Redondo, Jordi

"Is really Syntipas a translation? : the case of The faithful dog"

JORDI REDONDO (GIRLC, UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA)

'IS REALLY *SYNTIPAS* A TRANSLATION? THE CASE OF *THE FAITHFUL DOG*'

The fable entitled 'The faithful dog' has been transmitted by means of a manifold sample of versions, from which Pausanias' is the oldest, according with a sure chronology. It is commonly said that the Greek version afforded by the Book of Syntipas the philosopher *is a mere XIth century translation of the hypothetically reconstructed original Indian text. Our contribution suggests that the text of the* Syntipas' *version does not follow the grammatical patterns of literary translation. Just on the contrary, it shows a striking lexical coincidence with the text given by Pausanias. Therefore, we conclude that the* Syntipas' *version of 'The faithful dog' is an original text which has to be inserted into a Greek tradition.*

Keywords: Classical Language, Fable, Folktale, Indoeuropean Heritage, Koine, Pausanias, Translation

1. Introductory

Several of the most expanded stories all along the Indo-european countries are related to the popular literature which of course can be found at the very core of their inherited tradition(s). Certainly, the tale of the dog, the baby and the snake is attested not so deeply, backwards in the past, as another interesting fable, that of the hawk and the nightingale, for this one is already attested in Hesiod's *Works and Days*.[1] The oldest witness of our story, usually entitled 'The faithful dog' after the Latin medieval version 'Canis fidelis', should be the Aesopean fable entitled 'The Paysant and the Dog'. Nevertheless, it is not attested till the late collections such as

---

[1] Hes. *Op.* 203–212. See the accurated analysis of the fable in Van Dijk, Gert-Jan. 1997. *AINOI. ΛΟΓΟΙ. ΜΥΘΟΙ. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature. With A Study of the Theory and Terminology*. Leiden — New York — Köln: Brill, 127–134.

L'Estrange's 1692 edition, and therefore it takes a secondary role regarding the transmission of the fable.[2] Other extant Asian and European versions must be placed in the late Medieval Age, from the XIIIth century onwards. *Sapienti pauca*, it should be kept in mind that the alleged Indian, Persian and Arabic versions belong to the happy world of our modern reconstructions. Actually, the best witness for the antiquity of the Greek version is the IInd century AD historian Pausanias, whose text is the following:

Ἀμφικτύονες δὲ δόγμα ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν πόλεων ἀπωλείᾳ τῶν ἐν Φωκεῦσιν ἐξενεγκόντες, ὄνομα ἔθεντο αὐτῇ Ὀφίτειαν. οἱ δὲ ἐπιχώριοι τοιάδε ἐπ᾽αὐτῇ λέγουσι· δυνάστην ἄνδρα ἐπιβουλὴν ἐχθρῶν ἐποπτεύσαντα ἐς νήπιον παῖδα, καταθέσθαι τὸν παῖδα ἐς ἀγγεῖον, καὶ ἀποκρύψαι τῆς χώρας, ἔνθα οἱ ἄδειαν ἔσεσθαι πλείστην ἠπίστατο· λύκον μὲν δὴ ἐπιχειρεῖν τῷ παιδί· δράκοντα δὲ ἰσχυρὸν ἀνέχειν τὴν φρουράν, ἐσπειρωμένον περὶ τὸ ἀγγεῖον. ὡς δὲ ὁ πατὴρ ἦλθε τοῦ παιδός, τὸν δράκοντα ἐπιβουλεῦσαι τῷ παιδὶ ἐλπίζων, ἀφίησι τὸ ἀκόντιον, καὶ ἐκεῖνόν τε καὶ ὁμοῦ τῷ δράκοντι τὸν παῖδα ἀπέκτεινε· διδαχθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμαινόντων, ὡς εὐεργέτην καὶ φύλακα τοῦ παιδὸς ἀπεκτονὼς εἴη, μίαν τὴν πύραν τῷ δράκοντι καὶ τῷ παιδὶ ἐποίησεν ἐν κοινῷ τό τε δὴ χωρίον ἐοικέναι καὶ ἐς τόδε καιομένῃ πυρᾷ φασι, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ δράκοντος ἐκείνου τὴν πόλιν ὀνομασθῆναι.[3]

This is the English translation published by Jones in 1918:

"[…] The Amphictyons, when they published their decree for the destruction of the cities in Phocis, gave it the name of Amphicleia. The natives tell about it the following story. A certain chief, suspecting that enemies were plotting against his baby son, put the child in a vessel, and hid him in that part of the land where he knew there would be most security. Now a wolf attacked the child, but a serpent coiled itself round the vessel, and kept up a strict watch. When the child's father came, supposing that the serpent had purposed to attack the child, he threw his javelin, which killed the serpent and his son as well. But being informed by the shepherds that he had killed the benefactor and protector of his child, he made one common pyre for both the serpent and his son. Now they say that even today the place resembles a burning pyre, maintaining that after this serpent the city was called Ophiteia."[4]

---

2   L'Estrange, Roger [ed.]. [7]1724. *Fables of Aesop, and other eminent mhythologists: with morals and reflections.* London: D. Brown. The tale — nr. 464 in this collection — is entitled *A Trusty Dog And His Master,* pp. 502–503. L'Estrange largely increased the former standard edition, that published by Heinrich Steinhöwel (Ulm, 1476; Augsburg, 1477–1480), whose edition added the fables supplemented by Avianus, a Latin poet of the late Empire, and by Rinuccio da Castiglione, an Italian humanist who edited a Latin translation in 1492.

3   Paus. X 33. Another instance of popular literature in Pausanias' historiography occurs at I 41, 4. For a complete reappraisal on the mythical and legendary contents dealt with by this historian, see Gasent, Amparo. 2010. *Errades de l'heroi i conseqüències a la Descripció de Grècia de Pausànies.* Master dissertation, Universitat de València.

4   Jones, William Henry Samuel — Ormerod, Henry Ardene [transls./eds.]. 1918. *Pausanias.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 198.

A second contribution, now in press, intends to analyze the reception of the general theme among the different versions of the fable. We will now concentrate on the place of the *Book of Syntipas* within the whole transmission of the text.

2. The Byzantine version of the *Book of Syntipas*

The origin and composition of the so-called *Sendebar*, an unreachable question for Loiseleur-Deslongschamps,[5] have been intensively dealt with by Comparetti, Perry, and Maltese.[6] All of them suggest that the very first version of the book was written in Persian before the IXth century, when it was translated into Arabic by Musa ben Isa al Kesrawi, whose death happened in 874. This Arabic version was after translated into Syriac, and it was this Syrian text which originated the Greek translation, made towards the end of the XIth century by Michael Andreopoulos, who offered his work to a prince identified by Comparetti with Gabriel of Melitene. The exact knowledge of the origin is blocked by the misleading extant state of the textual transmission, given that, as abovesaid, no rest remains of the Indian, Persian and Arabic versions. An alternative hypothesis suggests that the Greek translation was made towards 1080 by Simeon Seth, a Hebrew physician working at the Byzantine court,[7] although it is not clear which source text he used.[8] Actually Simeon translated the Arabic *Calilah and Dimnah*, entitled in Greek *Στεφανίτης καὶ Ἰχνηλάτης*.[9] Nevertheless, it must be said that here does exist

---

[5]   Loiseleur-Deslongschamps, Auguste Louis Armand. 1838. *Essai sur les fables indiennes et sur leur introduction en Europe, suivi du Roman des Sept Sages de Rome: en prose.* Paris, 83–84. It must be said that the author of the edition was A. J. V. Le Roux de Lincy.

[6]   Comparetti, Domenico. 1869. *Ricerche intorno al Libro di Sindibad*. Milan: Bernardoni; Perry, Ben Edwin. 1959. "The Origin of the *Book of Sindbad*." *Fabula*, 3, 1–94; Maltese, Enrico V. 1993. *Il Libro di Sindibad. Novelle persiane medievali dalla versione bizantina di Michele Andreopoulos*. Torino: UTET.

[7]   See on this physician Brunet, Marc Émile Prospère Louis. 1939. *Siméon Seth, médecin de l'empereur Michel Doucas; sa vie, son oeuvre. Première traduction en français du traité 'Recueil des propriétés des aliments par ordre alphabétique'*. Bordeaux: Delmas.

[8]   Jacobs, Joseph. 1896. "Jewish diffusion of folk-tales." *Jewish Ideals and Other Essays*. London: D. Nutt — New York: Macmillan (= Boston 2005), 144 and 157. The chapter is available online: http://www.authorama.com/chapters-on-jewish-literature-15.html.

[9]   See Geissler, Friedmar. 1962. "Über einige europäische Varianten des Pancatantra." *Forschungen und Fortschritte,* 36, 205–208; Eideneier, Niki. 1967. "Δύο μῦθοι

a manuscript tradition attesting the Persian and Syriac text,[10] which is not the case of *Sendebar*.

New and valuable suggestions on the Greek version can be obtained from the text itself. The Byzantine version goes as follows:

Ἦν γάρ τις στρατιώτης ἀνήρ, ὃς τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τοῖς ὑπ᾽ αὐτῷ μεγιστᾶσι τῆς οἰκείας ἕνεκεν ᾠκείωτο γενναιότητος. κύνα δέ τινα ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐκέκτητο ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς τῆς γεννήσεως παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἀνατραφέντα καὶ τὰ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ τούτῳ ἐπιταττόμενα ὥσπερ τις τῶν λογικῶν πράττοντα· ὅθεν καὶ προσπαθῶς ὁ στρατιώτης περιεῖπε τὸ κυνάριον. ἐν μιᾷ γοῦν ἡ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς σύζυγος πρὸς τοὺς ἑαυτῆς ἀπῄει γεννήτορας, καὶ τὸν ἑαυτῆς νηπιάζοντα παῖδα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λιποῦσα ἀκριβῶς αὐτῷ προσέχειν τῷ ἀνδρὶ παρήγγειλεν· ἐγὼ γάρ, φησίν, οὐ χρονίσω τοῦ ἐπανελθεῖν. καὶ ταῦτα εἰποῦσα κεκοίμηκεν τὸ παιδίον πρότερον καὶ εἰθούτως ἐκεῖθεν ὑπανεχώρησεν. τοῦ δέ γε ἀνδρὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ προσκαρτεροῦντος καὶ τοῦ παιδίου ὑπνώσαντος ἄθρον τις τῶν τοῦ βασιλέως παρεγένετο δορυφόρων. καὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ τοιούτου κρούσαντος ἐξῆλθεν ὁ στρατιώτης θεασόμενος τὸν κρούσαντα. ἑωρακὼς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνος, ὁ βασιλεὺς καλεῖ σε, πρὸς αὐτὸν εἴρηκεν. ὁ δὲ στρατιώτης ἅμα τῷ λόγῳ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ στρατιωτικὰ περιβάλλεται ἄμφια, καὶ τὴν σπάθην ἀράμενος καὶ τῷ δορυφόρῳ μέλλων ἀκολουθῆσαι προσκαλεῖται τὸν κύνα καὶ παραγγέλλει αὐτῷ τά τε ἐκεῖσε καὶ τὸ παιδίον τηρεῖν, τοῦ μηδένα, φησίν, τὸ παράπαν προσπελάσαι τῷ οἰκήματι. ὁ μὲν οὖν στρατιώτης τῷ κυνὶ ταύτῃ παραγγείλας πρὸς τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀπῄει παλάτιον. Τοῦ δέ γε κυνὸς τῷ παιδὶ παρακαθημένου κἀκείνου ὕπνῳ κατεχομένου ὁρᾷ ὁ κύων ὄφιν τινὰ παμμεγέθη κατὰ τοῦ παιδὸς ἕρποντα καὶ αὐτὸν ἀμφιελίξαι σχεδὸν ἐπειγόμενον. αὐτίκα γοῦν ἐγερθεὶς πόλεμον πρὸς τὸν ὄφιν συνέστησεν καὶ καταδακὼν αὐτὸν παραχρῆμα νεκρὸν ἀπηργάσατο. κατ᾽ αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν ὥραν ἐπανῆκεν ὁ στρατιώτης καὶ τούτου εἰσερχομένου ὁ κύων αὐτῷ χαριέντως προσαπήντησεν. θεασάμενος δὲ ἐκεῖνος αἵματι τὸ τοῦ κυνὸς στόμα λελυθρωμένον ἐδόκει περὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς τὸν παῖδα βέβρωκε, καὶ θυμωθεὶς κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ τῷ ξίφει τύψας τὸν κύνα ἀπέκτεινεν. εἶτα ἐντὸς τῆς οἰκίας γενόμενος ὁρᾷ τὸν παῖδα καθεύδοντα καὶ μὴ κατά τι τὸ σύνολον παραβλαβέντα, ἑωράκει δὲ καὶ τὸν ὄφιν ἀποκταθέντα καὶ πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῦ παιδίου κείμενον, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔγνω ὡς ὁ κύων τὸν ὄφιν ἀπέκτεινεν. εἶτα πικρῶς μετεμέλετο ὅτιπερ ἀναιτίως τὸν κύνα ἀνῄρηκεν, οὐδὲν δὲ πάντως τῆς μεταμελείας ἀπώνατο. καὶ σὺ οὖν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, μὴ οὕτως ἀκόπως τὸν υἱόν σου ἀνέλῃς, μήπως καὶ τῷ σῷ κράτει ὡς ἐκείνῳ δὴ τῷ στρατιώτῃ συμβήσεται καὶ μεταμελόμενος ἐπευχαῖς οὐδὲν σεαυτὸν ὀνῆσαι δυνηθήσῃ. καὶ ἄλλης δέ μου διηγήσεως ἄκουσον.

The formal characteristics of the text give us huge information on the whole of the work. First of all, the Byzantine *Syntipas* is written in a literary language which seems intended for a high-cultured diffusion. In this tale, the author uses constantly the dative case as well as many middle and

ἀπὸ τὸν Στεφανίτη καὶ Ἰχνηλάτη σε δημώδη γλῶσσα". *Ἑλληνικά,* 20, 430–435; Cicanti, O. 1972. "Deux variantes grecques de l'oeuvre *Stephanitès et Ichnilatès.*" *Revue d'Études sud-est Europ.,* 10, 449–458; Papademetriou, John-Theophanes-A. 1960. *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of Stephanites kai Ichnelates*. Urbana: Illinois UP.

10   On the Syrian version, see Pajkova, A. V. 1965. "O znacenii drevnesirijskoj versii sbornika Kalila i Dimna." *Kratkie soobscenija Institiuta narodov Azii. Istorija i filologia bliznego Vostoka*. Moscow, 35–44.

passive verbal forms. Dative instances are 29, that is to say, a dative case at each line of the text, namely βασιλεῖ, αὐτῷ (ter), τούτῳ, πατρὶ, ἀνδρὶ, λόγῳ, δορυφόρῳ, τῷ οἰκήματι, τῷ κυνὶ, ταύτῃ, τῷ παιδὶ, ὕπνῳ, αἵματι, τῷ ξίφει, τῇ κεφαλῇ, τῷ σῷ κράτει, ἐκείνῳ [...] τῷ στρατιώτῃ, and ἐπευχαῖς. Middle forms are 22, a high frequency also, namely ᾠκείωτο, ἐκέκτητο, παρεγένετο, θεασόμενος, περιβάλλεται, ἀράμενος, προσκαλεῖται, παρακαθημένου, ἐπειγόμενον, ἀπηργάσατο, εἰσερχομένου, θεασάμενος, γενόμενος, κείμενον, μετεμέλετο, ἀπώνατο, συμβήσεται, μεταμελόμενος, ἀνατραφέντα, ἐπιτραττόμενα, κατεχομένου, and λελυθρωμένον. The passive forms are 4, namely ἐγερθεὶς, θυμωθεὶς, παραβλαβέντα, and ἀποκταθέντα. If we now check the indicative past forms in order to evaluate the use of the augment, we will notice that all of them show a completely regular application of the Classical rule: the sixteen past forms are all of them provided with the augment — a seventeenth form, ἐπανῆκεν, being in any case ambiguous —, a half with the syllabic augment, viz. ἐκέκτητο, ὑπανεχώρησεν, παρεγένετο, συνέστησεν, ἀπέκτεινεν (bis), ἔγνω, and μετεμέλετο, and a half with the temporal one, viz. ᾠκείωτο, ἀπήει (bis), παρήγγειλεν, ἀπηργάσατο, προσαπήντησεν, ἀνήρηκεν, and ἀπώνατο. Therefore, at the morphological level the language of the text imitates perfectly the Classical one.[11]

At the syntactical and the lexical level some data lead to a slightly different conclusion, since there are some clear arguments which point to a later chronology. Certainly, such a short text attests non-frequent, even poetical prepositional clusters, viz. τῆς οἰκείας [...] ἕνεκεν γενναιότητος and πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ. As a matter of fact, all the 19 prepositional clusters can be ranged as perfectly Classical. Take also into account particles as γοῦν (bis), μὲν οὖν and οὖν, and six instances of absolute genitives, namely προσκαρτεροῦντος, ὑπνώσαντος, κρούσαντος, παρακαθημένου, κατεχομένου, and εἰσερχομένου. Finally, there are examples of articular and final infinitive, τοῦ ἐπανελθεῖν, and τοῦ μηδένα [...] προσπελάσαι τῷ οἰκήματι, respectively. Nonetheless, the temporal value accorded to the perfect forms κεκοίμηκεν, ἑωρακώς, εἴρηκεν, and ἀνήρηκεν, the first one coordinated with an aorist, suggest that the text belongs to a post-Classical author. Finally, both the lexical selection and the word order follow literary, Classical models, viz. τῆς οἰκείας ἕνεκεν ᾠκείωτο γενναιότητος,

---

[11] Take as a reference the synthetic plusquamperfect in the authors checked by Hinterberger, Martin. 2007. "Die Sprache der byzantinischen Literatur. Der Gebrauch der synthetischen Plusquamperfektformen." In Hinterberger, M. — Schiffer, Elisabeth — Hörandner, Wolfram [eds.]. *Byzantinische Sprachkunst*. Berlin — New York: De Gruyter, 107–142.

γεννήτορας, and so on. Koiné terms are rare indeed: as a morphological coinage, such a term as κυνάριον can be perfectly Classic,[12] and the same comment is to be made about ἄμφια,[13] although both of them suggest a later datation; the adverb ἀκόπως — as the adjective from which it is derived — also points to a post-Classical datation, but it can hardly being alluded to as a Koine term.[14] A different case deals with the adverb εἰθούτως, in itself a coinage of the later ages of the Greek language, probably not attested before the Christian era.[15] In the whole text we also notice just one Latinism, viz. παλάτιον.[16] Two other post-Classical words, namely μεγιστᾶσι (dative) and ἀπώνατο, deserve a particular comment. The first one is attested in the *Septuaginta*, Menander and the New Testament,[17] and the second in Lucian and Proclus.[18] To sum up, the text shows the trends of an Atticist author writing towards the first, second or third centuries AD.

   Our conclusion on the language of this tale suggests that the *Book of Syntipas* is not a literal translation of the Syriac version, but an original Greek text written long before the Byzantine age. Any translation, especially from a language with different morphological and syntactical patterns, should produce such a literary text, which is only comparable with the more cultured prose. Actually some years ago Cupane suggested that the so-called Byzantine version should be considered just a free adaptation:[19] the author should have created his own text, characterized by a literary expression

---

12   The same word is actually attested at X *Cyr.* VIII 4, 20. On this diminutive suffix belonging to the colloquial stratus of the language, see Chantraine, Pierre. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien.* Paris: Klincksieck, 74–75. The Greek Koine certainly made a wide use of this formation.

13   As a Classical instance, see S. frg. 400 Radt.

14   As a Classical instance, see Hippocrates *Vict.* III 70. The opuscle *On Diet* can be placed in the IVth century BC.

15   It should be not without sense to consider the transmitted form a ghost word instead of the adverbs ἐστούτο, *then*, or εἰωθούτως, *as usually*.

16   The borrowing παλάτιον is widely attested from the early centuries AD, cf. Lampe, Geoffrey William Hugo. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon.* Oxford: Clarendon UP, 998. See for instance *Acts of Peter and Paul* 10, 31 and 84. The term σπάθη must not be included among Latinisms, as it is attested with the meaning *sword* from Alcaeus XV 6 onwards.

17   LXX *Si.* 4, 7 and 10, 24, Men. 1035, *Ev. Mc.* 6, 21, Artem. 1, 2 and Man. 4, 1.

18   Luc. *Am.* 52, Procl. *In Alc.* p. 89.

19   Cupane, Carolina. 1999. "Bisanzio e la letteratura della Romania. Peregrinazione del romanzo medievale." In Pioletti, Antonio — Rizzo Nervo, Francesca [eds.]. *Medioevo romanzo e orientale. Il viaggio dei testi.* Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino, 31–49, p. 41: "Le due raccolte di novelle a cornice, *Sintipas e Stephanites e Ichnelates* sono entrambe liberi adattamenti di modelli orientali," etc.

modelled on the Classical authors. But there is a striking coincidence which cannot be simply casual. Pausanias tells about a powerful lord who suspected a conspiracy against his small child, δυνάστην ἄνδρα ἐπιβουλὴν ἐχθρῶν ἐποπτεύσαντα ἐς **νήπιον** παῖδα. The alleged Byzantine author of the *Book of Syntipas* — Michael Andreopoulos, according with the text — writes that the mother recommended to her husband to give careful attendance to her small child, καὶ τὸν ἑαυτῆς **νηπιάζοντα** παῖδα (…) ἀκριβῶς αὐτῷ προσέχειν τῷ ἀνδρὶ παρήγγειλεν. The adjective νήπιον and the participle νηπιάζοντα are nearly perfect synonymes, for they only differ regarding the aspectual and modal nuances exclusive of the participle form. The verb νηπιάζω is attested at very few Classical authors, namely the Hippocratean *Epidemies* and the poet Erinna.[20] Post-Classical authors were not more interested in the word, for it occurs only at Saint Paul and Porphyry.[21] In the Byzantine literature, there is only an instance at the *Physiologos*.[22] Yet the big distance, literary and social as well, that separates both Byzantine texts, *Physiologus* and *Syntipas*, makes quite difficult any influence between them. On the other hand, the adjective νήπιος is also not so common as it could seem: besides Homer, the tragedians, Hippocrates, Plato, Aristotle, and some isolated instances attested in Antiphon, Aeschines and Lycurgus, it is noticeable indeed that the word lives a certain renaissance in the Imperial Age, when it is attested in Josephus, Pausanias, Apollodorus, and many papyri. Anyway, the wording νήπιον / νηπιάζοντα deserves our attention, and gives room for a strong case of intertextuality. Our suggestion is indeed that the Syntipas text belongs to the same tradition attested in Pausanias. Until now

---

[20] Hp. *Ep.* 17; Erinna *PSI* 9.1090.55+15, cf. Neri, Camillo. 2003. *Erinna. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Bologna: Pàtron, 355–358.

[21] I *Ep. Cor.* 14, 20; Porph. *Gaur.* 12, 4. The Porphyrean authorship of the treatise *Ad Gaurum,* formerly assigned to Galen, was established by the editor of the text, Kalbfleisch, Karl. 1895. "Die neuplatonische fälschlich dem Galenos zugeschriebene Schrift *Ad Gaurum quomodo animetur fetus.*" *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akadamie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl.,* 33–62. On the text itself, see Dorandi, Tiziano. 2008. "Pour une histoire du texte du traité *Ad Gaurum* attribué à Galien." In Brisson, Luc — Congourdeau, Marie-Hélène — Solère, Jean-Luc [eds.]. 2008. *L'Embryon: formation et animation. Antiquité grecque et latine, traditions hébraïque, chrétienne et islamique.* Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 123–137. On the Byzantine reception of the treatise, see Congourdeau, Marie-Hélène. 2008. "La postérité byzantine de l'*Ad Gaurum.*" In L. Brisson — M.-H. Congourdeau — J.-L. Solère [eds.] (2008: 185–198). Needless to point out that Porphyry's testimony was inspired by the Hippocratean instance.

[22] Kriaras, Emanuil. 1990. *Ετυμολογικό Λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής ελληνικής δημώδους γραμματείας 1100–1669 XI.* Thessaloniki: Sfayianakis, 242. This case is parallel to that attested in Porphyrius.

the scholars paid an extreme attention to the words of the prologue: εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν Ἑλλάδα αὐτὸς φράσιν μετήγαγον. We now take for granted that the transmitted text is not a translation, as it is also false that it is written in the contemporary Greek language of an XIth century author. The text itself seems ambiguous, for the participle παροῦσαν can suggest two different translations: either *I translated myself the text to the* **contemporary** *Greek language*, or *I translated myself the text to* **this** *language which is offered to you, to the Greek one*. Yet this second translation looks much more rhetorical and vague, for the participle does not give us concrete information.

3. Why this text must be a translation? Or are fables transmitted only by a literary way?

Given that the Byzantine text can not be a translation, we must find an answer for the following paradox: it has long since been recognized that the *Book of Syntipas* offers the best text, the closest to the hypothesized original work.[23] Until now this original could be reached only by means of a chain of lost texts, whose (in)direct heir had to be the Greek *Syntipas*. The translation-theory denied from the very beginning any originality of this version. Consequently, a more far and old version had to be found. In the quest for this literary Graal, the first author who argued for the Indian provenience of the whole tradition was Görres,[24] and for the last two centuries his theory has been continued or supported by many authors.[25] Anyway, it

---

23   D. Comparetti (1869: 28): "Di tutte le versioni quella che meglio ed in più gran parte rappresenta l'originale è il *Syntipas*. Ad eccezione del principio, fin là dove si tratta della prima educazione del principe, nella qual parte altre versioni, come abbiamo veduto, meno compendiano il testo primitivo, per quasi tutto il resto il *Syntipas* trova riscontro in una o più versioni, e dal confronto risulta ch'essa segue l'originale con maggior fedeltà che qualunche altra."

24   Görres, Joseph. 1807. *Die teutschen Volksbücher*. Heidelberg: Mohr — Zimmer (= 1927), 154–155.

25   De Sacy, Silvestre. 1816. *Calila et Dimna ou les Fables de Bidpaï en arabe. Mémoire sur l'origine de ce livre et sur les diverses traductions qui ont été faites dans l'Orient.* Paris: Debure; A. L. A. Loiseleur-Deslongschamps (1838); Benfey, Thomas. 1858. "Bemerkungen über das indischer Original der zum Kreise der Sieben Weisen Meister gehörigen Schriften." *Mélanges asiatiques St. Petersburg,* 3, 14–25; Benfey, Thomas. 1859. *Fünf Bücher indischen Fabeln, Märchen und Erzählungen I. Einleitung: Über das indische Grundwerk und dessen Ausflüsse, sowie über die Quellen und Verbreitung des Inhalts derselben.* Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus; Goedeke, Karl. 1866. "Liber de septem sapientibus." In Benfey, Thomas [ed.]. *Orient und Occident III. Insbesondere in ihren gegenseitigen Beziehungen.* Göttin-

must be said that one of the first scholars dealing with the question, Silvestre De Sacy, just accepted that in some moment the tales were transmitted from India to Persia.[26] It was his fellow Loiseleur-Deslongschamps who emphasized the theory of the Indian origin.[27]

An alternative theory suggests that the origin must be placed in Persia.[28] Yet this view does not imply any substantial change — unless we give an extraordinary relevance to the hypothesized Buddhist inspiration[29] —, for the main idea continues to be the same: it is not so important that there is an Eastern origin for both the genre and the tales; on the contrary, the substantive basis of this Eastern theory states that there is no link between the Asian and the European Indo-European cultures, as if no inherited tradition were at work.

There is room, however, for a completely different scope to the question if we accept the (non-exclusive) Greek origin of the tale. In support of this theory it is to be taken into account the abovesaid version afforded by Pausanias, which was obtained during his travels thoroughout Greece. The tale was part of the local traditions kept in Phocide, a region far from the

---

gen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 385–423; D. Comparetti (1869). See also Kechaioglou, George. 1988. "Translations of Eastern 'Novels' and Their Influence on Late Byzantine and Modern Greek Fiction (11th–18th centuries)." In Beaton, Roderick [ed.]. *The Greek Novel A.D. 1–1985*. London — Sydney: Croom Helm, 155–166.

[26]   S. de Sacy (1816: 8): "Tout ce que je prétends établir, c'est que les originaux des aventures de Calila et Dimna, et des autres apologues réunis à celui-là, avaient été effectivement apportés de l'Inde dans la Perse."

[27]   A. L. A. Loiseleur-Deslongschamps (1838: 128–131, esp. 130): "[...] La forme même de ce livre, qui se compose, com on a vu, de plusieurs narrations liées à un drame principal, [...] l'existence d'un cadre où tous les contes viennent se placer, d'un récit principal auquel se rattachent des récits sécondaires, est un fait tout à fait particulier du conte et de l'apologue chez les indiens, et je ne le retrouve dans aucune des productions anciennes et authentiques des littératures persane ou arabe."

[28]   von Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph. 1860. "Fabelwerke des Morgenlandes." *Jahrbücher der Literatur,* 90, 36–124, pp. 67–68; B. E. Perry (1959); Runte, Hans R. [ed.]. 1984. *Seven Sages of Rome and the Book of Sindebad*. New York: Garland; Runte, Hans R. 1989. "From the Vernacular to Latin and Back: The Case of The Seven Sages of Rome." In Beer, Jeannette M. A. [ed.]. *Medieval Translators and Their Craft.* Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 93–133; Speer, Mary B. 1989. *Le roman des Sept Sages de Rome: A Critical Edition of the Two Verse Redactions of a Twelfth-Century Romance.* Lexington: French Forum.

[29]   Another variant tries to find the origin of the work in a Pythagorean milieu, cf. Carra de Vaux, Bernard. 1934. *Encyclopédie de l'Islam IV.* Leiden: Brill, 454. There is a coincidence with Perry's view that the IInd century AD *Vita Secundi*, a work having a strong Pythagorean trend, furnished a literary model to the Persian *Sendebar,* cf. B. E. Perry (1959).

most active cultural centres all along the Greek history. The antiquity of the legend reported by Pausanias can be rooted in the Indoeuropean heritage, as it was the case with many other fables, myths, and legends. The religious value accorded to the testimonies delivered by Pausanias has been reevaluated and praised in the recent years.[30] No doubts are formulated on his accuracy as a real and credeable witness regarding all the accounts he gives us on whatever matter.[31] Therefore, there is a general favorable agreement about Pausanias' interest in Greek religion.[32]

Finally, about the tale of the faithful dog there is another theory suggested by the French anthropologist Schmitt. After a report on a popular cult to a doglike saint written towards 1250 by the medieval compilator Étienne de Bourbon,[33] Schmitt concludes that the legend of the protecting dog, now chanonised, had its base in an ancient Indo-European folkloric background; the result was a particular cult that emerged in a certain moment in the Loira

[30]   Birge, Darice. 1994. "Trees in the Landscape of Pausanias' *Periegesis*." In Alcock, Susan E. — Osborne, Robin [eds.]. *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Clarendon, 231–245, p. 231: "Without the information that we derive from Pausanias, our knowledge from ancient Greece would be inconmensurably poorer." Miller, Dean A. 2000. *The Epic Hero*. Baltimore — London: John Hopkins UP, 73: "Pausanias [...] is always good value for his casual recollection of mythic or archaic tradition."

[31]   Lynn Larson, Jennifer. 1995. *Greek Heroine Cults.* Madison: Wisconsin UP, IX: "It is possible to demonstrate that he was quite consistent about visiting sites in person, and often went out of his way to see antiquities in obscure villages. [...] He consistently seeks out the oldest as the most interesting, almost completely neglecting monuments and dedications later than 150 BC."

[32]   Habicht, Christian. 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley — Los Angeles: California UP, 151–152: "Pausanias seldom loses sight of his goal, but he is, as it has often been observed [...] attracted by sacred buildings, and his interest in religion is documented on every page of his work; it is here that he most reveals his personality. Although he was a learned and skeptical man, he still had faith in the gods, or rather, perhaps, in the divine." On Pausanias' religious beliefs, see Della Santa, Mario. 1999. *La religiosità di Pausania.* Bellinzona: Casagrande. See also Redondo, Jordi. 2006. *Introducció a la religió i la mitologia gregues.* València: Universitat de València, 220.

[33]   Lecoy de la Marche, Albert [ed.]. 1877. *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit d'Étienne de Bourbon, dominicain du XIIIe siècle.* Paris: Renouard, 325–328. A previous publication by Quétif, Jacques — Echart, Jacques [eds.]. 1719. *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum recensiti notisque historicis et criticis illustrati I.* Paris, 193, was quoted by Migne, Jacques-Paul. 1846. *Encyclopédie théologique XLVIII. Dictionnaire des sciences occultes I.* Paris: Ateliers Catholiques du Petit-Montrouge, coll. 780–782.

and Rhone area.[34] Schmitt stresses the strong mechanisms of the oral tradition as the most determining factor regarding the reception of the tale. From a different perspective, this presence of the legend in Western Europe, being independent from any concrete literary source, shows that the complex translation-theory after an Indian original must be deeply revisited.

---

[34] Schmitt, Jean-Charles. 1979. *Le saint lévrier. Guinefort, guérisseur d'enfants depuis le XIIIe siècle.* Paris: Flammarion.