

## PAÑCATANTRA STUDIES

by A. VENKATASUBBIAH.

### I. Mother Śāṇḍilī's Barter of Sesame.

The story of Mother Śāṇḍilī's barter of sesame is found in all the older versions of the Pañcatantra (i. e., in T, SP, Spl, Pn, So, Ks, N, and Pa<sup>1</sup>) excepting the Hitopadeśa<sup>2</sup>. In Spl, this story is introduced by the verse:

*nāksmāc Chāṇḍilī mātā vikrīṇāti tilais tilān |  
luñcitān itarair yena kāryam atra bhaviṣyati ||*

1 The following abbreviations are used in the course of this article and those that follow:

- Hit: for Hitopadeśa.  
Ks: for Kṣemendra the author of Bṛhatkathāmañjarī (BKM) and also for the Pañcatantra version contained in that work.  
N: for the Nepalese version of the Pañcatantra as published by Hertel in his editions of the Southern Pañcatantra and the Tantrākhyāyika.  
Pa: for the original Pahlavi translation of the Pañcatantra and also for the Syrian and Arabic versions derived from it.  
Pañca: for Pañcatantra and also for Hertel's book, *Das Pañcatantra. Seine Geschichte und Verbreitung* and for the *Pañcatantra Reconstructed* of Prof. Franklin Edgerton.  
Pn: for Pūrṇabhadra, author of the so-called textus oratorius of the Pañcatantra and also for that work (edited by Hertel in the *HOS*).  
So: for Somadeva, author of the Kathāsaritsāgara (KSS) and also for the Pañcatantra version contained in that work.  
SP: for the Southern Pañcatantra (Hertel's edition).  
Spl: for the so-called textus simplicior of the Pañcatantra (edited by Bühler and Kielhorn in the *BSS*).  
T and Tantra: for Tantrākhyāyika (Hertel's editio princeps).

2 The story is, likewise, not found in Durgasiṃha's Pañcatantra, a version of the Pañca. written in the Kannaḍa or Canarese language at some time in 1015 to 1042 A. D.

"Mother Śāṅḍilī does not, without grounds, exchange husked sesame for unhusked sesame; there must be some reason for it", and is briefly as follows:

A Brāhmaṇa, once, on the morning of the day of dakṣiṇāyana-sankrānti, asked his wife to feed a (Brāhmaṇa-) guest on the occasion in honour of the sun-god. The wife at first said that there was absolutely nothing in the house with which she could feed a guest and began to upbraid her husband for his poverty; but she at last allowed herself to be pacified by her husband and said that there was some sesame in the house and that she would husk it and pound it and feed a Brāhmaṇa with it. She accordingly poured some hot water over the sesame, removed the husk, and placing it in the sun to dry, became engaged in other work. In the meanwhile, a dog came and pissed in the sesame, seeing which the Brāhmaṇī thought: "Alas! With what ingenuity does fate persecute persons! Even this sesame has now been made unfit for use. I shall, however, go to somebody's house and get unhusked sesame in exchange for this. Every one will agree to such an exchange". She accordingly went to somebody's house and inquired: "Will any one give me unhusked sesame in exchange for this husked sesame?" The mistress of the house, hearing this, went within in order to bring unhusked sesame and exchange it for the husked sesame when her son, looking into Kāmandaki's book, said: "Mother, do not take this husked sesame of this woman in exchange for unhusked sesame. There must be some reason why she offers husked sesame in exchange for unhusked sesame". Hearing this, the mistress of the house rejected the husked sesame.

In Tantra., on the other hand, the above verse reads as —

*nāksmāc Chāṅḍilī mātā vikrīṇāti tilais tilān |  
luñcitāṃ luñcitair eva kāryam atra bhaviṣyati ||*

"Mother Śāṅḍilī does not, without grounds, exchange husked sesame for husked sesame only; there must be some reason for it"; and the story related therein, too, differs in some respects from the Spl version. It is, briefly, as follows:

A Brāhmaṇa, once, on the morning of a parva-divasa, asked his wife to feed some Brāhmaṇas on the occasion. The wife protested that it was not possible to do so, and said that one so poor as he should not entertain ideas of feeding Brāhmaṇas. After some

time, she came round and said that she had some rice and some sesame with her and that she would, with the help of the disciple Kāmandaki, prepare some *kṛsara* with them and feed three Brāhmaṇas. Accordingly she placed a measure of sesame before the pupil Kāmandaki and asked him to husk it. \*As the attention of the pupil was wholly engaged otherwise, the sesame was defiled by a dog\*. Seeing this, the Brāhmaṇī said to Kāmandaki: "Alack! This is a misfortune and I can not feed the Brāhmaṇas with this sesame. Go you however with this sesame, and exchanging it for black sesame, return without delay. I shall even prepare black *kṛsara*". Kāmandaki accordingly went to a Brāhmaṇa's house to effect the exchange and was there asked by the Brāhmaṇa's wife, "How do you give this sesame?" Kāmandaki replied:

*suklān kṛṣṇaiḥ prayacchāmi yadiṣṭam grhyatām iti |  
tatheme luñcitā bhadre luñcitān eva dehi me ||*

As the exchange was accordingly effected, her husband returned home and asked his wife what the matter was. She said, "I have obtained an equivalent quantity of white sesame in exchange for black sesame". Hearing this, he laughed and said,

*nāksmāc Chāṅḍilī mātā vikrīṇāti tilais tilān |  
luñcitāṃ luñcitair eva kāryam atra bhaviṣyati ||*

"Mother Śāṅḍilī does not, without grounds, exchange husked sesame for husked sesame only; there must be some reason for it".

Thus, in the Tantra., the introductory verse speaks of the exchange of husked for husked sesame while, in Spl, it speaks of the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame. This is the theme of the prose story also, not only in Spl, but in SP, Pn, and the Pahlāvi versions.

Which of these two forms of the introductory verse and of the following prose story is original and which secondary? This question has been discussed<sup>1</sup> on more than one occasion (*Über das Tantra.*,

\* The starred passage is a reproduction of the translation of Hertel. The original text which reads *tathā cānuṣṭhite tilaprastham Kāmandakīnā dhiṣṭhitam luñcayety āsthāpītam | tathā cātivyagravāt te tilāḥ katham api duivāc chunā viṣvālītāḥ* is obscure and in all probability corrupt.

<sup>1</sup> The question has likewise been discussed in AJP, Vol. 36, p. 266ff. and in his *Pañcatantra Reconstructed* 2, 106ff. and 1, 217, by Prof. Franklin Edgerton who, though differing from Hertel in some minor points, agrees with him that the Tantra. version is original and, in essence, reproduces this version in his "reconstructed" Pañcatantra.

p. 127ff.; *Das Süd. Pañca.*, p. LXIIff.; *Tantra.-Über.*, 1, 28ff.; *Das Pañca.*, p. 440ff.) by Prof. Hertel who has every time arrived at the conclusion that the Tantra. version of the story and of the introductory verse is original while that of the Spl and other versions is later and corrupt.

The reasons urged by him in these books in support of such conclusion are most ingenious and plausible; but, unfortunately, not one of the propositions mentioned by Hertel in the course of his argumentation can in fact bear examination:

1. In the first place, it is not certain that the reading *lūncittā lūncittaiḥ sāmṛddha* of the Spl MS. h in pāda c of the introductory verse is an obvious corruption of the reading *luñcitāml luñcitaiḥ sārddham*. Rather is it more probable that it is a corruption of the reading *luñcitvā luñcitaiḥ sārddham* (where the second word is, not *luñcitaiḥ* but *aluñcitaiḥ*) which seems to be the reading intended here. With this reading, the introductory verse yields the same sense as do the corresponding verses of Spl, SP, Pn, N, and the Pahlavi versions, and like these, is in conformity with the following prose story.

Similarly, the Spl MS. of the H-class, on which, according to Hertel, Ratnasundara based his Gujarati version, seems likewise to have read *luñcitvā luñcitaiḥ sārddham* or some corrupt reading derived from it, in pāda c. The latter seems more probably to have been the case; for, pāda c, as given by Ratnasundara, is corrupt and makes the verse unintelligible, while pāda a has a reading that is found nowhere else. Moreover, Ratnasundara's reading<sup>1</sup>, *luñcitair luñcitā yena* differs so much from that of Tantra., *luñcitāml luñcitair eva*, that it is difficult to accept Hertel's opinion that it supports the latter. It thus becomes clear that Hertel's contention that the Tantra. reading of the introductory verse is supported by that of the oldest Spl MS. of the σ-class and one MS. of the H-class does not rest on a solid foundation.

2. Secondly, it is difficult for one to assent to Hertel's proposition that the redactors of the SP, N, Spl and Pahlavi versions, all derived from K that had a lacuna in the prose story, filled up

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the prose story, too, in Ratnasundara refers to the exchange of husked for husked sesame — a feature that is found in the prose story of no other Pañca. version, not even in the Tantra.; see below.

this lacuna falsely, each one as he liked and independently of the others, and that it is a mere accident that these versions have all filled up the lacuna in the same way. I for one can not believe in such accidents; and besides, Hertel has overlooked the fact that, according to his own hypothesis, all these versions had preserved intact the introductory verse in its original form, and that hence there was no necessity for the redactors of these versions to fill up the lacuna as each one liked. If there really were a lacuna in the prose story, the most natural thing for the redactors of the above versions to do would be to fill it up in conformity with the introductory verse. This is what one expects them to do; and one has, in the absence of valid reasons to the contrary (and Hertel has brought none such forward), the right to assume that they have in fact done so. It follows then from this that the agreement amongst the above versions in respect of the incident of the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame in the prose story is due, not to an accident, but to the fact that this incident is in conformity with the introductory verse.

Hertel's talk therefore about the lacuna in the archetype K and its filling up is unnecessary and not quite to the point; for, since the redactors of the above-named versions must have filled up the lacuna (in case there really was one) in the prose story in conformity with the introductory verse, they must have used words of the same import as those that stood there originally. And as we are not at present concerned with the words of the story but with the sense, it makes no difference to us whether there was a lacuna in the archetype K which was later on filled up by the redactors of the above-named versions or whether we have before us the original words of the prose story.

As a matter of fact, however, I agree with Prof. Edgerton in his opinion (*Pañca*, 2, 118) that 'Hertel's "lacuna" and subsequent "restoration" are alike imaginary'. Hertel, I conceive, was obliged to have recourse to such conjectures because, though confronted with the SP, Spl, N, Pn, and Pahlavi versions of the introductory verse and prose story which are unanimous in referring to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame, he still felt convinced that the Tantra. version alone of this verse and story, which, in his opinion, refer to the exchange of husked for husked sesame, has preserved these features of the original Pañcatantra. He has there-

fore attempted to minimise the value of this body of evidence by putting forward his conjectures about the "lacuna" and "false restoration" and thus denying the originality of the prose story of these versions.

In reality, Hertel's belief that the prose story of the original Pañca. and that of Tantra. which has preserved unchanged this original prose story, referred and refers to the exchange of husked for husked sesame is due to a misunderstanding<sup>1</sup>. The Tantra. version of the prose story, far from referring to the exchange of husked for husked sesame, refers in fact to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame. This comes out clearly from the details mentioned in the story. Mother Śāṅḍilī, we read therein, says to her husband that she has some sesame and some rice and that she would, with the help of the pupil Kāmandakī, prepare some *ḥṛsara* for feeding three Brāhmaṇas. The sesame grains are then husked (though this fact does not come out clearly in the prose text which, as noted above, is here obscure and probably corrupt, it is placed beyond doubt by the wording of the two verses, II, 49: *suklān ḥṛṣṇaiḥ prayacchāmi . . . tatheme luñcitā bhadre . . .* and II, 50: *vikrīṇāti tilais tilān|luñcitāṃ|luñcitair eva*) and perhaps when placed in the sun to dry, are made unclean by a dog. Then Mother Śāṅḍilī asks Kāmandakī to exchange the husked sesame for black sesame, and says that she will even (since the circumstances do not permit her to prepare white *ḥṛsara*) prepare black *ḥṛsara* with it.

It is clear from this that Mother Śāṅḍilī wants Kāmandakī to bring her in exchange for the husked sesame black sesame — that is, sesame black in colour or unhusked black sesame; for with unhusked black sesame only is it possible for one to prepare *ḥṛṣṇa-ḥṛsara*. Husked black sesame, like husked white sesame and like husked yellow sesame, is white in colour. It is the husk only that varies in its colour, being sometimes white, sometimes black (this is the most usual colour of unhusked sesame), and sometimes yellow

<sup>1</sup> Even apart from this consideration, I must confess that I can not see the force of Hertel's contention that that version of the prose story only which refers to the exchange of husked for husked sesame inculcates "List" and is fit to be included in the Pañcatantra while the version that refers to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame does not inculcate "List" and is not so fit. Both versions of the story seem to me to be of the same character; and each seems to be as well, or as ill, adapted to inculcate "List" as the other.

or brown. The husked sesame is always white<sup>1</sup> in colour; and it is absurd to speak (as Hertel has done) of "husked sesame that is black in colour" or of preparing *ḥṛṣṇa-ḥṛsara* with husked sesame.

Thus the Tantra. version, too, refers in the prose story to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame; only, instead of

I Prof. Edgerton has, on pp. 106—108 of Vol. 2 of his abovementioned book, given expression to the opinion that the story originally dealt with an exchange of husked for husked sesame, but that this was clearly stated only in the introductory verse whereas the prose story spoke only of offering white for black sesame. And he goes on to write: "It is possible that this was understood by later redactors as "huskt for unhuskt", that is, that the sesame was black with the husks on, but that the huskt kernels were white. From information at my disposal it appears that there are various kinds of sesame, of different colours, some black on the outside and white inside, but some either white or black both outside and inside. The later versions which speak of "huskt for unhuskt", may have understood "white for black" in that sense; and this may be responsible for their change".

I do not know from what source Prof. Edgerton has gathered the above information about the existence of a variety of sesame that is black both outside and inside. Like others that live in India, I have seen large quantities of both husked and unhusked sesame and I have always found that, though the unhusked sesame is of different colours — white, black (this, as already observed above, is the most usual colour of unhusked sesame), brown or brownish red, yellow or yellowish white, the husked sesame kernels are always white in colour. That however does not preclude the possibility of the existence of such a variety of sesame, and I therefore addressed an inquiry on this matter to the Imperial Department of Agriculture in India and received in reply a letter from Dr. F. J. F. Shaw, Imperial Economic Botanist, wherein he writes, "With reference to your letter inquiring about the varieties of sesamum having black kernels, I regret that I have no knowledge of such a type of oil". Similarly, one reads in the *Encyclopaedia of India* (of E. Balfour), Vol. 3, p. 583, in the article on *Sesamum Indicum*: "Any disparity of colour observed in this oil is to be attributed to the mode of preparation. The method sometimes adopted is that of throwing the fresh seeds, without any cleansing process, into the common mill, and expressing in the usual way. The oil thus becomes mixed with a large portion of the colouring matter of the epidermis of the seed, and is neither so pleasant to the eye, nor so agreeable to the taste, as that obtained by first repeatedly washing the seeds in cold water, or by boiling them for a short time, until the whole of the reddish-brown colouring matter is removed, and the seeds have become perfectly white. They are then dried in the sun, and the oil expressed as usual". Here, too, one finds it stated, though not explicitly, that the sesame kernels are white in colour and that the colouring matter is found in the epidermis or husk only and not in the kernels. There can thus be no doubt that Prof. Edgerton's belief that there exists a variety of sesame that is black both outside and inside is not founded on fact.

using the expression *aluñcitās tilāḥ* as Spl uniformly does (p. 17, ll. 21, 24, 25, 26; p. 18, l. 1) to denote unhusked sesame, the Tantra. uses the expression *kṛṣṇās tilāḥ* (77, 17; 78, 6; 7 and verse II, 49 also: in this verse the expression *śuklāḥ [tilāḥ]* is similarly used to denote husked sesame). That is to say, the difference between the two versions in this respect is a mere verbal one and does not affect the substance of the story.

It has likewise been remarked by Prof. Edgerton, on p. 107 l. c., that the verbal correspondence between the SP phrase *ghṛṣṭa-tilais tilān pariḡhīvā* and the corresponding Tantra. phrase *imāṃs tilān luñcitān api kṛṣṇatilaiḥ parāvartayitvā* is "sufficiently close to suggest that there has been a phonetic confusion between *kṛṣṇa-* and *ghṛṣṭa*". As he has said nothing about the verbal forms *pariḡhīvā* and *parāvartayitvā*, it seems that he is of the opinion that the Ur-SP or the archetype from which this is derived had the reading *kṛṣṇa-tilais tilān pariḡhīvā*. This means, however, "getting in exchange sesame for (this) black sesame", a meaning that is not only the exact opposite of what is stated in the Tantra. (compare the verse *śuklān kṛṣṇaiḥ prayacchāmi* and the passage *samārghās tilā mayā labdhāḥ|śuklāḥ kṛṣṇaiḥ*), but is also, since black sesame is the same as unhusked sesame, in disaccord with the other passages of the SP story itself that refer to the sesame having been husked first, and with the prose stories of all the other versions also. The suggestion therefore about the phonetic confusion is one that can not be accepted.

The prose story thus, in the Tantra., as in the other Pañca. versions, refers to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame; and it is therefore clear that this was a feature of the original story, and that not only the Tantra., as Hertel says, but the other versions also have preserved this original feature. If therefore there is anything in any version that is not in accord with this original feature, one may set it down at once as a later addition or corruption. Such, for instance, is the introductory verse of the Tantrākhyāyika. This verse speaks (as we have seen) of the exchange of husked sesame for husked sesame, while the prose story of Tantra. preserving the original feature speaks of the exchange of husked sesame for unhusked sesame. The verse is thus clearly a later addition or corruption and not original.

The introductory verses of the Spl, Pn, N and Pa. versions on

the other hand refer to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame and are thus in consonance with the following prose story. There seems, however, to be no doubt that their readings of pāda c, *luñcitān itarair yena* (Spl; Pn) and *nirluñcitair aghṛṣṭāms tat* (N) are, as suggested by Hertel (*Pañca.*, p. 441) due to the redactors of these versions. They are not, however, emendations of the original text made by the several redactors in order to bring the verse into conformity with the prose story (as held by Hertel), but paraphrases of the original pāda made by these redactors in order to make the sense of the pāda quite clear and remove all ambiguity from it.

I have said above that the corrupt reading of the Spl MS. stands in all probability for the reading *luñcitvā 'luñcitaiḥ sārddham* where the second word is not *luñcitaiḥ* but *aluñcitaiḥ*. The word *sārddham* may, as suggested by Hertel, be a gloss that has crept into the text: it is in any case not original. In all probability, the verse seems originally to have had *luñcitvā 'luñcitair eva* in pāda c and to have read:

*nākasmāc Chāṇḍilī mātā vikrīṇāti tilais tilān |  
luñcitvā 'luñcitair eva kāryam atra bhaviṣyati ||*

"Mother Śāṇḍilī does not, without grounds, exchange sesame grains after having husked (them), for unhusked sesame grains only; there must be some reason for this". Regarding the word *luñcitvā* in pāda c above, compare that word in Spl, 17, 16: *tatas tilāṃl luñcitvā tila-cūrṇena brāhmaṇam bhōjayiṣyāmi*; Pn, 139, 24: *te tilā uṣ-ṇodakena saha sammardya luñcitvā sūryātape dattāḥ*; *luñcaya* in Tantra., 77, 14: *tilaprasthaṃ Kāmandakinādhiṣṭhitam luñ-cayety āsthāpitam* and the synonymous words used in SP, 34, 1: *tataḥ prabhāte tilān udghṛṣya brāhmaṇi sodhayitum pravṛttā* and the Pahlavi versions which all mention that the sesame was husked.

It may be seen that pāda c of the above verse is ambiguous, as the second word in it may be either *luñcitaiḥ* or *aluñcitaiḥ*; and it is with the view of removing this ambiguity that, I conceive, the redactors of the Spl and N versions paraphrased it and read *luñcitān itarair yena* and *nirluñcitair aghṛṣṭāms tat* there. The Tantra. reading, *luñcitāṃl luñcitair eva*, too, seems in all probability to be a corruption of the original reading *luñcitvā 'luñcitair eva* due, not to the redactor, but rather to some copyist.

We have seen that the Tantra. version of the prose story retains

its original character and refers to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame. This seems to be the case with Tantra. verse II, 49 also:

*suklān kṛṣṇaiḥ prayacchāmi yadiṣṭam grhyatām iti |  
tatheme luñcitā bhadre 'luñcitān eva dehi me. ||*

Hertel has translated this as, "Weiße gebe ich für schwarze; ist es Euch erwünscht, so nehmet sie hin. Und weiter; diese sind enthülst, meine Liebe; gib mir gleichfalls enthülste". That is to say, he thinks that the first word in pāda d is *luñcitān* and speaks here too of husked sesame that is black in colour. This, as pointed out above is an absurdity and it seems therefore preferable to regard pāda d as beginning with the word *aluñcitān* and to translate the verse as, "I give white (i. e., husked) sesame grains for black (i. e., unhusked); take them if you wish. Thus these grains, O gracious lady, are husked; give me unhusked ones only".

3. Hertel says that it is not necessary to look into Kāmandaki's *Nītiśāstra* first in order to declare that there must be some particular reason for Śāṇḍilī to offer to exchange husked sesame for unhusked sesame; and he seems therefore to imply that every one would look upon such a proposal with suspicion. It may be so perhaps so far as he himself is concerned; but an offer to exchange husked for unhusked sesame is not, in itself, in the least suspicious. And even today, such exchange of husked for unhusked seed grains, not of sesame only, but of rice, green gram, black gram, etc., is not infrequent in Indian villages. Husked rice is exchanged for twice its measure of unhusked rice (or paddy as it is called), while other husked grains are generally exchanged for unhusked ones in the proportion of three to four measures.

Mother Śāṇḍilī's offer to exchange husked for unhusked sesame is not therefore by itself suspicious. The suspicion must have arisen from Mother Śāṇḍilī's character, from her reputation for cunning and craftiness as Hertel himself has said (*Tantra.-Über.*, I, 28; compare also Pn, 140, 15; *bhadre sātīva nipuṇā vyavahāra-kusalā ca | tasmāt tyājyā ete tilāḥ*), and not from the proposal itself. I agree however with Hertel that the mention of Kāmandaki's *Nītiśāstra* in Spl is made in a clumsy manner and that its text here is corrupt.

4. Hertel has also, in the course of his reasoning, laid much stress on the equivalence of the sesame which the Brāhmaṇī (in

Tantra.) receives in exchange for the (unhusked) sesame which she gives to Mother Śāṇḍilī. I find it difficult to understand why this feature should fit well in the Tantra. version of the story and not with that of Spl. Mother Śāṇḍilī offers to exchange the husked sesame for an equivalent quantity (let it be noted that Tantra., 78, 6: *samārghās tilā mayā labdhāḥ | suklāḥ kṛṣṇaiḥ* and Pn, 140, 12: *samārghā' mayā tilā labdhā luñcitā aluñcitaiḥ* both mention the word *samārghāḥ*, equal in value, and not *samamātrāḥ*, equal in quantity) of unhusked sesame, that is, if we assume (and there is nothing improbable in such assumption) that the usage now current was current at that time also when the story was written, for  $1\frac{1}{3}$  times the quantity she is offering and not for the same quantity; for such an offer would have at once aroused suspicion. She therefore made only the usual offer and expressed her willingness to exchange her husked sesame for an equivalent quantity of unhusked sesame with the confidence that some one would be sure to accept it (compare *sarvo 'pi jano 'nena vidhinā dāsyati* in Spl, 17, 22 and Pn, 140, 5). The Brāhmaṇī who made the exchange (in Tantra. and Pn) received that quantity only of husked sesame which she would have got if she herself had husked the sesame that she gave to Mother Śāṇḍilī, and nothing more. But she derived an advantage from the exchange in that she saved herself the trouble and labour of husking the sesame; and it was with a view to this advantage, and not with the view of getting a larger quantity of husked sesame, that she effected the exchange.

5. I do not think that Hertel is correct in his opinion that the express mention of Śāṇḍilī's name in the introductory verse serves no other object but to show that her name had become proverbial for cunning. There are many other introductory verses in the Pañca. in which mention is made of proper names, for instance of Āṣāḍhabhūti, Duṣṭabuddhi, Ṭiṭṭibha (Duṇḍuka), Mandavisarpiṇī, Sūcimukhi, Somilaka, Caṇḍarava, Kakudruma and Somaśarman; and not even Hertel will, I believe, venture to assert that every one of those named above had become proverbial for cunning. It is my belief that proper names are mentioned in introductory verses, not because the individuals denoted by such names had become pro-

1 Hertel's edition reads *samarghā(h)* which without doubt is a mistake for *samārghā(h)*.

verbal for cunning or for any other characteristic, but because the author could not compose other verses in their place that are equally apposite, without the use of such proper names.

The foregoing discussion has, I trust, made it clear that the prose story in its original form referred to the exchange of husked for unhusked sesame. This is the theme, as we have seen, of the prose stories in Spl and Tantra. alike, which however differ in some minor matters. Mother Śāṇḍilī says, in Spl, that she will feed one Brāhmaṇa, in Tantra., that she will feed three. In Spl, her attempt to exchange sesame comes to naught while, in Tantra., it is crowned with success. The name Kāmandakī that occurs in the story refers, in Spl, to the well-known writer on *Nītiśāstra* while, in Tantra., it denotes a pupil of Mother Śāṇḍilī's husband.

In all these points, it seems to me that the Spl version is more faithful to the original than that of Tantra. The husband of Mother Śāṇḍilī is very poor and is upbraided by her for his extreme poverty: it is therefore more likely that his wife had provision to feed one Brāhmaṇa only (as is said in Spl) and not three (as as is said in Tantra.). Regarding the result of Mother Śāṇḍilī's endeavour to exchange sesame, SP and So agree with Spl in saying that it was unsuccessful; and since So's version is, as a rule, faithful to the original (compare Hertel, *Tantra-Über.* I, 29: "Eine inhaltlich sehr altertümliche Fassung des Pañcatantra bietet Somadeva" and Edgerton, *Pañca.*, 2, 27: "In general he [scil. Somadeva] shows extraordinary fidelity to the sense of the original"), I am inclined to believe that in this point, too, Spl is more faithful to the original than Tantra.

Regarding the name Kāmandakī, it seems to be the view of Hertel that this denoted originally, as is said in Tantra., a pupil of the Brāhmaṇa, and that its application by the redactor of Spl to the well-known writer on *Nītiśāstra* is a later development. This view I am unable to accept; for it would be a most extraordinary coincidence that the author of the original story should have on this occasion chosen a name to denote the Brāhmaṇa's pupil which later was borne by the author of a wellknown book on *Nītiśāstra* and, so far as our knowledge goes, by nobody else<sup>1</sup>. I do not believe in

<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the feminine form of the name, Kāmandakī, is met with, outside SP, in Bhavabhūti's *Mālatīmādhava* only and nowhere else.

such a coincidence and it is my opinion that the name Kāmandakī was used from the first with reference to the writer on *Nītiśāstra*. The Pañcatantra, as we know, is itself a book on the *Nītiśāstra*; and nothing is more natural than that its author should refer to other writers on the same science. Compare the second introductory verse of Tantra. where mention is made of Bṛhaspati, Śukra, and the "great" Cāṇakya who have written books on this subject, and the beginning of the third book in the same version (p. 109, 6—7) where reference is made to the books on *Nītiśāstra* written by Manu, Bṛhaspati, Bhṛgu (i. e., Śukra), Parāśara, Śāṅkayana, Cāṇakya and "other writers". It is thus more probable that the name Kāmandakī was used from the first to denote the writer on *Nītiśāstra* than that the redactor of Spl should have newly applied to denote such writer a name that originally denoted somebody else. To judge from the versions of the prose story contained in Spl and Pn, it would seem that Kāmandakī who shows himself so shrewd, was, in the original version of the story, the son of the Brāhmaṇi<sup>1</sup> who gave or wanted to give unhusked sesame to Mother Śāṇḍilī in exchange for husked sesame.

Kāmandakī's *Nītiśāstra*, however, is much later than the original Pañcatantra, whose author does not know of Kāmandakī

<sup>1</sup> Hertel has observed (*Pañca.*, p. 189) that the redactor of Spl saw in the word *mātā* of the introductory verse, not a nominative, but a vocative. Apparently therefore, he thinks that, as in Ratnasundara's Kathākallola, so in the Ur-Spl also, this verse was spoken by the Brāhmaṇi's son to his mother when advising her to reject Śāṇḍilī's offer. This is not improbable; for the word *mātā*, in case we regard it as a nominative, has not got its natural significance here and is to be looked upon as an honorific epithet, and it is not usual, in Sanskrit, to use this word in that manner except in the vocative case. And besides, as the Spl text is here, as observed above, "verballhorn", it is not unlikely that Hertel is right in his above view. In any case, it is obvious that, in the above story, it is the Brāhmaṇi's son who can give utterance to the above verse with the most appropriateness; and it is equally obvious that the verse is not suited to the speaker in Tantra. For, in this version the verse is spoken by the Brāhmaṇi's husband who sees before him Kāmandakī only and not Śāṇḍilī, and yet says *nākasmiṃ Chāṇḍilī mātā . . .* "Mother Śāṇḍilī does not without grounds, etc.". It is to be noted that there is no such inconsistency in Pn; for though, in this version too, it is the Brāhmaṇi's husband who speaks the above verse, he has first inquired to whom the husked sesame belonged and been told that they belonged to Śāṇḍilī-mātṛ. But in Pn, the story is concerned with the barter of sesame made, not by Mother Śāṇḍilī, but by Śāṇḍilī's mother! That is to say; Pn's text too is corrupt in this portion of the story.

and his book on Niti. It follows hence that the story of Śāṇḍilī's barter of sesame was not a part of the original Pañca., but must have been added later, but some years before the book was translated into Pahlavi (in c. 550 A. D.). For, this story is found in the Pahlavi versions and though the name Kāmandaki is not mentioned in them, there can be no reason to doubt that it was mentioned in the Sanskrit original of that translation<sup>1</sup>. The story is not found in Durgasiṃha's Pañca., a version in which all the original Pañcatantra stories are preserved; and this fact, too, goes to show that the story in question is, in all probability, a later addition and not original.

To sum up, then, the results of the foregoing discussion, (1) the introductory verse, *nākas māch Chāṇḍilī mātā . . .* seems, in all probability, to have read originally *luñcitvā 'luñcitair eva* in pāda c; (2) this reading was paraphrased, in order to avoid all ambiguity in connection with the second word in it, by Spl and N which read *luñcitān itararair yena* and *nirluñcitair aghrṣṭāms tat* there, and corrupted into *luñcitāml luñcitair eva* by Tantra.; (3) the prose story, in all the older Pañca. versions, including Tantra., is concerned with the exchange of husked sesame for unhusked which was the theme of the original prose story also; (4) the Spl version, though contaminated, is on the whole more faithful to the original than Tantra.; and (5) both the verse and story are, in all probability, later additions and did not form part of the original Pañcatantra.

<sup>1</sup> It follows from this that Kāmandaki's Nitiśāstra was in existence before c. 550 A. D., and was written at least some ten or twenty years before that time. The opinion of Winternitz (Gesch. d. ind. Litt., 3, 526), based on not sufficient grounds, that Kāmandaki in all probability wrote his work in 700—750 A. D. seems therefore to be incorrect.