



Title	The Development of the Names of Characters in the Pañcatantra/Kalīlah wa-Dimnah : Characters in Embedded Stories
Author(s)	Iwase, Yuka
Citation	関西アラブ・イスラム研究. 2002, 2, p. 7-23
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/105816
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

The Development of the Names of Characters
in the *Pañcatantra*/*Kalīlah wa-Dimnah*:
Characters in Embedded Stories

Yuka Iwase*

『パンチャタントラ』『カリーラとディムナ』に登場する
人物・動物の名前について
—— 挿話中の登場人物・動物 ——

『パンチャタントラ』は5つの枠物語と枠の中で語られる挿話から成るが、枠物語の登場人物の多くが名前を持つのにに対し、挿話の登場人物の場合は、同じ話でも版ごとに名前が異なることもあれば、登場人物に名前のある版とない版がある。『タントラキヤイカ』と『カリーラとディムナ』を比較すると、前者では登場人物に名前のない挿話の方が挿話よりかなり多いが、後者では、ほとんどの挿話において登場人物に名前がない。

博士論文の中でプロットの発展を論じる際に、登場人物の名前を扱ったが、本研究では、これを一つのテーマとして論じる。『パンチャタントラ』と『カリーラとディムナ』に共通する27の挿話のうち、博士論文で扱った3つの挿話について、登場人物の名前を論じた議論を再度取り上げ、登場人物の名前の発展を論じる。

3つの挿話を個々に調べた結果、「ライオンと野兎」では、ライオンの名前が版ごとに異なる状況を見ても、もともとはライオンには名前がなく、叙述的な形容詞が名前に発展したという結論に達した。また、「ライオンの従者と駱駝」では、ライオンにも駱駝にももともと名前はなかったと結論づけた。駱駝の名前については、ある地域でのみ使われた一般名詞が別の固有名詞に書き換えられたと思われる。「悪者と正直者」の場合は、多くの版で2人の登場人物の名前となっている2つの実詞がもとはエピソードであった可能性を示した。

本研究で取り上げた3つの挿話に関する限り、オリジナルな『パンチャタントラ』においては、どの登場人物にも名前はなかったという結論に達した。この結論を一般化するためには、「野兎と象」を含む他の挿話をも調べる必要がある。また、枠物語については、パフラヴィー版をもととするセム語諸版において、サンスクリットの音を反映した名前が登場人物につけられているが、より詳しく調べる必要があると思われる。

* 岩瀬由佳 國學院大學 講師

1. Introduction

While most characters in the framing stories of the *Pañcatantra* have names, characters in the encapsulated stories have names in some texts, while in others they do not. In addition, the name of a character differs from version to version in some stories. In my doctoral thesis (Iwase 2000) I discussed the development of four stories from the *Pañcatantra*, by examining most extant versions of the *Pañcatantra* in their original languages, namely Sanskrit, Arabic, Syriac and Hebrew. There I considered whether or not characters in each story originally had names as we have in most extant texts as part of discussion on the development of the plot, and I also explored the development of the names of characters. The purpose of this paper is to explore the problem of names as a single subject, largely depending upon the discussion on the names in my doctoral thesis.

In some of the embedded stories main characters have names just as in the framing stories, whereas in others they do not. The table below shows the number of stories in which characters have names, do not have names, or have epithets only, in the *Tantrākhyāyika* and ‘Azzām’s edition of the *Kalīlah wa-Dimnah*:

	Number of stories in which characters:		
	1) have names	2) do not have names	3) have epithets only
<i>Tantrākhyāyika</i>	10	17	2
<i>Kalīlah wa-Dimnah</i> (Arb I)	1 ¹⁾	26	2

Among the twenty-seven stories which the *Tantrākhyāyika* and ‘Azzām’s edition of the *Kalīlah wa-Dimnah* have in common except for the framing stories, in one story alone characters have names and in seventeen stories characters do not have names. It is noteworthy that the characters in almost all the embedded stories of the *Kalīlah wa-Dimnah* do not have names. In this paper I shall examine three stories, all of which belong to Book I or the chapter on estranging friends: ‘Lion and Hare’, where one main character has a name in most texts except the *Tantrākhyāyika* and the Pahlavi-based texts, ‘Lion’s Retainers and Camel’, where two main characters have names in all the Sanskrit texts examined but not in the Pahlavi-based texts, and ‘Honest-wit and Evil-wit’, where two main characters have either names or epithets.

Wright²⁾ has discussed the names of the characters and place names in the Semitic texts. Edgerton³⁾ and Venkatasubbiah⁴⁾ discussed the names of the two main characters in ‘Honest-wit and Evil-wit’, which is embedded in Book I. Edgerton concludes that the name of the merchant who deceives his companion is originally *Duṣṭabuddhi*, and Ven-

1) The story of ‘Elephant and Hare’ in Book III or the chapter on war and peace. In all the extant Pahlavi-based texts examined the messenger hare alone has a name.

2) Wright 1981 (Syr 2): xv-xxiv.

3) Edgerton 1920.

4) Venkatasubbiah 1928: 1-10.

katasubbiah concludes that *Abuddhi* is the wicked one's father's name. It seems to me that the problem of the names in 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit' needs further discussion.

2. The Names of the Characters in 'Lion and Hare'

The story of 'Lion and Hare' goes as follows:

Beasts in a forest, suffering from their king's killing them, propose that they should offer an animal as a meal to him every day. When the lot falls on a hare, he goes to the lion so slowly that he misses the lion's meal time. Asked the reason for his delay, the hare replies that another lion has kept him. The lion tells him to show him that lion, and the hare takes him to a well, in which the lion plunges and dies because he mistook his own reflection for his rival himself.

There are various versions of the story of 'Lion and Hare', which are included in a large number of sources.⁵⁾ The story of 'Lion and Hare' is included in all the extant versions of the *Pañcatantra* that are written in Sanskrit,⁶⁾ the two recensions in Arabic and Syriac translated directly from the Pahlavi version,⁷⁾ and most texts translated from the Arabic version including the later Syriac version and the later Hebrew version. The *Śukasaptati* also contains the story of 'Lion and Hare'.⁸⁾

2. 1. Does the Lion Have a Name?

In the Pahlavi-based texts examined none of the characters in the 'Lion and Hare' has a name. In the *Textus Ornatior* of the *Śukasaptati* alone the hare has a name (Cakora).⁹⁾ Since it is unlikely that all the other versions, especially older versions such as the *Tantrākhyāyika*, have omitted the hare's name, it seems certain that the original did not give the hare a name. As for the lion, however, if one reads all the different versions of this simple story, one may be puzzled at how variously the lion is named and why in some texts he does not have a name.

Although the lion is variously called in later Indian texts, Edgerton chose Madonmatta 'one who is intoxicated with pride' for his name,¹⁰⁾ which does not appear as his name in any text examined. This Tatpuruṣa compound (*mada-unmatta*) is rather used as a descriptive adjective to qualify the lion in the *Pañcākhyānaka* and in the title stanza in the following texts: the *Pañcākhyānaka*, the *Textus Simplicior* of the *Pañcatantra*, the

5) For the variety of the sources in detail, see Benfey 1966b: 179-84 and Edgerton 1924b: 190 -1.

6) Cf. Hertel 1912b: Parallel Specimen I.

7) TĀ (I-6), PĀ (I-7), Sp11 (I-8), Sp12 (I-8), SP (I-6), KSS (X-60, 91-107), BKM (37-47), Hit (II-8), Arb1 (I-7), Arb2 (I-7), Syr1 (I-6), Syr2 (I-7) and Heb2 (I-7) respectively.

8) ŚukS (31) and ŚukO (40).

9) See Table 1. According to Monier-Williams (1899: 380b), the noun cakora signifies perdx rufa, which is fabled to live on moonbeams. This name is, therefore, suitably used as the hare's name since in India a hare is connected with the moon, but does not tell anything about the traits of the hare in our story.

10) Edgerton 1924a: 75.

Southern Pañcatantra, the *Hitopadeśa* and the *Textus Ornatior* of the *Śukasaptati*. Here I raise a problem which has not been discussed: what was the original name of the lion, or, did the lion really have his own name in the original form of this story?

Table 1: The Names of the Lion and the Hare in Indian Texts

Lion	Hare
— (TĀ, KSS, BKM)	—
Mandamati ‘slow-witted’ (PĀ)	
Bhāsuraka ‘splendid one’ (Spl)	
[Madotkaṭa ‘intoxicated with pride’] (SP)	
Durdānta (Hit)	
Cf. Piṅgala ‘tawny’ (ŚukS),	Cf. Cakora (ŚukO)
Kuṭila ‘deceit’ (ŚukO)	

Van Buitenen defines Sanskrit epithets as ‘all-purpose adjectival qualifications’.¹¹⁾ In Sanskrit literature a character in a story is so variously named that one can hardly know which is the real name of the character, since proper names are so often descriptive adjectives. According to Goldman one characteristic use of epithets in Sanskrit literature is the substitution of an attributive term for a proper name.¹²⁾ One can be sure about a character’s name only when a substantive is followed by *nāma* ‘by name’ or its equivalent. An epithet of a character can develop into a proper name if the characterization of the epithet is so strong that the term *nāma* is added by a later redactor.

2. 2. The Lion’s Name

The lion’s name, as shown in the table above, varies from text to text, and none of the texts has the same name. While Mandamati (PĀ) represents the lion’s folly and is not a suitable name for the king,¹³⁾ Bhāsuraka (Spl) is a proper name for a sovereign, and Durdānta (Hit) is suitable for a tyrant. Madotkaṭa (SP),¹⁴⁾ which is synonymous with *madonmatta*, fits a haughty king. These four images represented by the names seem to be appropriate for the lion in this story as I will demonstrate below. In both recensions of the *Śukasaptati*, however, the names for the lion are neither of foolish, heroic nor tyrannical image: Piṅgala (ŚukS) is proper to be used for one who has tawny colour, and Kuṭila (ŚukO) is for one who is crooked either in shape or in mind to mean ‘deceitful’. If the lion was named Madonmatta in the original form of the story as Edgerton assumed, why should these texts have chosen other names for him?

11) Van Buitenen 1980: xxxix.

12) Goldman 1990: 108.

13) It seems that, while the *Textus Simplicior* chose a name suitable for a great king, Pūrṇabhadra preferred another name to describe the lion’s folly.

14) According to Hertel (1906: 73), in four MSS out of seventeen read *madoṭkaṭa*, and in the other MSS the lion does not have a name.

The lion does not have his own name in the following versions: the *Tantrākhyāyika*, the majority of the manuscripts of the *Southern Pañcatantra*, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*. None of the Semitic texts presents the lion's name or his attributes. If the original story gave the lion his own name, why should these texts have omitted it? These facts seem to show that the lion did not have his own name in the original form of 'Lion and Hare'.

3. The Names of the Characters in 'Lion's Retainers and Camel'

The story of 'Lion's Retainers and Camel' goes as follows:

A camel becomes a lion's follower. The lion is wounded in battle and unable to go hunting, and tells his retainers to go to find animals. The carnivorous followers conspire against the camel so that he offers his own body as the lion's food. He does so, and they kill and devour him.

There are various versions of the story of 'Lion's Retainers and Camel', which are included in a large number of sources.¹⁵⁾ The story of 'Lion's Retainers and Camel' is included in all the extant versions of the *Pañcatantra* that are written in Sanskrit, the two recensions in Arabic and Syriac translated directly from the Pahlavi version, and most texts translated from the Arabic version including the later Syriac version and the later Hebrew version.¹⁶⁾

Table 2: The Names of the Lion and the Camel in Indian Texts

Lion	Camel
Madotkaṣa (All Skt exept BKM) 'intoxicated with pride'	Krathanaka 'predator' (TĀ)
Vikaṣāṣa ? (BKM)	+ Kathanaka 'one who narrates' in one MS (once),
'one who has formidable eyes'	+ Krathaka in one MS (3 times)
	Vikaṣa + Vikaṣaka (PĀ) 'formidable, hideous'
	but: Vikaṣa + Krathanaka in one MS
	Kathanaka (Spl 1, SP)
	Krathanaka (Spl 2)
	— (KSS, BKM)
	Citrakarṇa 'one who has speckled ears' /
	Citravarṇa 'one of bright fawn colour' /
	Chidrakarṇa 'one whose ears are torn' (Hit)
	(Cf. Edgerton 1924b: 167)

Although Edgerton assumes that the lion is named Madotkaṣa and the camel is Kathanaka, I reconsider their names and traits by exploring their development in different

15) For the variety of the sources in detail, see Benfey 1966b: 179-84 and Edgerton 1924b: 190 -1.

16) TĀ (I-9), PĀ (I-13), Spl 1 (I-11), Spl 2 (I-11), SP (I-8), KSS (X-60, 143-162), BKM (63b-73b), Hit (IV-9), Arb1 (I-10), Arb 2 (I-10), Syr 1 (I-9), Syr 2 (I-10) and Heb 2 (I-10) respectively.

texts to determine whether they really had names in the original work of the *Pañcatantra*. The table below shows the names and traits of the lion as well as of the camel in the Indian texts. None of the Semitic texts describes them in the story. For the crow, the tiger or wolf, and the jackal, all the texts examined are silent about their names.

3. 1. The Lion's Name

In the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* the lion is described as *vikatākṣa* ‘one who has formidable eyes’, which can be either an adjectival compound qualifying the lion or the lion’s name peculiar to this version.¹⁷⁾ In the Semitic texts, which are based on the lost Pahlavi version, the lion does not have a name. In all the other texts the lion is called *Madotkaṭa* ‘intoxicated with pride’. However, in the *Tantrākhyāyika*, unlike the other versions where the lion has a name, the lion’s name is introduced at the beginning of the story but thereafter he is called not by his name but by the name of the species, namely ‘the lion’. Therefore, even if the reading of *madotkaṭa* belongs to the original, it seems that it was an epithet rather than a name.

In most versions there seems nothing to tell us what personality the lion has, except for the epithet *madotkaṭa*. The later Hebrew version alone describes him as merciless, and in this version the consequence of his treachery is implied.

3. 2. The Camel's Name

In the majority of the texts examined the camel is called either *Krathanaka* or *Kathanaka*, the latter of which Edgerton thinks to be the original reading.¹⁸⁾ Through the argument below I shall try to show whether Edgerton’s assumption is convincing or not, and then speculate on the original state in the *Pañcatantra*.

3. 2. 1. *Krathanaka* and *Kathanaka*

The *Tantrākhyāyika* does not give the name of the camel at the beginning of the story where the crow tells the lion about the camel. However, when the three retainers go hunting together with the camel, the readers suddenly encounter the name *Krathanaka* ‘predator’,¹⁹⁾ which is understood to be the camel’s name from its context. In Kosegarten’s edition of the *Textus Simplicior* of the *Pañcatantra* too the camel is called *Krathanaka*. According to Hertel, in one manuscript of the *Pañcākhyānaka*, namely Bh, the camel is first called *Vikaṭa* ‘formidable’ or ‘hideous’ and is only later called *Krathanaka*.²⁰⁾ Hertel assumes that this is because the manuscript Bh copies the *Textus Simplicior* after the expanded introduction by Pūrṇabhadra. In the majority of the manuscripts of the

17) It is noteworthy that the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* applies *vikatā-* to the lion, whereas in the *Pañcākhyānaka* *Vikaṭa* is the camel’s name. The *Pañcākhyānaka* and the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* sometimes show such similarities which no other version has—the title stanza of ‘Iron-Eating Mice’ for instance.

18) Edgerton 1924a: 111 and 1924b: 167-8.

19) *krathanakena*. However, in one manuscript of TĀ his name appears as *krathakena* (Hertel 1910: 40).

20) Hertel 1912: 68-9. For the manuscript Bh, see *ibid.*: 16.

Pañcākhyānaka, on the other hand, the camel is called *Vikaṭa* in the first half of the story and then called *Vikaṭaka*, which is synonymous with *Vikaṭa*, in the second half of the story. In Kielhorn's edition of the *Textus Simplicior* of the *Pañcatantra* and the *Southern Pañcatantra* the camel is named *Kathanaka* 'one who narrates', and in the *Hitopadeśa* he is variously called such as *Citrakarṇa* 'speckled-eared'. The camel does not have a name in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* and all the Semitic texts.

Edgerton assumes that *Kathanaka* is the original name of the camel because one manuscript of the *Tantrākhyāyika* has the reading of *kathanako* in one place, although another manuscript reads *krathako* twice, and because of the crow's remark on the camel: he regards *krathanaka* as a corrupt form of *kathanaka*. In his view the camel is properly called *Kathanaka* 'Fabulous'²¹⁾ because he relates his story. However, since *kathanaka* does not tell the camel's attributes, it seems the opposite to me: an episode has turned into a name. As regards the crow's remark on the camel, *ākhyātanāmoṣṭro* 'yam means, I assume, 'This is [a creature] called "camel".' The Bāhuvrīhi compound *ākhyāta-nāmā* means either '[one] whose name is *Ākhyāta*', as Edgerton assumed, or 'having that as the name by which it is called', which is my interpretation. Since the camel is a stranger to the lion, the lion would certainly be anxious to know the species, not his personal name. At any rate, *Ākhyāta* does not sound a fitting name, and I do not see any good reason why the author of the *Tantrākhyāyika* had to change the camel's name at the beginning of the story, from *Kathanaka* to *Ākhyāta*, and then adopt *Krathanaka* as his name. The *Pañcākhyānaka* paraphrases the crow's remark as *uṣṭro* 'yam loke prakhyātanāmā' 'This is a camel, which is the name they call in this world', presumably because the reading in the *Tantrākhyāyika* is not very clear, especially for the readers who expect the camel's name because of *nāmā* in spite of the context of the expression. In addition, it is not only in the *Pañcākhyānaka* but also in the *Textus Simplicior* of the *Pañcatantra* and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* that the crow talks of the camel's species, not his name in more plain speech than in the *Tantrākhyāyika*. Therefore, I assume that *kathanaka* does not belong to the original.

As regards *Krathanaka*, although *krathanaka* could have been chosen ironically as the camel's name if the author of the original text meant 'predator', it is doubtful whether it is necessary to go that far. Therefore, although in the majority of the texts the camel is named either *Krathanaka* or *Kathanaka*, both of them seem to be inappropriate names for the specific camel, for neither of them shows the camel's attributes. Therefore, neither of the two names seems original.

3. 2. 2. The Original Name of the Camel

Because it is unlikely that characters in stories embedded in the *Pañcatantra* have names or epithets which seem meaningless or inappropriate, both *Krathanaka* and *Kathanaka* are presumably derived from some specific name, epithet or common noun to qualify or signify the camel, which belongs to the original *Pañcatantra*. Since *krathana* is a proper

21) Edgerton 1924b: 167.

noun well attested in the epics,²²⁾ it seems possible that this noun took the place of an orthographically similar noun.

The *Tantrākhyāyika* is written in the Śāradā script,²³⁾ which is, according to Renou and Filliozat (1985: 679), proper to Kashmir and the surrounding regions and used in all the ancient Kashmirian manuscripts. In the writing system of the Śāradā script, as well as in that of the Nāgarī script, *krathanaka* resembles *kramelaka*, a common noun signifying ‘camel’.²⁴⁾ Professor J. C. Wright kindly remarked to me that *kramelaka* is a rare northwestern regional noun at an early time and later a learned word in Koṣas and late Kavya literature²⁵⁾ and that all modern vernacular words, including northwestern, to signify ‘camel’ are from *uṣṭra*, not from *kramela* or *kramelaka*. It should be noted that the manuscript of the *Tantrākhyāyika* was found in Kashmir, which lies in north-west India. Therefore I assume that in the original work of the *Pañcatantra* the camel did not have a name and that the common noun *kramelaka*, which means ‘camel’ in the northwestern region only, was changed at a considerably early stage of transmission to *krathanaka* by a copyist who did not know the word or a careless one who was familiar with the proper name Krathanaka:

kramelaka > *krathanaka*
क्रमेलक क्रथनक (in the Nāgarī script)

Undoubtedly the name Krathanaka was brought in to supply a name to the anonymous protagonist of ‘Lion’s Retainers and Camel’. Presumably it was after this replacement that *nāma*, a particle to mean ‘by name’, was added to the text. This assumption may explain the reason why in the *Tantrākhyāyika* the camel is called Krathanaka in the middle of the story while the readers are not informed that it is his name at the beginning of the story: the situation in the *Tantrākhyāyika* may show an intermediate stage of the transmission where *nāma* is not yet interjected.

3. 2. 3. The Development of the Camel’s Name

From the orthographic resemblance of *krathanaka* and *kathanaka* one may assume that either the former or the latter was miscopied or emended intentionally, for the difference of *-kra* and *-ka* is subtle both in the writing system of the Nāgarī script and in that of the Śāradā script. Edgerton assumes that *kathanaka* is original and that *krathanaka* is secondary. However, it seems to me that, on the contrary, *kathanaka* is based on *krathanaka*,

22) Krathana is the name of a monkey in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Rām 4: 63: 4, 5:1:39, 6:2:47, 36:3:28), of an Asura (Mbh 1: 1488, 1: 2693; Harivaṃśa 12696) and of a Nāga (Mbh 1: 4550), according to Böhtlingk and Roth (1855-75: vol. 2. 476a).

23) For the table of the Śāradā alphabet, see Renou and Filliozat 1985: 690-2, Grierson 1916: 684-7.

24) *Kramelaka* is the Sanskritization of the Prakrit *kamelaa*, which is derived from the Semitic-originated Greek word *kamēlos*. Cf. Mayrhofer 1956: 277 and Liebich 1964: 432-4.

25) E.g. the *Uṇāḍikoṣa* in the *Śabdakalpādruma*, the *Amarakoṣa* 2, 9, 75; Hemacandra’s *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* 1253; the *Naiṣadha-carita* 6, 104., according to Böhtlingk and Roth 1855-75: vol. 2, 494b and Böhtlingk 1991: 113c.

for the reading of *kathanako* appears only in one place of one manuscript in the *Tantrākhyāyika*. Although Krathana is indeed a well-known proper name, some redactors or copyists may feel that it is awkward since its meaning does not have to do with the specific camel in the embedded story. They may prefer Kathanaka as the camel's name and emended the text intentionally, for in most texts the camel 'narrates'²⁶⁾ how he comes to the forest.

The *Southern Pañcatantra* seems to present the extremity of the case where the camel is named Kathanaka, by dramatization and alliteration: in this version after the camel had related (*akathayat*) his story the lion names him Kathanaka, whose root is *kath-*, the same as that of *akathayat*.

Other names such as Vikaṭa (PĀ) and Citravaraṇa (Hit) are apparently the results of later attempts to supply the specific camel with a fitting name.

In addition, none of the three carnivorous followers, even the crow or the jackal who plays an important role in the plot of the story, has a name. This seems to suggest that in the original *Pañcatantra* none of the characters in 'Lion's Retainers and Camel' has a name.²⁷⁾

4. The Names of the Characters in 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit'

4. 1. The Title Stanza in the *Tantrākhyāyika* and Kalilah's Introduction of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit' in the Pahlavi Version

The plot of the story of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit' goes as follows:

Two merchants, one honest and the other wicked, bury some money under a tree. The wicked one later steals the money, then accuses the honest one of theft and takes him to court. The wicked merchant hides his own father in a hollow tree at night. The father, by pretending to be the spirit of the tree, gives testimony for his wicked son. The father, smoked out, falls out of the hollow. Thus the trickery of the wicked merchant is revealed.

There are various sources containing the story of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit'.²⁸⁾ The story of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit' is included in all the extant versions of the *Pañcatantra* that are written in Sanskrit except the *Hitopadeśa*, the two recensions in Arabic and Syriac, and most of the offshoots translated from the Arabic version including the later Syriac version and the later Hebrew version.²⁹⁾ The *Śukasaptati* also contains the story of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit'. Another source of the story of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit' is Jātaka 98 or the *Kūṭavāṇijajātaka* (a story of the previous birth as a deceitful merchant).

In order to explore the development of the characters' name, I shall first examine

26) TĀ and PĀ: *samākhyāta*, Sp I: *niveditaḥ*, and SP and Hit: *akathayat*.

27) Edgerton assumed *kathanaka* for the camel's name and *madoṭkaṭa* for the lion's.

28) For the variety of the sources in detail see Benfey 1966b: 275-9 and Edgerton 1924b: 2, 190.

29) TĀ (I-15), PĀ (I-26), Sp I (I-19), SP (I-14), KSS (X-60, 210-33), BKM (115-28), Arb 1 (I-12), Arb 2 (I-12), Syr 1 (I-11), Syr 2 (I-12) and Heb 2 (I-12) respectively.

Kalilah's Introduction of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit' in the Semitic texts to speculate upon the lost Pahlavi version as well as the original state of the Arabic version, comparing Kalilah's Introduction with the title stanza in the *Tantrākhyāyika*.

Table 3: The Title Stanza in the *Tantrākhyāyika* and Kalilah's Introduction of 'Honest-wit and Evil-wit' in the Semitic Texts

	texts and/or English translation
TA	<i>duṣṭabuddhir abuddhiś ca dvāv etau dhiñmatau mama/ tanayenātipāṇḍityāt pitā dhūmena māritah // 167 //</i> He who is evil-witted (<i>duṣṭabuddhir</i>) and he who is dull-witted (<i>abuddhiś</i>) are both thought to be reproachable by me. A father was killed with smoke by a son on account of [the son's] excessive cleverness. (167)
Arb 1	مع أنه قد غلب عليك المكر والعجب، وهما خلتا سوء. إنه سيصيبك، من عاقبة ما أنت فيه. ما دخل على الخب شريك المغفل. Indeed craftiness (المكر) and pride (العجب), [both of] which are attributes of evil, have conquered you. What came upon the deceiver (الخب), the partner of the dupe (المغفل), will befall you as a consequence of what you are involved in.
Arb 2	وأنت يا دمنة قد غلب عليك الخب والعجز والخب والعجز خلتا سوء والخب أشدهما عاقبة. فأشبهما أمرا بالخب شريك المغفل. And you, O Dimnah, cunning deceit (الخب) and incapability (العجز) have conquered you. Cunning deceit and incapability are attributes of evil, and with regard to the consequence cunning deceit is the severer of them. How well these two resemble the deceiver (الخب), the partner of the dupe (المغفل), in the situation!
Syr 1	And you, Damnag, are acting craftily. He who acts craftily (ܕܡܢܓܝܬܐ) is most wicked, for a simple person (ܕܡܢܐܬܐ) does not know at all what to do and a crafty person (ܕܡܢܓܝܬܐ) seeks to act through stratagems. It will happen to him, [what is] just like [what happened to] that crafty man (ܕܡܢܓܝܬܐ), the simple man's (ܕܡܢܐܬܐ) partner, who chokes his father with smoke and laid him in a coffin, while the simple man (ܕܡܢܐܬܐ) takes dīnārs to his house.
Syr 2	On this account, arrogance of spirit has captured you, pride has held sway over you, gluttony has overcome you, covetousness has slain you, and feebleness of knowledge has humbled you. Deceitful (ܕܡܢܓܝܬܐ) companions are worse than insanity (ܕܡܢܓܝܬܐ) and resemble that simple man (ܕܡܢܐܬܐ), who had partnership with a cheat (ܕܡܢܓܝܬܐ).
Heb 2	Your arrogance is shaking you, and the pride of your heart has deceived you. I know that your end will be like the end of the deceiver (המרמה) [who was] with the simple man (הפחית).

The older Syriac version probably presents the reading in the lost Pahlavi version best, for, with all expansion in this version, one can still see the structure of the Sanskrit title stanza and get the equivalent words for the Sanskrit key terms *duṣṭabuddhi* 'evil-witted person' and *abuddhi* 'no-witted person' in the title stanza. It seems certain that *duṣṭabuddhi* was rendered as 'one who acts craftily' in the lost Pahlavi version, which the agreement of the older Syriac version and the Arabic version suggests. It is noteworthy that the older Syriac

version does not refer to arrogance, unlike the other Semitic versions.

‘Azzām’s edition and Cheykho’s edition of the Arabic version present some different readings in Kalīlah’s introduction of ‘Honest-wit and Evil-wit’. First of all, the two attributes of evil, which both texts enumerate, are not the same: while in ‘Azzām’s edition they are craftiness (*makr*) and pride (*‘ujb*), in Cheykho’s edition they are cunning deceit (*khabb*) and incapability (*‘ajz*),³⁰⁾ which are certainly the Arabic rendering of the Sanskrit *duṣṭabuddhi* and *abuddhi*. The readings in the two Arabic-based versions may seem to make the situation complicated, for the later Syriac version multiplies the components of the list and neither of them mentions craftiness or cunning deceit that appears in the two editions of the Arabic version:

Arb 1: craftiness	—	pride	—
Arb 2: cunning deceit	incapability		—
Syr 2: —	feebleness of mind	arrogance of spirit, pride	gluttony, covetousness
Heb 2: —	—	arrogance, pride	—

It does not seem likely that the reference to ‘arrogance’ has been invented by the redactors of the Arabic based versions separately. Similarly ‘feebleness of mind’ in the later Syriac version does not seem a later insertion, for both the older Syriac version and Cheykho’s edition of the Arabic version refer to *abuddhi*.

One possible solution of this complex situation is as follows: in the original state of the Arabic version the two attributes of evil were equivalent to Sanskrit *duṣṭabuddhi* and *abuddhi* as in the older Syriac version, whatever the exact Arabic terms may be, and Cheykho’s edition seems to retain this original state. In the course of transmission the second attribute might have been changed into a word signifying pride as in ‘Azzām’s edition. It seems possible that a certain religious notion has influenced the expression of pride to go with craftiness, rather than with *abuddhi*: in Islam God does not love arrogant people³¹⁾ and arrogance is said to attract God’s punishment, even perdition.³²⁾ Moreover, in the Qur’an arrogance is associated with craftiness at least in two places,³³⁾ for arrogance and evil-plotting are thought to be attributes of unbelievers. The text could reflect the preference of arrogance, with orthographic change; the Arabic العجب ‘pride’ is not very dissimilar to العجز ‘incapability’ orthographically, which may have encouraged a redactor who preferred pride to incapability as attributes of evil to choose the word العجب :

30) Cf. In Jurjī Zaydān’s edition (1983:196) the two attributes are: *khabb* (cunning deceit) and *fujūr* (immorality).

31) E.g. the Qur’an 4: 36, 16: 23, 31: 18 and 57: 23.

32) E.g. 7: 36, 7:40, 16:29, 40: 60, 40: 75-76 and 41: 15-16.

33) E.g. 34: 33 and 35: 43.

4. 2. The Name of the Two Main Characters³⁴⁾

Table 4: The Name and Epithets of the Two Main Characters³⁵⁾

	Honest-wit	Evil-wit
1) Indian texts	Dharmabuddhi 'an honest-witted man' (All Skt?)	Duṣṭabuddhi 'an evil-witted man' (TĀ?, PĀ, SP, KSS) Pāpabuddhi 'a wicked man' (Spl?, five times as an epithet? in PĀ) —?, <i>durbuddhi</i> - (once), 'an evil-witted man', <i>duṣṭabuddhi</i> - (twice), <i>abuddhi</i> ? (three times) 'no-witted man' (BKM) Cf. Duṣṭabuddhi (ŚukS, ŚukO), Atipaṇḍita 'exceedingly wise' (Jāt 98)
2) Older Syriac version	— <i>brīrā</i> 'a simple man'	— <i>ṣnī'ā</i> 'a crafty man'
3) Arabic version and its descendants	— Arb: <i>al-mughaffal</i> 'the heedless man' or 'the simpleton' Syr 2: <i>būrā</i> 'simple' Heb 2: <i>ha-ṣrī</i> 'the simple man'	— Arb: <i>al-khabb</i> 'the deceiver' Syr 2: <i>nḵūltānā</i> (twice) 'a deceitful man', <i>ṣnī'ā</i> (ten times) Heb 2: <i>ha-mrammē</i> 'the deceiver'

Although the Sanskrit texts presents several names/epithets for Evil-wit, they agree with each other on Honest-wit's name: Dharmabuddhi 'one whose moral sense is virtuous' or 'virtuous-minded one'.³⁶⁾ However, the *Tantrākhyāyika* does not tell us in the beginning of the story that *dharmabuddhi* and *duṣṭabuddhi* are the two main characters' names: the particle *nāma* 'by name' appears only later to tell us that *dharmabuddhi* is the name of the one deceived. The *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* does not say anywhere that the two substantives are their names and is filled with various epithets for Evil-wit. In the Semitic texts, although neither of the two characters has a name, the epithet of the character equivalent to Honest-wit in Sanskrit texts is *al-mughaffal* 'the one who is heedless enough to be easily duped' or 'the simpleton', and the epithet of the other character is *al-khabb* 'the deceiver'. As I discussed above, the former is apparently derived from the Sanskrit *abuddhi*, which appears only in the title stanza except for the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*, and the latter from *duṣṭabuddhi*. All the other versions seem to understand *dharmabuddhi*

34) Although the two main characters are differently named, for the purpose of clarity I shall use the names Honest-wit for the one deceived and Evil-wit for the one who deceives the other.

35) Epithets are shown in italics.

36) This compound is supported by the same name for the Bodhisattva in an Avadāna (1: 91.16) and *dharmarati*, a similar compound, in some literary works such as the *Raghuvamśa* as an adjective and in the *Lalitavistara* as a proper name.

and *duṣṭabuddhi*/*pāpabuddhi* as the characters' names.

This disagreement of the texts being considered, although Edgerton does not entertain doubt that in the original *Pañcatantra* the two characters' names were *dharmabuddhi* and *duṣṭabuddhi*, it seems to me that presumably the characters in the embedded story did not have names in the original work of the *Pañcatantra*.

In addition, the agreement of Honest-wit's name and the disagreement of Evil-wit's name may suggest that the original *Pañcatantra* contained Honest-wit's speech in which he describes himself *dharmabuddhi* as in some texts such as the *Tantrākhyāyika*, but it was devoid of epithets for the two characters in the beginning of the story. It may explain why Evil-wit's name in Sanskrit texts varies.³⁷⁾ I assume that the expression *dharmabuddhir aham* 'I am honest-witted' and the wickedness of the merchant who deceives his partner may together have encouraged a redactor to bring those epithets in the story, one from the story itself and the other from the title stanza³⁸⁾ and that in the course of transmission these epithets developed into proper names:

<i>dharmabuddhir aham</i> (in the story)	→ Honest-wit = Dharmabuddhi (all the Sanskrit texts)
wickedness demonstrated + <i>duṣṭabuddhi</i> (in the story) (in the title stanza)	→ Evil-wit = Duṣṭabuddhi (most Sanskrit texts)
+ <i>abuddhi</i> (in the title stanza)	→ Evil-wit = <i>abuddhi</i> (BKM)

For the name *Pāpabuddhi* in the *Textus Simplicior* of the *Pañcatantra*, if its archetype had, like the *Tantrākhyāyika*, the adjective *pāpaḥ* to qualify Evil-wit at the end of the story, the adjective may have affected Evil-wit's name on the analogy of *dharmabuddhi*:

wickedness demonstrated + <i>pāpaḥ</i> (in the story) (in the story)	→ Evil-wit = Pāpabuddhi (Spl)
---	----------------------------------

Therefore, in the case of the *Tantrākhyāyika*, the epithets in the form of adjectival compounds, *dharmabuddhi* and *duṣṭabuddhi*, were presumably brought in at an early stage of transmission, and later they were understood as the characters' names. There are not good grounds to support this speculation. However, if it contains a little of truth, the *Tantrākhyāyika* has the oldest form of the text among the prose Sanskrit versions, although it already shows development of the characters' names to some degree.

5. Conclusion

Every extant text must have gone through not a few changes in the course of transmis-

37) The Pali version of this story presents Evil-wit as *atipaṇḍita*, which is presumably taken from the second hemistich of the *gāthā*, and does not mention *duṣṭabuddhi* either in the *gāthā* or in the story.

38) See Table 3.

sion to date. Some redactors may have changed the unfamiliar name of an animal to a proper name which is familiar to him and orthographically similar, and others may have given an unnamed character a name.

For the story of ‘Lion and Hare’, Although Edgerton assumed *madonmatta* for the lion's name and none for the hare's, since, when names occur, no single version has the name, either of the lion or of the hare in common with any other, it seems most probable that neither of the two characters had a name in the original and that most names given in later texts were originally descriptive substantives which have developed into proper names. For the story of ‘Lion's Retainers and Camel’, although Edgerton assumed *kathanaka* for the camel's name and *modotkaṭa* for the lion's, I assume that neither of them has a name in the original work of the *Pañcatantra* and that *kathanaka* is based on *krathanaka*, which is a corrupt reading of *kramelaka*, which is a common noun meaning ‘camel’. For the story of ‘Honest-wit and Evil-wit’, I concluded that it seems most probable that the two substantives, *dharmabuddhi* and *duṣṭabuddhi*, are epithets of the two characters, which developed into proper names in later texts.

As far as the three embedded stories examined in this paper are concerned, I have reached the conclusion that none of the characters had a name in the original work of the *Pañcatantra*. I hope that by examining other stories including ‘Barter of Sesame’ and ‘Hare and Elephant’ I can conclude that in the embedded stories, in whichever Book they may be, none of the characters originally has a name. It also seems necessary to examine the framing stories as well.

* In this paper Arabic letters are transcribed according to the Library of Congress romanization rules.

Abbreviations

- Arb = Arabic or the Arabic version
Arb 1 = The *Kalīlah wa-Dimnah*, edited by ‘Azzām (‘Azzām 1981)
Arb 2 = The *Kalīlah wa-Dimnah*, edited by Cheykhō (Cheykhō 1905)
BKM = The *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (Mankowski 1892)
Heb 1 = The Older Hebrew version (Derenbourg 1881)
Heb 2 = The Later Hebrew version (Derenbourg 1881)
Hit = The *Hitopadeśa* (Parab 1968)
Jāt = The *Jātaka* (Fausbøll 1877-97)
KSS = The *Kathāsaritsāgara* (Durgāprasād and Parab 1930)
PĀ = The *Pañcākhyānaka* (Hertel 1908)
Skt = Sanskrit or the Sanskrit texts
SP = The *Southern Pañcatantra* (Hertel 1906)
Spl = The *Textus Simplicior* of the *Pañcatantra*: (Bühler 1891ab, Kielhorn 1896)
ŚukO = The *Śukasaptati* (Textus Ornator) (Schmidt 1898)
ŚukS = The *Śukasaptati* (Textus Simplicior) (Schmidt 1893)

- Syr 1 = The Older Syriac version (Schulthess 1911)
Syr 2 = The Later Syriac version (Wright 1981)
TĀ = The *Tantrākhyāyika* (Hertel 1904)

Bibliography

1) Texts and Translations

Bṛhatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra:

- Shivdatta, MM. Pt. and Kashinath Pandurang Parab, ed. (1982) *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra*. New Delhi: Panini.
Mankowski, Leo von, ed, tr. (1892) *Der Auszug aus dem Pañcatantra in Kshemendras Brihatkathāmañjarī*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.

Hitopadeśa of Nārāyaṇa:

- Kāle, M.R., ed., tr. (1967) *Hitopadeśa of Nārāyaṇa*. 6th edn. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
Parab, Kāśināth Pandurang, ed. (1968) *The Hitopadeśa of Nārāyaṇ Paṇḍit: A Protégé of King Dhavalachandra*. 17th edn. Re-ed. by Nārāyaṇ Rām Ācārya. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Book Prakashan.

- 金倉圓照・北川秀則訳 (1968) 『ヒトローパデーシャ: 処世の教え』岩波文庫 赤 61-1.
東京: 岩波書店.

Kalīlah wa-Dimnah of Ibn al-Muqaffa':

- ‘Azzām, ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, ed. (1981) *Kitāb kalīlah wa-dimnah*. Cairo 1941. 2nd ed. Beirut: Dār al-Shurūq.
Cheykhō, L. (1905) *ʿAqdam nuskah makhṭūʿah muʿarrakhah li-kitāb kalīlah wa-dimnah*. La version arabe de Kalīlah et Dimnah d’après le plus ancien manuscrit arabe daté, publiée par le P. L. Cheikhō S.J. Beyrouth: al-Maṭbaʿah al-Kāthūlikīyah.
Jurjī Zaydān, ed. (1983) *Tārikh Kalīlah wa-dimnah*. Beirut: Dār al-hudā al-waṭaniyah.
菊池淑子訳 『カリラとディムナ: アラビアの寓話』東洋文庫 331. 東京: 平凡社 1978.
Miquel, André, tr. (1980) *Le livre de Kalila et Dimna*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.

Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva:

- Durgāprasād, Pandit and Kāśināth Pāndurang Parab, ed. (1930) *Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadevabhattacha*. Fourth ed. Revised by Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇṣīkar. Bombay: Pāndurang Jāwajī.
Tawney, C. H. tr. (1880-4) *The Kathā Sarit Sāgara: Ocean of the Streams of Story*. 2 vols. Calcutta.

Later Hebrew version:

- Derenbourg, Joseph, ed. (1881) *Deux versions hébraïques du livre de Kalīlāh et Dimnāh*. Paris: F. Vieweg.

Later Syriac version:

- Wright, W., ed. (1981) *The Book of Kalilah and Dimnah or the Fables of Bidpai: Translated from Arabic into Syriac, Being the Later Syriac Version (Eleventh Century)*. Oxford 1885. Repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press.
Keith-Falconer, Ion G.N., tr. (1970) *Kalilah and Dimnah or the Fables of Bidpai: an English Translation of the Later Syriac Version after the Text Originally Edited by William Wright, with Critical Notes and Variant Readings Preceded by an Introduction, Being an Account of their Literary and Philological History*. Cambridge 1885. Repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press.

Older Hebrew version:

- Derenbourg, Joseph, ed., tr. (1881) *Deux versions hébraïques du livre de Kalīlāh et Dimnāh*. Paris: F. Vieweg.

Older Syriac version of Bōd:

Schulthess, F., ed., tr. (1911) *Kalila und Dimna: die altsyrische Version des indischen Fürstenspiegels (Pañcatantra) oder Bidpai's Fabeln*. Berlin.

Pāli Jātaka:

Fausbøll, V., ed. (1877-97) *The Jātaka together with its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gautama Buddha*. 7 vols. London: Trübner & Co.

Cowell, E. B., ed. (1895-1907) *The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births*. Translated from the Pāli by various hands under the editorship of Professor E. B. Cowell. 6 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pañcākhyānaka of Pūrṇabhadra:

Hertel, Johannes, ed. (1908) *The Panchatantra. A Collection of Ancient Hindu Tales in the Recension, called Pancakhyānaka, and dated 1199 A.D., of the Jaina Monk, Purnabhadra*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Ryder, Arthur W., tr. (1964) *The Panchatantra*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 1925. First Phoenix edition.

Southern Pañcatantra:

Hertel, Johannes, ed. (1906) *Das Südliche Pañcatantra. Sanskrittext der Rezension b mit den Lesarten der besten HSS. der Rezension a. Abhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse, vol. 24, No. 5, Berlin*.

Śukasaptati (Textus Ornator):

Schmidt, Richard, ed. (1898) *Der Textus ornator der Śukasaptati*. München.

———, tr. (1899) *Die Śukasaptati (Textus ornator), Aus dem Sanskrit uebersetzt*. Stuttgart.

田中於菟弥訳 (1963)『鸚鵡七十話』東洋文庫 3. 東京: 平凡社.

Śukasaptati (Textus Simplicior):

Okada, Amina, tr. (1984) *Les Contes du Perroquet: traduit du sanskrit. Connaissance de l'Orient collection UNESCO d'œuvres représentatives. Reproduit et achevé d'imprimer par l'Imprimerie Floch à Mayenne. le 12 décembre 1984*.

Dépôt légal: décembre.

Schmidt, Richard, ed. (1893) *Die Śukasaptati, Textus simplicior*. Leipzig.

———, tr. (1894) *Die Śukasaptati (Textus simplicior), Aus dem Sanskrit uebersetzt*. Kiel.

Tantrākhyāyika:

Hertel, Johannes, ed. (1904) *Über das Tantrākhyāyika, die kasmīrische Rezension des Pañcatantra*. Leipzig.

———, tr. (1909) *Tantrākhyāyika. Die älteste Fassung des Pañcatantra aus dem Sanskrit über- setzt mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen. Teil 2: Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*. Leipzig and Berlin.

———, ed. (1910) *Tantrākhyāyika. Die älteste Fassung des Pañcatantra nach den Handschriften beider Rezensionen zum ersten Male herausgegeben. Abhandlungen der Königlich-lichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologische-historische Klasse, NF 12 No. 2. Berlin*.

———, ed. (1915) *The Panchatantra. A Collection of Ancient Hindu Tales in Its Oldest Recension, the Kashmirian, Entitled Tantrakhayika*. The original Sanskrit text, Editio Minor, reprinted from the critical Editio Major which was made for the Königlische Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Textus Simplicior of the Pañcatantra:

Benfey, Theodor, tr. (1966a) *Pantschatantra: fünf Bücher indischer Fabeln, Märchen und Erzählungen*. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen. [Based on Kosegarten 1848.] Vol. 2. Leipzig 1859. Repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhanklung.

Bühler, G., ed. (1891a) *Pañcatantra II & III*. Bombay Sanskrit Series No. 3. Bombay.

———, ed. (1891b) *Pañcatantra IV & V*. Bombay Sanskrit Series No. 1. Bombay.

- Kielhorn, F., ed. (1896) *Pañcatantra I*. Bombay Sanskrit Series No. 4. Bombay.
- Kosegarten, Io. Godofr. Ludov., ed. (1848) *Pantschatantrum sive quinquepartitum de moribus exponens ex codicibus manuscriptis edidit commentariis criticis auxit*. Pars prima, textum sanscritum simpliciore tenens. Bonn.
- Fritze, Ludwig, tr. (1884) *Pantschatantra: Ein altes indisches Lehrbuch der Lebensklugheit in Erzählungen und Sprüchen*. Aus dem Sanskrit neu übersetzt. [Based on Bühler 1891a, b and Kielhorn 1896.] Leipzig: Otto Schulze.
- Lancereau, Édouard, tr. (1965) *Pañcatantra*. Paris 1871. nouv. éd. avec une introduction de L. Renou. [Based on Kosegarten 1848.] Paris: Gallimard.
- 田中於菟弥・上村勝彦訳『パンチャタントラ：五巻の書』アジアの民話 12. 東京：大日本絵画 1980. [Based on Bühler 1891a, b and Kielhorn 1896.]
- 2) Secondary Sources
- Benfey, Theodor, tr. (1966b) *Pantschatantra: fünf Bücher indischer Fabeln, Märchen und Erzählungen*. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen. [Based on Kosegarten 1848.] Erster Teil. Leipzig 1859. Repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhanklung.
- Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolph Roth. (1855-75) *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. Fünfter Theil. St. Petersburg.
- Böhtlingk, Otto von. (1991) *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung*. Sieben Bände. First St. Petersburg edn. 1883-6. First edn. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- van Buitenen, tr. (1980) *The Mahābhārata*. Vol. 1. The Book of the Beginning. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1973. Phoenix edn.
- Edgerton, Franklin. (1920) "Evil-wit, No-wit, and Honest-wit". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 40: 271-5.
- . *The Panchatantra Reconstructed*. Vol. 1: Text and Critical Apparatus. New Haven: American Oriental Society 1924a. (= American Oriental Series vol. 2)
- . *The Panchatantra Reconstructed*. Vol. 2: Introduction and Translation. New Haven: American Oriental Society 1924b. (= American Oriental Series vol. 3)
- Goldman, Robert P., introd., tr. *The Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki: an Epic of Ancient India*. Vol.1: *Bālakāṇḍa*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1990.
- Grierson, George. "On the Sarada Alphabet". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 17 (1916): 677-708.
- Hertel, Johannes. (1912) *The Panchatantra-Text of Purnabhadra: Critical Introduction and List of Variants*. Harvard Oriental Series 12. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Iwase, Yuka. (2000) *Development of Selected Stories from the Pañcatantra/Kalilah wa Dimnah: Genealogical Problems Reconsidered on the Basis of Sanskrit and Semitic Texts*. 大阪外国語大学博士論文シリーズ. 大阪：大阪外国語大学言語社会学会.
- Liebich, B. von. (1964) "Griechische militärische Wörter im Indischen". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution* 6 (1930-32). Repr. Vaduz: Kraus Reprint Ltd.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. (1956) *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. (1899) *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. New Edition, greatly enlarged and improved. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Renou, Louis and Jean Filliozat. (1985) *L'Inde classique*. Tome II. Paris.
- Venkatasubbiah. (1928) "Pañcatantra studies 2: Duṣṭabuddhi and Dharmabuddhi. 3: The Ape and the Crocodile". *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 4: 1-26.