhārata. But from what he omits it is impossible to say whether it was in his Mahābhārata or not.

These were Dr. Bühler's views on the subject, as far as I can gather from his last letters to me. No doubt, he would have stated his arguments far more fully and more vigorously if he had been spared to write his intended '*īikā*.'

Dr. Bühler's loss, irreparable as it is for all students of Indian history and literature, will be felt most keenly by all those who try to grapple with the difficult problems of Mahābhārata criticism, and who will constantly miss the ingenuity and the historical instinct of that great scholar and teacher.

M. WINTERNITZ.

Oxford, June 5, 1898.