Myrtia, nº 33 (2018), 295-319

Forgotten Connections: Implicit and Explicit Uses of Classical Scholarship in the Comparisons of Sir William Jones's *On the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India* (1784)

Sebastiaan Godefridus Clercx*
Humboldt Universität zu Berlin / Freie Universität Berlin

Resumen: Este artículo trata sobre el filólogo, abogado y (proto-)indólogo Sir William Jones (1746-1794) y, en particular, sobre su introductorio ensayo en India *On the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India* redactado en 1784. No sólo se centra en cómo elaboró su comparación de la mitología greco-romana y la hindú, sino también tiene en cuenta la tradición académica de reinterpretar la mitología en un contexto bíblico. Aunque esta tradición venía haciéndose desde hace siglos, la inclusión de la mitología hindú dio un empuje a los estudios comparativos europeos. Para comprender sus métodos y heurística, este artículo investiga tres ejemplos del ensayo (Saturn-Manu-Noah, Minos-Manu y Dionysus-Rāma-Raamah), y cómo Jones los redactó, utilizando el tesauro mitológico el *Pantheum* del jesuita François Pomey.

Abstract: The present paper discusses the philologist, lawyer, and (proto-)Indologist Sir William Jones (1746-1794), and in particular his introductory essay in India *On the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India*, composed in 1784. It not only concentrates on how he compared Greco-Roman with Hindu mythology, but while answering it also takes into account the scholarly tradition of reinterpreting mythology in a Biblical context. Although the tradition was centuries old, Jones's inclusion of Hindu mythology provided a boost for European comparative studies. In order to understand his methods and heuristics, this paper explores three case studies from the essay (Saturn-Manu-Noah, Minos-Manu, and Dionysus-Rāma-Raamah), and how Jones composed them, using the mythological thesaurus the *Pantheum* by the Jesuit François Pomey.

Palabras clave: Recepción clásica – historia de los estudios clásicos – mitología comparada – François Pomey - Sir William Jones

Keywords: Classical reception – history of classical scholarship – comparative mythology – François Pomey - Sir William Jones

Recepción: 27/02/2018 **Aceptación:** 14/05/2018

* **Dirección para correspondencia:** Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Klassische Philologie, Unter den Linden 6, D-10099 Berlin; E-mail: s.g.clercx@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The following contribution will try to answer an unasked question about the oeuvre of a very well-known scholar: How did the polyglot, lawyer, and (proto-) Indologist Sir William Jones (1746-1794) compare Greco-Roman with Hindu mythology? In answering this question, special attention will be given to Jones's use of the classical Greco-Roman sources in his introductory essay *On the Gods of Greece, Italy, and India* (henceforth: *On the Gods*), which he composed in 1784. In this text, Jones aimed to come to grasps with Hinduism, as he encountered it during his stay in India, by realigning Hindu culture with Greco-Roman antiquity in order to eventually fit both into the framework of Biblical history: as we will see, this venture was not revolutionary, but Jones's main contribution was the inclusion of Hindu beliefs. By exploring how Jones, as a classicist by training, adopted and adapted sources from Greco-Roman antiquity to support his comparisons between Greco-Roman and Hindu mythology, we can learn a great deal both about his (comparative) method and his use of the classical tradition.

Since Jones is not so well known among classicists or scholars of the classical tradition, a succinct outline of his intellectual background in Europe and India is in place here before presenting the research question and reviewing the relevant scholarship concerning *On the Gods*.[1] After studying classics and oriental languages at Oxford, Jones produced an impressive amount of publications on a variety of philological topics, ranging from a poem on chess, *Caissa* (1763), to the *Histoire de Nader Chah* (the Persian monarch; 1770), to Neo-Latin poetry inspired by Persian literature *Poeseos Asiaticæ commentariorum libri sex* (1777).[2] For financial reasons, however, he had to set aside his philological interests, given that he was not able to find patronages to support his scholarly and literary pursuits.[3]

[1] The depth and broadness of Jones's learning is reflected in the scholarly literature discussing his life, works, and influence. Doing justice to Jones's scope of learning, G. Cannon composed two monographs on Jones in 1990 and 1995 discussing various aspects of his life, while he also studied aspects of his life in more detail (e.g. G. CANNON 1984; 1990; 1998). See for similar works e.g. J.P. SINGH, 1982, S.M. MUKHERJEE, 1987, R. ARNOLD, 2001. See Th.R. TRAUTMANN, 1998, for a full and detailed description of Jones's personal, political, and professional life. I use the texts from Teighnmouth's collection *The Works of Sir William Jones* in 13 volumes.

[2] See especially R. FYNES, 1998.

[3] See D. IBBETSON, 1998, for a full overview of Jones's life, methods, and philosophy as a lawyer.

His affinity with Arabic and Persian made him an attractive employee for the East India Company (henceforth: EIC), as he would be able to engage with both the languages and the laws of the indigenous peoples under control of the EIC. After arriving in Calcutta in 1783, he was requested to chart both Islamic and Hindu law, and he hoped that his appointment as a lawyer for the EIC would help him save enough funds to pursue his philological interests in classical philology in the future. However, his legal occupations in India brought him into contact with Hindu mythology, as it was policy of colonial rule in India to judge the local population according to native law.[4] This made Jones find out soon that India was a philologer's treasure trove:

> "To what shall I compare my literary pursuits in India? Suppose Greek literature to be known in modern Greek only, and there to be in the hands of the priests and philosophers; and suppose them to still be worshippers of Jupiter and Apollo: suppose Greece to have been conquered successively by Goths, Huns, Vandals, Tartars, and lastly by the English; then suppose a court of judicature to be established by the British parliament, at Athens, and an inquisitive Englishman to be one of the judges; suppose him to learn Greek there, which no other European had even heard of. Such am I in this country, substituting Sanscrit for Greek, the Brahmans, for the priests of Jupiter, and Vālmic, Vyāsa, Cālidāsa [IAST Vālmiki, Vyāsa, Kālidāsa] for Homer, Plato, Pindar."[5]

In 1787, Jones wrote to his acquaintance Earl Spencer that the situation in India was as if classical antiquity was still alive. Very soon he would be able to continue his philological interests. Together with Henry Thomas Colebrooke (1765-1837) and Nathaniel Halhed (1751-1830), Jones had founded the Asiatick Society of Bengal one year after his arrival. This society's lectures were published in *Asiatick Researches*.[6] After Jones had finally managed to study Sanskrit,[7] he stirred enthusiasm for Indian language and culture throughout Europe. His translation of Kālidāsa's play

[4] See for example G. CANNON, 1984, pp. 87-88.

[5] 1787 Letter to Earl Spencer *Letter*s, no. 464, ii. 742-761. Note that Jones's transliteration of Sanskrit names predates the 1894 foundation of the International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration. I will henceforth (additionally) provide the IAST transliteration.

[6] See G. Cannon, 1984, on the role of colonial rule in the founding of the Asiatick Society.

[7] It was not evident for Europeans to learn Sanskrit, as Hindu pandits did not easily allow outsiders into their holy language; see e.g K. RAJ, 2007, esp. pp. 120-134, for the Western perspective, and e.g. R. ROCHER, 1989, for the Indian side.

Abhijñānaśakuntala or, in Jones's own translation, *Sacontalá or The Fatal Ring: an Indian drama* (1789), echoed throughout Europe, and it was for example influential in the works of Goethe.[8] Jones's most influential contribution to the *Asiatick Researches* would later on be known as the "philologer's passage" (in *The Third Anniversary Discourse on the Hindus*; 1786).[9] In this passage, he observed that "the Sanscrit language" was "more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin", and concluded that the three must have been related at some point. True, Jones was not the first to claim that several languages, which were not the iconic three Biblical languages of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, were related, but his observation entered the history books as the defining moment for the study of comparative Indo-European linguistics. Hence, both linguists and intellectual historians have celebrated Jones as the founding father of Indo-European linguistics, and as one of the last renaissance men of Europe, although it is important to note that, from roughly the seventies and eighties onward, scholars have tended to be more critical of his accomplishments.[10]

The impact of the renowned third anniversary lecture has eclipsed scholarly work on other aspects of Jones's activities. A. Murray (1998), who offers papers covering nearly every aspect of Jones's life, clearly shows that Jones cannot be approached from a one-dimensional perspective. One of the areas of expertise which show most clearly the different strands of his pursuits is his philological output, even though his endeavours in classical scholarship were only appreciated until quite recently.[11] His classical interests cannot be fully understood without taking into

[8] See e.g. M.J. FRANKLIN, 2011, pp. 251-253.

[9] *Works* III, pp. 24-46; the philologer's passage, pp. 34-35.

[10] J. FELLMAN, 1975, was one of the first to notice that Jones might not have been the first comparative linguist in our sense of the term. The Leiden scholar Marcus Zuerius van Boxhorn (1602/12-1653) was, for example, one of the first to propose that languages, such as Greek, Latin, and Germanic, stem from a non-preserved language (Indo-Scythian), rather than e.g. Hebrew. The French Jesuit Gaston-Laurent Coeurdoux (1691-1779) connected Sanskrit with the related European languages at the same time as Jones, although Coeurdoux' works were published later. Likewise, the Austrian Carmelite missionary Paulinus S. Bartholomaeo's (1748-1806) Sanskrit grammar (*Sidharubam seu Grammatica Samscrdamica*; 1790, Rome) predates that of the British colonials. Scholars such as O. SZEMERÉNYI, 1980, or M.J. FRANKLIN, 2011, p. 36, tend to evaluate Jones's contribution to linguistics more benignly, while L. Campbell, 2006, is mostly negative. P.J.A.N. RIETBERGEN, 2007, blames the prominent place of Jones to the anglocentrism of later scholars. See T. VAN HAL, 2015, for a balanced overview of the role of Sanskrit in the development of Indo-European linguistics.

[11] Esp. R. FYNES, 1998, illuminates the way in which classical scholarship influenced other aspects of his activity. The interest in the role of the classical tradition in colonial discourse in India is slowly gaining momentum. Two key monographs on the topic are P. VASUNIA, 2013, and C. HAGERMANN, 2013.

account his other philological studies, initially Persian and Arabic, and later onwards also Sanskrit. Jones believed that the 'classical' tradition (i.e. the Greco-Roman heritage of the West) could be revitalized by oriental motives,[12] which he showcased in his Latin poetry.[13]

The present paper will concentrate on Jones's first contribution to the 1784 volume of the *Asiatick researches*, which was entitled *On the Gods of Greece, Italy and India*. This text illustrates how traditional classical scholarship was applied to oriental studies in Jones's work in order to embed ancient mythology into the framework of Biblical history. So far, however, *On the Gods* has received little detailed treatment in its own right. With the exception of P.J. Marshall's (1970) critical edition of the text, which has ample footnotes elucidating the essay, most other studies about Jones treat the text in a more general or selective way, or cite portions of it, in the context of a larger argument about colonialism, orientalism, or the comparative method in general, or in the light of Jones's oeuvre as a whole.[14] Notwithstanding a general interest in *On the Gods* in a range of interesting contexts, the absence of a more focused, detailed discussion of Jones's essay is remarkable. This

[12] The notion of an oriental renaissance in Jones's works was first explored by R. SCHWAB, 1950, and G. CANNON, 1964, pp. 155-166, and 1990, pp. 298-315, and the research on this notion was most recently continued by D. Weir, 2003, who contrasts the works of William Blake (1757-1827) with those of Jones. Jones uses oriental motives rather than classical ones, while writing in classicizing Latin (for instance *Poeseos Asiaticae commentariorum libri sex, Works* VI; and *Poems, Consisting Chiefly of Translations from the Asiatick Languages*, *Works* X), or ancient Greek (such as that of Anacreon, Attic drama, or Callimachean poety).

[13] R.P. LESSENICH, 2015, for example, has recently argued that Jones contributed to the early advancement of the pre-Romantic period by distancing himself from classicism, and by favoring oriental motives. More generally, Jones's literary output has been studied by V. DE SOLA PINTO, 1946, and MD. A.T. MOJUMDER, 1978, who pursued to redeem Jones's literary qualities, as his works had hitherto been dismissed as being of minor quality. A research project on Jones's Neo-Latin poetry is currently underway at the University of Warwick under supervision of Dr. John T. Gilmore.

[14] So, for instance, U. APP, 2009, pp. 6-15, and H. MOMMA, 2013, pp. 40-43, discuss the text in light of Jones's comparative method. L. POLIAKOV, [1971] 1993, pp. 214-226, B. LINCOLN, 1999, pp. 76-100, and S. ARVIDSSON, 2006, pp. 17-23, situate it in their wider arguments about Jones's role in the development of European nationalism and racism, while TH.R. TRAUTMANN, 1997, pp. 28-61, discusses Jones's work in the context of colonialism and its place in the development of European racism. T. BALLANTYNE, 2002, pp. 22-30, concentrates on the role of Jones's works within the context of oriental attitudes of the British colonials towards the native Indian population. P. VASUNIA, 2015, works from *On the Gods* to illustrate the broader implications of the status of classical scholarship in colonial India.

is especially so since, in a sense, *On the Gods* paved the way for Jones's fame as an Indologist: his efforts to align Hindu with classical mythology, and ultimately Biblical history, particularly warmed his audience in Europe to Indian culture. In my view, a more detailed study of the text is also desirable in order to be able to put into perspective G. Cannon's (1990, p. 297) rather harsh judgement about it. He dismisses *On the Gods,* because most of its findings were proved to be incorrect, but to evaluate the text according to our own modern standards of accuracy would blind us for Jones's own sensitivities and complexities, and obscure our view on Jones's scholarly practice.[15]

2. "I have no European book"

In order to illuminate one scholarly aspect of *On the Gods*, classical philology is an attractive venue, because Jones was well-versed in the discipline. If we want to understand how Jones connected the world of the Hindus with that of classical antiquity,[16] it seems fair to ask how Jones used the classical sources to find, support, and substantiate his comparisons between ancient Greek and Hindu mythology. Are there any clear selections, omissions and fore-groundings in his essay *On the Gods*? Surprisingly, Jones himself answers part of the question quite early on in his essay. He apologizes for the fact that, for reasons of time, his work is "very superficial" (*On the Gods*, p. 324), and that his investigation lacks depth

> "principally because I have no European book, to refresh my memory of old fables, except the conceited, though not unlearned, work of Pomey, entitled the *Pantheum*, and that so miserably translated, that it can hardly be read with patience."

We can infer from this that Jones did not have the luxury of a library at his disposal, and it seems rather likely that he would not highlight this issue out of sheer modesty. Although he seems to have loathed Tooke's English translation of the Jesuit François Pomey's "conceited" Latin *Pantheum* (1757),[17] he found it agreeable as an *aide de*

[15] See also, H. MOMMA, 2013, pp. 40-43, who acknowledges G. Cannon's judgement, but accepts the historical value of the essay nonetheless.

[16] In contrast to Greco-Roman mythology, discussion of Hinduism is open to religious sensitivities. That Sir William Jones had no such scruples, should be taken into account, but should also be placed in the historical context.

[17] Full name *Pantheum mythicum, seu fabulosa deorum historia, hoc epitomes eruditionis volumine breviter dilucidèque comprehensa*; The English translation by Andrew Tooke was published in 1778.

mémoire. He added that, if he were to browse the works of "mythologers", he would be able to make many more comparisons.

The fact that his reservoir of classical sources was limited to Pomey, implies that his use of the classical sources is conditioned by a pre-selection of classical mythology. As Pomey provides multiple versions of the same Greco-Roman myths, the aim will be to determine what Jones's selective habits are in his use of Pomey, and to determine why Jones decides for the choices he makes: how does he adopt and adapt the sources from Pomey's *Pantheum*? To what extent does Jones select from Pomey, and how much does he omit from this material? Are all (classical) sources directly traceable through Pomey, or does Jones also use sources that are not mentioned in the *Pantheum*? In addition, I will also examine how Jones approached the materials he did select for inclusion into his argument. To what extent did he reject or criticize any sources, or did he only mention those sources that proved to be of any help? Such a critical treatment of Jones's sources seems particularly urgent since Marshall's edition is selective and, in some cases, directs the reader to the wrong *loci*. More importantly, however, Marshall did not take into account the fact that Jones solely used Pomey's work.

Before examining three case studies that illuminate these questions from various perspectives, I first need to say a little bit more about Jones' views of history and myth, which form the necessary background for any interpretation of *On the Gods*.

3. Aims and outline of Jones's *On the Gods*

Like almost all of his contemporaries, Jones saw both Greco-Roman and Hindu mythology through the lens of Biblical history. He assures his audience that for him Biblical history stands as "adamantine pillars", notwithstanding the conclusions he draws from his research of Hindu mythology. He sees a future in which there is a place for the antiquity of Indian literature: Jones even openly states that he is open to arguments which can "clearly convince [him], that Moses drew his narrative through *Egyptian* conduits from the primeval fountains of Indian literature, (...)."[18] Yet, he consistently reaffirms his belief that earth's history according to Genesis is an irrefutable fact, only in need of further elaboration. Mosaic history is

[18] *Works* III, pp. 324-326.

his framework, and through this perspective he evaluates Hindu mythology.[19] This means that, on the level of the interpretation of individual myths, he had to find ways to insert the ancient mythologies into his Biblical framework of world history, and his comparisons between Greco-Roman and Hindu mythology helped him to achieve exactly this.[20]

Jones realized that comparing myths from different cultures was not without methodological problems. Right at the start of his essay, he distinguishes accidental and related similarities in mythology (*On the Gods*, p. 319). Jones believes that the parallels between Greco-Roman and Hindu mythology which he identifies, testify to a form of genetic relatedness. Jones says that the resemblances amongst the "popular worship of the old *Greeks* and *Italians* and that of the *Hindus*", and the religions of "Egypt, China, Persia, Phrygia, Phoenice, Syria; (...) the southern kingdoms and even islands of America" (*On the Gods,* pp. 319-320) cannot be accidental, even though this assumption may not be made a priori. Regarding the Germanic cults in northern Europe, Jones also claims that they were not just similar to that of Italy and Greece, but were "same in another dress with an embroidery of images apparently *Asiatick*" (p. 320). He accordingly hypothesizes that the "most distinguished inhabitants of the primitive world" must have split up at some time in early history from the "rational adoration of the only true God" (p. 320). According to Jones, we can conclude, the religions of these people are not just related in a superficial typological way: at a certain point in time they shared their religious beliefs in the one god.

But if all these peoples were originally united in the belief of one god, the question remains how their different mythologies could have emerged. To explain this, Jones offers four ways of explaining how "rational" beliefs can give way to mythology (p. 320-322).[21] Jones says that perverted historical or natural facts stem from "ignorance, imagination, flattery, or stupidity"; that the ancients deified static,

[19] TH.R. TRAUTMANN, 1997, pp. 28-61, B. LINCOLN 1999, pp. 76-100, B. LINCOLN, 2002, S. ARVIDSSON, 2006, pp. 13-21, and U. APP, 2009, esp. pp. 6-15, have shown that Jones's world view was principally Bible-based: as a consequence, his interpretation of oriental sources largely depended on Christian doctrine.

[20] Jones's final resort to Scripture in his conclusion is met with negative critique by modern scholars. A. DAVID, 1996, pp. 175-176, sees a certain pragmatism behind Jones's yielding to doctrine, while M.J. FRANKLIN, 2011, p. 227, notes "a real failure of nerve".

[21] B. LINCOLN, 2002, p. 4, calls this method 'euhemerist hermeneutics'.

natural phenomena through "wild admiration of the heavenly bodies"; that "(...) the magick of poetry" personifies abstract notions, as it is poetry's "essential business (...), to personify the most abstract notions, and to place a nymph or a genius in every grove and almost in every flower"; and that "metaphors and allegories of moralists and metaphysicians" are often portrayed as deities. From these categories, we witness the combined influence of Bacon, Newton, and Bryant.[22] Here, we should take into account that Pomey's work may have been used for more purposes than just a thesaurus of mythology: if we consult Pomey, we see that Jones also follows the philosophy of Pomey's *Pantheum*.[23] Pomey believes that a firm knowledge of classical mythology does not just contribute to a profound knowledge of (true and real) religion, but also equips the student with a firm grasp of poetics.[24]

4. General introduction case studies

After Jones has set out his analytical criteria, he starts his essay with the comparison of Gaṇeśa and Janus, as deities of starts and openings. The topics that Jones afterwards discusses in his essay are: Saturn and time in India; Jupiter, the oneness of different aspects of Jupiter and the Hindu *trimūrti*; how female deities can be reconciled in a similar manner; and finally, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, two avatars of Viṣṇu. As the present discussion cannot be exhaustive, I will show three different ways in which Jones uses Pomey's text. First, I will discuss how Jones reshapes Saturn's genealogy as compared to Pomey, in order to fit both the Greco-Roman and the Hindu evidence in the Biblical narrative of the flood. Second, the case of Minos, an excursus on Saturn and chronology, elucidates Jones's associative method in

[22] *On the Gods* (p. 392). B. LINCOLN, 2002, in particular argued that Jones takes his view on history mainly from three sources in particular, to wit the works of Francis Bacon (1561-1626), Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1726), and Jacob Bryant (1715-1804) (cf. *Works* III, pp. 39-40). The influence of the Newton and Bryant is studied by TH.R. TRAUTMANN, 1997, pp. 41-61, while B. Lincoln pays special attention to the impact of Bryant (1999, pp. 76-100) and Newton (2002). To a lesser extent, S. ARVIDSSON, 2006, pp. 13-21, treats Bryant, and U. APP, 2009, pp. 6-15, treats Newton and Bryant. There is no full treatment of Francis Bacon's place in Jones's historical views to my knowledge.

[23] See *Pantheum* pp. 2-3; TOOKE, 1731, pp. 2-4. It must be noted that in the rest of this paper, Pomey's *Pantheum* will refer to Tooke's English translation that Jones possessed.

[24] P.-J. SALAZAR, 1991, p. 883, sees Pomey's *Pantheum* as a medium for learning to discern poetry from history, truth from falsehood; see also P. RUTISHAUSER, 2008, for a succinct portrayal of the *Pantheum* as a whole.

constructing his comparisons. At first glance, Jones's text may seem erratic or chaotic, but when we follow his reading of Pomey, we see that there is a rationale behind it. Third, the comparison of Dionysus and Rāma will be adduced as an example of how Jones tacitly engages with classical scholarship - Vossius, Huetius, and Bochart - that he finds through Pomey.

4.1. The flood as landmark: Saturn – Noah – Manu (*On the Gods*, pp. 329-347)

In order to illustrate how Jones used comparisons between Greco-Roman and Indian mythology to align pre-Christian myths with the Bible, it is helpful to look at his discussion of Saturn, Noah, and Manu. This discussion shows how Jones, on the basis of a series of identifications, forges a web of mythological interconnections that allow him to introduce Hindu mythology into a Biblical framework. Here, Jones uses the second of the two traditions on Saturn's genealogy, which connects Saturn with Noah. The former notion of Saturn being the son of "Earth and Heaven, who was the son of Sky and Day" (*Pantheum*, p. 125) is tacitly rejected by Jones. Instead, he continues the second option provided by Pomey (*Pantheum*, pp. 130-132), which identifies Saturn with the son of Oceanus and Thetys. This re-identification, relying on other traditions than Pomey, e.g. that of Bochart, allows him to establish a connection with Noah, who was saved, instead of born, from the flood.[25]

A look at the use of sources, reveals how Jones selected his materials to support his case. While Jones does not explicitly refer to Pomey or Bochart here, Jones adduces paraphrases from Plato's *Timaeus* 40E-41A and Vergil's *Aeneid* 6.784-787 to substantiate his claim. When displayed next to the original *Timaeus* passage, the paraphrase seems incomplete:

> "that both SATURN or time, and his consort CYBELE, or the Earth, together with their attendants, were the children of Ocean and Thetis, (...)."[26]

[25] Pomey's discussion of the Saturn-Noah connection, *Pantheum*, pp. 130-132, follows Bochart's description: see Bochart *Phaleg* book I, 11B. In his collected works, Jones only cites Bochart twice: both times in *On the Gods*, once in the introduction, p. 320, and once in the passage on Saturn, p. 331.

[26] *On the Gods*, p. 330; cf. Pl. *Ti.* 40E-41A γῆς τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ παῖδες Ὠκεανός τε καὶ Τηθὺς ἐγενέσθην, τούτων δὲ Φόρκυς Κρόνος τε καὶ Ῥέα καὶ ὅσοι μετὰ τούτων, ἐκ δὲ Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας Ζεὺς Ἥρα τε καὶ πάντες ὅσους ἴσμεν ἀδελφοὺς λεγομένους αὐτῶν, ἔτι τε τούτων ἄλλους ἐκγόνους.

But when we compare it to the untranslated (Latin) paraphrase in the footnote in *Pantheum*, p. 131,[27] Jones's paraphrase is rather a translation of Pomey's footnote:

> Κρόνος καὶ Ῥέα ὅσοι μετὰ τούτων &c *id est Saturnus et Rhea et qui cum illis fuêre ex Oceano et Thetide nati perhibentur.*

The paraphrase of Vergil is more problematic in light of Jones's use of Pomey. It is clear that he wants to use it to introduce Ceres as the daughter of Saturn, in order to locate the Hindu goddess Lakṣmī in the comparison with Saturn. Jones says that "the goddess of harvests, [who] was, it seems, their daughter", and then paraphrases Vergil:

> "the mother and nurse of all as crowned with turrets, in a car drawn by lions, and exulting in her hundred grandsons, all divine, all inhabiting splendid celestial mansions."[28]

Jones connects this passage with Ceres, but the Latin original narrates the *Berecyntia mater*, or Cybele. This element is not taken into Jones's account, while at the same time Cybele is already assigned to be the wife of Saturn via the *Timaeus* passage. Ceres either as Saturnus' daughter or as his sister are not uncommon tropes, and both are subscribed to by Pomey.[29] Taking into consideration the notion that Jones was able to consult the original Latin,[30] - perhaps motivated by Tooke's translation - [31] Jones may have felt the need to paraphrase the Vergilian quote selectively to suit his argumentative needs. What is clear, is that Jones wanted or needed a quote concerning a fertility goddess to add Ceres (Berecynthia) as Saturn's daughter, and we will see later on that he needed Ceres to fit the Hindu goddess Lakṣmī into his constellation.

[27] In general, Tooke does not translate Pomey's footnotes.

[28] *On the Gods*, p. 330; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.784-787 in Pomey's Latin text (also in Tooke's translation): *Qualis Berecyntia mater / invehitur curru Phrygiae turrita per urbes / laeta deum partu, centum complexa nepotes, / omnis caelicolas, omnis supera alta tenentis.*

[29] Compare *Pantheum*, p. 125 and 160 respectively; the former is found rarely, and goes back to Ennius' *Euhemerus* (via Lactant. *Div. inst.* 1.14), while the latter Hesiodic one is more common and Greek in origin (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 453-454).

[30] Cf. *Pantheum*, p. 155.

[31] See *Pantheum*, p. 155: "High as the mother of the Gods in place, / And proud, like her, of an immortal race."

After several other references, which Jones adopts without further discussion,[32] Jones paraphrases Ovid's *Fasti* 1.235-240 "the divine stranger arrived in a ship on the Italian coast" as an indication that Saturn survived the flood by boat. It cannot be found in Pomey's texts, suggesting that he worked from memory here. On the other hand, Jones literally translates Pomey's Latin translation of the Greek Alexander Polyhistor, to show that Saturn, just as Noah, had predicted the flood:

> *Saturnus praenunciat magnam imbrium vim futuram, et fabricandam esse arcam, et in ea cum volucribus, reptilibus, atque jumentis esse navigandum.*[33]
>
> "that he predicted an extraordinary fall of rain, and ordered the construction of a vessel, in which it was necessary to secure men, birds, and reptiles from a general inundation."[34]

"If it really came from genuine antiquity", Jones gives it preference over Ovid's account, being more in accordance with "the true history of Noah" (*On the Gods*, p. 331). Jones's caution seems to stem from the indirect attestation of the source, since Polyhistor's account is quoted via Cyrillus' *Contra Julianum*, yet he sees no problem to introduce it into his argument. Interesting here is that he has faithfully used Pomey's Latin translation (via Tooke) of the Greek original.

Jones (*On the Gods*, p. 331) concludes that the flood is an anchoring point for later chronologies: Noah and his wife, "[who] was in fact the universal mother", emerged from the waves, after they had found land after the flood. Saturn and Cybele (the earth mother) sprang forth from Oceanus and Thetis, two aquatic deities, and formed the sky and earth. Noah and his wife are, thus, the prototypes for Saturn and Cybele. The second genealogy that Pomey provides, makes the Saturn-Noah connection more compelling, as Saturn is the son of two aquatic deities, who Jones sees as allegory of the Biblical flood. With this genealogy in mind, Jones continues to wonder whether there is an Indian Noah, so as to bring Hindu mythology into the comparison. The immediate answer to the question is yes: "this was Menu [IAST Manu], or Satyavrata, (...), or child of the sun." The similarity between Noah and

[32] Festus' etymology of Saturn from *a satu* "from planting" *Verb. sign.* 186.19 (see Pomey *Pantheum*, p. 126); the stern of a galley found on the reverse of Roman coins as an allegory of Noah's ark from Plut. *Mor.* 274e (see Pomey *Pantheum,* p. 131).

[33] Pomey *Pantheum*, p. 131: Pomey seems to have combined this Latin quote out of Cyr. *Juln* 1.7.9-11 and 1.7.4-7.

[34] Jones *On the Gods*, p. 331.

Manu is based on the fact that both of them had given life to a renewed world: Manu was regarded as the progenitor of men, and as the author of the *Laws of Manu* (*Manusmṛti*, which Jones would later on translate into English). Jones cites the story of Manu from an Indo-Persian translation of the *Bhagavatapurāṇa*,[35] which he calls "whimsically dressed up in the form of an allegory" (p. 338): the allegorical Indian evidence of the Biblical deluge. Viṣṇu's avatar Matsya had warned Manu for the coming flood, who therefore managed to save his family, the seven sages, and most importantly, the Vedas. Jones admits that there are other examples of deluges in the *purāṇa*s. The second avatar of Viṣṇu, Kūrma, and third, Varāha, who also save the world from flood, do not represent the Biblical flood, but rather an allegory of the salvation of earth and life from water. Jones reduces the three narratives of the deluge to one by analysing them as "a moral, a metaphysical, and an astronomical, allegory" of the same Biblical event.

At the end of his discussion (*On the Gods*, pp. 346-347), Jones needs the new model of Saturn's genealogy again to show that Ceres as Saturn's daughter should be connected with the Hindu deity Lakṣmī. This explicit inclusion of Ceres as Saturn's daughter, serves to further cement the relationship between Saturn and Manu. Jones suggests that Lakṣmī should be seen as Manu's daughter, while he admits that the sage Bhṛgu, one of the seven sages saved *by* Manu, is actually her father. Here he blends both figures through their involvement with "the first Code of sacred ordinances (was) promulgated". Jones does not seem to be troubled by this fact, and he continues his comparison. He substantiates his assumption that Ceres is similar to Hindu Lakṣmī with three arguments. First, they are linked through the consonantal correspondences of Ceres and Lakṣmī's name Srī(s) [IAST Śrīḥ] in the nominative, "*fortune* or *prosperity*" (see table 1). Second, Jones states that it cannot be coincidence that two "nations" represent a deity, which "preside[s] over their labours" (i.e. agriculture), as a woman.

Sanskrit	S	-	r	ī	s
Latin	C	e	r	e	s

Table 1: Srī and Ceres (if the <c> is understood as a sibilant)

[35] Canto 8.24.5-59; *On the Gods* pp. 332-338; cf. N.S. Shukla, 1974, or A. Truschke, 2015, for the term Indo-Persian, and the problems concerning lacking text editions.

Third, and perhaps most interestingly, during his visit of the temples at "Gayá" [IAST Bodh Gayā], he saw a statue of Lakṣmī with "full breasts and a *cord* twisted under her arm like a *horn of plenty*". The connection with Ceres and the cornucopia seems evident. The plate in Pomey's *Pantheum* shows her with poppies in her left hand, and a torch in the raised right hand. The central coin in the bottom of the plate may be interpreted as Ceres holding a cornucopia, but it may as well be an ear of corn. We read in Pomey that "her bosom swells with breasts as white as snow" (p. 160); this does seem to come close to Jones's phrasing. Jones adopts Pomey's idea of the swelling bosom, but the cornucopia as Ceres' attribute may be an addition by Jones. Perhaps the earlier confusion of Cybele and Ceres may be at work here. At any rate, it must be noted that Lakṣmī's inclusion relies on the associative connection between her father Bhṛgu and Manu. Her presence provides Jones with a Hindu parallel of the allegorical deity of land and life recovered after the flood. In the past paragraph, we have seen that Jones follows Pomey, and the associated tradition, closely, as it concerns the genealogy of Saturn; Pomey's primary genealogy is neglected, while the second is adapted in order to fit the Hindu material, e.g. Ceres and Lakṣmī.

4.2. Minos = Manu; Saturn ≈ Manu ≈ Noah (*On the Gods*, pp. 339-346)

Jones's discussion of Minos is part of his treatment of Saturn. In *On the Gods* p. 339 Jones introduces Minos in the Noah-Saturn-Manu discussion, and goes into the parallelisms of Biblical and Hindu chronology. As we have seen, the equation of the Biblical flood and the flood during Manu's age allows him to uphold the comparison of Saturn and Manu. Furthermore, Jones argues that the Hindu Satyayuga equals the Saturnian age through an analysis of Viṣṇu's avatars.[36] On pages 339-343 he sets apart and compares the ages of the three traditions (table 2):

[36] The *yugas*, or 'cosmic ages', are represented by Viṣṇu's avatars: in the Satyayuga the deity comes to earth as Matsya 'the fish-man', Kūrma 'the tortoise', Varāha 'the boar' (according to Jones, the boar is second, and the tortoise third), Narasiṃha 'the lion-man'; in the Tretāyuga as Vāmana, Paraśurāma 'Rāma with the axe', Rāma; in the Dvāparayuga as Kṛṣṇa; and in the Kaliyuga as the Buddha, and at the end of times (which is still to come) as Kalki.

	Greco-Roman	*Hindu*	*Biblical "true history"*
1	Golden age (Saturnian)	Satyayuga	Ante-Diluvian age, Noah, and age of Babel
2	Silver age	Tretāyuga	Patriarchal age
3	Copper age	Dvāparayuga	Mosaick age
4	Iron (earthen) age	Kaliyuga	Prophetical age

Table 2, based on *On the Gods* pp. 339-343.

To Jones, the vices and virtues particular to each age link different traditions together. The first is characterized by "abounding in gold" for the Greco-Roman tradition, and *satya* in the meaning of "*truth* and *probity*", while Jones identifies the first biblical age as "purest age". To Jones, the patriarchal age is "pure"; the age of Moses, "less pure" - the divine ordinances are "comparatively well-observed" and "uncorrupted"; but in the "impure" age of the prophets "apostate kings and degenerate nations" continue until end of days. In the Greco-Roman ages, Jones sees the decrease in virtue paralleled in the decrease in value of the metal, while he notes that the deterioration of the ages is also reflected in the characterization of the Indian *yugas*. As Pomey only briefly discusses the golden age (pp. 126-127), it seems likely that Jones did not rely on the *Pantheum* here, and tapped from his own learning.

In the rather elaborate excursus that follows, in which he dwells from the golden age and Satyayuga, to chronology and Minos, to lawgivers, and finally to time and death, Jones claims that the king Minos known from classical antiquity actually was the Indian Manu. Although he engages little with the actual content of the *Pantheum*, this passage gives an example of how Jones reads it associatively.

After having established the parallels between the different traditions, Jones notes that the Hindu *yugas* are too "arithmetical[ly]" and "geometrical[ly]" to be true. Although he believes that ancient philosophers, such as Archytas and Archimedes, would have enjoyed their rhythmic structure, Jones discards the *yugas*, in favour of the irregular "true history" of the Bible, evaluating the *yugas* as a "puerility", "riddle", "mystery", and not worthy of "serious history".[37] Jones calls Archytas "*the measurer of sea and earth and the numberer of their sands*", referring to Horace's *Odes* 1.28.1-2,[38] seemingly quoting from the top of his head, as

[37] Cf. R. ARNOLD, 1999, pp. 57-58 where he illustrates and studies Jones's disdain for classical philosophy, and its disconnection from society.

[38] *Te maris et terrae numeroque carentis harenae / mensorem cohibent, Archyta,...*

there is no trace of the lines in Pomey. At the same time, this reference implies the Cretan king Minos, who is mentioned in line 9 of the same Ode.[39] Jones argues that Minos must have been Manu, subtly adducing the etymological correspondence of the consonants in the nominative *Menu*-s [IAST Manuḥ] and *Minos*. Furthermore, he infers from unspecified passages of Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliotheca Historica* (probably 5.4.64.2 and 5.4.77.4) that "the Cretans (...) used to feign, that most of the great men, who had been deified, in return for the benefits which they had conferred on mankind, were born in their island", and that Minos, thus, may have been from India rather than Crete. Jones supposes here that Minos *is* Manu, after having travelled from India to Crete. Pomey refers to *Bibliotheca* 5 too, when he (*Pantheum* pp. 126-127) explains that Diodorus noted that Saturn, in the golden age, civilized the Italians after his banishment by Jupiter. As Jones probably consulted this exact passage in Pomey for Saturn and the Golden Age above, it seems likely that he ran across Pomey's reference, and was reminded of the passage about Minos.

With the possibility of Minos's oriental origin open, the coupling of Minos and Manu serves to underscore the element of the lawgiver, which is attributed to Saturn as well. Jones quotes the Latin of Vergil *Aeneid* 8.321-322 to show Saturn's function as a lawgiver, found in Pomey's *Pantheum* (p. 127):

> *Qui genus indocile ac dispersum montibus altis*
> *composuit legesque dedit* (...)[40]

The quote has been taken literally from Pomey's treatment of Saturn and the golden age. *Qui* in verse 321 (given as the pronoun *is* in Pomey's text) fits within the English sentence structure of Jones's own text, referring to the antecedent "lawgiver" (p. 345). The idea is that Saturn and Manu are both lawgivers in the ages that are marked by the flood. The notion that Minos and Saturn are related is new, as far as Pomey is concerned, but we can follow Jones's associative reading of the Pomey passage, to the Diodorus association, to another quote related to the golden age, namely from the *Aeneid*.

Finally, from Saturn as a lawgiver, Jones returns to Minos and Manu, involving Manu's brother Yama, who, as a judge of the dead, either let the deceased

[39] *Iovis arcanis Minos admissus* "Minos who was admitted to Jove's secrets"; own translation.

[40] "Who tamed the wild tribe that was dispersed over the high mountains and gave them laws."

ascend to "Swerga [IAST Svarga], or the first heaven" or descend to "Narac [IAST Naraka], the region of serpents". The silent assumption that Minos was, together with his brother Rhadamanthus, the lawgiver of the dead in Greek mythology, helps Jones to affirm the connection between Manu-Yama and Minos-Rhadamanthus,[41] and to argue that Yama's identification with Kāla, the demon of time and death, links Yama, and by association Manu, to Saturn and his Greek name Cronus. The Greek name Κρόνος "Cronos", Jones notes, can easily be confused with the Greek noun for time χρόνος "chronos". Although the idea is not unique to Pomey,[42] Jones must have been heavily consulting this passage when he wrote the present chapter in *On the Gods*.

Crucial is that Jones uses the siblingship of both pairs, and the association of Yama with time and death, as an argument to further link Minos and Manu, and consequently Manu and Saturn through the additional evidence of time, death, law, and the deluge. The manner in which Jones uses Pomey here is highly associative: he meanders from the division of the ages, to Archytas (his own invention), to Minos while using the Diodorus passage for other reasons than Pomey, yet again clinging to the topic of lawgiver, which was treated by Pomey with the Diodorus passage, and then citing from the *Aeneid* via Pomey. This method makes the first reading of Jones's text rather complex, yet it gives us also an extraordinary view into his way of thinking and associating.

4.3. Dionysus in India, and Rāma (*On the Gods*, pp. 370-374)

After he has spent considerable time to the notion of the oneness of the *trimūrti* (Brahmā, Śiva, and Viṣṇu), Jones turns to Viṣṇu's seventh *avatāra* Rāma.[43] This figure attracts Jones's attention, because he sees correspondences with the Greco-Roman deity Dionysus (*On the Gods*, pp. 370-374). Jones states that "both nations had records or traditionary accounts of his *giving laws* to men", but he is more interested in Dionysus' conquest of India to reinterpret the older idea of Dionysus as the Biblical son of Cush, Nimrod (cf. Pomey *Pantheum,* pp. 64-66). Connecting Dionysus with Rāma, Jones is led to believe that the Hindu evidence rather points to Raamah, another of Cush's sons. To illustrate his point, Jones

[41] See also "the judges of hell" Pomey's *Pantheum*, pp. 234-235.
[42] See *Pantheum*, pp. 132-133.
[43] An *avatāra* is a manifestation of a deity on earth to restore balance to the world.

establishes the parallels in the main narratives about Dionysos and Rāma: first their respective devotees, then the main plotlines of Nonnus's *Dionysiaca* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and finally the links between the places associated with them.

Jones's immediate concern goes out to the complexities of the narratives surrounding the figure of Rāma. The *avatāra* is a model for kingship, and as the main protagonist of the Sanskrit epic the *Rāmāyaṇa*, he is banished by his stepmother, who wants her own son, Bharata, as the next in line for the Ayodhyā royal throne instead of Rāma, the actual eldest prince. Fifteen years, Rāma, his wife Sītā, and his brother Lakṣman spend in exile, but Sītā is abducted by the demon-king Rāvaṇa to the island of (Śrī) Laṅkā. There, helped by the deity Hanumān and his brother Lakṣmaṇa, Rāma wages war to retrieve his wife. In the end, they return to Ayodhyā, where Rāma becomes king. After a brief sketch of the *Rāmāyaṇa* plot, Jones turns to Rāma's retinue of the "numerous and intrepid race of those large Monkeys", and in particular Hanumān. Speaking from his own experience, Jones notes that the monkeys, "*Indian* Satyrs", stand in high veneration among Hindus, "live in tribes of three or four hundred, are wonderfully gentle (I speak as an eye-witness), and appear to have some kind of order and subordination in their little sylvan polity."[44] He concludes that these creatures must be what the Greeks called satyrs. The second level of comparison is the couple Pan and Hanumān, and in particular by the introduction of the latter's father, the wind god Pavana, for a twofold reason. First, Jones argues that the aspect of the wind god Pavana is found in Pan's improvement to the flute by adding six reeds to it, while, second, Jones remarks that Hanumān is the namesake of one of the four "systems of *Indian* musick", which connects him with Pan as the inventor of the pan flute.

Jones provides a second argument in the parallels that follow from the epic representation of Rāma. He connects the "war of *Lancá* [IAST Laṅkā]", or the *Rāmāyaṇa* composed by the poet Vālmīki, with "the learned and elaborate work of Nonnus, entitled *Dionysiaca*". In both epics, Dionysus and Rāma travel eastwards to complete their goal, and specially titillating to Jones is Dionysus' journey to India, accompanied by his army of Maenads and Satyrs (the monkeys). Jones is confident (*On the Gods*, pp. 372-373) that a close reading of both texts, will yield more proof that Dionysus and Rāma are the same. His third argument is that Dionysos was born on mount Meros, the Indian mountain Meru, close to the city of Naiṣadha, known as

[44] *On the Gods*, p. 371.

Nysa or Dionysopolis "by the Grecian geographers", although Jones concedes that Rāma is more popularly believed to have been born in Ayodhyā.

Jones's investigation of Dionysus and Rāma leads him to conclude that they must be related to Cush's fourth son Raamah (Jones's spelling of Ra'mâh; Gen. 10.7). The connection with Raamah engages with an interesting discourse with Pomey's "historical sense of the fable" (*Pantheum*, pp. 64-66). Pomey says that Bacchus may have been the mythologized Cush's son Nimrod (Gen. 10.8), deriving his ideas from Samuel Bochart's *Phaleg* (p. 13b.c.), for several reasons,[45] ranging from the resemblance of *Bacchus* and Hebrew *Bar-chus* "son of Chush" to Moses calling Nimrod "a great hunter" and *Bacchus* ζαγρεύς "hunter".

By mentioning Dionysus-Rāma as a son of Cush, Jones implicitly engages with Pomey and older scholarship, but he leaves aside some details: for example, Pomey also illustrates the notion that *Moses* might have been the template for the Greco-Roman Dionysus. When we take a closer look at the footnotes of either possibilities (Nimrod and Moses), we see that Pomey refers not just to Bochart's *Phaleg*, but also his *Canaan* (pp. 477-486), and via Bochart's *Canaan* Pomey refers to Gerard Vossius' *De Theologia Gentili* (liber I, caput XXX, pp. 224-235).[46] Furthermore, Pomey refers to Pierre-Daniel Huet's *Demonstratio Evangelica* (pp. 79c, 151a). All of these authors treat Dionysus'/Bacchus'/Liber's (possible) connection with both Nimrod and Moses, while sharing the same arguments (Pomey provides the summary of the discussion). Jones only engages implicitly with Nimrod, while he ignores Moses. By mentioning a son of Cush as the template for Dionysus, he involves himself in the discussion, but the evidence that Jones produces does not dispel Pomey's and Bochart's argument. Yet, Jones's presentation of the Indian material can be seen as an addition to (or perhaps refinement of) the historical place of Bacchus-Dionysus in biblical history: to Jones, the Indian material clarifies which son of Cush is related to the Greco-Roman god. The evidence of Rāma in connection with Dionysus, and the similarity between Rāma and Raamah provide Jones with more compelling evidence.

Although Jones ties into pre-existing ideas on Dionysus, Nimrod, and Moses, it is hard to believe that he did not consult the according passages in Pomey. Twice Nonnus' *Dionysiaca* are cited by Pomey, once in relation to the word νόσος (*Pantheum* p. 57), the second time because Dionysos split the rivers the Orontes and

[45] Cf. the footnote on *Pantheum*, p. 64.

[46] See *Pantheum* p. 64 footnote z "Vossius apud Bochart. in suo Canaan et Huet. in Demonstr. Evang."

the Hydaspes with his Thyrsus, as a resemblance to Moses splitting the Red Sea (*Pantheum* p. 65). Both the sources and the type of discussion that Jones introduces in his essay lead to believe that he consulted this passage in the *Pantheum*. In itself, this notion may seem trivial, but when we reconsider the overt models for the genre of the essay, we see that the case of Rāma reveals that the levels of scholarship in Jones's *On the Gods* are more complex than may seem from the surface.

Jones explicitly mentions scholars such as Bacon, Newton, or Bryant as his primary intellectual sources. At the same time, we saw that Jones admits slightly embarrassed that he used Pomey's *Pantheum* as a 'source of sources', but we also encountered dependence on Pomey's methodology, and use of classical scholarship through Pomey, such as Huetius, Bochart, and Vossius – all of them, Pomey included, continental scholars. It would be easy to accuse Jones or modern scholarship of Anglophone chauvinism, but it seems in any case that a careful scrutiny of the sources of *On the Gods* has proven powerful to address multiple layers of both explicit and implicit scholarship.

5. Conclusion and outlook

If we return to our initial question of how Jones adopts and adapts sources from Pomey's *Pantheum*, we are now able to formulate some more definitive answers. As I have shown in the previous pages, Jones relies quite consistently on Pomey as 'a source of sources'. True, we have seen that he adduces his own sources (e.g. Horace *Ode* 1.28) to construct his argument. But his dependence on Pomey was predominant either through direct citation (Plato's *Timaeus*) or indirect clues (Diodorus' *Bibliotheca*). Generally, in the three case studies, we have seen three distinct types of adaptation and adoption. First, whereas Jones is strictly interested in the scholarly (Biblical) interpretation of history, and the allegorical explanation of Greco-Roman mythology in it, Pomey provides both the literary diversity of Greco-Roman mythology, and a short illustration of the kernel of Biblical truth in every myth. Especially when Jones discusses Hindu mythology, he needs to adduce additional evidence from Greco-Roman mythology to make the inclusion of Hindu material possible, as was shown in the case of Ceres. Second, we can see Jones's associative browsing between a limited number of pages in Pomey. While the actual text of the *On the Gods* may at times seem erratic and also rather associative, tracing the quotations from *On the Gods* to the *Pantheum* allows us to witness the mind and thinking, the method and heuristics of a 18th century scholar in India, bereft of his library.

Third, the fact that Jones's heavy reliance on Pomey has been left unnoticed in the scholarship marks a huge gap in our understanding of a key text in Jones's oeuvre. Although Jones's methods may not have been as original as scholars would have hoped, we can now see that he included, often indirectly, a more varied array of traditions in his thinking than we previously have seen, while we may also speculate that his comparative interests already existed in Europe. This brings us to the question as to why he brought specifically Pomey to India? Just because it was a convenient thesaurus, or also because it contained references to European scholarship on the connections between human cultures in the context of Scripture? In light of his use of both primary and secondary sources via Pomey, and his scholarly interests in his later Indian career, this hypothesis may not be too farfetched.

From what preceded, some other questions on forgetting in modern scholarship emerge. First of all, it seems almost unexplainable why previous scholarship has not noticed Jones's own claim that he was only able to use Pomey's *Pantheum* as a 'source of sources'. In past scholarship, a lot of attention has been drawn to Jones's explicit sources of inspiration, such as Newton, Bryant, and Bacon, but through his usage of Pomey other implicit traditions become visible: by carefully following the classical sources from Jones to Pomey, we came across other possible, yet indirect, models for Jones's *On the Gods*. This raises the question whether such (accidental) negligence of indirect sources occurs more often, and more importantly if we can train ourselves to become more sensitive to such overt overlooking of important sources. Perhaps a more thorough look at implied sources might offer a fruitful start to a more sensitive scrutiny of texts such as Jones's other Anniversary Discourses. Although such an approach is more philological than historical, and rather labor-intensive, it yields a view on traditions that are implicitly taken into account by the object of research. Such an approach may also visualize the train of thought of scholars such as Jones, providing an additional heuristic tool, besides careful examination of sources such as letters, to approach their scholarly practice. Furthermore, in historical case studies, where the citation habit is different from modern-day scholarship, criticism of sources embedded in explicit citations may be necessary to open up new vistas on forgotten connections.[47]

[47] I would like to thank Dr. Han Lamers (Oslo), and Prof. Dr. Toon Van Hal (Leuven) for helping me find my way into the history of philology, and in particular into this paper. I would also like to thank Meenaksi Ramesh MA for our wonderful conversations on Hinduism, Omar Barahona MA for correcting the Spanish summary, Redmer Kronemeijer MA for lending his critical eye, and of course the reviewers for their useful commentary.

6. Bibliography

U. APP, 2009, "William Jones's Ancient Theology", *Sino-Platonic Papers* 191.

R. ARNOLD, 2001, *William Jones: ein Orientalist zwischen Kolonialismus und Aufklärung,* Würzburg.

S. ARVIDSSON, 2006, *Aryan Idols; Indo-European Mythology as Ideology and Science,* Sonia Wichmann (translation), Chicago - London.

T. BALLANTYNE, 2002, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire,* Hampshire.

S. BOCHART, 1646, *Geographia sacra: Chanaan seu de coloniis et sermone Phoenicum,* Cadomi.

S. BOCHART, 1651, *Geographiae sacrae pars prior Phaleg,* Cadomi.

L. CAMPBELL, 2006, "Why Sir William Jones Got it all Wrong, or Jones' Role in how to Establish Language Families", *Anuario del seminario de filología Vasca "Julio de Urquijo"* 40, pp. 245-264.

G. CANNON, 1964, *Oriental Jones; a Biography of Sir William Jones (1746-1794),* London.

G. CANNON, 1984, "Sir William Jones, Persian, Sanskrit and the Asiatic Society", *Histoire épistémologie langage: genèse du comparatisme indo-européen* 6.2, pp. 83-94.

G. CANNON, 1990, *The Life and Mind of Oriental Jones,* Cambridge.

G. CANNON, 1995, "Oriental Jones: Scholarship, Literature, Multiculturalism, and Humankind", in *Object of Enquiry; the Life, Contributions, and Influences of Sir William Jones (1746-1794),* G. Cannon and K.R. Brine (eds.), New York – London, pp. 25-50.

G. CANNON, 1998, "Sir William Jones and the New Pluralism over Languages and Cultures", *The Yearbook of English Studies* 28, Eighteenth-Century Lexis and Lexicography, pp. 128-143.

A. DAVID, 1996, "Sir William Jones, Biblical Orientalism and Indian Scholarship", *Modern Asian Studies* 30.1, pp. 173-184.

J. FELLMAN, 1975, "The First Comparative Indo-Europeanist", *Linguistics* 145, pp. 83-85.

M.J. FRANKLIN, 2011, *'Orientalist Jones': Sir William Jones, Poet, Lawyer, and Linguist, 1746-1794,* Oxford.

R. FYNES, 1998, "Sir William Jones and the Classical Tradition", in *Sir William Jones, 1746–1794 A Commemoration,* Alexander Murray (ed.), Cambridge, pp. 45-65.

C. HAGERMAN, 2013, *Britain's Imperial Muse: The Classics, Imperialism, and the Indian Empire, 1784-1914,* Hampshire - New York.

T. VAN HAL, 2015, "Die Rolle des Altindischen bei der Gründung der Sprachwissenschaft als akademischer Disziplin; Revolution oder Kontinuation?", in *Metasprachliche Reflexion und Diskontinuität: Wendepunkte, Krisenzeiten, Umbrüche*, Gerda Haßler (ed.), Münster, pp. 154-166.

P.-D. HUET, 1690, *Demonstratio evangelica ad serenissimum Delphinum*, Paris.

D. IBBETSON, 1998, "Sir William Jones as a Comparative Lawyer", in *Sir William Jones 1746-1794: a Commemoration*, Alexander Murray (ed.), Oxford, pp. 19-42.

SIR W. JONES, 1807, *The Works of Sir William Jones* (*Teignmouth's Memoirs of the Life, Writings and Correspondence of Sir Williams Jones*) 13 vols., London.

SIR W. JONES, 1970, *Letters*, Garland Cannon (ed.), Oxford.

R.P. LESSENICH, 2015. "Sir William Jones and the Romantic Poetics", *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 167, pp. 314-324.

B. LINCOLN, 2002, "Isaac Newton and Oriental Jones on Myth, Ancient History, and the Relative Prestige of Peoples", *History of Religions* 42, pp. 1-18.

B. LINCOLN, 1999, *Theorizing Myth: Narrative Ideology, and Scholarship,* Chicago - London.

P.J. MARSHALL, 1970. *The British Discovery of Hinduism in the Eighteenth Century,* Cambridge.

MD.A.T. MOJUMDER, 1978, *Sir William Jones: A Poetical Study,* Dacca.

H. MOMMA, 2013, *From Philology to English Studies: Language and Culture in the Nineteenth Century,* Cambridge.

S.N. MUKHERJEE, 1987, *Sir William Jones: A Study in Eighteenth-century British Attitudes to India,* Cambridge.

A. MURRAY, 1998, *Sir William Jones, 1746–1794 A Commemoration*, Cambridge.

L. POLIAKOV, [1971] 1993, *Der arische Mythos; zu den Quellen von Rassismus und Nationalismus*, Margarete Venjakob (translation), Hamburg.

P.F. POMEY, [1658] 1757, *Pantheum mythicum seu fabulosa deorum historia, hoc epitomes eruditionis volumine breviter dilucidèque comprehensa,* Amsterdam.

K. RAJ, 2007. *Relocating Modern Science; Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650-1900,* Hampshire - New York.

P.J.A.N. RIETBERGEN, 2007, *Europa's India: fascinatie en cultureel imperialisme, circa 1750-circa 2000,* Nijmegen.

R. ROCHER, 1989, "The Career of Rādhākānta Tarkavāgīśa, and Eighteenth-Century Pandit in British Employ", Journal of the American Oriental Society 109.4, pp. 627-633.

P. RUTISHAUSER, 2008, *Das Pantheum Mythicum des Pere Pomey und ausgewählte Bearbeitungen als Vorläufer von K. Ph. Moritz' Götterlehre*, Munich.

P.-J. SALAZAR, 1991, "Les pouvoirs de la fable: mythologie, littérature et tradition (1650-1725)", *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 91.6, pp. 878–889.

R. SCHWAB, 1950, *Le Renaissance orientale,* Paris.

N.S. SHUKLA, 1974, "Persian Translations of Sanskrit Works", *Indological Studies* 3.1-2, pp. 175-191.

J.P. SINGH, 1982, *Sir William Jones, His Mind and Art,* New Delhi.

V. DE SOLA PINTO, 1946, "Sir William Jones and English Literature", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11.4, pp. 686-694.

O. SZEMERÉNYI, 1980, "About Unrewriting the History of Linguistics", in *Wege zur Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftlichte Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler*, Gunter Brettschneider and Christian Lehmann (eds.), Tübingen, pp. 151–162.

A. TOOKE, [1713] 1803 (31st reprint), *The Pantheon representing the Fabulous Histories of the Heathen Gods and Most Illustrious Heroes; in a Plan and Familiar Method, by Way of Dialogue,* London.

TH.R. TRAUTMANN, 1997, *Aryans and British India,* Berkeley.

TH.R. TRAUTMANN, 1998, "The Lives of Sir William Jones", in *Sir William Jones, 1746–1794 A Commemoration*, Alexander Murray (ed.), Cambridge, pp. 66-121.

A. TRUSCHKE, 2015, "Regional Perceptions; Writing to the Mughal Court in Sanskrit", *Puruṣārtha* 33, pp. 251-274.

P. VASUNIA, 2013, *The Classics and Colonial India,* Oxford.

P. VASUNIA, "Sir William Jones and the Gods of Greece, Italy and India", *Backdoor Broadcasting Network; Academic Podcasts,* http://backdoorbroadcasting.net/archive/audio/2015_02_12_RAS/2015_02_12_Phiroze_Vasunia_talk.mp3, 12-02-2015, accessed 12-07-2016.

G.J. VOSSIUS, 1641, *De theologia gentili et physiologia christiana*, Amsterdam.

D. WEIR, 2003, *Brahma in the West; William Blake and the Oriental Renaissance,* New York.