II

THE PROSE-AND-VERSE TYPE OF NARRATIVE AND THE JĀTAKAS.

I HAVE on several occasions—partly following Windisch—supported the view that in ancient India a type of narrative was popular, wherein, inside a general framework of prose, there appear, in emphasized passages, especially in the more important speeches and replies, verses. For the conventional tradition of such narratives, it sufficed to teach and to learn the verses. Hence the prose framework as a rule stood firm as to its sense, and not as to its literary form. Or rather, as was only to be expected under such conditions, even the sense of the prose did not stand really firm, but tended in course of time to undergo one transformation after another, as one generation of narrators yielded place to the next. Nay, more; the prose could even become quite forgotten, the poetic insertions meanwhile continuing to be handed down as part of the established tradition of texts preserved by a school. The chances are, therefore, that in spite of the comments of Indian exegesists invariably poured upon them, such verses remain unintelligible; will only perhaps become, or begin to become, intelligible in proportion as our combinations succeed in restoring the forgotten framework of prose. It is as verses in such narratives ("Ākhyāna") that I have tried to explain a number of Rigvedic *sūkta's*. Pischel, Geldner, and Sieg have worked along similar lines.

I have usually looked upon the Jātakas of the Pali canon as supplying the most essential support to these views.

Their structure seemed to have been clearly explained by the important investigations of Rhys Davids, Senart, and others. This support A. B. Keith—amongst other arguments opposing the theory in question—has been seeking to deprive me of in his interesting essay, "The Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian Drama" (*JRAS.* 1911, 979 ff. esp. 985 f). He describes the Jātaka collection as a work to which the epigram applies:

> "Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque,
> Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua."

I consider this verdict somewhat pessimistic, so far at least as it concerns the literary form of the Jātaka text, which is the point here at issue. It seems to me that, at least up to the present, there has been in fact an entire consensus among most of us on this point. I should like to the best of my power to preserve that intact from Keith's scepticism—nay, further, to win over that distinguished inquirer to our side.

"There is no cogent evidence," writes Keith, "that any part (of the Jātaka collection) is a real Ākhyāna."

Before testing this proposition, I will try to explain the situation to the uninitiated. In so doing, some points must be touched upon, in which Keith and I can hardly be said to differ in opinion.

I select a Jātaka: No. 212—verse begirt by prose. The verses—only these rank as canonical—run as follows:

"Different is the appearance above from that below. I ask thee, brahminee, what meaneth this below and this above?"

"I am a mime, your honour. Begging came I hither. But he whom you seek hath slunk away into the store-chamber."

Nobody can imagine that the Buddhists would have found pleasure in reciting such unintelligible fragments to each other. Nor would such an introductory phrase as, "Now I will tell of the Brahmin, his wife, her lover, and

the mendicant," have sufficed to enlighten the listener. It was indispensable that the story should begin with the absence of the Brahmin and the visit of his wife's lover, to whom she gives food. A begging play-actor is standing by; suddenly the Brahmin returns; the lover hides in the store-room. The wife adds more stew for her husband to that left over by her lover. The stew below is cold, that on the top hot. The Brahmin, astonished at this, utters the first of the above-mentioned verses. He naturally suspects mischief. Perhaps he first suspects the mendicant. The latter anyway tells the husband what he has seen, and utters the second verse. And there then follows inevitably the conclusion: how the lover was fetched from the store-room, and, with the faithless wife, received the beating that was due.

The commentator of the Jātaka book tells the story in exactly the same way.[1] He writes in prose; he adds the verses where they are needed for the context, and explains their meaning. I would add that this is a typical case, recurring hundreds of times. The verses taken alone are, to a large extent, meaningless. Then comes in the prose, and by it all becomes clear; that the verses were intended to complete just that context indicated by the prose is self-evident. If confirmation were needed, it could be furnished by the very numerous cases in which the subject-matter of these stories agrees—essentially, if not in every detail—in other respects with the commentator's prose. Thus we find Jātakas introduced in the great Pāli-Piṭaka texts, where they, verses surrounded by prose, are recited in the ancient style of those texts. Other tales also occur in the Cariyā Piṭaka. Or, again, Jātakas occur in Northern Buddhist texts, such as the *Mahāvastu*, the collections of the Avadānas, and the carefully-polished *Jātakamālā*; or non-Buddhistic literature gives the requisite confirmation. Again, in sculpture:—bas-reliefs of Buddhist buildings,

[1] He only omits the incident, which I have introduced, of the husband at first suspecting the mendicant whom he sees before him. It is a natural assumption, but is nothing more.

many with inscriptions expressly referring to the Jātakas. In some of these cases not included in the body of the Pāli Jātakas the entire story is in prose, or, as in the Cariyâ Piṭaka, it is written entirely in verse. Thus, in the *Mahāvastu* (vol. II, p. 209 ff.), the *Sāmajātaka* (No. 540) runs first of all in pure prose,[1] and afterwards in purely metrical form. Considering the esteem in which the Pāli canon deserves to be held,[2] I think we shall have every reason to consider the type of mixed prose and poetry found in it, and which is *almost* the only prevailing one,[3] as the oldest or as one of the oldest. It frequently occurs also in the Jātakas incorporated in the Vinaya, etc., and in many examples of Northern Buddhist literature, especially in the *Mahāvastu* and in the *Jātakamālā*, etc.[4] The inscription of Barhut (cp. *ZDMG.* LII, 643, *n.* 2), which names the *Yaṃ bram(h)ano avayesi jatakaṃ*, also points to it, and is identical with the strophe which we find in

[1] Not counting the one verse (p. 212, 19 f.) quoted from the Dhammapada.

[2] I intend to return to this in another connection later on.

[3] *Absolute* monopoly cannot be claimed for it, nor is that surprising. In some cases our Jātaka text shows metrical parts which give the whole narrative, so that the prose is superfluous (cp. Lüders *NGGW.* 1897, 126, *n.* 1; Senart, *Journ. as.*, 1901, I, 400). I will not enter here into details, which would necessitate a special inquiry. On the other hand, a Jātaka, where so many have but one verse, is quite conceivable with no verse at all. True, it could not then be included in our body of Jātakas, since this is essentially a collection of verses (see below; concerning No. 5, where there is in Fausböll's text no verse, cp. Chalmers' translation; on the exceptional case of the Kuṇāla-Jātaka, see p. 26, *n.* 1). Other Pali texts, however, may confirm the existence of such a Jātaka. Cp. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 196 (I judge the case in question to be more rare than the writer claims it to be). I do not, for that matter, hold it to be quite clear whether, in the case of a tale given in mere prose, as an integral part of a leading canonical text, verses may not have dropped out of such a narrative as superfluous, which had once formed a feature of the latter when told independently.

[4] Only in these texts the prose appears as the work of the author, not of the commentator.

Jāt. 62 of the Pāli thesaurus (vol. I, p. 293).[1] This, again, would be incomprehensible without the prose as furnished by the commentator.

But if prose-additions, like those handed down in the Jātakatthavaṇṇanā (*v.* p. 21, *n.* 3), belong necessarily, with few exceptions, to the verses of our Pāli Jātakas, then we must also add that *this* form of the prose cannot be the original one.

Before I refer to the reasons for this conclusion, I wish to say that I am not convinced by the arguments with which R. O. Franke (*ZDMG.* LXIII, 13) seeks to demonstrate a divergent theory. Franke finds it quite improper to regard the creation of the Jātaka gāthās as a whole (with certain exceptions) and that of the Jātaka prose as two separate acts. He has recourse to a comparison between two passages in Jātakas 539 and 507. In 539 the Bodhisat has entered the town Thūṇa as a religious mendicant, and comes to the house of an arrow-maker:

koṭṭhake usukārassa bhattakāle upaṭṭhite (J. 539, 163)

whereupon a conversation unfolds itself between the two men. Here Franke finds the words *bhattakāle upaṭṭhite* out of place, without connection with the meaning of the verse. "To one who has gone a little into the mysteries of the canonical compilation, it will at once occur that another factor has been here at work." The same pāda, namely, is also to be found in No. 507, 19, in which verse it is preceded by the words *so tassa gehaṃ pāvekkhi.* Herewith, Franke holds, J. 539 corresponds, not in the verses, but in the prose just preceding the verse-passage quoted above (163): *pavisitvā . . . gehadvāraṃ patto.* From this he evidently draws the conclusion that this prose-passage, being similar to the meaning of the former verse, has now

[1] That is to say, the standard canonical strophe of the Jātaka; the other verses woven into the Commentary have not the same rank. That this is so comes out in the opening titular citation of the Commentary, in which the Jātaka is designated by the corresponding words: *yaṃ brāhmaṇo ti*—the opening words of the strophe, though this is, in the tale, preceded by another verse (*sabbā nadī*, etc.).

led to that continuation of the above-mentioned verse, although for the context it was meaningless.

Truly an ingenious conclusion, only to my mind too ingenious. In 507 and 539 the same situation occurs; an ascetic comes to a strange house. According to the customs of the Indian ascetics, he comes to beg for food (rendered explicitly *piṇḍāya caranto* in the prose of J. 539 after v. 162), and this would occur at mealtime. That a brahmin or samaṇa goes to beg of a householder *bhattakāle upaṭṭhite* is also told in the *Sutta Nipāta* passage (130), from which the Jātakas have probably derived these words. How often does it not occur in the Jātakas, that certain words, judged by the main idea, are more or less superfluous, and are only adduced because the poet is fascinated and carried away by the situation, and portrays it as if it were an end in itself? Hence, I find nothing striking in the fact that the idea of the ascetic, coming to beg for food at a house, has produced the words applied to the same situation in the well-known Vasalasutta of the *Sutta Nipāta*, and thence probably having found their way into that other Jātaka on the occurrence of just that same situation;[1] this being the arrival at *āhāradeśakāle*, as the *Mahāvastu* (II, 49, 10, 12) says, with which we may compare the pious man in the *Jātakamālā* (p. 35, 19-21), looking out at the *āhārakāla* for any approaching guests.

To understand this kind of thing we have no need of any prose influence. But even if we persist, unnecessarily as I think, in seeing prose-influence at work, we could still side with my view as to the origin of these Ākhyānas. For in cases of this kind, speaking generally, it is near enough to that view to hold that a passage like our *pavisitvā . . . gehadvāraṃ patto* of the commentator's prose, may already have been imagined by the writer of the verse, he having composed it concerning a certain situation, which according to rule had to be described in prose. If

[1] Repetition of favourite standard passages in these poems is very frequent.

we really attach weight to the allusion to J. 507, 19,[1] as shown by Franke, all proof that the *existing* prose is contemporary with the verses is thus excluded. We only needed to regard this prose as the substitute, similar only on the whole, for the prose that was in the mind of the author of the verse. In just the case before us, it is true, the whole consideration seems to me to fall away; yet not in the sense, that what it would take away from the power of Franke's hypothesis to prove the contemporaneity of the prose in question and the verses, remains to the credit of the prose. For it was hardly the original intention of the author of the verses so to divorce the *upaḍḍhā gāthā* 162 from the following verse, by means of the prose, as we see it in the text that is now before us. On the contrary, verses 162 and 163 contained one continuous description of the entire incident,[2] and apparently there was no room, in the ancient form of the passage, for the now interjacent prose, which precisely, according to Franke, would have been the origin of the *bhattakāle upaṭṭhite* of the verse.

But whatever one may think of this supposition, it is, in my opinion, certain that this *bhattakāle upaṭṭhite* is not suited to be the foundation of hypotheses concerning the contemporaneity of the prose and the verse, hypotheses contradicted by all the clues which in other respects throw light on this question.

[1] I mention incidentally that this proves less than it seems to do. In 507, 19, it was *gehaṃ pavekkhi*. In the prose, 539, *pavisitvā* refers to the entry into the town. That the wanderer then comes to the *gehadvāraṃ* is a fresh fact.

[2] I note in passing that this description seems to have suffered while being handed down. Before or after the hemistich *koṭṭhake*, etc., there will have been a hemistich to which *koṭṭhake* structurally belongs —say, with an *aṭṭhāsi*, as the Commentary has it. The next verse consists of two opening *pādas* (*tatra ca so usukāro* and *ekaṃ ca cakkhu niggayha*); after the former a following *pāda* has been lost (containing, say, "he was working at an arrow"), which would have made good the number of *pādas* and made the *ca* (after *ekaṃ*) intelligible. Cp. on the passage Franke, *WZKM.* XX, 351.

I give once more a brief summary of these clues, which do not appear to have received everywhere the consideration they deserve.

Our Jātaka book, edited by Fausböll, calls itself *atthavaṇṇanā*. We can constantly see that the verses appear to it as something given, requiring a commentary.[1] As we know, in the great Phayre MS. which comprises the whole canon, the Jātaka consists only of verses.[2] (The Kuṇāla Jātaka, No. 536, forms, so far as I can see, a remarkable and unique exception.[3]) The prose shows, in the most perfect

[1] Cp. Senart, *Journ. as.*, 1901, I, 397 ff. "Besides," runs Lüder's pertinent remark, *NGGW.* 1897, 119 *n.* 2, "the arrangement according to the number of the gāthās, shows that originally these alone counted."

[2] Hertel (*ZDMG.* LXIV, 62; *WZKM.* XXIII, 280) is of opinion, judging by certain MSS. of the Pañcatantra and cognate works, which contain only the verses, that the Phayre MS. of the Jātaka contains a selection of the verses taken from the prose and verse compilation, which was to serve as the basis for a Jātaka translation into some vernacular. It would be strange enough, if it had been possible for such a casual private venture to have found its way, in place of the canonical Jātaka text, into the main body of the Phayre MS. The way in which the fact of the Phayre MS. fits into the circle of facts, marshalled above, shows too that it cannot be explained away thus. It may here be mentioned that this MS., as containing only verses, is not unique. Minayeff (*Recherches sur le Bouddhisme*, 152) speaks of one such at St. Petersburg and one at Paris. Rhys Davids has kindly pointed out to me that Nos. 135, 136 in Cabaton's List of the Pali MSS. in the Bibl. Nationale, if rightly described, must be of this kind. He adds that an edition of gāthās only, with Singhalese translation, was begun in 1905 at Colombo.—Besides, our Jātaka Commentary, in a number of passages (*v.* Fausböll, vol. VII, p. iii at the end), distinguishes, in the text of the verses, between the Pali reading and the Aṭṭhakathā reading. Is this, too, an allusion to a tradition containing only verses? It would be an advantage to know how the Phayre MS. stands with regard to that distinction.

[3] The Kuṇāla-Jātaka appears, in the midst of the Jātaka Book, as an exotic piece, obviously broken off from elsewhere. Here we have *canonical prose*, with verses. Intermingled is the commentarial prose of the Atthavaṇṇanā, which can easily and surely be divided off from the canonical, even though Fausböll's text and Francis' translation scarcely give an idea of this. The canonical prose reveals characteristic turns belonging to the canonical diction of the Pali Piṭakas

harmony herewith, the commentator's style, and not the hieratic diction of the Suttanta or Vinaya prose, with which it forms so sharp a contrast.[1] But—as if the tradition could not do enough to bring this state of things to our notice—in a whole series of cases a story of this kind is put, in one of the great canonical texts, into the Master's mouth. *There* it is that we see the prose in the form that in ancient times—the time of the genesis of the Sutta and Vinaya collections—appeared to be the suitable

(*e.g.*, *yena . . . ten' upasaṃkamiṃsu*, *upasaṃkamitvā . . . etad avocuṃ*, etc.) On the other hand, it has a flavour that is clearly divergent from the diction of the great Pali Sutta and Vinaya texts; cp. *e.g.* the long concatenations of compounds (vol. V, p. 416, 419 f., Fausböll). As a whole, it reminds us of parts of the North Buddhist texts, *e.g.* the *Divyāvadāna*. The progress of our knowledge of this literature, or of the respective Chinese translations, may one day permit us to determine more precisely whence it sprang. That a MS. of the Canon, like the Phayre, would here give the prose as well seems to me scarcely doubtful, though I am not in a position to affirm it positively. The introductory formula *evam akkhāyati* (suggesting *ākhyāna*) *evam anusūyati* looks like a constant, standing formula in such a canonical text. In the Pali Commentary these words form, so to speak, the catchword amounting to the title of a Jātaka. At the end, the identifying of the persons taking part with those surrounding the Buddha, and with himself, in verses, is here and elsewhere effected by the phrase *evaṃ dhāretha jātakan ti*. The phrase may be characteristic of certain sources (?), and, anyway, occurs more than once in the *Mahāvastu*. For our inquiry, the Kuṇāla-Jātaka yields yet another confirmation, among so many others, of how firmly rooted was the form in mixed prose and verse.

[1] The later diction of the *aṭṭhakathā*, writes Hertel, merely proves that the recension of the Jātaka which has come down to us is later than the main body of the canonical texts (*WZKM.* XXIV, 123). This does not go very far. It is scarcely doubtful that the *aṭṭhakathā* (more accurately, the *atthavaṇṇanā*) is the work of a commentator writing in Ceylon several centuries after Christ, presumably translating from the Singhalese, or working up Singhalese materials; a writer whose work makes no claim whatever to be entitled "canonical," and who himself, as is often shown, claims nothing of the kind (*v. int. al* Cowell's Preface to vol. I of the Jātaka translation; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 200 f.). On the very different circumstances of the verses light is thrown by the Barhut inscription mentioned above (p. 22), *pace* by other clues.

one for such a tale—viz., the old hieratic prose.[1] Finally, as if to make the indubitable still more indubitable, while the prose-compiler had at his disposal, obviously at most, and on the whole at least, a fair tradition of the essential contents of the stories implied in the old verses, there is, nevertheless, often to be found in the prose—especially in minor, decorative details, etc., yet at times in those also of greater importance—traces of a more recent authorship than in the verses. Although he judges differently in his statements (p. 22 f.) referring to J. 539, 163, Franke has himself pointed out this fact in several ways, perhaps even going too far. Above all, I may recall the points established by Lüders some time ago, founded on the story of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga and the Dasarathajātaka (*NGGW*, 1897, 119, 126 ff.; 1901, 51; *ZDMG*, LVIII, 689 ff.), as well as the masterly treatment of the more ancient and more modern literary and monumental forms of the Saḍḍantajātaka by Foucher (Mélanges. Sylv. Lévi 231 ff.[2]). I here give the result concerning the relationship of verse to prose in his own words:[3]

"Si les *gāthā* ont tous les caractères d'une très vieille complainte populaire, que la barbarie du procédé employé par le chasseur pour s'emparer de l'ivoire nous force à déclarer antérieure au médaillon de Barhut, c'est-à-dire au IIe siècle avant J.-C., il est non moins évident que leur *aṭṭhakathā* n'a pas été seulement remise en pāli, mais qu'elle a encore été accommodée au goût du jour par un clerc du Ve siècle de notre ère."

[1] Keith (986 *n.* 1) calls the Jātaka prose of Fausbøll's edition "just as probably an original composition without any predecessor." In the cases described (as well as in the Kuṇāla-Jātaka, *v.* above, p. 26 *n.* 1) we have under our eyes the predecessor of this prose.

[2] The evidence for the prose as being posterior would be carried to an extreme, if the whole narrative of the fifteenth Jātaka were really built up on a false reading in the gāthā (Lüders, *NGGW.* 1897, 128 *n.* 1). But I believe this would affirm too much.

[3] See p. 246 f. The value of this result seems to me unimpaired by the circumstance, that just this Jātaka, in its Pāli form, might be conceived, approximately at least, as consisting of verses only, needing no prose (cp. above p. 21, *n.* 1).

It seems to me that at least a part of the facts here co-ordinated is of such a nature, that the conclusions to be drawn distinctly refer to the structure of the Jātakas *as a whole*. It would be in itself very strange to judge each case separately —here to give priority to the gāthās, there to consider them contemporaneous with the prose—as Franke evidently does (cp. above p. 22 f.). This, however, I consider as excluded by the arguments just given.[1]

But now I have arrived at the point where I come upon the attempt to lift off its hinges the proof, which in my estimation is contained in all the foregoing, the assertion, namely, that we are dealing here with Ākhyānas, more correctly with Ākhyāna verses and a prose settled subsequently. Keith says (*op. cit.* 986. *n.* 1): "The discrepancies of prose and verse are no reasonable evidence in favour of the prose being a replacement of an older prose which really was consistent with the verse." He is of the same opinion as Hertel, who said (*WZKM.* XXIV, 122) that the frequent contradiction between prose and verses only proves that the author of the one is not identical with the author of the other, but that it proves nothing as to the origin and original disposal of the verses: "they may be Kathāsaṃgraha strophes,[2] or they may be borrowed from epic and dramatic poems or śāstras."

Thus authors who compose prose and quote[3] verse,

[1] I make, of course, an exception in the case of the Kuṇāla-Jātaka, which is obviously different from the rest of the collection.

[2] I do not overlook this "may be" that leaves open the possibility of Ākhyāna verses; and only refrain, for brevity's sake, in the following remarks, from always reminding the reader that of all this it is only said that it "may be." But as soon as it is seriously accepted that the matter may also have happened otherwise, then the possibility at least of that with which I am concerned must be admitted, namely, that here we have Ākhyānas, just as I assume them to be in the Ṛgveda; and, further, we have these Ākhyānas, in the canonical shape of the "Jātakas," existing in precisely the same form as I find in the Ṛgveda :—the verses without the prose.

[3] Keith in so many words admits that this was "just as probably" the case (p. 986 *n.* 1), as compared with the Ākhyāna theory. But the reader will not be deceived, if he credits him actually with a very decided inclination to the first-named view.

taken from who knows where?[1] In accordance with the idea that I have formed of the nature of the Ākhyāna, an occasional occurrence of this situation appears to me in no degree incompatible. Why should not the narrator, who wished to embellish his prose with poetic interludes, instead of composing the latter himself, borrow material which existed and may have been intended for something else? There was no question of any scruples regarding literary property. When the only strophe of the Mahāsudassana-jātaka (95) is the well-known verse *aniccā vata saṃkhārā*, etc., we are not likely to conclude that the author of the Jātaka composed it for that work.[2]

But it is, of course, one thing to regard such a working up of one or more quotations as a merely casual variation in mixed prose and verse, and quite another to trace the whole form (apart from the case of the Kathā-saṃgraha verses) back to such quotations, and thereby rob it, in a certain sense, of all reality.[3]

[1] Only the Kathāsaṃgraha strophes would be likely to be ascribed to the authors (or would not even they? cp. Hertel, *WZKM.* XXIV, 123). If a verse – whether standing alone, or where there are other verses—is added to a narrative, the whole of which it so pointedly summarizes, I consider it as lying well within the limits of my conception of the prose and verse tale.

[2] Senart (*Journ. as.*, 1901, I, 401) remarks that the Hiri-sutta of the *Sutta Nipāta* (V, 253-7), unmixed with prose, has preserved the strophes which form the nucleus of a Jātaka (No. 363). Here, too, I would fain believe that a story has been subsequently tacked on to didactic verses. But I may say here that I do not follow him when he, in the same connection, finds that, in the SN, the Dhaniya-, Cunda-, and Hemavata-suttas (I, 2, 5, 9), "offrent autant d'exemples décisifs de jātakas sans prose." Are these Jātakas?

[3] I am surprised that Keith (p. 986 *n.* 1) straightway regards Franke's views on Jāt. 539, 163, which we criticized above, as being in line with his own theory. What Franke says is clearly to this effect: that the prose has influenced contemporary verse; that it has helped to create this verse. Keith argues the converse. According to him, the verse must have been before the author of the prose; indeed, this author is supposed to quote it. Franke's construction, in fact, places in Keith's way a difficulty wherewith he would have to cope, not a support for him to lean upon.

Are we, in fact, to the extent imposed upon us by the latter conception, to regard the Jātaka verses as having been borrowed from epic or dramatic poetry or from Śāstras? That is the problem to be solved here.

A very large portion of these verses—I mean the greater part, reckoning without statistical precision—has not got the characteristic of philosophic universality that the *aniccā vata saṃkhārā* has, but by its contents proves to have been composed just for the context—or for one more or less similar—in which we find the corresponding verses.

Would these verses have been taken from dramatic poetry? Hertel thinks (*op. cit.*, 22) that just as Pūrnabhadra (*Pañcat.* I, 211) has borrowed a strophe of the Śakuntalā,[1] the compilers of the Jātakas may have plundered dramatic literature. Plundering dramatic literature is anyway a step beyond merely borrowing a verse from a drama. That verse of Kālidāsa's has a fairly general theme, such as might easily be transferred to another situation. And we know that there was and still is a Śakuntalā. Do not the dramas, which would have described the definite situations indicated by the corresponding verses, differ in this respect from the Śakuntalā to their own disadvantage? Did they, at the time when the Jātakas were first written, exist at all except in Hertel's imagination, which is so rich in the discovery of dramas? It may be permitted, provisionally, to doubt it.

Other matter which may be urged against such plundering of dramatic literature applies equally to the assumption of epic prototypes.

Let it be considered that, in order to sustain such a hypothesis, we can scarcely get on with less than hundreds of poetic Jātakas which must have formed the basis for the Jātakas in mixed prose and verse handed down to us.

To begin with, I do not find a shadow of proof for such assumption. The materials we possess lead us—for the

[1] He adds: Just as the Suparṇādhyāya is worked into the Mahābhārata. On the Suparṇādhyāya as drama I will say a few words below.

largest part of the narratives of our Jātaka collection—to the fact of the prose and verse Jātaka.[1] If, to deprive that fact of any significance, we imagine, for incalculable masses of these stories, doubles of more or less "epic poems," in pure poetic form, lying behind them, such an idea is mere free phantasy, and too free at that. If the author composed in prose, and interwove into his prose only such quotations in verse as were available here from a drama, there from an epic, or from a Śāstra, how does it happen that this embellishment was so regular, that it was never once omitted in the whole of our Jātaka collection—indeed, could not have been omitted, while for that which was lacking in this embellishment no place could be found in it? How is it that the opening words of the first quotation (*i.e.*, the first of any significance) became a title for the whole Jātaka? That the whole Jātaka collection was arranged according to the number of the verses which appeared in each piece? That those who handed it down expressly distinguished the verses, from the surrounding additions, as "text"? That they expressed themselves somewhat in the same way as in the following (cp. III, p. 61, 23 ff.)? The courtezan, deserted by her lover, asks the wandering play actors, wherever they go, "to sing this song particularly; thus she, directing the actors, tells them the first strophe." But we are not told how the strophe runs till later, when the troubadours are fulfilling their trust. "They sang," so the description runs, "the first strophe of the song," and, now only, follow the words of it, and then, how he who is sought, hearing the verses on his side, "uttered the second strophe," and so on. Or (vol. IV, p. 195, 6 ff.), "then there follow these (verses) [five ślokas follow]. Of these five, verse for verse, three belong to the Bodhisat, two to the King." What author who—as Keith thinks of the

[1] I except, on the one hand, the Jātaka-like narratives without verses, which are sometimes met with in the Piṭaka texts—these, for that matter, do not in the least represent the pure poetic type here postulated—and, on the other hand, the few Jātakas touched on above, p. 22 *n* 3.

Jātaka authors—writes his prose as "an original composition, in which verses are quoted, whether taken from the epic," etc., would write thus? So, rather, writes one who regards the verses not as something external, but as fixed data given to himself and his readers, and taken for granted as the necessary basis of his work. I have on a former occasion compared these verses fitted into the prose with verses in the middle of a prose story, such as a Grimm's fairy tale, and which are put into the mouths of the characters. The comparison is inapt only in so far as what appears in the Jātakas as a fixed type, systematically carried out, is only seen sparingly in the fairy tale as suggested by mere chance and mood of the narrator.

For, indeed, a reader of the Pāli Jātaka collection cannot fail to recognize the fact that the verses constitute an essential element in the form wielded by the compilers of these stories. And they are verses (I do not know whether rare exceptions should not be discounted) which are not given to the listener as quotations, as in the *Pañcatantra*, where passages so often bear the stamp of having been taken from a thesaurus of popular philosophy. They are verses which are seen to have their home in the narrative itself; they have their place and their value because the characters in the story, or Buddha himself, have so spoken. If a form of narrative characterized by the intermixture of such verses was once in vogue, would the authors[1] not really have been able or allowed to use it, by themselves composing their stories according to that form in mixed prose and verse, but only by constantly borrowing[2] behind the scenes from foreign productions the one important element in the form? I cannot at all see the sense of such an idea.

Let us now consider how materials, warding off attacks

[1] I have in mind at the moment the old authors behind whose mask the author of the Atthavaṇṇanā, in a certain manner and with recognized limitations, has concealed himself.

[2] Or did they rather create it than borrow it (cp. p. 28 *n.* 2)? In this case we have precisely the narrative form in mixed prose and verse as I accept it.

upon, and confirming the type here supported, of a prose-and-verse form of narrative, fortify it round about in the most different directions. I do not attempt, in enumerating them, any completeness.

Of the Vedic evidence I shall have more to say later.

From epic literature Lüders (*NGGW.* 1897, 131) has long ago (as I think rightly) vindicated for such *gāthāḥ* the quality of Ākhyāna strophes, for instance for those concerning Rāma, which are mentioned in the Harivaṃśa, and which might, as Lüders supposes,[1] be translated from folk dialect;

gāthāś cāpy atra gāyanti ye purāṇavido janāḥ—

strophes the relations of which with those of the Jātakas Lüders has finely discussed.

Franke's investigations[2] also have brought much to the light of day that is very important to us in this connection. I may mention particularly how Jātaka 384, appears in the M. Bh. II., Adhy. 41 (Franke, *op. cit.*, 319 f.). In the wholly metrical M. Bh. there appears at first, in the sermon of the sham holy bird, a clear reflex,[3] having a corresponding value, of the first gāthā in the Jātaka: M. Bh.—*dharmaṃ carata, etc.* Jātaka.—*dhammaṃ caratha, etc.* Then the M. Bh.—with a distant resemblance to the fourth *gāthā*—emphasizes a verse, addressed to the bird, denouncing its hypocrisy, above its context by the above mentioned and elsewhere recurring formula:

gāthām apy atra gāyanti ye purāṇavido janāḥ.

Thus the course of the epic, even in verses, characterizes a definite verse in quite a distinct sense as that of a *gāthā* handed down from the past, and attributes to it a quality

[1] Cp. also Charpentier, *ZDMG.* LXII, 745.

[2] "Jātaka Mahābhāratā-Parallelen," *WZKM.* XX, 317 ff. In the same connection the articles of Charpentier should be consulted.

[3] This expression is, of course, not meant to prejudice the question of the historical relations of the two versions.

which corresponds[1] exactly to the value of those *gāthās*, which, in the Pāli text, arise out of the prose.

Further, I should like to draw attention to the parallels between M. Bh. (III. Adhy. 194, Franke, p. 320 f.) and Jātaka 151. In both texts two travelling kings meet, and the question arises which must get out of the way of the other. The M. Bh. tells the story in prose. A wise man appears and *ślokatrayam apaṭhat* :—then follow those *ślokas* which are remarkably like the Jātaka *śloka* talk between the charioteers. Without ignoring some differences, we may say that the prose-poetic narrative of the Jātaka appears here in another prose-poetic version, the verses in the one corresponding almost literally to the verses in the other.[2]

But above all what we have chiefly to consider, as confirming the form obtaining in the great Jātaka collection, is the remaining field of Buddhist literature. Attention has been drawn above (p. 27) to those Jātakas which are found in the Sūtra and Vinaya texts of the Pāli canon. Do we there meet perchance, in an age which is many centuries earlier than the genesis of the Jātakatthavaṇṇanā, with those pure metrical narratives, which are supposed to have been plundered by the author of the Atthavaṇṇanā? We meet now with pure prose, now—in most cases, if I do not err—exactly as in the later Jātaka, with prose mixed with verse. For the purely metrical form in the Jātaka collection, occasionally appearing in between the traditional mixed form, there is no such guarantee of age.[3] Texts like

[1] Could we not conclude with some ingenuity, from such a passage alone, that this form of mixed prose and verse narrative was the basic form of the passage in question in the epic?

[2] The story also of the frog-princess and the horses of Vāmadeva (*M.Bh.* III, Adhy. 192), which is at least in part mixed prose and verse, does not seem to me to admit of being so readily settled as it is by Keith (992). It is characteristic that the *ślokau cātra bhavataḥ* occurs, where, at the speech of the frog-king, two verses appear first in the midst of what has so far been unbroken prose.

[3] I note in passing that the verse narratives of the Jains, several of which Charpentier (" Studien über die indische Erzählungs-literatur," *ZDMG.* LXII, f.) has recently and very pertinently compared with Jātakas, can hardly be judged otherwise.

the Cariyā Piṭaka,[1] or, still more, the Apadāna, are, as experts in Buddhist literature will scarcely dispute, entirely secondary. The old *Sutta-Nipāta* has several narratives, on the childhood and youth of the Buddha-about-to-be, in pure metrical form (Asita; departure from home; meeting with Māra). Thus the *possibility* at least will be admitted that at that time Jātakas also were composed in this form. But even supposing this to have actually been the case, the fact would remain untouched, that the prose and verse form, which the Jātaka collection bears for the most part, was already in existence and popular at the time when the Nikāyas and the great Vinaya texts originated—that, for instance, the Maṇikaṇṭha Jātaka (253) appears in the Vinaya (vol. III, p. 145 ff.) with exactly the same three verses as in the Jātaka collection, and also with a prose frame work as in the latter; only with archaic prose in place of commentarial prose. To argue that this form of narrative, assured through the agreement of old and new evidences, arises from a much earlier purely epic poetical form, or even a dramatic form:—is not this a flight from the solid ground of fact to the regions of air?

We may strengthen our belief, that the prose and verse Jātaka form was firmly rooted in the literary consciousness of India, by the fact, that we see this form decisively asserting itself in the North Buddhist literature, too, and at a time when purely metrical Jātakas were actually to be found in it,[2] yet co-existing quite distinctly beside them.

[1] See hereon Charpentier, *WZKM.* XXIV, 351 ff.

[2] Thus, if I mistake not, in the *Mahāvastu* in a much larger proportion than the pure prose and the pure poetry. Whoever examines the purely metrical Jātakas there, will scarcely feel tempted to attach weight to them with regard to the question of the older development of this form of narrative. We may at this point incidentally remind ourselves that—among other texts—the *M. vastu* gives an opportunity, through comparison with the Pāli Jātakas, of illustrating the long-known fact (so von Oldenburg, *JRAS.* 1893, 302; Pischel, "Die ind. Literatur" [in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, T.I., Abt. VII], 188) that the different versions of the Jātakas generally agree in the verses, but are as a rule very different in the prose form. This also testifies that the verses are at the

The prose and verse Jātaka of the *Jātakamālā* is the direct offspring of the prose and verse Pāli Jātaka. There is only this difference, that, in the Pāli Jātaka, the gaps, which existed in the old time when there was no fixed prose, are only inadequately filled in, and are therefore easily recognizable. In the *Jātakamālā*, on the other hand, the need of artistic form has penetrated into the prose also. That is a step further in the treatment of the old form, rather than the creation of a new form.

Thus, in conclusion, even in those non-Buddhist prose and verse texts, where the gnomic element in the verses has attained predominance and almost sole rule, as in the Pañcatantra, I should prefer to assume not exactly a new form, but rather a shifting of importance, or, if you will, the formation of a new variety of the old Ākhyāna form. The ever-increasing pleasure in being orthodoxly proficient, one might say, in *punditdom*, led to this: that the possession of popular philosophy here was fain to show itself as proficiency in the literature of that philosophy. Thus the actual or feigned quotation, which was expressly given as such, was thrown into strong relief. This is certainly something different from the old Jātaka, but the difference is not fundamental.

I will conclude my disquisitions on the Jātakas with the remark that the prose and verse form, within the Pāli canon, possesses much further reaching significance than for those texts merely. Were there need, the theory of the prose and verse form could be still further confirmed by these wider fundamentals. Take, for instance, the narrative occurring at the beginning of the *Mahāvagga* (Vinaya

base of the whole (notice also the similarity in the Jātaka verses, and the difference in the Jātaka prose, in those Jain parallels, in the case which Charpentier discusses, *ZDMG.* LXII, 728). Comparisons between the Pāli texts and the *M. vastu* (which Windisch has so successfully made concerning important episodes in the traditional story of Buddha) must also be made for the Jātakas (as a continuation of Charpentier's work); and these comparisons must be the most extensive possible, and must include all accessible Northern material.

Piṭaka) of the first events after the Buddha's attainment of Buddhahood. That we are concerned with an old text belonging to the bedrock of Buddhist literature, anyone, who cannot see this fact for himself, may learn from Windisch's investigations.[1]

In this section, the main part of which is in prose, we find, *e.g.*, the following: Buddha doubts lest it be futile to announce his doctrine to mankind. *Gāthās* arise in his mind: "With labour have I attained it; all too deep and difficult is it: they that are wrapt in darkness will not see it" (verses). Then Brahmā approaches him and expresses the desire that he would teach. The request of the god passes into a verse: "In Magadhaland formerly impure doctrine was announced; preach thou from the height of thy knowledge the pure Word." Buddha glances over the world and recognizes that there are beings on whom the labour of teaching will not be lost. Then he speaks a *gāthā* to Brahmā: "May the gates of immortality be opened to those who have ears" (chap. V). Now the Master arises and journeys to Benares. The ascetic Upaka meets him and speaks: "Radiant appearest thou! Who is thy teacher?" (prose). Buddha replies in *gāthās*: "I am the allknowing. No teacher have I. My like there is not. I go to Benares to roll the Wheel of the Doctrine in the benighted world" (chap. VI). And so, in like manner, the interweaving of prose and verse continues. Mārā "went thither where the Exalted One was; when he had arrived, he addressed the Exalted One with a *gāthā*," and verse for verse follow the speeches of Mārā: "Bound art thou with every band," etc., and Buddha's replies (chap. XI.). Later on, after Buddha has converted Uruvela-Kassapa and is journeying with him, doubts arise among the people as to which of the two is the teacher and which the scholar. Then Buddha speaks to Kassapa a *gāthā*: "How comes it, Kassapa, that thou hast left thy sacrificial fire?" And again follows, verse for verse,

[1] "Die Komposition des *Mahāvastu*," *ASGW.* Phil. Hist. Kl. Bd. XXVII, *n.* 14.

Kassapa's answer, new question, and new answer: "I have beheld the sanctuary of peace, and therefore take no further pleasure in sacrifice" (chap. XXII).

In very many places of the Piṭakas—I allude especially to the *Sutta-Nipāta*—we find this interweaving of prose and verse. Here we have essentially and obviously the same form as in the Jātakas.[1] But is there any necessity to point out how entirely arbitrary it would be to see in such verses borrowings, perhaps, from old Buddha epics, perhaps even from mimetic Buddha mysteries? The true interpretation, I take it, is plain. This age feels it natural to interrupt the even flow of simple recording at certain points; for instance, where weighty matters are spoken of, where mental tension is tightened or relaxed, where pregnant words are let fall, but also where triumphant sagacity succeeds in unravelling a difficult riddle, where through such sagacity's keen perception of the Particular the Universal is revealed—at such and similar points is the even step interrupted. It is not felt sufficient to express at such points merely the necessary. The inner emotion of the speaker and of those whom he allows to speak must find expression. Sharp accentuation is aimed at. There is a desire to describe how beautiful or sublime, how terrible, how significant, perhaps, too, how laughable is this or that, how in their course abiding systems manifest themselves.[2] It is then that the author rises from prose to verse form. By this we know that at this point a height is reached which it is fitting to adorn by art. In the midst of the unmeasured indefiniteness of the prose diction appear formations of another kind, welded, rounded off, and gathering into themselves the essence of the whole. Non-Indian parallels might be adduced, but I refrain. The Indian materials speak sufficiently for themselves. It is quite too narrow a conception that only a prose form,

[1] Cp. also Winternitz, *WZKM.* XXIII, 130; Rhys Davids, *Buddh. India,* 180 ff.

[2] My short paraphrase of the section from the Buddha legend can scarcely illustrate this; the text itself must be read.

or only a poetic form, can justify its existence, and that, when a mixture of both is found, it must follow that a prose-writer is quoting a poetic text. That mixed form has deeper roots.

My conception of the Jātaka as a prose-poetic Ākhyāna appearing to me on this wise established, I should like to speak very shortly, with reference to Keith's discussion, on the significance of these Ākhyānas for the question of the Ṛgvedic Ākhyāna, and, further, as to how matters stand in regard to some works which I take to be Ākhyānas of the later Vedic age.

Keith notes, apparently in order to lower the importance of the Jātakas for the whole problem (p. 985), that the "composition of the tales" (of the Jātaka) cannot be dated. I will here put aside the archæological Jātaka records. But it may be remembered that, independently of the Jātaka collection, the existence of a number of prose and verse Jātakas is attested by the great Piṭaka texts. Concerning the age of these I have no need to speak here; that it is in every case considerable will not, or should not, be disputed.[1] I cannot adopt the standpoint that Keith apparently takes (p. 986), that these literary strata are altogether too recent to be brought into the problem of the Vedic Ākhyāna. Let it be considered how closely associated as a matter of literary history the old Buddhist didactic dialogue is with that of the Upaniṣads; how similar, for instance, the riddle verses of the Buddhists are to the Vedic ones, or how, in the prosody of the canonical Pāli texts, we hear the distinct echoes of Vedic laws, obliterated later.[2]

If then, the interval between the Buddhist Ākhyānas and those I accept as such in the Ṛgveda were empty of testimony to this literary species, such a fact would scarcely

[1] I shall on another occasion return to this (cp. above, p. 21, *n.* 2).

[2] Cp. my remarks, "Gurupūjākaumudī," 9 ff. (*NGGW.* 1909, 228 ff.).

arouse suspicion. For as the surviving epic texts have almost throughout already taken the step from the old Ākhyāna form to the form which is poetical throughout, such testimony can only be looked for—at least, as to the main point—within the Vedic literature. This literature has, however, so much to do with theologisms, sacrificial rites, and such like, that an omission from it of such testimony might well be comprehensible, and in no case could we expect to find more than a rare occurrence of anything of the kind.[1]

Such occurrences can, however, be actually demonstrated with the greatest certainty. I refer first of all to the Suparṇādhyāya. How completely Hertel's interpretation of this text as drama (*WZKM.* 23, 273 ff.) is up in the air has not escaped Keith (p. 1,004). The text itself is expressly characterized in two places (1, 5; 31, 7) as *ākhyānam*. If these are only appendices to the text they yet have the weight of old evidence. That that may have originally signified "drama," Hertel (*op. cit.*, 338) may be at liberty to believe. For me the story-like character of the text is sufficiently clearly pronounced in that catchword. And as this narrative, as it stands, obviously needs materially supplementing, it is necessary, for the question how to imagine them, to go to that Brāhmaṇa passage (*Ait. Br.* VII, 18, 10, 11), where a priest *ākhyānam . . . ācaṣṭe* to the king. This brings me to the Śunaḥśepa story. About the Suparṇādhyāya I will only first say that Keith (p. 1,004), who does not believe in Hertel's theory

[1] I pass by for the moment the known case in which narratives are woven into the discussion of rites—narratives which have for the most part, though not throughout, a pure prose form (see below, p. 45 f.). Explanations of a rite in narrative form and narrative as such are two somewhat different things. If in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the story is related of the Flood or of Cyavana in order to explain the rite of the *iḍā* or of the *āśvina graha*, that is not on the same lines as when, in the Aitāreya Br., an *ākhyāna* is given, which the Hotar tells the King, and the manner in which he tells it is described. The value of the one and of the other testimony for the question of the literary type of the narrative proper is, in my opinion, altogether different.

(drama), believes just as little in mine (Ākhyāna).[1] He does not say what raises his doubts about it, apart from his general distrust towards prose and verse narratives. Nor does he say how he on his part comes to terms with the gaps which need supplementing.

Now, in the Śunaḥśepa story we can distinguish with, as I have thought and still think, unambiguous clearness a union of prose and verse, the prose pervading the whole and upholding the coherence of the whole. More accurately the union is with three groups of verse. Keith attempts to deny to one after the other their significance in the sense of the prose and verse Ākhyāna (p. 989). I can by no means accept his reasons.

Firstly (Ait. Br. VII, 13), the King's question to Nārada and Nārada's answer as to the blessing a son brings to the father. "We have simply here a fragment of a gnomic poem, or rather poems taken over bodily."

The address *Nārada* in connection with the preceding prose sentence, *tasya ha Parvatanāradau gṛha ūṣatuḥ*, seems to me quite unambiguously to connect the verses with the situation, here explicitly stated and so usual in the epic, of a great sage visiting a king.[2] The fact that gnomic matter follows does not arouse the least doubt in the genuineness of the connection with the framework of narrative. The great epic, as well as the Jātakas, can illustrate how the tendency to intersperse the narrative with moralizings ran in the Indian blood.[3] It is instructive to meet this connection here already, but not a matter for suspicion. Even if verses from another source are woven into the prose—

[1] Anyway, he verifies "the fact that part of the tale is certainly narrative."

[2] Does the vocative *brahmāṇaḥ* in § 7 point to a different situation from that presented in the prose framework? I scarcely believe it. The blessing of fatherhood is to be magnified here by contrast with the importance of *tapas*, as it is, in the context, under other aspects. This thought might easily lead to the use of that vocative.

[3] In the Vedic examples of such a mixture of narrative and moralizing is the text quoted in Baudh. Dharm. II, 2, 3, 33 ff. perhaps also to be reckoned in?

which we cannot of course positively deny—why could we not judge as we did above concerning the Jātakas (p. 30)?

The second verse group (chap. XV) is supposed to represent "another little gnomic poem." A vocative *Rohita* appears. As Indra is represented as speaking to the Prince Rohita, I think that that fits in excellently. The verse in question will have been composed for this connection; at all events will have been adapted to it. I really cannot understand what, in view of this harmless and unlaboured conception, can be urged in favour of Keith's mistrustful theory. This gnomic poem is supposed to have been addressed to some Rohita; from that the Rohita of this story is supposed to derive his existence. But the Prince, of whose wanderings we here learn, will certainly have had a name in the story from the beginning. Why not Rohita, as it is related? And why may not the verse, which is represented as being addressed to him, have been actually addressed to him, and for that reason contain the vocative *Rohita?* Have we any ground for twisting this simple matter? May not the *flair*, which permits the philologist to discover mystification and deceit in the texts, be just a little too subtle?[1]

In the third verse-group there is no longer gnomic purport. Ajīgartā, Śunaḥśepa, Viśvāmitra, and his sons are speaking. The subject is Viśvāmitra's adoption of Śunaḥśepa, and the position the latter will take among Viśvāmitra's sons. That is, we are told, an independent poem worked into the text, without connection with Hariścandra or Rohita. But consider how often and how naturally, in somewhat longer narratives, the action is grouped round new central points, especially where the feeling for rigid unity of action is less developed. New characters, new motives, are introduced. If the critic here,

[1] I note, further, that I am just as little convinced, when Keith remarks, on the separation of the verses always by means of the same prose sentences: "there cannot be the slightest doubt that the separation is artificial." Every verse stands, just as the text gives it, as a variation on the common theme. This situation, recurring year after year, and this correspondingly recurring moralizing, seem to me beyond suspicion.

all too intent on disclosing in what he sees before him the traces of transforming and adulterating factors, were to conclude everywhere that foreign matter had been put together into a merely apparent whole, where should we come to?[1] We shall not, of course, dispute the fact as such, that processes of patchwork in the history of the stories have played a fairly prominent rôle. As to that, it seems to me that the products of such patchwork ought not to be simply ruled out of the question when discussing the form in which stories are told; even such composites will generally keep within a prescribed form. But for our particular case, it seems to me that the separateness of the verses in the concluding act of the story from what has preceded them is by no means so complete as is assumed by Keith. Śunaḥśepa says there to Ajīgarti: *Adarśus tvā śāsahastam ... gavāṃ trīṇi śatāni tvam avṛṇīthāmad Aṅgiraḥ*. And again, in what follows, the verses bear reference to the event herein alluded to. It is true that Hariścandra and Rohita are not mentioned by name. But is not the mention of how Ajīgarti let himself be bribed by 300 cows to murder his son, at once a reference to the buyer, and to the events which have brought about the purchase? Thus, if these verses point back to what lies before and outside them, the earlier parts of the narrative provide us with the necessary information concerning and exactly corresponding to that reference. So that I really do not know why we are not to believe that the one and the other—without secondary adaptations or misleading disguises of other matter contained in them—belong as

[1] May I adduce, for purposes of comparison, something in the same connection? The welding of the Ṛgvedic material to form sacrificial liturgies differs, as is acknowledged, often and materially from its construction in the Ṛksaṃhitā. Here the tendency arose to conclude from this fact that the façade of our Ṛgveda was, to a great extent, only façade; that much of what was seen revealed itself to criticism as composed of quite different forms lying behind it. How this distrust of what has been handed down to us—this tendency to look behind imagined curtains—should, in my opinion, be regarded, I have set forth in *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1907, 218 ff.

much together as they appear to do. Hereby, then, as was argued in the discussion on the Jātakas, there is hardly any inducement left to discover behind the verses interspersed with prose "an independent poem."

If we look back on the Śunaḥśepa story as a whole, the result will, I think, be essentially different from Keith's, "that if the story of Śunaḥśepa is a genuine Ākhyāna, no more extraordinary literary type ever existed." That the well-known interweaving of the Ṛgvedic hymns[1] (which is not alluded to above) does not correspond to their true nature, is a thing apart, cannot surprise us here, where it is no ordinary tale-teller who narrates, but a Ṛtvij, when we consider the ideas held in the Brāhmaṇa age as to the beginnings of Ṛgvedic poetry.

But for the rest I see nothing but a sufficiently passable coherent narrative, in which important dialogues appear in verse form. The prose narrates soberly and monotonously, indicating merely the events, but the gnomic wisdom embodied in the speeches urges strongly towards verse-form; so does the passion of the dialogue between father and son, the pathos of the blessing which Viśvāmitra utters over his obedient sons. At the conclusion two verses, not in dialogue, which comprise the final result, portray a picture of the order and happiness which have grown out of all the suffering. What can there be so remarkable and suspicious in that?[2]

We saw (p. 36) that, as in the Buddhist literature, the interweaving of verses in the prose of the Jātakas proved to be only one instance of a more general feature. So we find correspondingly in the Vedic prose texts the same form of portrayal at least scattered here and there, also in smaller

[1] I revert below (p. 47, *n.* 1) to the part played by these Ṛgvedic hymns.

[2] In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa there is probably another isolated Ākhyāna verse (V, 30, 11) in the strophe of the Lotus thief, which is there introduced with the words *tad yad ado gāthā bhavati* (in the text of the strophe clearly to be read *apa yo jahāra;* also *ruṇaddhu?* But cp. Jāt. 488, verse 2, *bhavanti*. The corruption might depend upon § 12). Cp. Hopkins' *Great Epic*, 381 *n.* 3; Geldner, *ZDMG.* LXV, 306 f. See also Charpentier, *ibid.*, LXIV, 65 ff.

dependent narratives.[1] I select a few instances only. In the Brāhmaṇa narrative, which for the rest is in prose, where Indra comes to Manu in the form of a sacrificial priest, the brahmin answers the question as to who he is with a verse, *kim brāhmaṇasya pitaram*, etc. (*Maitr. S.*, p. IV, 8, 1, cp. Kāṭh. XXX, 1; so also, with the Buddhists, a *gāthā* of the Sundarikabhāradvājasutta, *Sutta-Nipāta* 462). In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XI, 5, 5, there is introduced into a peculiar narrative—the commentator characterizes it as *ākhyāyikā*—a fight between gods and Asuras, connected with a sacrifice completed at Janamejaya. In the middle of the prose are verses, in which the gods speak to Prajāpati, Prajāpati to the gods, and the Dānavas confess their defeat.[2] As conclusion: *ity asurarakṣasāny apeyuḥ*, as it is usually called with the Buddhists, when Māra and Buddha have interchanged verses: *atha kho Māro pāpimā tatthevantaradhāyīti*. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad IV, 3, narrates in prose how a brahmacārin begs from two brahmins. They give him nothing. Then he speaks—first a verse of mystical contents, containing the names of both in the vocative, and then the complaint, in prose, that nothing has been given to him. Whereupon one of the two considers, and for his part replies in like mystical verse. Finally prose: the beggar is given something to eat. *Ibid.* V, 11, prose statement: some men seek a teacher in order to gain theosophic instruction. They are directed to King Aśvapati. The latter speaks contentedly of the virtue prevalent in his kingdom. The *śloka* follows: *Na me steno janapade na kadaryo na madyapo, nānāhitāgnir nāvidvān na svairī svairiṇī kutaḥ.* Thus here also, in a prominent place of the story, is a verse in the middle of the prose. The Kaṭhopaniṣad may be mentioned here as a yet more significant piece, which begins with prose,

[1] I mentioned above (p. 41, *n.* 1) that such short narratives woven into the Brāhmaṇas are, as a rule, in pure prose.

[2] In par. 13, Eggeling wrongly avoids the translation, "We Dānavas do not understand," etc., by which the Dānavas are shown to be the speakers.

then gives the reflection of Naciketas in verse, then again prose, and then the discussion of Naciketas and Yama in verse. Keith, indeed (985 *n.* 1), thinks that this is in some measure similar to the Ākhyāna type. He remarks, however, that the source of the Upaniṣad TB, III, 11, 8, is only in prose; that the Upaniṣad proves nothing as to the earlier Vedic age. Anyway, the obviously pre-Buddhist text will be welcomed as a warrant for the prose-poetic form standing midway between the old Vedic and the Buddhist age.

Hence, when all is said, it is in no way possible to affirm such a severance of Buddhism from the Vedic period as would debar our bringing evidence from the one to serve for the other. Matter handed down in very different fields is linked together in the evidence it affords of the mixed prose and verse type. If particular instances seemed to resist the attempt to explain them away, one matter gave confirmation to the conception afforded of another. Accordingly my theory of that type will also appear plausible from the outset for the older Vedic time. However, I do not intend here to begin again to discuss Vedic material itself to see whether in it my theory does not find confirmation. I will pause at the threshold of the Ṛgveda. I would only like, in conclusion, to touch upon just one objection which Keith makes (p. 987 f.) against my ideas about the prose and verse Ākhyāna. He finds it hard to follow my assumption, indispensable in so many instances, of the loss of the prose portions, in view of the remarkable preservation of Vedic prose-texts like the Brāhmaṇas.[1]

[1] I purposely mention here only the Brāhmaṇas, not the prose *mantras* of the Yajurveda. For the latter, permeated through and through with ritualistic sanctity, had naturally from the outset a chance of preservation, which lifts them above comparability with the prose of stories, and, in my opinion, with that of the Brāhmaṇas as well. Where Keith (p. 988) seems to regard as the ultimate basis of the Yajurvedic literature texts, in which those *mantras* were inseparably bound up with a prose explaining both them and the rites I cannot agree. I refer to my investigations in *Hymnen des Ṛgveda*, Prolegomena, 1888, 290 ff, especially 294 ff.

Keith himself feels that the objection loses its force as soon as facts are produced, in which that which was hard to comprehend yet comes to pass. I have endeavoured to indicate such facts in the foregoing. But I should like to remove that incomprehensible also, so far as it can be removed. I cannot of course be expected to prove that no other course was conceivable but the one which took place—that preservation of the prose was out of the question; just as the investigator of the Ṛgveda will not expect to be able to prove, that joining the songs to Pavamāna into *one* maṇḍala was the only conceivable alternative to the distribution of the songs to the other gods into all the maṇḍalas.

Now in trying to explain the prevalent loss of the prose in view of the preservation of the verses, I do not of course depend upon the argument that verse is easier to remember. I might fairly be confronted by the Brāhmaṇa prose-texts and the great Buddhist prose sūtras. But is it, then, improbable that the prose of the Ākhyānas appeared essential only according to the sense, and not according to the letter? The description in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of the recital of the Śaunaḥśepam is instructive. Opposite to the officiating priest sits another on an equally sumptuous seat. The latter's whole task consists in responding to every Ṛc which occurs in the discourse with an *om*, to every non-Ṛgvedic verse with a *tathā*. Are not these verses in consequence lifted above the prose context of the narrative as of greater significance, like the *pṛcaḥ*, only of course in a less degree?[1]

[1] It is at the same time noticeable, that the appearance of this priest with his responses of *tathā* characterizes the verses not as purely accidental flotsam, but as being essentially blended with this mode of narrative. Another Ākhyāna, which is expressly named as such, in which Hotar and Adhvaryu also take sumptuous seats, and the Adhvaryu responds with *om* and *tathā*, is the *pāriplavam* (Śat. Br. XIII, 4, 3; Āśv. Śraut. X, 7; Śāṅkh. Śr. XVI, 2); the *om* and *tathā* recall a certain similarity (how far-reaching may be questioned) with the structure of the Śaunaḥśepam. We may recall the narrative addresses described by Śāṅkhāyana Śr. XVI, 11, at the head of which the Śaunaḥśepam stands, which may thus be regarded as being more or less similar

Whether we agree with this estimate or not, it appears to be a fact. Hence it becomes, I think, intelligible—and to this conclusion the situation in the Jātakas points in the same way exactly—that the reciting of the narrative was only (and this is self-evident) tied to the letter, as to the verses, but in the prose part was bound only by the contents.[1]

The countenance conferred hereby on verses in the tradition would be yet intensified, if Ākhyānas were found, already in early times, deserving a place in the orthodox tradition of Vedic lore. The natural place for them was in the Ṛgveda. But here, where everything that was to be learnt was arranged in verse form, the adoption of a mixed prose-and-verse text would have been as ill-suited to the context as the adoption of pure verses was well suited, not to speak of the advantage to be obtained by diminishing the already more than sufficient matter to be learned. When, then, the age of the Brāhmaṇa prose came, its theological contents might seem to the priestly circles, anyway, more urgently to need the exact preservation of a literal text, fixed once for all, than the stories of battles, intrigues, love adventures, and fables.

Let it be remembered how—at least in a number of schools—accentuation of itself raised the reciting of Brāhmaṇa prose into the sphere of a certain ritualistic sanctity.

---

in kind to this. As an integral part of each one of these addresses a Ṛgveda section is introduced. The constant recurrence of these Ṛg.-references suggests that such an element was considered to be essential for the type of that kind of narrative. The whole type may thus be considered as essentially the same, whether secular *gāthās* figured in purely secular narratives, or Ṛg.-verses in the ritualistic use by the Hotar, side by side with those *gāthās* or alone; only that the latter were at hand, and therefore taken over—a matter that cannot be concluded with respect to the former.

[1] That when anywhere in some longer prose text the recital of a story is told or described (Śaunaḥśepam in Ait. Br.; Jātakas in the Vinaya, etc.) reproduction of the prose was involved, is, of course, a matter which stands by itself.

That the lower estimation of the prose portions of the narratives does not harmonize with the demands of the highest literary delicacy of feeling is certainly true. And so this state of things also was surmounted, when in that respect progress had been made. But that it once existed we have —apart from the fact that positive clues point to it— obviously no reason *a priori* to find at all improbable.