

§ 34. From Benfey's investigations it appears that the truest extant representative of the Indian original is the Syriac version, *Kalilag and Damnağ*. Next to the Syriac stands the *Buch der Beispiele*, which, besides, is in language remarkable for its dignity, strength, and beauty; upon this latter version, moreover, are based almost all the printed ones previous to 1644. To the German version almost exclusively, therefore, is Europe indebted for the wide-spread knowledge of this cycle of literature from the last part of the fifteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century.

§ 35. After this account of the direct descendants of the Indian original in the Occident, it remains to speak of the history of that original in India, and of its sources. Whether Barzōi translated from one work of thirteen chapters (cf. § 28) or from several independent works, the fact remains that the originals of all of his sections may be certainly identified on Indian ground save three:¹ five, namely, form the Pañcatantra; two other sections figure as a supplement to the first book of a later recension of the Pañcatantra; and yet other sections, three in number, appear in the Mahā-bhārata.

The first three books of the Pañcatantra (above, § 26) were recast by Somadeva about 1070 A.D., in his Kathā-sarit-sāgara, chapters 60-64. Somadeva's abstract of these three books shows that they had the same form then as at the time of the Pehlevi translation (570). As representatives of the Indian original, the offshoots of the Pehlevi version surpass even the Indian offshoots. These latter, as respects their truthfulness in reflecting the Indian original, are arranged by Benfey as follows: first, the recension of the Indian original used by Somadeva; second, the one on which the Southern Pañcatantra (of Dubois) is based; third, the one from which the Hitopadeśa is made; and last, the one from which proceed the common Sanskrit recensions of the Pañcatantra.

§ 36. At the time when Barzōi made his Pehlevi version, Buddhism was already on the decline in India, and Brahmanism regaining its lost supremacy. It was not to be expected on the one hand that the Brahmins would allow a work of such great artistic merit as the original *Mirror for Magistrates* to be lost and forgotten, nor, on the other, that they would preserve it without transforming its whole spirit, which was that of fanatical hatred for Brahmanism. They have, therefore, omitted or transformed such parts as showed most Buddhist animus, leaving, however, many marks uneffaced which betray its Buddhist origin.

In one other way, too, the original was modified. In most of its sections a doctrine was inculcated by means of a single fable or story, and only a sparing use was made of inserted apologues. But gradually the means became an end; into the main story were inserted others, and others still into these, until the main story became a mere frame, and the result was comparable to a set of Chinese boxes.²

§ 37. Respecting the sources of the Indian original only a general statement can be made. There were current among the Buddhists, fables and parables which they ascribed to Buddha, and whose sanctity they sought to increase by identifying the best character in any story with Buddha himself in a former birth. Hence the tales were called *Jātakas* or 'Birth-stories.' There is evidence of the existence of a collection with that name as early as the Council of Vesālī, about 380 B.C.; and in

¹ Of the remaining three, one is shown by its spirit of deadly hatred towards the Brahmins to be the work of Buddhists, and the other two are in Benfey's judgment genuinely Indian.

² Pedagogical reasons forbade the retention of this arrangement, except by way of specimen. Thus section ix is boxed into viii, and xv and xvi into xiv.