2. The information under each name and the references related to it are given not according to the sequence of the *parvans* as, for example, was done by Sörensen, but all the available information is first suitably arranged and then given in a certain order. In the case of longer entries, the arranged information is first classified under certain heads, e. g. the information under Gāṇḍīva (pp. 97-103) is classified under such heads as : A Etymology; B. Origin; C. History; D. Association with Arjuna; E. Description; F. Big Sound (produced by it); G. Use by Arjuna; H. Arjuna's vow regarding the bow; I. Comparisons; J. Defeat; K. Return to Varuṇa. Where found necessary, the information, first classified under the major heads as above, is further divided into sections and sub-sections, e. g. the information about the use of Brahmāstra given under F. (pp 123-124) is classified according as : 1. its use in the epic war, and 2. its use outside the epic war; and then again, its use by various heroes such as (i) Droṇa, (ii) Arjuna, (iii) Karṇa etc., and then further (a) (by Droṇa) against Arjuna, (b) against Yudhiṣṭhira etc.

3. Information given for a particular name is limited to the actual occurrences of the name in the text. Hence every single incident related to the name is not narrated up to its end but is left when the name does not figure in the further development of the incident, e. g. under the entry Vajra[1] (pp. 131-137), the incident related to the meeting of Bali and Indra, or the one in which Garuḍa and Indra figure (p. 134) are narrated only up to the point where Vajra figures in those incidents and are not told in full.

4. Similarly in the case of an item like Gāṇḍīva, Arjuna is very likely to have used this bow on all important occasions after he received it at the time of the burning of the Khāṇḍava forest. The information and the references in the Index are, however, limited to the actual occurrences of the name Gāṇḍīva in the text of the Mahābhārata[1].

5. Actual citations from the text are given if it was felt that it would help the reader if he had before him the actual words of the text; or in the case of the *subhāṣitas* (e. g. *daivenopahato rājan ... nānyat tatra parāyaṇam* on p. 7. 2, or *na hi kaścit kṛte kārye ... sāvaśeṣāṇi kārayet* on p. 38. 2); or in the case of etymologies (*dhatte dhārayate cedam etasmāt kāraṇād dhanam* p. 18. 1), or in the case of unintelligible or doubtful expressions (*sāgarasya gṛhān iva* p. 31. 2; *sarpāṇāṁ pragrahā yānti* p. 32. 2; *ekas tatra balopeto dhuram udvahate 'dhikām* p. 75. 1).

6. Commentator Nīlakaṇṭha's (Nī.) view is cited if he has a different opinion (e. g. Krathana according to him is the name of a Yakṣa p. 14. 2); or in support of the meaning adopted of a peculiar word (e. g. *kṛtrimaḥ svecchāsampādyaḥ* p. 17. 2; *draviṇavattarau balavattarau* p. 18. 1; *tṛṇarājas tāluḥ* p. 99. 1); or if he has a fanciful etymology to suggest, e. g. of Pināka p. 116. 2. In all the cases where

---

1. It is only in rare cases like the one of the elephant Supratīka of Bhagadatta that references are given although the elephant's name is not specifically stated (p. 71. 2).