

A Tale from the Pañcatantra in Central Asia? The Lion, the Bull and the Fox*

Orta Asya'daki Pañcatantra'dan Bir Anlatı mı? Aslan, Boğa ve Tilki

Jens WILKENS

Göttingen Academy of Sciences and Humanities (Göttingen/Germany)
E-mail: Jens.Wilkens@phil.uni-goettingen.de

The Indian *Pañcatantra* is doubtlessly one of the great successes in pre-modern literature as it was translated into numerous languages. In the article the Old Uyghur fragments which were previously assigned to this work are re-examined. It is argued that two Manichaean pieces are genuine textual testimonies of the *Pañcatantra/Kalīla wa-Dimna* tradition while the Buddhist fragments belong to the fifth chapter of the cycle of stories *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* 'garland of legends pertaining to the ten courses of actions'. Parallels to the story told in the latter work are examined. In the appendix a tentative new edition of the Manichaean fragments is provided.

Key Words: Pañcatantra, Kalīla wa-Dimna, Old Uyghur, narrative literature, Turfan studies.

* The paper was read on the International Conference “*The Pañcatantra Across Cultures and Disciplines*” in Leipzig organized by the Saxon Academy of Sciences and the Indian Council for Cultural Relations (September 26-29, 2012). It was intended for publication but after repeated unsuccessful enquiries directed at the editors which remained unanswered I decided to withdraw the paper and publish it in this journal.

I. Introduction

Ancient Central Asia is often described metaphorically as a kind of cultural turntable where influences from various regions (India, China, West Asia, North Eurasia) met and were transmitted to other countries. The impact of the so called world religions such as Buddhism, Manichaeism, Christianity and – in later times – Islam with their respective literary heritage and traditions of writing culture was considerable not only in literature, but in art and architecture as well, especially in the oases along the ancient Silk Roads. Most influential over several centuries was certainly Buddhism with its various schools and affiliations.

Tales from some versions of the *Pañcatantra* and related works are known from several vernaculars of Central Asia, from Buddhist and from Manichaean sources. Except for some Chagatay translations¹ of Naṣr-Allāh Monši's Persian rendering of the Arabic version of *Kalīla wa-Dimna* a complete version of the *Pañcatantra* or its literary descendants has not been discovered yet. From pre-Islamic times only individual stories from the repertoire of the *Pañcatantra* have come down to us and are found in a variety of source materials. The tale of the sorcerers who charm the bones and hide of a dead lion and bring him back to life, which is included in some versions of the *Pañcatantra*,² was depicted at Penjikent and is included in the Tocharian A version of the *Puṇyavanta-Jātaka* from Šorčuq.³

¹ The information supplied by Hertel 1914: 407 on the Chagatay translations has to be checked against Wolfart 1992 because not all versions listed by the former are really in Chagatay. See Sagaster 2009: 591b, as well, who states that only two East Middle Turkic (Chagatay) translations were made from Naṣr-Allāh Monši's text. Of the other three mentioned by HERTEL two are in Old Ottoman and one in Ottoman. A survey of all Chagatay and Early Modern Uyghur manuscripts of *Kalīla wa-Dimna* would be most welcome. Several manuscripts are kept in the Jarring Collection (Lund University Library).

² Pūrṇabhadra (V, 3), textus simplicior (V, 4), Ancient Marāṭhī (V, 3) (cf. Hertel 1914: 272).

³ First edition in Sieg 1916. Reedited in Sieg-Siegling 1921: 10-11 (fols. 11b2-13a5) and translated in Sieg 1944: 14-16.

Every student who wants to learn Classical Mongolian using a Western language primer naturally resorts to GRØNBECH and KRUEGER’s “*An Introduction to Classical (Literary) Mongolian*”.⁴ Tales from the *Pañcatantra* such as “*The ass in the panther’s skin*”⁵ or “*The hare and the lion*”⁶ are familiar to every reader of this book. These short but beautifully crafted tales are found in the Mongol translation of the commentary to Sa-skya Paṇḍita’s (CE 1182-1251) (*Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*) ‘treasury of aphoristic jewels’; in Tibetan: *Legs par bśad par rin po che’i gter*.⁷ But this work is not the only Mongol commentary which contains stories known from the *Pañcatantra* literature. A Mongolian manuscript known as the Burdukov manuscript, which includes tales from the *Pañcatantra*, was edited in 1921 by the Russian scholar VLADIMIROV.⁸ This manuscript is customarily even in recent publications referred to as ‘the Mongolian *Pañcatantra*’ but in fact it is the Mongolian translation of a Tibetan commentary to a text named *sKye bo gso ba’i thigs pa* which is ascribed to Nāgārjuna⁹ and was translated into Tibetan in the 9th century CE by the famous translators Śīlendrabodhi and Ye śes sde. Its Sanskrit title can be reconstructed either as **Jantupoṣaṇabindu* or **Janapoṣaṇabindu* ‘drop of

⁴ Grønbech-Krueger 1993.

⁵ See Bødker 1957: 98 [No. 991], for parallels. The story is missing in the early Syriac and Arabic translations. It may not have been part of the Pahlavi translation and its underlying Sanskrit original. See Taylor 2007: 14.

⁶ Parallels cited in Bødker 1957: 14 [No. 28].

⁷ GRØNBECH-KRUEGER edited these tales on the basis of a xylograph in the Royal Library, Copenhagen. Three *Pañcatantra* tales of a Tibetan commentary to the *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* were edited by Bethlenfalvy 1965. This commentary entitled *Legs par bśad pa rin po che’i gter gyi ’grel pa* was written by a pupil of Sa-skya Paṇḍita, dMar ston Chos kyi rgyal po. See Roesler 2002: 160, and especially footnote 8. On p. 161 (footnote 10) all tales of dMar ston’s commentary having parallels in the *Tantrākhyāyika/Pañcatantra* and in other narrative works are enumerated. Many tales are contained in the *dPe chos rin chen spuñs pa* of Po-to-ba Rin-chen-gsal (Roesler 2011) as well.

⁸ A reedition was provided by KRUEGER in 1965. See the unpublished PhD dissertation by Choi 1996 as well.

⁹ This ascription is unwarranted. See Hahn 2007: 434.

nourishment for the people'.¹⁰ Both texts, the *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* and the **Jantu-poṣaṇabindu*, allude in several stanzas to tales from the *Pañcatantra*. This is why complete versions of the tales are given in the commentaries. There are four different Mongolian versions of two Tibetan commentaries – the *Nor bu'i rgyan* 'Jewel Ornament'¹¹ and the collection of stories bearing no title – to the **Jantu-poṣaṇabindu*. The Mongolian commentaries include some stories which cannot be found in the Tibetan ones.¹²

The Ancient Uyghurs to whom this paper refers to are famous for the wide range of source languages on which their literary tradition built upon. The Manichaean Uyghurs were deeply influenced by Sogdian literature from which they translated several works, and it was presumably the Sogdians who first introduced them to the tale which corresponds to the frame story of the first *tantra* (Skt. *mitrabheda*) in the *Pañcatantra* which is discussed below. A Sogdian fragment in Manichaean script edited by HENNING preserves a short version of the story of the three fish named One-Thought, Hundred-Thoughts and Thousand-Thoughts which is known, e.g., from the *textus simplicior* and *Pūrṇabhadra*, both texts being Jain versions of the *Pañcatantra*.¹³ The names correspond to *ekabuddhi* 'one

¹⁰ Roesler 2000: 468 (footnote 4) and Roesler 2011: 68 (footnote 181). For a full German translation of the *sKye bo gso ba'i thigs pa* see Hahn 2007: 216-231. Rich bibliographical information on the **Jantu-poṣaṇabindu* and its Tibetan and Mongolian commentaries is provided in Roesler 2011: 68-72 and Kiripolska 1996: 162-164, footnotes 8-9.

¹¹ On the *Nor bu'i rgyan* see Roesler 2002: 168-169. Roesler 2011: 68 (footnote) gives an overview of the tales in the *Nor bu'i rgyan* which have a parallel in a *Pañcatantra* version.

¹² Furthermore, it is reported that in the middle of the 13th century Malik Iftihār ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr is supposed to have translated tales of the *Kalīla wa-Dimna* from Persian into Mongolian. See Allsen 2000: 33. The Mongols are likely to be the transfer agents of stories to other people such as the Lamut (Even), a Tungusic speaking people of North East Siberia. Cf. the tale of the turtle and the two geese in Doerfer 2011 II: 105-107 (text) and the remarks by KNÜPPEL, the editor of DOERFER's work, on pp. 12-15.

¹³ See Bødker 1957: 57 [No. 497], Hertel 1908: 269-270 (book IV, tale 4) and Hertel 1914: 16. For the version in Ancient Marāṭhī (V, 4) see Hertel 1914: 272. For other types see Bødker 1957: 72 [No. 690] and 77 [No. 739]. One is inclined to disagree with HENNING as far as the name "One-Thought" is concerned. He thinks that it refers to a fool but it is maybe the high amount of thoughts which is judged negatively. See the story of the two snakes in Bødker 1957, [No. 1029]. The first one with one head and a hundred tails saves his life as a forest fire breaks out whereas the second one with

thought', *śatabuddhi* 'hundred thoughts' and *sahasrabuddhi* 'thousand thoughts', but the animal which escapes in the Sanskrit versions is not a fish but a frog (Skt. *maṇḍūka*).¹⁴ We do not know the literary context in which the tale was transmitted by the Sogdian Manichaeans. The Manichaeans often extracted certain tales from their original context in order to give them a specific Manichaean interpretation by means of a so called *epimythion* which follows after the narrative in order to give an allegorical explanation.

Very instructive are Manichaean Sogdian parallels to Burzōe's preface to his translation of the *Pañcatantra* known as *Kalīla wa-Dimna*,¹⁵ the Middle Persian original being unfortunately lost. One – the famous story of the pearl borer¹⁶ – is known to the scholarly world since 1945, the other, a description of the fetus and its sufferings in the mother's womb, was introduced to the public by RECK in the year 2005.¹⁷ This highly interesting excursus derives from Indian medical lore which was most likely added by Burzōe himself.¹⁸

II. A Uyghur version of the *Pañcatantra*?

In the following I would like to reexamine the materials in Old Uyghur. The most important publication to date is a groundbreaking article written by GEIS-

a hundred heads and one tail burns to death, because each head wants to escape in a different direction.

¹⁴ Already noted by Henning 1945: 471 = 1977: 175. In another well-known *Pañcatantra* tale, included in several versions, there are three fishes named *Anāgatavidhātṛ*, *Pratyutpannamati* and *Yadbhaviṣya*. A Buddhist tale of three fishes is found in CCCA I: 226-227 (No: 60). See CCCA IV: 128-129 for further parallels.

¹⁵ A recent survey of the *Kalīla wa-Dimna* literature is given in Riedel 2010. Very detailed is the article by Grotzfeld et al 1993. On the relationship between *Kalīla wa-Dimna* and *Pañcatantra* see Brinkhaus 2008.

¹⁶ Text and translation in Henning 1945: 466-469 [= 1977: 170-173]. One manuscript is in Sogdian script, the other in Manichaean script. It is possible that further fragments not mentioned by HENNING belong to this tale. See VOHD XVIII/1, catalogue nos. 16, 110, 235.

¹⁷ See Reck 2005 (shelf marks: So 18700 + M 501e). For a catalogue description see VOHD XVIII/1, catalogue no. 293 where an additional fragment (shelf mark: MIK III 6261) which can be joined to the other two is described as well.

¹⁸ See De Blois 1990: 27-28.

SLER and ZIEME which appeared in the Journal *Turcica* in 1970 under the title “*Uyghurische Pañcatantra-Fragmente*” (i.e. “*Uyghur fragments of the Pañcatantra*”). As will be demonstrated below, the title is somewhat misleading because the eight fragments edited in this article do not all belong to a Uyghur version of the *Pañcatantra* but they are part of one particular story which is found in the *Pañcatantra* literature and its adaptations as well. In fact, it is maybe the most well-known story, namely the frame story of the first *tantra*.

The authors arranged these fragments into three different groups:

Group 1: fragments A 1 (Mainz 657)¹⁹, A 2 (U 1796)²⁰, A 3 (U 1802), B 1 (Mainz 238) and B 2 (U 182)

Group 2: A 4 (MIK III 6324)²¹ and A 5 (U 1057)²²

Group 3: B 3 (U 231).

GEISSLER and ZIEME already indicated that those pieces which they had labeled with the letter A are likely to be Buddhist, whereas those with the letter B are Manichaeic.²³ This observation is still valid today. The reason for this arrangement lies in the postulated contents of the stories. However, the identification of the work to which most of these fragments belong, makes it perfectly clear, that those pieces which are labeled with the letter A in the first edition – i.e. the Buddhist ones (A 1-5) – are all part of one and the same story.

¹⁹ The numbers in brackets are shelf marks of fragments from the Berlin Turfan collection. Fragments with the signatures M, Mainz, So and U mentioned in this article are kept in the collection of the Academy of Sciences and Humanities of Berlin-Brandenburg whereas those with the signatures MIK are part of the collection of the Museum of Asian Art (Berlin).

²⁰ No shelf mark is given in Geissler-Zieme 1970: 40.

²¹ No shelf mark is given in Geissler-Zieme 1970: 41-42.

²² Geissler-Zieme 1970: 36 thought that these two fragments belong to an inserted tale of the first book of the *Pañcatantra*, namely “The cunning jackal” or “The lion, his attendants and the simple-minded camel”.

²³ *Ibid.* 32-33 (note 1).

In the introduction to my catalogue²⁴ of the Manichaean Turkic fragments from the Berlin Turfan collection I was able to show that one of the Manichaean fragments (i.e. B 1 = Mainz 238) belongs to the same manuscript as the *Vita Aesopi*²⁵ and presumably goes back to a Sogdian version of *Kalīla wa-Dimna* which itself was translated either from the lost Middle Persian translation or - less likely - from the old Syriac translation *Qalīlāg w-Damnaḡ* of Bōd²⁶ (late 6th century).²⁷ The literary impact of the latter was rather limited as emphasized by Niehoff-Panagiotidis 2003: 14.

The Sogdians were familiar with the *Pañcatantra* and the fables of Aesop, too, as the wall-paintings from Penjikent show.²⁸ The Manichaean fragments Mainz 238 and U 231²⁹ are presumably part of the book *Kalīla wa-Dimna* as can be inferred from the names of the protagonists. The bull is called *sinčvu* (Mainz 238 r12) and the name of the jackal *t(a)mnak* is preserved in U 231 r4,8 as well. These names correspond to *saṃjīvaka* and *damanaka* in the Sanskrit versions of the *Pañcatantra*.³⁰ After checking the original manuscript Mainz 238 we can now restore the name of the other jackal in line 2 of the recto as *k(a)lil(a)[k]* and equally in line 11 of the verso *k(a)l[il(a)k]* (spelled <kllk>).³¹ On the other Manichaean fragment U 231 we can now reconstruct the name *k(a)l(i)l(a)[k]* in line 12 (recto) as

²⁴ VOHD XIII/16, 15. Here the parallel in the Syriac version was identified for the verso (in the catalogue identified as ‘recto’ following Geissler-Zieme 1970).

²⁵ Interestingly, Niehoff-Panagiotidis 2003: 34 refers to the Codex Gr. 397 of the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York which contains a fragmentary Byzantine translation of *Kalīla wa-Dimna*, a version of the *Vita Aesopi*, a collection of Aesop’s fables, the fables of Babrios and the text of the *Physiologos*.

²⁶ As for the name of the translator see De Blois 1990: 2-3.

²⁷ The frame story of the lion and the bull in the old descendants of the Middle Persian version of *Kalīla wa-Dimna* differs from the account in the *Pañcatantra*. See the summary in De Blois 1990: 22-23.

²⁸ Cf. Marshak 2002.

²⁹ The other Manichaean fragment U 182 is too small to judge its affiliation.

³⁰ Cf. Syriac *Snzbuḡ* and *Dmng*.

³¹ Geissler-Zieme 1970: 36 already surmised that *kāl/* in line B 1 (= v2) could point to a connection with *Kalīla* in the Persian and Arabic versions.

well. The names of both jackals are very close to the reconstructed Middle Persian forms *dmnk* and *klylk* representing *Damanak* and *Karīrak*.³² Because both fragments belong to the frame story of the first chapter of *Kalīla wa-Dimna*, the assignment to two different groups of stories, namely group 1 and 3, in the first edition is unwarranted.

Whether there was a complete version of the book *Kalīla wa-Dimna* in Old Uyghur is difficult to prove but U 231 bears the pagination *on iki* ‘twelve’ which could point to the fact that the fragment belonged to the introductory part of a book which lacked a division into chapters. The parallel can now be found in the early Syriac version.³³ On the recto both jackals converse together and on the verso Kalilak is introduced to the lion king as a son of the former minister. Recto and verso have to be placed in reverse order when comparing the text with the first edition. Mainz 238 is a dialogue between the two jackals in which Damnak (Old Uyghur *t(a)mnak*) decides to get rid of the bull.³⁴ Here, too, recto and verso have to be assigned in reverse order when compared with the first edition. The identification of the parallels in the Syriac version allows for several new readings of the manuscripts. New transcriptions and translations are provided in the appendix below. It can now be confirmed with near certainty that both Manichaean pieces are genuine fragments of the work *Kalīla wa-Dimna*.

III. The Buddhist Fragments

In this present paper I would like to focus on the Buddhist pieces which belong to several manuscripts. GEISSLER and ZIEME already mentioned the fragment with the shelf mark Mainz 86 to which they came across as their article was already in the press. Several years later – in 1993 – ÖLMEZ published this fragment in connection with the verso of MIK III 6324 which had been labeled as fragment A 4 in the edition by GEISSLER and ZIEME. He gives some improved readings and a fresh translation. In his article ÖLMEZ ascribes to the arrangement of fragments

³² See De Blois 1990: 12. Maybe the final /k/ is to be transcribed as /g/. See Niehoff-Panagiotidis 2003: 15 (footnote 27).

³³ Schulthess 1911, II: 7-8 (German translation).

³⁴ Schulthess 1911, II: 18-19 (German translation).

as proposed by GEISLER and ZIEME. He gives no hint as to the identification of the story or the literary work to which it might belong.

The first scholar who suspected that the so called *Pañcatantra* fragments were originally part of a particular collection of stories, namely of the *Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā* “garland of legends which pertain to the ten courses of action” (henceforth: *DKPAM*) was LAUT.³⁵ However, this was only an assumption and - it has to be added - this identification can be accepted only regarding the Buddhist texts and not the Manichaeian ones. The Old Uyghur *DKPAM* is a translation from Tocharian A³⁶ and is divided into ten chapters each of which is devoted to one particular Skt. *karmapatha* ‘course of action’. All stories are introduced and commented upon by a teacher called Śāstrapriya or Śāstrakāra³⁷ who explains to his pupil the effects of transgressing the ten *karmapathas*. The dialogue of teacher and pupil constitutes the frame story of the whole collection.

It can now be stated with certainty that the story in question belongs to the fifth *karmapatha* which is devoted to the offence of calumny (Skt. *paśūnyavāda*). Now that the Buddhist fragments edited by GEISLER and ZIEME (1970) as well as Ölmez 1993 are identified as belonging to the *DKPAM*, their original sequence and location can be established. The tale immediately follows the Avadāna of Kāñcanasāra, a story in which the Bodhisattva is willing to learn a cherished stanza from a wicked Brahmin and has to bear that this evil person fixes numerous wicks onto his body.³⁸ After hearing the stanza the Brahmin sets fire to the wicks so that the Bodhisattva burns like a tree of lamps. The animal fable begins on the fragment MIK III 6324. The first five rather damaged lines of the recto are devoted to a short comment by the teacher who states that king Kāñcanasāra³⁹

³⁵ Laut 1996: 198. In his catalogue of the former West Berlin part of the Turfan Collection (= VOHD XIII/10) EHLERS did not include the Buddhist ‘Pañcatantra fragments’ published by GEISLER and ZIEME.

³⁶ The Tocharian A version was itself translated from Tocharian B.

³⁷ The name differs in the manuscripts.

³⁸ A leaf from a Sogdian translation made from one of the two Tocharian versions was published by Sundermann 2006. In the Sogdian version the Avadāna of Kāñcanasāra is found in the fifth chapter as well.

³⁹ The name has to be partly reconstructed.

experienced sufferings similar to those in hell. Then follows a formula corresponding to Skt. *namo buddhāya, namo dharmāya, namas saṅghāya*. Afterwards a beautiful illustration of the Kāñcanasāra-Avadāna covers several lines.⁴⁰ Then a few lines are appended in which the teacher remarks that the story is a Jātaka of the Buddha. Unfortunately, the text is damaged. On the verso the teacher exhorts his pupil to listen carefully because he is going to tell a story which has been transmitted in a *śāstra*. In line 7 the story proper begins.

Regarding new materials belonging to the tale there is a newly identified parallel consisting of four fragments.⁴¹ Furthermore, two fragments (U 1796 and U 1802), formerly published individually, are now to be joined.⁴²

The sequence of fragments is as follows:⁴³

MIK III 6324 v5-12

MIK III 6324 v12-19 = U 1057 v2-8

MIK III 6324 v14-24 = Mainz 86 r2-12

Mainz 86 r12-26

Mainz 86 v1-27

[gap]

Mainz 657 r1-19

Mainz 657 r19-33 = U 1888a + U 1054b + U 1054a + U 1054c r1-14

U 1802 + U 1796 r1-4 = Mainz 657 r33-37 = U 1888a + U 1054b + U 1054a + U 1054c r14-17

U 1802 + U 1796 r5-9

⁴⁰ In the secondary literature this depiction is usually identified as the story of Hariścandra which is also part of the *DKPAM* but which belongs to a different chapter.

⁴¹ VOHD XIII/18, catalogue no. 133 (fragments U 1888a + U 1054b + U 1054a + U 1054c). It is likely that the recto of the hitherto not localized fragment U 1735 belongs to the end of the story.

⁴² See VOHD XIII/18, catalogue no. 134.

⁴³ An edition and translation of the story is now found in Wilkens 2016: 484-491 (lines 05059-05205).



U 1802 + U 1796 r9-19 = Mainz 657 v3-13

Mainz 657 v13-14

Mainz 657 v14-21 = U 1888a + U 1054b + U 1054a + U 1054c v1-7

Mainz 657 v21-28 = U 1888a + U 1054b + U 1054a + U 1054c v8-17 = U 1802 + U 1796 v2-10

Mainz 657 v28-36 = U 1802 + U 1796 v10-20

Mainz 657 v37

[gap]

U 1735 r1-5

[gap]

IV. Contents of the Old Uyghur Tale

After putting all fragments into the correct order, the tale runs as follows:⁴⁴

A pregnant cow is about to give birth to a calf while an equally pregnant lioness kills her. By tearing the abdomen apart the calf is given birth to. The lion cub and the calf both start to suckle the teats of the lioness. She is at first offended but after a while accepts the young calf as her son with the following thoughts:

“I have killed his mother. Therefore this poor creature does not have a mother any more. He is completely without sin. He thinks that I am his mother. As my own son is dear to me, so this child of a creature, which entered the womb of an animal, is dear to me (now). May the poor thing, which is left without a mother, suckle my teats and be my child.”⁴⁵

⁴⁴ See the summary of the parallels in Bødker 1957: 12-13 [No. 19].

⁴⁵ *munuŋ anasin m(ä)n ölürdüm <=> anı üçün bo erinč tnl(ı)g ögsüz bolup kaltı muŋar nä ärsär yazok yok : meni anam ol tep sakınur : mäniŋ oglum näčük amrak ärsär ančulayu ymä yıldı aź[unnt]a barmış tnl(ı)glarınŋ oġlanı [anta]g ok amrak ol : ögsüz kalmış bo erinč tnl(ı)g [ämigi]min ämip bolzun mäniŋ oglum : (Mainz 86 r11-20).*

Afterwards the young lion and the young bull⁴⁶ become like elder and younger brother and grow up together. One day a vixen appears on the scene. She imagines herself feeding on the flesh of this well-bred bull but admits that she is completely powerless compared to him. She finally understands that with a great deal of cunning she might be victorious and thinks about using calumny.⁴⁷ In the end she succeeds by instilling fear and mistrust in both animals so that they fight each other. The end of the story is not preserved but it is almost certain that both animals must have killed each other.

V. Parallels

The first editors cited parallels mostly from the well-known motif-indexes of folk tales⁴⁸ and from translations of narrative literature but did not attempt an analysis. The story is similar to the famous story of the lion, the bull and the two jackals in the first *tantra* of the different versions of the *Pañcatantra* in which the lion Piṅgalaka kills the bull.⁴⁹ In the *Pañcatantra* the lion is accompanied by two attendant jackals: Karaṭaka and Damanaka. BØDKER in his survey of Indian animal tales discusses the variants which concern us here under type no. 19 whereas the genuine *Pañcatantra* type is to be found under type no. 18.⁵⁰ As a *śāstra* is mentioned in the introduction of the Old Uyghur story (“It is related [lit. heard] as follows in a *śāstra*”)⁵¹ one might at first glance speculate that this refers to a certain kind of *nītiśāstra* from which the story was taken. But in the *DKPAM* there are several other stories which one would usually classify as *Jātakas* or *Bodhisattvāvadānas* which have the same introduction. Consequently, the term *śāstra* is rather imprecise here.

The closest version known to me is found in the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* (henceforth: *MSV*). It belongs to the third *pātayantika* of

⁴⁶ In the text we find *kotuz öküz* which literally means ‘yak bull’ (Mainz 86 v15). In the *Maitrisimit* we find *kotuz öküz* as a translation of Tocharian A *kayurş* ‘bull’. See Carling 2009: 102a.

⁴⁷ See Uther 2006: 141-147 for the fox as a cunning and deceiving animal in world literature.

⁴⁸ Geissler-Zieme 1970: 35-36.

⁴⁹ An artistic representation of the *Pañcatantra* story is found on the first register in room 41/VI in Penjikent. See Marshak 2002: 86-88 (Figs. 36-38).

⁵⁰ Bødker 1957: 12 [No. 18].

⁵¹ *inčä k(a)ltı šastrda äštilür* (MIK III 6324 v5-6).

the *Vinayavibhaṅga*⁵² and was translated into German by SCHIEFNER in 1876.⁵³ An English version of SCHIEFNER's translation was published by RALSTON in 1906 under the title “*the jackal as calumniator*”.⁵⁴ Already GEISSLER-ZIEME took notice of this parallel. Next to the frame story of the *Pañcatantra* and Jātaka No. 349 they already gave story No. 394 in CHAVANNES' translation of Chinese stories from the Tripiṭaka as a reference.⁵⁵ Now, this story is part of the 根本說一切有部毗奈 Genben shuo yiqie you bu pinaiye (*Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*, No. 1442, Vol. XXIII, p. 768 a2-c10).⁵⁶ This is the Chinese version of the *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the MSV. Therefore, its being close to the Tibetan narrative is not surprising.

Next to the MSV the closest known parallel is story no. XX in the well-known Mongolian work *Siditü Kegür* ‘the bewitched corpse’,⁵⁷ better known as *Siddhi-Kür*,⁵⁸ which is an adaptation with many deviations of the Sanskrit cycle of stories *Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā* ‘25 (stories) of the Vetāla’. It is unknown when this collection was introduced to Central Asia.⁵⁹ Customarily the introduction of the work into Tibet is credited to the outstanding Buddhist scholar Atiśa (CE 982-1054).⁶⁰ There are several Tibetan versions known under various titles such as *Ro lañs grub can gyi gtam rgyud* or *Ro dños grub can gyi sgruñ* which served as a model

⁵² Volume XLIII (Je) 10, 1, 4 (222a). Reference according to Panglung 1981: 135.

⁵³ Schiefner 1876: 780-784 = Schiefner (Ed. RALSTON) 1906: 325-328 (story XXXIII A). The German version was reedited by WALRAVENS some years ago (Schiefner 2007: 63-65). Based upon the tale translated by SCHIEFNER is HOFFMANN's (1965: 127-130, No. 29) translation.

⁵⁴ A summary is given in the work by Panglung 1981: 135.

⁵⁵ Geissler-Zieme 1970: 34 called this version group 1, version a.

⁵⁶ CCCA II: 425-429 (N° 394). See De Jong 1964-1965: 241.

⁵⁷ Four folklore versions including a Buryat and an Oirat tale from the *Siddhi Kür* are listed in the work by Lőrincz 1979: 29 under No. 8 (“Der Fuchs und die beiden Freunde”). See the Mongol story translated into Russian in Anonymus 1959: 58-59 as well which is very close to the parallels under discussion here.

⁵⁸ There are several titles in the Mongolian version, among others *Siditü kegür-ün üliḡer* and *Siditü kegür-ün čadiy*. See Kaschewsky 2007: 638.

⁵⁹ Louis Renou 1963: 18 thought that it came to Central Asia prior to the 13th century.

⁶⁰ Kaschewsky 2007: 638. See also Roesler 2002: 155-156 (footnote 3) where other narrative works introduced by ATIŠA are discussed.

for the Mongolian collections which began to spread in the 16th and 17th century.⁶¹ But the tale in question is neither included in any of the Tibetan versions known to me nor in the Indian versions of the *Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā*. The different Mongolian versions belong to two groups: one short version consisting of 13 tales⁶² and one long version comprising 26 tales.⁶³ The story of lion, bull and jackal is to be found in the long version only, the additional tales of which (compared with the short version) were edited by JÜLG already in 1868 and translated in the same volume.⁶⁴

In the version of the *Siddhi-Kür* the lion cub has already been born and the lioness is about to devour it because she is starving of hunger. But she is not able to do it and sets out to search for food. She makes out a herd of cattle all of which set to flight except for one single cow. The calf has already been born as the hungry lioness kills the cow. (The same is true of the Tibetan and Chinese versions of the *MSV*.) The calf follows the lioness after the death of its mother. In agreement with the versions of the *MSV* and the *DKPAM* the calf and the lion cub both suckle at the teats of the lioness whereby both become foster-brothers.⁶⁵ One day a bone of a wild animal is stuck in the windpipe of the lioness and she is about to die. She is, however, able to advise the “brothers” that they must not be divided by an enemy who uses cunning. The illness of the lioness and her last piece of advice are mentioned in both versions of the *MSV* as well. The story in the *Siddhi*

⁶¹ See Lőrincz 1967: 203. There are more versions in Mongolian languages (Oirat, Buryat, Monguor, Ordos) and in Shibe Manchurian.

⁶² There are around 40 versions with 13 tales, all of which were translated from Tibetan (Lőrincz 1967: 204).

⁶³ In Tibet, there are versions with 13, 21 and 26 tales. A xylographed folklore version consists of 16 tales. See Lőrincz 1965: 306-307. Roesler 2011: 86 mentions versions with 25 and 37 tales in Tibet.

⁶⁴ Jülg 1868: 31-35, transl. *ibid.* 171-176. There are several other editions, among others the romanized edition of the Ulan Bator Print from 1928 by Kara 1984. Story no. 20 is edited on pp. 79-82. There are some variants to the text edited by JÜLG.

⁶⁵ This is not only an important motif of fairy tales such as in the story no. XXII of the *Siddhi-Kür* but also significant for social life in Central Asia, especially in the Mongol Empire and its successor states (cf. Vásáry 1982). In some Middle Turkic sources such as the *Bāburnāme* there is special title *kökaldäš* which means ‘foster-brother’ (cf. *ibid.* 549-554). Foster-brotherhood in Central Asia is a very close relationship and stories dealing with this motif must have had a special appeal to Central Asian peoples.

Kür was - just like its parallel in the *DKPAM* - adjusted to Central Asian environment, because the jackal⁶⁶ in the Indian original (represented in the Tibetan and Chinese versions as well) was replaced by a fox (Mong. *ünegen*).⁶⁷ Unlike in the Old Uyghur story the fox is not female. As the fox appears on the scene he is concerned that he has to share the lion's prey with the bull. Contrary to the story in the *DKPAM*, he first approaches the lion to spread calumny. He refers to the lioness's killing of the bull's mother (the same is true for both translations of the *MSV*). He says that the sign of the bull's evil intentions will be: the squirting of earth with his horns, the position of his tail and his mooing. Afterwards the fox approaches the bull with a similar story. He says that the signs of the lion's willingness to kill the bull are as follows: he will rise early, shake his mane, stretch his claws and throw up the earth. The same is true for the Chinese tale in T 1442. Differing in the order in which the jackal approaches first the lion and then the bull (*Siddhi Kür*) or first the bull and then the lion (T 1442) both versions share many traits. One gets the impression that the Old Uyghur version was deliberately shortened because originally the vixen must have approached the lion, too. Even in the *DKPAM* the typical signs of the bull's behavior are described in detail before both animals attack each other. It is reasonable that the *Siddhi Kür* and both translations of the *MSV* have preserved an original trait of the story in that the fox/jackal approaches the lion, too and describes the supposed signs of enmity of the bull.

There is a Pāli version of the story as well - i.e. Jātaka No. 349 "Sandhibheda-Jātaka"⁶⁸ - which shows interesting deviations in the prose narrative. Already in the introduction to this Jātaka there is mention of the central concept which is treated in the fifth chapter of the *DKPAM* as well to which the Old Uyghur story belongs: *pesuñña* 'calumny'.⁶⁹ In this Jātaka it is the pregnant cow which befriends the lioness after having run away from the herdsman.⁷⁰ In this respect the Jātaka

⁶⁶ In India the most common species is the Golden Jackal (*canis aureus*) which plays a considerable role in Indian art, religion and literature. See Geer 2008: 150-158.

⁶⁷ Usually the fox does not play such a prominent role in Indian fables as the jackal.

⁶⁸ Transl. Cowell 1895-1913, III: 99-101.

⁶⁹ Fausbøll 1875-1897, III: 149.

⁷⁰ Fausbøll 1875-1897, III: 149: *tassā ekāya sīhiyā saddhiṃ vissāso uppajji*.

tale differs from all the other versions under discussion. After a while the animals give birth to a calf and to a cub respectively. Like their mothers the young animals become close mates. A further motif is the hunter who witnesses the friendship. After having informed the king, the latter presumes that a third one is likely to cause trouble. The king is identified at the end of the story as one of the Buddha's former births.⁷¹ The king asks the hunter to inform him, should a third one appear on the scene. And sure enough, the hunter watches a jackal joining the lion and the bull and informs the king. The words with which the jackal causes enmity between the two friends are rather vague: "This one says so and so about you"⁷². The king is right in inferring that he and the hunter will be too late and that lion and bull will be dead before they arrive. The concluding *gāthās* are recited by the king. In the first *gāthā* a person, identified as the king only in the prose, addresses his charioteer. And again in the third and fourth *gāthā* the charioteer is addressed. This means that the two persons who appear on the scene after lion and bull have killed each other are very likely to be original elements of the Jātaka, although they seem to be a secondary element in the story when compared with the parallels.

FALK, who did not take into account the other parallels examined here but only compared the *Tantrākhāyika* with the information gleaned from the Jātaka *gāthās*, thought that the author of the first *tantra* knew the original Jātaka story and deleted the human actors.⁷³ It is more likely that he revised a version of the tale which must have been similar to the one in the *MSV*. One can assume that the very same story which the compilers of the *MSV* adopted was the model of the frame story of the *Pañcatantra/Tantrākhāyika* as well. This comes close to the alternative explanation given by FALK.⁷⁴ I agree with FALK that in the original story both animals killed each other⁷⁵ and that the author of the first *tantra* for

⁷¹ Cowell 1895-1913, III: 101. It is conceivable that the need for such an identification of the Bodhisattva character was the reason for having introduced the hunter and the king into the story.

⁷² Oldenburg 1897: 193. Cowell 1895-1913, III: 100: "This is the way he speaks of you".

⁷³ Falk 1978: 113.

⁷⁴ „das ursprüngliche Sandhibheda-Jātaka (oder eine in anderen als buddhistischen Kreisen tradierte inhaltsgleiche Fabel) als eine Vorlage des ersten Tantras“ (Falk 1978: 114).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

reasons of political theory changed the story so that the lion survived. The second *gāthā* refers to “the meanest of animals” (*miḡādhamā*) in the plural who “eat up the bull as well as the lion” (*ūsabhañ ca sīhañ ca bhakkhayanti*). This means that originally there was more than one jackal (perhaps two) in the story.⁷⁶ Obviously, prose and verse section do not tally.⁷⁷ The fourth and last stanza is as it were the motto of the second tale translated by SCHIEFNER:⁷⁸

„Those men will prosper
Like men who have gone to heaven,
Who to the words of the divider
Will not listen, O charioteer.”⁷⁹

This tale which was translated by SCHIEFNER is a kind of counter concept to the story outlined above. Very close variants are to be found in the 十誦律 *Shi-song lü*, (transl. CCCA II: 233-237 [N° 336])⁸⁰ and Pāli Jātaka No. 361 “*Vaṇṇāro-hajātaka*”.⁸¹ The Chinese version belongs like its MSV counterpart referred to above to the third Pātayantikadharmā called *bhikṣupaiśunya*. The close friends, a lion and a tiger, cannot be incited against each other by the jackal.⁸²

⁷⁶ See Falk 1978: 111 as well.

⁷⁷ Already remarked by Falk 1978: 111.

⁷⁸ Schiefner 1906: 328-331 (story XXXIII B); Schiefner 1876: 784-788 = Schiefner 2007: 65-67.

⁷⁹ Oldenburg 1897: 193.

⁸⁰ This is from the *Vinayavibhaṅga* of the Sarvāstivādins (T 1435, Vol. XXIII, p. 66a26-c19). An analysis is given in Rosen 1959: 125. See also De Jong 1964-1965: 240.

⁸¹ Fausbøll 1875-1897, III: 191-193; transl. Cowell 1895-1913, III: 126-127. For further parallels see CCCA IV: 172 and especially Geissler-Zieme 1970: 34-35 (version group I, version b). See Julien 1859, I: 110-114 as well.

⁸² See for this type also Bødker 1957: 51 [no. 430]: “Jackal tries to put enmity between tiger and lion, but they talk it over, and instead of killing each other kill jackal, or put him to flight.”

Table

Motifs in the DKPAM and parallels⁸³

+ a motif is present

- a motif is not present

(+) a motif is present but it differs from the DKPAM

DKPAM	MSV (tib.)	T 1442 (MSV)	Siddhi Kür	Jātaka No. 349	Pañcatantra (frame)
female cow (yak) is pregnant	-	-	-	-	-
lioness is pregnant	+	+	-	-	-
lioness kills cow (yak)	+	+	+	-	-
calf is brought to life	-	-	-	-	-
calf begins to suckle milk	+	-	+	-	-
young yak (bull) and lion cub be- come foster-brothers = adoption of the yak (bull)	+	+	+	-	-
both become inseparable friends	+	+	+	+	+ ⁸⁴
vixen (or fox) appears on the scene	+	+	+	+ ⁸⁵	(+) ⁸⁶
vixen wants to taste yak's (bull's) meat	-	(+)	-	(+)	-
vixen thinks about her strata- gems	+	+	+	-	+
calumny would lead to success	-	-	-	-	-

⁸³ The table takes into account the positions of HERTEL on the one hand, who saw in the *Tantrākhyāyika* the most faithful testimony of the original text, and of EDGERTON on the other hand, who thought that the Southern Recension of the *Pañcatantra* comes close to the original on which he based his reconstruction. *Mahābhārata* 12.112 which Falk 1978: 114-144 had identified as one of the sources of the first *tantra* is irrelevant for our study.

⁸⁴ The grown-up bull Sañjivaka who pulls a cart together with the bull Nandaka is stuck in a mud and is not able to free himself so that he is abandoned by the leader of the caravan. Sañjivaka is finally able to free himself from the mud and recovers from his weakness. He befriends the lion Piṅgalaka after the jackal Damanaka found out that the source his master, the lion, heard resound in the forest is only the mooing of the bull.

⁸⁵ The *gāthās* point to more than one jackal. See above.

⁸⁶ Two jackals, Karaṭaka and Damanaka, are the sons of the former minister.

vixen meets yak (bull) and pretends to be concerned	+	+	-	-	+
vixen tells yak (bull) that lion wants to kill him	+	+	-	-	+
yak (bull) does not believe this	+	+	-	-	+
vixen says that if lion roars next morning this will be the sign that he will kill yak (bull)	+	+	-	-	(+) ⁸⁷
lion roars	+	+	-	-	(+) ⁸⁸
yak (bull) is frightened and moos loudly/squirts earth with his horns	+	+	-	-	-
lion is concerned	+	+	-	-	+
fight (text breaks up here)	+	+	+	+	+

Recently a further parallel was discovered by KARASHIMA and VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA in the Sanskrit manuscript of an Avadāna anthology from Bairam Ali (Turkmenistan).⁸⁹ It runs from fol. 68 v4 up to fol. 69 v1 and is a kind of summary of the story in the Vinaya. A further allusion to this tale is found in the Parthian *Ārdahang Wifrās* although it is not certain to which version the Manichaean author referred to.⁹⁰

VI. Conclusion

By comparing all the materials referred to above we can draw the following conclusion: The Buddhist tale in question is not a *Pañcatantra* tale in the strict sense. If we compare the matching and the differing traits it becomes immediately obvious that the Old Uyghur tale is in many respects at variance with the prose section of the *Sandhibheda-Jātaka*. As regards the *Pañcatantra* frame story, the events leading to the intimate friendship between the lion and the bull are completely different from the other parallels.⁹¹ The animals in the *Pañcatantra*

⁸⁷ The alleged signs of the evil intentions of the lion are different.

⁸⁸ See preceding footnote.

⁸⁹ Karashima-Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya 2015: 320-323.

⁹⁰ Henning 1943-1946: 72 [135].

⁹¹ BENFEY thought that the frame story of the first *tantra* goes back to a Buddhist source. To support his theory he quotes the story from the *Siddhi Kūr* (1859, II: 528-529) and refers to the similarity

are types of political actors whereas in the Buddhist tale any connection with political theory is absent. Further differences cannot be discussed in detail here.

Because of the similarity of the motifs and their sequence, the version in the Old Uyghur *DKPAM* is either directly or indirectly related to the *MSV*. However, the Old Uyghur version differs in one respect from the *MSV*: in both versions of the latter the cow had already given birth to a calf when killed by the lioness. The Old Uyghur story gives a more pointed account. By tearing up the cow's belly with her claws the lioness performs some kind of Caesarean section. The lioness is the first living creature with which the calf comes into contact. Another difference lies in the fact that the lioness first wants to kill the calf, too, but after some reflection she decides that the calf will be a mate once she had given birth to her own cub. What makes the Chinese version unique is that after the last advice of the lioness the Buddha as the narrator of the story admonishes the *bhikṣus* and pronounces the famous *gāthā* "All aggregations end in dissolution, everything high ends in downfall, all unions end in separation, all that lives is subject to death." In the Chinese version the fox resolves to eat both animals,⁹² i. e. the lion and the bull. And, similarly, in the Pāli *Sandhibheda-Jātaka* prose the fox has the following thought: "There is no meat that I have not eaten except the flesh of lions and bulls. By setting these two at variance, I will get their flesh to eat."⁹³ In this respect the Chinese and the Pāli versions are closer to the Old Uyghur story in which the vixen wants to taste the bull's meat whereas in the Tibetan translation of the *MSV* this motif is missing altogether.

In both translations of the *MSV* the fox first approaches the bull and afterwards the lion whereas in the *Siddhi Kūr* it is the other way round. In the *DKPAM* the vixen approaches only the bull.

between the title of the first *tantra* (*mitrabheda*) and the Jātaka tale (*sandhibheda*) (1859, I: 91). BENFEY also assumed that the frame story ultimately goes back to a Greek model (1859, II: 529). Although many of BENFEY's assumptions cannot be accepted at face value today, the Buddhist version found in the *MSV* and in the *gāthās* of the *Sandhibhedajātaka* may be closer to the lost 'prototype' of the story than the elaborated story in the *Pañcatantra*.

⁹² CCCA II: 426.

⁹³ Cowell 1895-1913, III: 100.

A trait found only in the Old Uyghur tale is the vixen's realization that calumny alone would lead to success. This observation underlines the overall theme of the fifth chapter of the work to which the fable belongs.

VII. Appendix: A New Edition of the Manichaean *Kalīla wa-Dimna* Fragments⁹⁴

In the following the two genuine *Kalīla wa-Dimna* fragments are reedited although due to the poor state of preservation some problems could not be solved. The transliteration is found below the transcription. Both fragments are from codex books.

Fragment 1

U 231 (expedition code : T II K x 11)

recto

- | | | | | | | |
|----|----|---------------|----------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| 01 | 01 | [|] | T : | [|]/ |
| | | [|] | t : | [|]/ |
| 02 | 02 | [|] | üčünč | üt ⁹⁵ | |
| | | [|] | wyčwnč | ʾwyt | |
| 03 | 03 | [äriḡ | t(a)mnak |]/ <i>R</i> | ymä | inčä |
| | | [|] | /r | ymʾ | ʾynčʾ |
| 04 | 04 | [tep ötünti : |] | <i>RS</i> /[|]/ | /// //ʾ <i>R</i> tägiml(i)ḡ |
| | | [|] | <i>rs</i> /[|]/ | /// //ʾr tʾkymlk |
| 05 | 05 | [| i]ki | törlügä ⁹⁶ | ötrü | bolur : |
| | | [|] | ky | twyrlwkdʾ | ʾwytrw pwlwr : |

⁹⁴ In the edition round brackets mark defective writings. Restorations are given in square brackets. Illegible letters are represented by a slash. Partly preserved words which cannot be restored are transliterated in small capitals. In the translation restored parts are given in square brackets, while additions by me are in round brackets. Typical “Manichaean punctuation” is rendered with a : in bold typeface.

⁹⁵ Geissler-Zieme 1970: line 203: *oyun* ‘game, play’.

⁹⁶ Geissler-Zieme 1970: line 206: *törlüg*.

- 06 06 [n]ä y[m]ä ärsär : alkuka sävitir . taplatir
[]/ /[]/ ʾrsʾr : ʾlqwqʾ sʾvytyr . tʾplʾtyr
- 07 07 *bir*⁹⁷ k(ä)ntü eliglär bäglärdä : el işin üdintä
pyr kntw ʾylyklʾr pʾklʾrdʾ : ʾyl ʾyšyn ʾwydyntʾ
- 08 08 [iśläs]är⁹⁸ : ekinti azu yer suv törösin kodup
[]ʾr : ʾykyntyʾz w yyr swv twyrwsyn qwdwp
- 09 09 [nom] işin iśl[ä]sär⁹⁹ : inčä k(a)ltı : yaṇan¹⁰⁰
[] ʾyšyn ʾyšl[]sʾr : ʾynčʾ q̄lty : yʾnkʾn
- 10 10 [iki] törlüg¹⁰¹ yerdä yaraşur : azu taşdın
[] twyrlwk yyrdʾ yʾrʾşwr : ʾz w tʾşdyn
- 11 11 []dʾ : azu eliglär hanlar ü[di]ntä : :
[]dʾ : ʾz w ʾylyklʾr qʾnlʾr ʾwy[]ntʾ : :
- 12 12 [ötrü] k(a)l(i)l[ak inčä te]p tedi : kutlug kıvlıg
[] kl/[]p tydy : qwtlwq qyvlyq
- 13 13 []/[]]/R[]/// tutduk¹⁰²
[]/[]]/r []/// twtdwk
- 14 14 []]/ ʾw//

⁹⁷ The left half of the word is damaged. Reading quite certain according to the context.

⁹⁸ Restoration not certain but the phrase is obviously parallel to the next line.

⁹⁹ The new reading [nom] işin iśl[ä]sär is quite certain.

¹⁰⁰ *yaṇan* is a variant of *yaṇa* ('elephant'). See Clauson 1972: 943b. Vovin 2008: 415 thinks that "Among the three forms *yaṇa* ~ *yaṇan* ~ *yaṇan*, *yaṇa* appears to be the earliest (...)". But of all occurrences the Manichaean manuscript U 231 (not mentioned by VOVIN) is the earliest.

¹⁰¹ Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 211: [...] *tözlüg*.

¹⁰² Spelled <twtdwk> to represent *tutduj* "you grasped". Cf. *kältik* representing *kältij* in line 21. Both instances have <k> for classical <nk> (i.e. /ŋ/). This graphic phenomenon is encountered in some Buddhist texts as well.

- ʾwytrw tmnʾk ʾynčʾ typ ʾw[]twnty : pyr / []
- 23 09 tagın muḅlu(g)ka¹⁰⁹ tägi yorıdım : ol ʾw/[]
tʾqyn mwınlwqʾ tʾky y///d/m : ʾwl ʾw/[]
- 24 10 : birök muntag iš bols(a)r : kim m(a)ḅa [iš]¹¹⁰
: pyrwk mwntʾq ʾyş pwlsʾr : kym mnkʾ []
- 25 11 yumuş tägımlıg ärsär : m(ä)n ol išıg [išlägäli]¹¹¹
ywmwş tʾkymlyk ʾrsʾr : mn ʾwl ʾyşyk []
- 26 12 [u]sar m(ä)n : elıglär kapıgınta [kama]g¹¹² iš yumuş]¹¹³
[]sʾr mn : ʾylyklʾr qʾpyqyntʾ []q ʾ[]
- 27 13 alay(ı)n [t]ep [tedı] : / []RS []
ʾpʾyn []yp [] : / []rs []
- 28 14 [a]lku¹¹⁴ k []
[]lq̄w k []

01-03 [Kalilak said:] “[...] and third, that one [gives] advice [and counsel to rulers.]” **03-04** And again [Damnak ... spoke:] **04-07** “[...] worthy [...] is possible (only) in two ways. S[om]e[ho]w (a worthy one) is loved and respected by all. **07-08** First, [i]f [he carries out] among his own kings and rulers the affairs of the state at their (appropriate) time. **08-10** Or second, if he performs actions [of religion] by discarding all worldly habits just like an elephant. **10** (A worthy person) is suitable at [two] places: **10-11** Either outside [...] or next to kings and rulers.”

¹⁰⁹ The second <w> looks like an *alif*. The first editors give no interpretation of the word.

¹¹⁰ *iş yumuş* is encountered several times in Old Uyghur.

¹¹¹ The lacuna seems to be rather small for the restoration.

¹¹² The lacuna seems to allow for a restoration of more letters. Possibly [*buyruklu*]g.

¹¹³ Restoration according to the context.

¹¹⁴ Possibly to be read in this way.

12 [Then] Kalilak [sa]id: 12-13 “[May you be] lucky and fortunate [...]. 13-14 [...] you grasped [...].”

[gap]

15 [...] 15-16 [And the ...] said: 16-17 “[He is] the son [...] of [the former minister].” 17-18 [And ...] said: 18 “[It is] Damnak. 18-19 [His father] used to serve₂] (at the court).” 19-20 At that moment [the lion] summoned [him]. 20 He said: 20-21 “[W]here do you go? 21 Where did you come from?” 22 Then Damnak said: 22-23 “For one r[ea]son I worked very hard (lit. I walked until distress). 23 And this [is as follows]: 24-27 If there is any (kind of) labour which I am worthy (to do) as a service₂] and if I should be able [to perform] this work, then I will take up [al]l kind of s[ervice₂] at the gate of the kings.” 27-28 [...] all [...]

Fragment 2

Mainz 238 (expedition code : T I α 40)¹¹⁵

recto

- 29 01 []/rč//[¹¹⁶]
- 30 02 k(ä)rgäk :: ötrü k(a)lil(a)[k tep ay(i)tdi :]¹¹⁷
krk³k : : ³wytrw klyl[]
- 31 03 s(ä)n näčük taplayur s(ä)n [: t(a)mnak tep]¹¹⁸
sn n³čwk t³pl³ywr sn []
- 32 04 tedi <: > m(ä)n inčä taplayur m(ä)[n¹¹⁹ kim bo]
tydy mn ³ynč³ t³pl³ywr m[]

¹¹⁵ Because the manuscript is ancient and we have the accusative suffix with an a instead of an /i/ in line 3 (verso) (*tñl(a)gag*) defective writings are transcribed, e.g., as *kat(a)glanur* instead of (classical Old Uyghur) *kat(i)glanur*.

¹¹⁶ Possibly to be read *ičti[n]*.

¹¹⁷ The name of the jackal was not recognized in Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 159. No restoration of the lacuna.

¹¹⁸ No restoration of the lacuna in Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 160.

¹¹⁹ One should read like this.

- 33 05 *üdkätägi inčä kat(a)glanga*[y m(ä)n¹²⁰]
 [] *lydkʰtʰky ʾynčʰ qʰtqlʰnqʰ*[]
- 34 06 [ädgü]kä¹²¹ kat(a)[g]lanur ärtim [:]
 [] *kʰ qʰt*[] *lʰnwr ʾrtym* []
- 35 07 []/ bolur ärti : amtı inč[ä]
 []/ pwlwr ʾrty : ʾmtı ʾynč[]
- 36 08 [] *kim*¹²² öñrä näčük ina[g]¹²³]
 [] *kym ʾwynkrʰ nʰčwk ʾynʰ*[]
- 37 09 [bolur] ärtim : ol ädgü yänä []
 [] ʾrtym : ʾwl ʾdkw yʾnʰ []
- 38 10 [kälgä]y¹²⁴ : inčip kamag *yalʰok*[lar]
 [] *y : ʾynčyp qʰmʰq yʰlnkwq*[]
- 39 11 [ädgü]lüg savka sakın[mış]
 [] *lwk sʰvqʰ sʰqyn*[]
- 40 12 *k(ä)rgäk <:=> bir ol kor* [yas¹²⁵]
krkʰk pyr ʾwl qwr []
- 41 13 [bo]lmasar¹²⁶ : ol []
 [] *lmʰsʰr : ʾwl* []
- 42 14 [] yänä κ[]/[]

¹²⁰ Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 162: *kat(i)glangil*.

¹²¹ Possibly to be restored in this way.

¹²² Reading not certain. No interpretation in Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 165.

¹²³ This is the most likely restoration.

¹²⁴ For the completion of the lacuna see line 50.

¹²⁵ The synonym compound *kor yas* is attested quite often in Old Uyghur.

¹²⁶ Alternative readings: *bilmäsär* or *bulmasar*. In Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 170 only: *//masar*.

		[] y'n' k[]/[]
43	15	[] kor ¹²⁷ [yas]
		[] q̄wr []
verso			
44	01	[] /q []
		[] /q []
45	02	[] k ugurinta ¹²⁸ al čaviš	
		[] k 'wqwrynt' 'l č'vyš	
46	03	[] ol ot yegüči tınl(a)gag	
		[] wl 'wt yykwčy tynlqq'q	
47	04	[tarkarga]y m(ä)n ¹²⁹ kim bo yerdä öñi	
		[] y mn kym pw yyrd' 'wynky	
48	05	[] / ketip bargay : m(ä)n öñrä	
		[] / kytyp p'rq'y : mn 'wynkr'	
49	06	[] birlä ačıg ¹³⁰ ädgülüg []	
		[] pyrl' 'čyq 'dkwlwk []	
50	07	[] : ädgü yänä mañaru ¹³¹ kälq[äy :]	
		[] : 'dkw y'n' m'nk'rw k'lk[]	
51	08	[] ymä as(a)gl(a)grak ¹³² ol [arslan]-	

¹²⁷ Reading not certain. No interpretation in Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 172.

¹²⁸ Possibly to be read in this way. No interpretation in Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 144.

¹²⁹ Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 146: (...) ymä.

¹³⁰ Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 148: *näčük*, which - judging from the manuscript - is not excluded.

¹³¹ Reading not certain.

¹³² Formerly read *sas(i)gl(i)grak* and translated as 'sehr grob' (this would be *s(a)rsigl(i)grak* as remarked by Erdal 1991: 64). The manuscript seems indeed to point to this reading at first glance, but semantically neither *sas(i)gl(i)grak* 'very foul' nor *sars(i)gl(i)grak* 'very harsh' fits the context. What

- []ymʾ ʾsq̄lq rʾq̄ ʾwl []
- 52 09 [ka¹³³ :] arslan öküzüg ag(a)[rlasar]¹³⁴
[]ʾrslʾn ʾw[]kwz wk ʾʾq[]
- 53 10 [ol]¹³⁵ arslanka ag(a)r ulug k[or yas]¹³⁶
[]//lʾnqʾ ʾʾqr ʾwlwq q̄l []
- 54 11 [] m(ä)n : : ötrü k(a)l(i)[lak]¹³⁷
[] mn : : ʾwytrw kl []
- 55 12 [tep ay(i)tdi : arslan] sinčvu öküzüg
[] synčvw ʾwykwz wk
- 56 13 [ag(a)rlasar¹³⁸] korı nä ü[č]-
[] q̄wry nʾ ʾwy []
- 57 14 [ün t(a)mnak tep te]di <: >¹³⁹ elig[är]
[] dy ʾylyk l []
- 58 15 [] //RʾLY []
[] //r ʾly []

looks like the right part of the letter <s> is in fact only a scrap with writing on it torn off from some other line and sticking to the beginning of the word.

¹³³ Thus to be restored.

¹³⁴ For the restoration see the footnote to line 56.

¹³⁵ Possibly to be completed in this way.

¹³⁶ See above for the restoration.

¹³⁷ In Geissler-Zieme 1970, line 153 the name was not recognized.

¹³⁸ To be restored in this way according to the Syriac text. Cf. the German translation: “Wenn der Löwe den Stier gut hält, ...” (Schulthess 1911, II: 19).

¹³⁹ It is clear from the Syriac version that the following sentence is spoken by Dmng (= Damnak).

[Damnak said:] **29-30** “[What] is necessary [now]?” **30** Then Kalila[k asked]: **31** “How would you prefer it?” **31-32** [Damnak] said: **32-33** “I would prefer to exert myself until [this] time. **34** And I used to strive for [well-being]. **34-35** And it had been [...]. **35-37** Now like this [...] because in former times how I had [been] a confident [and ...]. **37-38** And that well-being [wil]l [return ...] again. **38-40** Nevertheless, it is necessary that all people should think [and ponder] about [bene]ficient things. **40-43** This one disadvantage₂ [...] if [...] is not, (then) that [...] again [...] a disadvantage₂ [...].

[gap]¹⁴⁰

44-48 On account of [...] a trick (or) a device [will help and] I [wil]l [remove] that being which feeds on grass (viz. the bull) so that it will [leave] this place and go away. **48-50** In former [times] I [received] honour and estimation together with [...; and] well-being will come back to me. **51-52** And [this will turn out] even more profitable [for] the [lion]. **52-54** (But) [if] the lion should ho[nour] the bull, I [see] a very serious disadvantage₂ for [the] lion.”¹⁴¹ **54-55** Then Kali[lak said:] **55-57** “[If the lion should honour] the bull Sinčvu [...] wh[y do you see] a disadvantage for him?” **57** [Damnak sai]d: **57-58** “[...] king[s will have a disadvantage in a sixfold way:]”.

Abbreviations

AOH = Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae.

CCCA = Chavannes 1910-1934.

DKPAM = Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā.

FFC = Folklore Fellows Communications.

MSV = Mūlasarvāstivādinaya.

r = recto.

T = Takakusu-Watanabe 1922-1934.

¹⁴⁰ Damnak’s speech is not interrupted.

¹⁴¹ This sentence is missing in the Syriac version.



T 1435 = 十誦律 Shisonglü (Sarvāstivādinaya), Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō, No. 1435, Vol. XXIII, pp. 1-470.

T 1442 = 根本說一切有部毗奈耶 Genben shuo yiqie you bu pinaiye (Vinayavibhaṅga of the Mūlasarvāstivādinaya), Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō, No. 1442, Vol. XXIII, pp. 627-905.

v = verso.

VOHD = Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland.

VOHD XIII/10 = Ehlers 1987.

VOHD XIII/16 = Wilkens 2000.

VOHD XIII/18 = Wilkens 2010.

VOHD XVIII/1 = Reck 2006.

References

ALLSEN, T. T. (2000). “The Rasūlid Hexaglot in its Eurasian Cultural Context”. The King’s Dictionary: The Rasūlid Hexaglot, Fourteenth Century Vocabularies in Arabic, Persian, Turkic, Greek, Armenian and Mongol, Ed. P. B. GOLDEN, Brill, Leiden-Boston-Köln: 25-49.

ANONYMUS (1959). Mongol’skie skazki, Ulaanbaatar.

BENFEY, T. (1859). Panchatantra: Fünf Bücher indischer Fabeln, Märchen und Erzählungen, aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen, Band 1-2, Leipzig: Brockhaus.

BETHLENFALVY, G. (1965). “Three Pañcatantra Tales in an Unedited Commentary to the Tibetan Subhāṣitaratnanidhi”, AOH, 18/3: 317-338.

BØDKER, L. (1957). Indian Animal Tales: a Preliminary Survey, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

BRINKHAUS, H. (2008). “Das indische Pañcatantra als Quelle von Kalīla wa-Dimna”, von listigen Schakalen und törichten Kamelen: Die Fabel in Orient und Okzident, wissenschaftliches Kolloquium im Landesmuseum für Natur und Mensch Oldenburg zur Vorbereitung der Ausstellung “Tierisch moralisch, die Welt der Fabel in Orient und Okzident” (22.-23. November 2007), Eds. M. FANSA; E. GRUNEWALD, Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden: 55-66.

CARLING, G. (2009). Dictionary and Thesaurus of Tocharian A, Vol. 1: A-J, in Collaboration with G.-J. PINAULT; W. WINTER, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

CHAVANNES, É. (1910-1934). Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois, Vols. 1-4, Paris: Ernest Leroux. [Reprint in Vols. 1-3, The Hague: Mouton & Co, 1965].

CHOI, HYONG-WON (1996). Sprachliche Untersuchung zum Pañcatantra in der mongolischen Version, Göttingen. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation).

CLAUSON, SIR G. (1972). An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

COWELL, E. B. (1895-1913). The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Translated from the Pāli by Various Hands, Vols. 1-6 + Index, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DE BLOIS, F. (1990). Burzōy's Voyage to India and the Origin of the Book Kalilah wa Dimnah, London: Royal Asiatic Society.

DE JONG, J. W. (1964-1965). "Cinq cents contes et apologues extraits du Tripiṭaka chinois, Vols. 1-4, The Hague: Mouton & Co", Indo-Iranian Journal, 7/2: 240-242. (Review)

DOERFER, G. (2011). Lamutische Märchen und Erzählungen, Teil I: Kategorisierte Märchen und Erzählungen, Teil II: Nicht-kategorisierte Märchen und Erzählungen, Nach dem Tod des Verfassers herausgegeben, eingeleitet und kommentiert von M. KNÜPPEL, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

EHLERS, G. (1987). Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 2: Das Goldglanzsūtra und der buddhistische Legendenzyklus Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā, Depositum der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin), VOHD XIII/10, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

ERDAL, M. (1991). Old Turkic Word Formation, a functional approach to the lexicon, Vol. 1-2, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

FALK, H. (1978). Quellen des Pañcatantra, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

FAUSBØLL, M. V. (1877-1896). The Jātaka Together with its Commentary Being Tales of the Anterior Births of Gotama Buddha, Vols. 1-6, London: Trübner & Co. [Vol. 3, Index: D. ANDERSEN, London 1897].

GEER, A. VAN DER (2008). *Animals in Stone: Indian Mammals Sculptured Through Time*, Leiden-Boston: Brill.

GEISLER, F.; P. ZIEME (1970). "Uigurische Pañcatantra-Fragmente", *Turcica: Revue d'Études Turques*, 2: 32-70.

GRØNBECH, K.; J. R. KRUEGER (1993). *An Introduction to Classical (Literary) Mongolian: Introduction, Grammar, Reader, Glossary*, 3rd edition, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

GROTZFELD, H. et al (1993). "Kalila und Dimna", *Enzyklopädie des Märchens Handwörterbuch zur historischen und vergleichenden Erzählforschung*, Band 7, Ed. R. W. BREDNICH, De Gruyter, Berlin-New York: 888-895.

HAHN, M. (2007). *Vom rechten Leben: Buddhistische Lehren aus Indien und Tibet*, Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Weltreligionen.

HENNING, W. B. (1943-1946). "The Book of Giants", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 11/1: 52-74. [Reprinted in: *Selected Papers II*, Leiden-Téhéran-Liège 1977: 115-137].

HENNING, W. B. (1945). "Sogdian Tales", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 11: 465-487. [Reprinted in: *Selected Papers II*: 169-192].

HERTEL, J. (1908). *The Panchatantra: A Collection of Hindu Tales in the Recension, called Panchakhyana, and Dated 1199 A.D., of the Jaina Monk, Purnabhadra, Critically Edited in the Original Sanskrit*, Cambridge: Harvard University.

HERTEL, J. (1914). *Das Pañcatantra: Seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung*, Berlin-Leipzig: Teubner.

HOFFMANN, H. (1965). *Märchen aus Tibet*, Düsseldorf-Köln: Diederichs.

JÜLG, B. (1868). *Mongolische Märchensammlung: Die neun Märchen des Siddhi-Kûr nach der ausführlicheren Redaction und die Geschichte des Ardschi-Bordschi Chan, Mongolisch mit deutscher Übersetzung und kritischen Anmerkungen*, Innsbruck: Wagner.

JULIEN, S. (1859). *Les Avadânas: Contes et apologues Indiens inconnus jusqu'à ce jour suivies de fables et de poésies Chinoises*, Vols. 1-3, Paris: Duprat.

KARA, G. (1984). *Siditü kegür-ün üliġer: The Mongolian Tales of the Bewitched Corpse, Mongolian Text of the 1928 Ulan Bator Print*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

KARASHIMA, S.; M. I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA (2015). “The Avadāna Anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan”, *Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia: The St. Petersburg Fragments (StPSF)*, Eds. S. KARASHIMA; M. I. VOROBYOVA-DESYATOVSKAYA, Vol. 1, International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, Tokyo: 145-505.

KASCHEWSKY, R. (2007). “Siddhi Kür”, *Enzyklopädie des Märchens Handwörterbuch zur historischen und vergleichenden Erzählforschung*, Band 7, Ed. R. W. BREDNICH, de Gruyter, Berlin-New York: 638-642.

KIRIPOLSKÁ, M. (1996). “A Tale of Chinese Origin in the Mongolian Stories from Pañcatantra”, *AOH*, 49/1-2: 161-170.

KRUEGER, J. R. (1965). *The Pañcatantra: Mongolian text of the Burdukov manuscript*, Bloomington: Mongolia Society.

LAUT, J. P. (1996). “Zur neuen Hami-Handschrift eines alttürkischen buddhistischen Legendenzyklus”, *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang*, Vorträge der Tagung “Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung”, veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.-12. 12. 1994), Eds. R. E. EMMERICK et al, Akademie Verlag, Berlin: 189-199.

LŐRINCZ, L. (1965). “Les ‘contes du cadavre ensorcelé’ (Ro-sgruñ) dans la littérature et le folklore tibétains”, *AOH*, 18/3: 305-316.

LORINCZ, L. (1967). “Les ‘contes du cadavre ensorcelé’ dans la littérature et le folklore mongols”, *AOH*, 20: 203-238.

LŐRINCZ, L. (1979). *Mongolische Märchentypen*, Translated from the Hungarian by J. GYŐRI, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

MARSHAK, B. (2002). *Legends, Tales, and Fables in the Art of Sogdiana*, with an Appendix by V. A. LIVSHITS, New York: Bibliotheca Persica Press.

NIEHOFF-PANAGIOTIDIS, J. (2003). *Übersetzung und Rezeption: Die byzantinisch-neugriechischen und spanischen Adaptionen von Kalila wa-Dimna*, Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

OLDENBURG, S. F. (1897). “Notes on Buddhist Art”, Translated from the Russian by L. WIENER, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 18: 183-201.

ÖLMEZ, M. (1993). “Ein weiteres alttürkisches Pañcatantra-Fragment”, *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher Neue Folge*, 12: 179-191.

PANGLUNG, J. L. (1981). Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya analysiert auf Grund ihrer tibetischen Übersetzung, Tokyo: Reiyukai Library.

RECK, C. (2005). “The Tribulations of Human Existence: A Sogdian Fragment Corresponding to a Passage of Burzōy’s Preface to Kalilah wa Dimnah?”, *Il Manicheismo: Nuove Prospettive della Ricerca* (sic), Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale” (Napoli, 2-8 Settembre 2001), Eds. A. VAN TONGERLOO; L. CIRILLO, Brepols Publishers, Turnhout (Belgium): 331-341.

RECK, C. (2006). *Mitteliranische Handschriften, Teil 1: Berliner Turfanfragmente manichäischen Inhalts in soghdischer Schrift*, VOHD XVIII/1, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

RENOU, L. (1963). *Contes du Vampire: traduits et annotés*, Paris : UNESCO.

RIEDEL, D. (2010). “Kalila wa Demna, I. Redactions and Circulation”, *Encyclopædia Iranica*, Ed. E. YARSHATER, 15/4: 386a-395a.

ROESLER, U. (2000). “Wer hängt der Katze die Schelle um? Überlegungen zur Genese und Tradierung von Erzählmotiven. Ein Beispiel aus dem Kommentar zum sKye bo gso ba’i thigs pa (*Jantupoṣaṇabindu)”, *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid METTE*, Eds. C. CHOJNACKI et al, Indica-et-Tibetica-Verlag, Swisttal-Odendorf: 466-480.

ROESLER, U. (2002). “Not a mere Imitation: Indian Narratives in a Tibetan Context”, *Facets of Tibetan Religious Tradition and Contacts with Neighbouring Cultural Areas*, Eds. A. CADONNA; E. BIANCHI, Casa Editrice Leo S. Olschki, Florence: 153-177.

ROESLER, U. (2011). *Frühe Quellen zum buddhistischen Stufenweg in Tibet: Indische und tibetische Traditionen im dPe chos des Po-to-ba Rin-chen-gsal*, Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

ROSEN, V. (1959). *Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātīmokṣa der Sarvāstivādin. Sanskritfragmente nebst einer Analyse der chinesischen Übersetzung*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

SAGASTER, B. (2009). “Kalila und Dimna. 1. 5 Türkische Versionen”, *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon 8 (Igi-Ker)*, Ed. H. L. ARNOLD, 3rd edition, Metzler, Stuttgart: 587a-594a.

SCHIEFNER, A. (1876). “Indische Erzählungen”, *Bulletin de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, 22: 123-138 [= *Mélanges Asiatiques* 7, 1876: 773-795].

SCHIEFNER, A. (1906). *Tibetan Tales Derived from Indian Sources*, Translated from the Tibetan of the Kah-Gyur by F. A. VON SCHIEFNER, Done Into English from the German, with an Introduction by W. R. S. RALSTON, London: Kegan et al.

SCHIEFNER, A. (2007). *Übersetzungen aus dem tibetischen Kanjur, Beiträge zur Buddhismuskunde und zur zentralasiatischen Märchenforschung*, Herausgegeben von H. WALRAVENS, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

SCHULTHESS, F. (1911). *Kalila und Dimna: Syrisch und Deutsch, I. Syrischer Text, II. Übersetzung*, Berlin: Reimer.

SIEG, E. (1916). “Die Geschichte von den Löwenmachern in tocharischer Version”, Aufsätze zur Kultur- und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients: Ernst Kuhn zum 70. Geburtstage am 7. Februar 1916 gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern, Marcus, Breslau-München: 147-151.

SIEG, E. (1944). *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I*, Berlin (Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1943, Phil-hist. Kl., Nr. 16).

SIEG, E.; W. SIEGLING (1921). *Tocharische Sprachreste, I. Band: Die Texte*, A. Transcription, Berlin.

SUNDERMANN, W. (2006). “A Fragment of the Buddhist Kāñcanasāra Legend in Sogdian and its Manuscripts”, *Proceedings of the 5th Conference of the Societas Iranologica Europæa* (Ravenna, 6-11 October 2003), Eds. A. PANAINO; A. PIRAS, Vol. 1, Mimesis, Milano: 715-724.

TAKAKUSU, J. [高楠順次郎]; K. WATANABE [渡邊海旭] (1922-1934). *Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō* [大正新修大藏經] (The Tripitaka in Chinese), Vols. 1-100, Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai.

TAYLOR, M. (2007). *The Fall of the Indigo Jackal: The Discourses of Division and Pūrṇabhadra’s Pañcatantra*, Albany: the University of New York Press.

UTHER, H.-J. (2006). “The Fox in World Literature: Reflections on a ‘Fictional Animal,’” *Asian Folklore Studies*, 65/2: 133-160.

VÁSÁRY, I. (1982). “The Institution of Foster-Brothers (emildäš and kökaldäš) in the Chingisid States”, *AOH*, 36/1-3: 549-562.

VLADIMIROV, B. JA. (1921). *Mongol’skij sbornik rasskazov iz Pañcatantra*, Petrograd.



VOVIN, A. (2008). “Some Thoughts on the Origin of Old Turkic *yaṅa ~ yaṅan ~ yayan* and Middle Mongolian *za’an* ‘elephant,’” *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, 18: 413-421.

WILKENS, J. (2000). *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 8: Manichäisch-türkische Texte der Berliner Turfansammlung, VOHD XIII/16*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

WILKENS, J. (2010). *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 10: Buddhistische Erzähltexte, VOHD XIII/18*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

WILKENS, J. (2016). *Buddhistische Erzählungen aus dem alten Zentralasien Edition der altuigurischen Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā, Band 1-3, Berliner Turfantexte 37*, Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols Publishers.

WOLFART, U. (1992). “*Kalīla wa-Dimna. 5. Türkische Versionen*”, *Kindlers Neues Literatur Lexikon* 18, Ed. J. WALTER, München: 855b-856a.