the eighteen fables of the Hitopadeça which do not occur in the Pañcatantra. Had the preface said "other works," the problem would be easier. Thus the story of the two giants, iv. 9, may be traced to the Mahā-bhārata, and the prototypes of other single stories are doubtless to be found in one and another ancient collection. Professor Peterson[1] thinks that the "other work" is the Nītisāra of Kāmandaka. The identification deserves further study.

§ 28. The contents of the Pañcatantra have been made the subject of one of the most important contributions to the literary history of the world by the late Professor Benfey. His principal results were published in his *Pantschatantra* (1859, see above, p. xviii, no. 8), and in his introduction to Bickell's edition of the *Kalilag und Damnag* (1876). The latter contains, pages VI–X, a brief résumé of these results. The summary given by Keith-Falconer (1885, see p. 315) is a systematic and lucid account of the history of the fables, and is the one most to be commended to English-speaking students. Some of the most important items follow.

A. The Indian original. In the sixth century of our era, there existed in India a Buddhist Sanskrit work, in thirteen chapters, treating of the conduct of princes.[2] Its doctrines were inculcated in the form of beast-fables, or stories in which animals play the part of human beings.

B. This Indian original was translated by a Persian physician named Barzōī, into the Pehlevī, the literary language of Persia, by command of the Sassanian king, Khosru Anūshīrvān, called The Just (531–579 A.D.).

§ 29. **C1**. Both the Indian original and its Pehlevī version are irrecoverably lost; but from the latter were made two very notable translations. The first was into Syriac, made about 570 A.D., and called *Kalilag and Damnag* after the two jackals, Karaṭaka and Damanaka, who figured prominently in the introduction of the Sanskrit original. A single notice of this version had been preserved in a catalogue of Syriac writings made by Ebed-jesus (died 1318), and published by Assemani at Rome in 1725. A Chaldean bishop, Georgius Ebed-jesus Khayyāth, on his way to the ecumenical council in 1870, stumbled upon a manuscript of this Syriac version in the episcopal library at Mardīn. Through the mediation of Ignazio Guidi in Rome, and by a wonderful combination of lucky accidents and persistent efforts, the existence of "the lost manuscript" was made known to the eager inquirers in Europe,[3] and at last published in text and German translation by Bickell.

§ 30. **C2**. The second translation from the Pehlevī was the *Kalilah and Dimnah* or *Fables of Pilpay* in Arabic, made by Abd-allah ibn al-Moqaffa, a Persian convert to Islam, who lived under the caliph al-Mansor and died about 760. This version was published, though not in the best recension, by Silvestre de Sacy at Paris in 1816, and an English translation of it was given by the Rev. Wyndham Knatchbull, Oxford, 1819.

According to the Arabic introduction, Dabshelim (deva-çarman) was the first king of the Indian Restoration after the fall of the governor appointed by Alexander

[1] See his Introduction, p. 29, 43, Notes, p. 3. The Nītisāra was edited by Rājendralāla Mitra, in the Bibliotheca Indica, vol. iv.

[2] Such was Benfey's conclusion. It was questioned by Weber, *Indische Streifen*, iii. 437. Barzōī's Pehlevī version (B.) may have been based on several *different* works—among them a Pañcatantra. Indeed, from the second chapter of the Arabic Kalilah and Dimnah, 'The mission of Barzōī' (Knatchbull, pages 40–41; cf. Keith-Falconer, p. xxi), and from other evidence (Keith-Falconer, p. liv f), this is the much more probable view.

[3] The story of the discovery is told by Benfey, in Bickell's book, pages XII–XXIII, as also in various periodicals there cited, p. XXII note, e.g. *London Academy* for Aug. 1, 1871.