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CORRIGENDA

passim: for "Vasudevahimdi" read "Vasudevahimdī"

page 14, bottom: add footnote "Supplementary notes thus signalled will be found at the end of each section of the summary."

19, line 22: for "Vimalabhā" read "Vimalābhā"

20, note 1 line 7: for "vidyadhāras" read "vidyādharas"

21, line 12: delete "between brother and sister"

21, footnote 1, line 1: for "the forest of the lake" read "the thicket of reeds"

24, line 1: for "niyamthā surattham" read "niyamthā surattham"

25, line 14: for "origin" read "origin"*

26, line 1: for "gandhāragrāma" read "gāndhāragrāma"

26, note 1, line 4: for "Umbildung" read "Umbildung"

27, line 2: for "Campa" read "Campā"; for "Bhanu" read "Bhānu"

29, last line: for "Harisiha" read "Harisīha"

33, line 7: for "8000...800,000,000" read "1008...108000"

33, line 15: for "sold" read "mortgaged".

37, line 25: for "bharumdas" read "bharumdas"

38, line 15: for "bharuma" read "bharumda"

40, line 8: after "left" insert "him"

44, line 25: for "sūras" read "suras"

44, line 6: delete "girl"

47, line 9: for "nilanirajanilābhā" read "nilanirajanilābhā"

50, last line: for "Samjñavyākaranam" read "Samjñavyākaranam"

58, line 19: for "dhoti" read "upper garment"

61, line 25: for "vidyadhari" read "vidyādharī"

64, line 8: for "sa" read "sā"

69, last line: for "sahīghihe" read "sahīghihe"

82, line 15: for "800" read "108"

87, note 1, line 2: for "kohāitto" read "kohāitto"

87, note 2: add "or perhaps she had been striking erotic poses."

91, line 14: for "to make him surrender" read "because of a promise to"

95, lines 25 and 28: for "swordsmen" read "sawyers"

95, line 28: for "sword" read "saw"

110, line 16: for "vis'ayesu" read "visayesu"

111, line 14: for "nopabhogaksamam" read "nopabhogaksamam"; for "KSS 16.2.82" read "KSS 16.2.81"
112, line 15: for "vrtah/" read "vrtah//"
112, line 19: for "tvam" read "tvām"
115, line 13: for "ha" read "had"
124, line 20: for "guhyaka" read "guhyaka"
128, line 8: for "Rati" read "Rati"
131, line 17: for "dhamillahimdi" read "dhamillahimdi"; for "Dhamilla" read "Dhamilla"
140, line 9: for "recitent" read "reticent"
140, line 19: for "Maribhūtika" read "Maribhūtika"
143, line 16: for "Vayupatha" read "Vāyupatha"
144, note 1, line 1: for "kadacit" read "kādacit"
147, note 2, line 4: for "ganiyadariga-" read "ganiyādariga-"
152, line 13: for "anjali" read "anjali"
153, line 5: for "ganikas" read "ganikas"
162, line 11: for "sākṣiṣākhāmr̥gandajān" read "sākṣiṣākhāmr̥gandajān"
162, line 21: for "Vikramorvasiśyam" read "Vikramorvasiśyam"
165, line 25: for "Jinendrasena" read "Jinendrasena"
195, line 6: for "Suvarnapbhumi" read "Suvarṇabhumi"
197, line 4: for "VH 14.23-5" read "VH 14.23-5"
205, line 21: for "jāgramiti" read "jāgramiti"
206, line 5: for "pasāhiya" read "pasāhiya"; for "scolding her at the same time" read "with an oath"
207, line 2: for "appropriate" read "inappropriate"
211, line 7: for "Naravahanadatta" read "Naravāhanadatta"
218, line 6: for "elder" read "younger"
242, line 11: for "variyaśi" read "variyaśi"
243, lines 7-8: delete "for...Vasudeva]" and substitute "very much"
243, lines 9-10: delete the words in square brackets
249, line 5: for "ganika" read "ganikā"
253, line 15: for "Vayuvegayaśas" read "Vāyuvegayaśas"
253, line 18: for "Naravahanadatta" read "Naravāhanadatta"
254, line 14: for "saktiyanas" read "saktiyanas"
255, note 1, line 2: for "hriyamānām" read "hriyamānām"
256, line 2: for "Naravahanadatta" read "Naravāhanadatta"
258, line 19: for "BKSS" read "BKSS"
261, lines 11-17: delete the quotation "pranaya- ...reverence."
272, line 22: for "Naravahanadatta" read "Naravāhanadatta"
292, line 16: for "Dhamillahimdi" read "Dhamillahimdi"
305, line 31: for "Samjñākaranam" read "Samjñāvyākaranam"
The Brhatkatha or Great Story, a narrative work highly esteemed in Indian literary history, survives only through the adaptation of a part or a whole of its original material in a number of later narratives. Three surviving works called after the Brhatkatha or claiming descent from it all tell the same story, though with important differences in structure and style. Another work, the Vasudevahimit, which declares no allegiance to the Brhatkatha, has been shown to draw much of its material from that source.

This thesis contains a study of the Vasudevahimit in its own right as a treasure of narrative and in its relationship to the other three works. One of these three, the Brhatkathaasleyokasamgraha, is incomplete; some suggestions are made about how the plot was to have continued on the basis of the preparations for later development that can be found in the extant fragment. Through a study and comparison of all four works, an attempt is made to answer the question, what can and what cannot be known about the Brhatkatha. This study emphasizes on the one hand the essential unity of the story material, and on the other hand the qualities of each separate version as a work of literature. It aims to judge the works by criteria appropriate to their special nature, and so to recommend the reading of them for enjoyment and instruction.
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It is often the practice when discussing works in Middle Indian languages, and especially when comparing them with Sanskrit works, to Sanskritize proper names. In general I have not followed this practice; however I have used the Sanskrit forms of common nouns like *vidyādhara* even when referring to the *Vasudevahimdrī*. Certain common nouns like "brahman" I take to be established English words, though "brahman" looks strange beside *kṣatriya*. Consistency in this as in other matters seems unattainable; I have respected inconsistencies in the spelling of proper names between texts (Madanamaṇjukā/Madanamaṇcukā) and to a certain extent within texts (Hepphaya/Hephaga). The translations of passages from the *Kathāsaritsāgara* are based on Tawney's translation, with some silent alterations; the others are my own except where acknowledgements are made.

I have used these acronymic abbreviations; certain other titles cited in abbreviated form (Lacôte, *Essai*) may be found in full in the bibliography:

*BB:* Budhasvāmin's *Brhatkathālokasamgraha*

*BKM:* *Brhatkathāmaṇjarī*

*BKŚS:* *Brhatkathālokasamgraha*

*GUP:* Gunabhadra's *Uttarapurāṇa*

*HTr:* Hemacandra's *Trīṣaṭṭihalākāpuruṣacaritra*

*HP:* Harivaṃśapurāṇa

*JHP:* Jinasena's *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*

*KSS:* *Kathāsaritsāgara*

*VH:* *Vasudevahimdrī*
Parts of the chapters "Priyadarśanā" and "Bhaṛatrayaśas" have already appeared in an article of mine ("Budhasvāmin's Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha continued") in the Indo-Iranian Journal, to which acknowledgements are hereby made.

It gives me great pleasure to acknowledge the help and hospitality, scholarly and otherwise, which as a stranger from another discipline I received from Professor J.W. de Jong and all the members of the Department of South Asian and Buddhist Studies. Most of all I must thank Mrs L.A. Hercus, my supervisor, who corrected my worst mistakes and gave this study such philological depth as it possesses. My thanks are also due to Miss K.J. Walker, who in typing my manuscript removed many faults of expression and other mistakes besides.
INTRODUCTION

This study is an expression of the pleasure to be found in Indian stories. It takes the form of a comparison of four story books, and an examination of their relationship to one another. All four, Saṅghadāsa's Vasudevaśāstra, Budhasvarmin's Brhatkathālokaṇasamgraha, Kṣemendra's Brhatkathāmahājārī and Somadeva's Kathāsaritśāgara, are descended from the Brhatkathā of Gunāḍhya, which since long ago has been no more than a legend. Much of the research in this area has concentrated on the problems of the original BK: its historicity, date, language, structure and literary qualities. I believe that, unless new material close to the source of the BK tradition is discovered, further research on these problems can only refine or multiply the existing hypotheses without attaining greater certainty. But the surviving versions deserve to be kept alive by reading and discussion, so that their virtues will not be neglected either because they have been underestimated or because they have been exaggerated in the past. In fact, the reputation of Indian narrative can only be enhanced by the evolution of modern literary theory and criticism away from an exclusive preoccupation with the literature of Europe and America of the last two or three centuries.¹

Nevertheless, hypotheses about the BK will continue to inform the study of its descendants, for the following reasons. The three works that proclaim their descent from the BK refer to Gunāḍhya as a storyteller of boundless fertility. Now a great story book, as

¹ Here I quote Maten, BB 1.
distinct from an epic or a novel, gives the impression that its only
limit is an arbitrary one, imposed by human frailty or artifice:
the twenty-five tales of a vetāla, the thirty-two tales of a royal
throne, the seventy tales of a parrot, the tales of a thousand and
one nights; were it not for that, the stories would go on for ever.
In the BK tradition this special quality resides in the person of
Gunāḍhya. It is least prominent in the BKŚŚ, the most like a novel
of the three works; Budhasvāmin merely alludes to Gunāḍhya in these
deliberately ambiguous verses:

\[
\text{rājño mānasavegasya rājiyaṁ no varṇyatām iti//}
\text{tābhyaṁ uktam aśakyaṁ tad guṇāḍhyenaśaṁsitum/}
\]

"Tell us about the government of king Mānasavega." They
said, "Not even Guṇāḍhya would be able to sing its praises."

BKŚŚ 14.59-60

Ksemendra and Somadeva describe in full the descent of the story:
how it was first told by Śiva to Pārvatī, and how it thence came to
the world of men. Guṇāḍhya was an intermediary in this process,
and it was his lack of success that imposed on the story its
limitation. We have the touching picture of the poet in the
wilderness reading aloud his composition, which, because it was
written in the barbarous language paiśāci, had been rejected by the
king to whom he had offered it. Only the beasts of the forest
listened, with tears in their eyes, as he recited it leaf by leaf, 
burning each as he finished.¹

Gunāḍhya was actually reciting a composition that he had taken
down from the dictation of another. This recognizes a peculiarity
of the story as a form of literature, that no story is unique, and
that one who recites a story or commits it to writing is a

¹ BKM 1.3.89-91, KŚŚ 1.8.18-21.
transmitter rather than an author. It is true that all literary study engages in a dialectic of type and individual creation, but the study of stories is heavily biased toward comparison, because no single telling of a story is perfect and definitive. Hence the dilemma that in reading the works in the BK tradition we look to their origin, as the authors themselves do, in a more splendid and less limited work long ago, and yet we know that the historical original cannot have been more than one version out of the many possible.

By chance, the four works under study first appeared in print in the reverse order of their composition. The most recent in date is Somadeva's KSS, which was published by Brockhaus in three volumes, the first of which, a text in devanagari script accompanied by a German translation of books 1-5, appeared in 1839. The other two volumes, of the text only in Roman characters, followed in 1862 and 1866. Wilson had already in 1824 brought to the attention of European readers "the Kathā Sarit Sāgara, or, as more generally, though less correctly denominated, the Great Narrative, or Vṛīhat Kathā".\(^1\) The dedication of the KSS to Śūryavatī, mother of Kalaśa the reigning king of Kashmir,\(^2\) establishes the date of the work as falling between his accession and her death, that is, between 1063 and 1082.\(^3\) Hence Somadeva was a younger contemporary of his compatriot Kṣemendra, a fecund writer from a literary family, whose

---

2. praśasti, 11-12.
earliest datable work is the Bhāratamanjari of 1037. In 1871, Burnell described a manuscript of Kṣemendra's Brhatkathāmaniṣṭhā. and in the following year Bühler published a study of the work, examining in particular the author's date, the relationship of the work to Somadeva's KSS, and the claims of both versions to be adaptations of an original in the paisācī language. The work itself was edited and translated in part by Lévi in 1885 and 1886; the editio princeps (and so far unica) of the whole appeared under the imprint of the Nīrṇaya Sāgara Press in 1901.

A third version of the BK, the Brhatkathālokasamgraha of Budhasvāmin, was found amongst a collection of Nepalese manuscripts acquired by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and Lévi brought back another manuscript of the same work from an expedition in Nepal. He entrusted the publication of the work to his pupil Lacôte, who published a text and translation of the first sarga in 1906, and devoted the remainder of his life to the publication of the complete work: the first volume (1-9) appeared in 1908, two further volumes (10-17, 18-20) appeared in 1920 and 1924, and after Lacôte's death in 1925 Renou completed the publication of the remainder (21-28), which appeared in 1929. The date of the BKSS is uncertain; Lacôte on

1 Lévi, "La Brhatkathāmaniṣṭhā de Kshemendra", 400; "... suite et fin", 218.
2 The Academy, September 15, 1871, 447.
3 "On the Vṛihatkathā of Kshemendra".
4 Opp. cît.
6 Lacôte, "Une version nouvelle", 22.
slender prosopographical and palaeographical grounds proposed the eighth or ninth century, but Indian scholars prefer the Gupta period.

Finally, the Vasudevahimi of Saṅghadāsa was published in 1930, having been first brought to the attention of scholars in Europe by Jacobi in 1914. But only in 1935 at the 19th Congress of Orientalists in Rome was its vital importance for the study of the BK revealed by Alsdorf, who afterwards in a series of articles discussed its language, its significance for the history of fiction, and its affinities with other versions of the Vasudeva story. Alsdorf gave the terminus ante quem of Saṅghadāsa's composition as the sixth century, but preferred on linguistic grounds a date several centuries before that.

In order to understand what this Śvetāmbara Jain narrative from the story cycle of the Harivaṃśa has to do with the BK, we must return to the time when the KSS was first printed. In a review of Brockhaus's first volume, Wilson observed that this collection of stories, popularly known as the BK, was in fact by the author's express declaration a compendium of a more extensive work. Having outlined Somadeva's preface, he went on to say:

1 Lacôte, Essai, 147-148.
2 For example Agravala in his preface to the Patna edition of the KSS, p. 7; also, I believe, in his posthumous Brhatkathāśloka-samgraha (Varanasi, 1974), which I have not seen.
3 "Some ancient Jaina works", 574-577.
4 "Eine neue Version der verlorenen Brhatkatha des Gunādhya".
5 "The Vasudevahimi, a specimen of archaic Jaina-Mahārāṣṭrī"; "Zwei neue Belege zur 'indischen Herkunft' von 1001 Nacht"; preface to Harivaṃśapurāṇa.
6 "Eine neue Version", 345; "The Vasudevahimi", passim.
From this it is clear that the Vṛihat Kathā was in all essential respects the same as the present work; but inasmuch as it was written in prose, and with that minuteness of detail which is the soul of all storytelling, it was without doubt a much more animated and interesting compilation.  

Works, vol. 4, 110

The translation of the lines to which Wilson refers has excited much discussion,¹ to which I have nothing to add. Suffice it to notice that Somadeva's profession not to be faithful to the letter of the original while remaining faithful to its spirit poses the question of the BK: what was the original like, if it was not like this? The publication of the BKM gave a second bearing on the problem, though unfortunately this new bearing is too close to the first to be really useful. As Bühler showed,² though Kṣemendra and Somadeva worked independently, they both used the same text as their source; this text was manifestly not the historical BK, because (apart from anything else) it recounted the legend of Guṇāḍhya. Speyer in his Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara also compared the BKM and the KSS, and concluded that Somadeva's poem gives a more faithful representation of the original, but that some of the differences in Kṣemendra's version may be due not to his fancy or to influence from other sources, but to his having kept certain peculiarities of the old BK.³

Lacôte used the BKSS to good effect in his Essai sur Gunāḍhya et la Brhatkathā. Here at last was a truly new bearing, and his reconstruction of the BK based on the BKSS is unlikely ever to be

---

1 Reviewed by Lacôte, who proposes his own translation, Essai, 123-128.
2 "On the Vṛihatkathā of Kshemendra", 308.
3 Studies, 36.
entirely superseded. His comparison of the three works emphasized the superiority of the *BKŚŚ* over the other two in symmetry, that is, the proportion of the main story to the subsidiary stories that are told occasionally by characters in the main story, and in realism. To Lacôte it was axiomatic that a work in which the intrigue of the main story is extensively developed is more authentic than a work in which the subsidiary stories overwhelm the main story. It was also axiomatic that a work which develops the motives of the characters in detail and portrays a broad spectrum of human activities is more authentic than one which does not. In particular, Lacôte argued that a certain confusion of motives in the version of the main story given by Kṣemendra and Somadeva, in which the heroine is the daughter of a princess, disappears if one thinks of her as the daughter of a prostitute as in the *BKŚŚ*. He further showed that the same pretentiousness which in thus elevating the status of the heroine changed the quality of the work from realism into anodyne fantasy explains why two characters in the *BKŚŚ* version, both of whom belong to the merchant class, are missing from the Kashmiri versions. 1 He explained the lack of symmetry in these versions as due to the intervention, somewhere in the history of the *BK* tradition, of a brief summary that eliminated "that minuteness of detail which is the soul of all storytelling" (as Wilson put it), which a later author, the source of the Kashmiri versions, restored as best he could with a mass of irrelevant narrative material. 2 In the *BKŚŚ* the hero, after a brief introduction, tells his own story; Lacôte noticed that Somadeva in the *KŚŚ* seems to acknowledge

---

1 *Essai*, 210-212.
the authenticity of such a first-person narration while himself recounting the hero's adventures in the third person.1

Now, Alsdorf showed that precisely these features of the BKŚŚ which Lacôte judged to be authentic are to be found in the VH, the antiquity of which adds much weight to Lacôte's arguments. We shall examine in due course the characters and incidents which he mentions here:


"Eine neue Version", 348-349

However, the question remains, is this resemblance between the VH and the BKŚŚ a convergence of two independent versions of the BK

1 Essai, 78.
that clearly indicates the nature of a common original, or is it simply proof that one of the two copied the other, in which case no further light is thrown on an ulterior source of the common story material? Possibly, as Lacôte himself nearly admitted,¹ the excellence of the BKŚS is due to its author, not to its source; the faults of the Kashmiri versions may after all go back to the work of Gūṇāḍhya. Some support for such a view may be found in Raghavan's study of Bhoja's Śrīgārāprakāśa.

Bhoja's references to the BK² suggest that he knew a Sanskrit version in which were to be found some of the book divisions regarded as inauthentic by Lacôte, and most remarkably the stories of king Vikramāditya³ which Lacôte rejected, along with other material, from his reconstruction of the BK as spurious additions. The date of Bhoja, the first half of the eleventh century,⁴ would permit us to suppose that the version he knew was the common original of the BKM and the KSS, but to judge by certain of his references this version was different in significant details from the work used by the Kashmiri poets.⁵ Therefore we have in the testimony of Bhoja another bearing on the BK question: a version of the BK independent from the BKM and the KSS but substantially like them in form and content. Raghavan identified this version as the lost Sanskrit

² Examined by Raghavan, Bhoja's Śrīgārāprakāśa, 839-844.
³ Raghavan, 841; Lacôte, Essai, 108-109 emphasizes the anachronism of Naravāhanadatta's hearing the story of Vikramāditya, which Raghavan defends as being Gūṇāḍhya's glorification of his patron, op. cit. 853-854.
⁴ Raghavan, 5.
⁵ Raghavan, 842-843.
translation of the BK by Durvinīta, since that is the only other Sanskrit version of which memory has come down to us;¹ this would confer a very respectable antiquity on the form and content of the Kashmiri versions, since Durvinīta has been dated to the first half of the sixth century. Still, one may reasonably doubt the necessity of this identification: Bhoja's Sanskrit BK may have been a recent work in a tradition different in detail from, but equally as inauthentic as, that known to Kṣemendra and Somadeva. Bhoja also quotes in the paisācī language a story which appears in the BKM and the KSS, and moreover in a part of these works which by Lacôte's theory is a later addition.² If the language of this citation were a guarantee that it came from a copy of the original paisācī BK of Gūḍādhya, then again the authenticity of the Kashmiri versions would be supported, but other explanations seem more likely; for example, that the reputation of the BK inspired later compositions in a literary Prakrit that followed the rules of paisācī as laid down by the grammarians.³

These two examples of Saṅghadāsa's VH and Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa represent, I believe, the two sources of new material for the study of the BK that remain to us: an extensive text that may be compared with the surviving versions, and the testimony of a scholar on versions no longer extant. The publication of Jain narrative texts, especially, is continuing, and we may hope for more valuable insights from this direction. The relevance of the works just named

¹ Raghavan, 844.
² Raghavan, 849-853.
³ That is, in Lacôte's reconstruction of the BK tradition, compositions like the work that both Kṣemendra and Somadeva used as their source, Essai, 206.
to the BK question has been explained with admirable scholarship by Alsdorf and Raghavan; if I express some doubts about the scope of their conclusions, it is because I want to explore an alternative approach which leaves to one side the hope of certainly reconstructing either the original or the tradition in detail. My aim is rather to document the complexity of the tradition in the belief that there lies the clue to the art of storytelling, the creation of ever new stories from material that is always the same.

The body of this thesis is in two parts. The first part is a summary of Sanghadāsa's VH which concentrates on the story of Vasudeva himself, including such minor stories as are relevant to my inquiry, and accompanied by a comparison of this version of the story with selected passages from other versions, mainly Jinasena's Harivāṃśapurāṇa and Hemacandra's Triṣaṭiśālākapuruṣacaritra. The way for this has been shown by Alsdorf in the preface to his Harivāṃśapurāṇa, an edition of part of Puṣpadanta's Mahāpurāṇa. It seemed worthwhile to include both the summary itself and the accompanying notes on the text and its interpretation since no such work has yet been published and the translations of the VH, Konow's in Norwegian and Sandesara's in Gujarati, are rather inaccessible. I have in fact only been able to use photocopied selections from the latter, kindly provided by the India Office Library, London. It would have been desirable to include similar complete summaries of the BKŚŚ, the BKMT and the KSS, but a summary of the first has recently appeared in Maten's Budhasvāmin's Brhatkathāślokasamgraha, and Lacôte's summaries of the latter two are as full as the lesser

---

1 See Essai, 68-122.
importance of these works requires. In any case the second part of
the present work contains extensive enarrations of the material
given by the three BK versions, as well as comparisons of the
different treatment of this material in all four story books,
including again a certain number of comments on text and translation.
Its divisions correspond not to the book-divisions in the surviving
works but to the natural articulations of the story; it thus
represents a definition of the BK, being not a reconstruction of
Gumādhyā's original but a statement about its irreducible element,
the story of Naravāhanadatta.
THE WANDERINGS
OF VASUDEVA

The tale, in principle, a story told by Vyasa, the successor of Mahārāja, to Jagad, the son of a rich merchant of Māyāpani, as part of the universal knowledge that the master passed on to his pupils. Jagad, in his turn, takes Prabhava, the son of Vīśākha, wife of Jayapāla, as his pupil, and the same we have it is told by Kṛṣṇa, the son of Vṛṣṇi, king of Māyāpani, by the Śīla, who finally tells the story as it was told by Vyasa to Jagad. Thus Kṛṣṇa had passed:

A blessed day, during how many lives must I pass before this world, so as to get the fruit of the other lives? Or how many in another world? 129.3-130.

The blessed one replies:

People like Bhāgavatī, who did possess the fruit in this life, have passed by several of them. Vasudeva and others who did possess the fruit in another time (i.e., the pleasure of gods and men at the time of perfection) in the form of an avatāra, 128.11-12.

Hearing this, the king very desirous to know more about Vasudeva and his predecessor:

Therefore the blessed one told the story of Vasudeva and King Dhruva by means of his descendants. This was confirmed by the descendants who followed his feet. Therefore and why should this story of this much be considered true in this very day by those who teach about disruptive, Vyāsa, Alkap and Śīla.

In fact he begins by telling about the wanderings of Vasudeva.
THE ORIGIN OF THE STORY

The VH is, in principle, a story told by Suhama, the successor of Mahavira, to Jambu, the son of a rich merchant of Rayagiha, as part of the universal knowledge that the master passed on to his pupil. Jambu in his turn takes Prabhava, the son of Vijnharaya king of Jayapura, as his pupil, and the VH as we have it is told to Konia, the son of Senia* king of Rayagiha, by the fifth ganadhara (Sejjiambhava, not mentioned by name), who recalls the story as it was told by Mahavira to Konia’s father. King Senia had asked:

O blessed one, during how many lives must I do penance in this world so as to enjoy its fruit in the other life? Or how many in another world? (26.9-10)

The blessed one replied:

People like Dhammilla, who did penance for fruit in this life, have passed over several of them; Vasudeva and others [who did penance for fruit] in another life [enjoy] the pleasures of gods and men at the price of penance in the time of an avasarpini. (26.11-12)

Hearing this the king was curious to know more about Vasudeva and his penance.

Thereupon the blessed one told the story of Vasudeva to king Seniya by means of his omniscience. This was remembered by the mendicants who followed his feet, Abhaya and the others; and then it was told as remembered and is told even today by those who teach about dharma, artha, kama and moksha. (26.14-16)

In fact he begins by telling about the wanderings of Dhammilla (27-76).
THE BASE OF THE STORY

After that the king asks for Vasudeva's story (77.1), and the master begins with an account of the family: the household of the Yādavas at Bāravatī, Vasudeva being the youngest of the ten Dasāras, the sons of Aṃdhagaveśha. His son was Kaṇha; we learn about Kaṇha's son by Ruppini, Pajjunṇa, and about another son of his by Jambavatī, Samba.*

THE OPENING OF THE STORY

One of Vasudeva's wives remarked to him, in the presence of his grandson Pajjunṇa, that he had won his wives during a hundred years of wandering, whereas Samba's wives (about 800 of them) cost Samba no effort at all.* Vasudeva replied:

*Samba kuvadduro iva suhāgayabhogasamtaḥ. maya puṇa paribbhamāme tani suhāni dukkhāni va aṇubhūyāni tani annena puriseṇa dukkarāḥ bojja tti cintemi

Samba is like a frog in a well, enjoying his easily-acquired pleasures. But I think it would be difficult for any other man to experience such joys and pains as I experienced during my wanderings. (110.22-23)

Pajjunṇa naturally wanted to hear the story of these delights and tribulations, and Vasudeva agreed to tell it, once for all, if Pajjunṇa assembled all those who wanted to hear. When all the Yādava elders were gathered about him, Vasudeva began his story. The rest of the work is narrated by him, in the first person when the adventures are his own.

113.20-118.21 Vasudeva first tells how Aṃdhagavāṇi on one occasion asked the sādhu Supaiṭṭha about the previous existence of his son Vasudeva.*
The sādhu told him this story: a certain Namdisena, an orphan, was brought up by his maternal uncle. In the family there were three daughters; the uncle promised to marry one of them to Namdisena, but each in turn as she reached marriageable age refused him. Namdisena was depressed, and saw no reason to go on living. He went to a lonely park intending to hang himself. A sādhu persuaded him by instructive stories to embrace the religion of the Jinas, and he made a name for himself as a man of unshakeable piety. But his rejection still rankled, and when on the brink of self-inflicted death by starvation he made a wish that he would return to human existence in a beautiful form, attractive to women. He was reborn as Vasudeva. Vasudeva then tells how his companion Kamsa was recognized as the son of Uggaseṇa and became king of Mahurā.¹

The action of the VH proper* begins when Vasudeva's father ¹20 Andhagavaṇhi shuts him away because his beauty perturbs the women of Bāravā and distracts people from their duties. Vasudeva escapes from confinement, composes a false suicide-note protesting his innocence, and leaves his city. At the next town he hears news ¹21 which confirms the success of his ruse, and after a night's rest he sets off again, confident that he can wander as he pleases. Coming to Vijayakheda he learns² that the king there, Jiyasattu,* has two daughters Sāmā and Vijaya³ whom he wishes to marry off to a handsome

¹ For a fuller exposition of the preliminary material, see Alsdorf, HP 36-38.
² From two men sitting under a tree outside the city; see below, page 19, n. 1.
³ Called Vijayaseṇā, 282.30 and 367.25, as in the other versions.
and skilful brahman or kṣatriya, one who excels his daughters in the arts of singing and dancing. Vasudeva introduces himself as a brahman, Goyama by name, and indeed proves himself a better dancer and singer than the girls. They ask how it is that he, a brahman, knows the warlike [?]\[^1\] arts, and he explains that it is a small matter for an intelligent man. He marries the girls, and in due course Vijaya produces a son, Akura. But one day someone half recognizes him, and he decides to leave.

\[^1\] sāmyāmiño, 121.29.
*Senia: in JHP, Gautama tells the story to Śrenīka.

*Samba: this material comes in its chronological order in JHP 43, GUP 72, HTr 8.5-7.

*Samba's wives cost him no effort at all: in HTr 8.7.127 ff. Samba boasts of his conquests to Vasudeva, but Vasudeva does not tell the story.

*previous existence of Vasudeva: JHP 18.125-175, HTr 8.2.13-50; not of course told by Vasudeva himself.

*the VH proper: JHP 19.7 onwards, GUP 70.217 onwards, HTr 8.2.115 onwards.

*Jiyasattu: called Sugrīva in HTr, and his daughter is Syāmā. In JHP Sugrīva's daughter is called Somā, on which see Alsdorf, HP 97; note however that here Sugrīva is a music teacher, not a king, 19.53-54; compare Alsdorf, HP 99.
Vasudeva heads north, and travels a long way, turning east in sight of the Himavānta mountains into the Kūmjarāvatta forest. He pauses at a lake, to which a herd of elephants comes. He decides to tame the leader of the herd, and does so, but no sooner has he mounted on the now docile beast than two aerial beings carry him off and put him down in a garden on a mountain; then after introducing themselves as Pavaṇāvega and Accimālī, they depart.¹

A middle-aged woman then approaches, introduces herself as the warden of the lady Sāmalī, a daughter of king Asaṇivega, and says that he was brought to the garden on Asaṇivega's orders by his ministers Pavaṇāvega and Accimālī because the king wished to give him his daughter in marriage. Vasudeva is bathed and beautified on the spot by a crowd of attendants, and led into the city, cheered by the people. Asaṇivega bids him welcome, offers him half his kingdom and, at an auspicious moment, marries him to Sāmalī. After the marriage, when they are alone, Sāmalī asks Vasudeva to promise never to be separated from her, and explains why:

Here on the south plateau of Veyaddha there is a city called Kiṃnarāgīya, of which Accimālī was king. He had two sons, Jalaṇāvega and Asaṇivega. Jalaṇāvega had a son by his wife Vimālabhā, called Amgāraka; Asaṇivega had a daughter by his wife

¹ As Alsdorf acutely notes (HP 99) the function of these two beings is to transfer Vasudeva, a man, to the world of the vidyādharas. But the two men mentioned p.16 n.2 above are surely not, as he says, "einfach Dubletten... zu den beiden Vidy.s" (ibid.). Rather they are comparable to the man of Campā 126.22, the brahman of Girikūḍa 182.13, the man of Ilāvaddhaṇa 218.1 and so on; the traveller's first contact with a strange place. But again, it is true that the helpful man tends to be alone, whereas helpful vidyādharas often come in pairs; compare Amiyagati's sons in laṁbha 3, Vihīṣaṇa's in 14.
Suppabhā, Śamalī herself. Accimālī, instructed by Jain monks, conceived disgust for the world and passed his kingdom and his science Paṇṇattī on to Jalaṇavega. Jalaṇavega in his turn retired from the world, leaving his kingdom to Asaṇivega and Paṇṇattī to Ṛṣṣik. The dowager Vimalabhā resented the loss of her authority in the household, and incited her son Ṛṣṣik to depose Asaṇivega.

Asaṇivega and Śamalī thereafter lived in exile on Mount Kailāsa. A monk, a colleague of Accimālī's, kindly predicted that Asaṇivega would regain his kingdom with the help of a certain man: the father of the future ruler of half Bharata. And how was he to be recognized? He would contend with a wild elephant in the Kumjaravatta forest. On learning this, Asaṇivega and Śamalī took up residence there, and men daily patrolled the forest in search of Vasudeva. News reached Ṛṣṣik that the fated man had been found; and Ṛṣṣik, Śamalī concludes, will surely try to kill Vasudeva.

Now the vidyādhāras have a rule that any of their kind who kills an enemy in the company of a monk, in a Jain temple, or when he is sleeping with his wife, shall lose his science. Therefore Vasudeva should not leave her side.

---

1 Compare 227.13-15, in which the third — and operative — interdiction concerns rape. The present rule seems to be adapted from that mentioned at 264.21-22, which applies to those siddhavijjas who commit an offence against a Jain temple, a mendicant monk or a couple. The nāga king Dharāra is responsible for the rule. It is not obvious why he should have authority over the vidyādhāras, unless there be some connection between this and the fact that Udayana enjoyed the hospitality of the nāgas (Adaval, Story of King Udayana, 48-50) and his son Naravāhanadatta became commander of the vidyādhāras.
They live together in the Kūmāravatta forest,¹ and Sāmalī teaches Vasudeva the art of music and two sciences, ḫaṃḍhavimokkha ("that which releases from bonds") and pattalahuīya ("that of being as light as a leaf"). Once, after Vasudeva has fallen asleep with Sāmalī, he awakes to find that he is being carried off through the air by a man whom he recognizes as Amgaraka from his resemblance to Sāmalī. Vasudeva resolves to fight his captor but finds himself immobilized.* Just then Sāmalī arrives, and tries by persuasion and (failing that) by menace to make her brother release her husband. Amgaraka drops Vasudeva, and he falls into a disused well full of palāla grass. He looks up to see the battle between brother and sister; Amgaraka slices Sāmalī in two with his sword, she becomes two Sāmalīs, then she strikes (or they strike) at Amgaraka and he becomes two...

Vasudeva turns from this battle of illusion² to his own predicament: standing uncomfortably in a well, abandoned by the sciences,³ with darkness all around. Seeing points of light in the darkness, he at first takes them for a tiger's eyes; but when after a certain time

---

¹ saravane, 125.20: "the forest of the lake"). This conflicts with the mention of the city of Asāṇivega, 123.21 ff., on which conflict see Alsdorf, HP 101; he concludes that the story is "eine irrtümliche Neuerung"). There is confusion here, but one can see what the author meant if one compares the case of another deposed king, Vijjuvega in lambha 14. His children live in rustic exile, but in a palace in a city nevertheless.

² māyā esā eesīm, 126.2-3. By contrast the kāussagga which Vasudeva is forced to assume in the well is dāvvao, "in earnest".

³ The author allows his hero a brief tenure of the two sciences so that he will not remain immobilized, and so that he will not be hurt in his fall. But then they are withdrawn in the phrase tato vijjadevayā hasīna adarisaapg gayā, "then the deity of science with a laugh disappeared" (126.4-5).
no tiger has leapt upon him, he concludes that there must be a house nearby with a lamp in the window. At dawn he climbs out of the well.*

* He pauses at a lake: called Jalāvarta in JHP and HTr.

* in a garden: called Kuñjarāvarta in HTr. In JHP, the city is called Kuñjarāvarta, the garden Sarvakāmika. On these names see Alsdorf, HP 100-101, and compare note 1, page 21 above.

* finds himself immobilized: As Aṃgāraka says, bhuyaṃgamaṃ ko avijjo geṇheī, "who takes hold of a snake without using a charm?", 125.25-26. Compare BKŚŚ 15.76, vandhyas tu tava saṃkalpaḥ phūtkāro vāsuker iva mantrayantritavīryasya.

* climbs out of the well: he has no difficulty in climbing out, because the well is full of palāla grass. Now palāla grass elsewhere breaks the hero's fall (247.14); Alsdorf (HP 102) pointed out that since his fall is thus made harmless, the science of falling as lightly as a leaf is a "Verbesserung"; so in JHP 19.113, GUP 70.258 and Puṣpadanta Mahāpurāṇa 83.13.3 Vasudeva at this moment falls harmlessly into a lake thanks to a vidyā parṇalaghī. Alsdorf continues, "Es ist klar, dass von diesem Zauber ursprünglich überhaupt nicht die Rede war; in der Tat fehlt er im Br. K. Śl. S. an der erwähnten Stelle" (ibid); but Vegavatī in the BKŚŚ does summon her family science and orders that Naravāhanadatta should fall yathā pattram (15.95).
When Vasudeva climbs out of the well he learns from a bystander that the country where he finds himself is Āṅgā, and the nearby city, Campā. He reveres the tīrthaṅkara Vāsupūja in a temple devoted to his cult. Coming out of the temple he sees a youthful crowd all with vīṇās in their hands, and a waggon of vīṇās which people are pressing to buy. He asks someone the reason for this preoccupation with vīṇās. In Campā, the man explains, there is a āśrūṭhin called Cārudatta, rich as Kubera. He has a most beautiful daughter called Gāmdhavvadattā, who is greatly accomplished in music. Every brahman, kṣatriya and vaiśya is busily practising his playing, because the man who can beat her at her skill shall have her as his wife. Every month there is a contest; the last was yesterday, and there will be another in a month's time.*

Vasudeva decides to stay and compete, and asks for the names of the best music teachers in Campā. Suggīva and Jasaggīva,¹ he is told.

Dissimulating both his wealth and his intelligence, he presents himself at Suggīva's home. The teacher refuses him, but Vasudeva slips a jewelled bracelet to his wife, and she ensures his admission. Suggīva hands Vasudeva a vīṇā and asks him to show what he can do. Vasudeva breaks the strings at his first attempt. "They were old," says the teacher's wife. "He will learn, gradually." He gives a song:

¹ Jayaggīva, text: an error for Jasaggīva (compare 133.3), as in the other versions.
eight mendicant monks came to Surattha and sat down under a kaviṭṭha tree. The tree fell down and broke their crown...

(VH 127.15-16)

His fellow students roar with laughter. "The merchant's daughter doesn't know that one, does she?" asks Vasudeva. In short, he plays the fool until the time for the contest comes around.

Suggīva refuses to let Vasudeva accompany him and the other pupils to the contest; Vasudeva slips his wife another bracelet. She sends him off with her blessing, giving him fine clothes, flowers and pān.¹

When Vasudeva arrives at the audience hall where the contest is to be held, Suggīva and his pupils disown him but Cārudatta himself, to the amazement of the company, offers him a seat.

Vasudeva notices on the wall a painting of two elephants. He remarks to his neighbour that one of the pair is very young. "Can you tell the age of elephants even in a painting?" the other asks.

For confirmation of his opinion, Vasudeva orders a bucket of water and young elephants to be brought in. The young elephants playfully spray one of the painted elephants with the water (recognizing it as their coeval). Everyone admires this feat.²

---

¹ tambola°, 127.23 and compare 352.9; a criterion for dating the VH? See Speyer, Studies 49.

² This interpretation assumes that appāũ 127.30 and bālarūvāṇī 128.1 refer to young elephants; compare Alsdorf, HP 103, where the words are respectively translated "kurzlebig" and "Kinder".
Gamdhavavadattā arrives, and waits behind a curtain. No one in the assembly dares to play. The examiners of the contest say, "She may as well go," but Vasudeva says, "No: let us see her special skill." Cārudatta commands a ṛnā to be brought for him to play. Vasudeva rejects it, saying that there is something inside which makes it unplayable; the offending object is a hair.1 Another ṛnā he rejects because it has a harsh tone being made from the wood of a burnt tree, and a third because its tone lacks depth — it was made from wood that had soaked in water. The fourth he accepts, asking only that his seat be changed for a better one. Then Cārudatta asks him to play the vinhūgīś (or vinhūgīyaga), the Viṣṇu song, if he knows it. Vasudeva has previously heard the song; because the assembly is curious, he tells the story of its origin2 (which I give in a very brief form).

Vinhukumāra by dint of ascetic practices acquired certain superhuman powers. He came to the rescue of a community of sādhus, threatened by Namū the purohita of king Mahāpauma of Hatthināpura. Vinhukumāra asked Namū on behalf of the sādhus for three paces of land. This was granted. But Vinhukumāra and his three paces grew to cosmic proportions, and the gods, alarmed, placated him with a song of praise performed by the a psarases and gandharvas and helped by the vidyādharas. In return for their help the vidyādharas were granted a certain music in the mode

129-131

1 128.10 tīmīyā tānti, dāmsīyā vālā "I wet the string and showed — hairs". The same motif BKSS 17.142, Jacobi, Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī 57.2. KSS 8.6.21 is even closer: siktvā tantrī... niragāt... vālas tadgarbhataḥ suṇāḥ. Tawney with bizarre effect translated vālaś (bālas, Brockhaus) ... suṇāḥ as "puppy".

2 For a fuller description see Alsdorf, HP 104-109.
gandhāragrāma to be performed on a seventeen-stringed vīnā. It was the vidyādhari Sāmalī who taught it to Vasudeva.¹

Concluding his story, Vasudeva takes the vīnā and, with Gandhavvadattā, sings the vīnhugīā. Cārudatta asks the experts for their opinion. They declare that her singing was in perfect accord with his playing, and his singing with her playing.² The curtain is opened.² The city's preoccupation with the vīnā is ended; Gandhavvadattā has found a husband. Cārudatta formally offers Vasudeva his daughter in marriage. He observes that in any case a brahman can have four wives, drawn from the four aryān castes, but that his daughter is not only a suitable match for Vasudeva, she is perhaps even more distinguished. Vasudeva wonders why. He is made ready for the ceremony, Gandhavvadattā is brought to him, and Cārudatta marries them with the fire-sacrifice.

Some days after the marriage the music teachers Suggīva and Jasaggīva offer Vasudeva their daughters too. He accepts, and lives happily in the company of all three, though Gandhavvadattā is his favourite. Some time later Cārudatta offers to explain why he has said that his daughter is suitable to or even better than Vasudeva in birth. At Vasudeva's invitation he tells his whole story.

¹ Compare however 128.16-17 maya puṇa sāhūṇam riddhisu gijjamāṇīsu puvvaṃ suyam “I for my part had heard it previously when the powers of the sādhus were being celebrated”, an explanation which suits the passage that follows, the "Jaina-Umbildung der... Viṣṇu-Bali-Legende" (Alsdorf, HP 106).

² usāriyā abhīntarajavāpiyā, 132.9. Does this mean that she was behind the curtain all the time? In the BKŚS there is a curtain in the room which, as one would expect, divides the players from the spectators and is used to open and close the spectacle, 17.81, 99, 157.
Cārudatta's autobiography and the story of Gamdhavvadatta

Once there was in Campa a śṛṣṭhīn called Bhānu, of good family, a disciple of the Jain monks (samaṇovāsa, 233.16), who had a wife Bhaddā, equally of good family. Because they had no son, they were sedulous in their worship of the Jina. The mendicant monk Cāru, who possessed superhuman powers, predicted that they would shortly have a son. Sure enough Bhaddā became pregnant and, looked after with the utmost care, in due course produced a son whom they called Cārudatta, Gift of Cāru. The boy grew up, cherished by all the family, in the company of the sons of his father's five closest friends: these companions were Harisīha, Varāha, Gomuha, Tamāntaga and Marubhūiga (or Marubhū). This boy was none other than the narrator himself. He was taught all the arts, was brought up in the religion of the Jina, and enjoyed himself in the company of his friends.

One day he and his friends went to the Amgamandre park to make an offering of flowers to the Jina. They went all the way to the river Rayatavāluya picking flowers. There they sent the servants away and sat on the river bank. Marubhūi proposed that they have a swim. Gomuha gave the medical reasons why on a hot day one should avoid plunging into water, so they only washed their feet. Then they picked lotus leaves and made toys with them.

Marubhūi ran off downstream alone to catch a boat he had made; suddenly he called out "Quickly, come and see something marvellous!"

Gomuha was sceptical and proposed several common sights that might

1 That is to say, at this point the narrative changes from the third to the first person. On this figure of narrative style, frequent in the VH, see Maten, BB 68.
have surprised Marubhūṇa, but they went to see nevertheless. Marubhūṇa showed them a sandbank. "So what?" He showed them two sets of footprints on the sandbank. "So what?" He pointed out that the footprints came to a sudden end. At this all the companions were curious, and Gomuha deduced from the shape and disposition of the footprints the following series of events:

136 A vidyādhara was carrying his loved one, who could not fly, to a place suitable for making love; then she walked beside him; they played and quarrelled; she tripped on a pebble and hurt her foot; he carried her again. They enjoyed one another in a hut made from vines. But when they came out the vidyādhara was attacked by an enemy and the woman was carried off.

The vidyādhara’s sword and shield were hanging on a tree where he had left them, and his clothes were scattered about the scene of the struggle. Cārudatta and his companions collected them and looked for their owner. They found the vidyādhara nailed to a tree, alive but in pain. Cārudatta remembered having heard¹ that vidyādharas carry medical herbs in their shields. They looked in the frog² of the shield and saw there four herbs — but which was the specific for removing foreign bodies? They experimented on a tree, found the right herb, and removed the nails from the vidyādhara’s head and four limbs.

Cārudatta retired a little distance with Gomuha, telling the others to sprinkle the unconscious vidyādhara with water and then

¹ sahūsamīve vijjāharakahāsu pavattāsu (pavattāsu, text), "from a sādu in the stories about vidyādharas that he preached", 138.18; a reflection of the part that vidyādharas played in Jain scripture. See Alsdorf, ZDMG 92 (1938), 469; Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, 2.810.

² cammarayañamamdukkim, 138.19.
They did this.* The vidyādhara leapt up in a rage, threatening a certain Dhūmasiha; then finding himself alone, he calmed down, washed himself and put on his clothes. He noticed the companions and came over. When he learnt that Carudatta's knowledge of herbs had saved his life, he thanked him, accepted his invitation to sit, and told his story.*

The story of Amiyagatī the vidyādhara

On the south plateau of the Veyaddha, in a town Sivamāndira, lived a vidyādhara king Mahimāvikkama. He had a son learned in the sciences, Amiyagatī by name — the narrator himself. Amiyagatī had two friends, Dhūmasiha and Goripumda.* Dhūmasiha in secret made proposals of love to Amiyagatī's wife Sukumāliyā. She reported to her husband the other's winks and amorous words (vikārākārabhāsiyāni, 139.26), and one day Amiyagatī caught his friend in the act. He ordered Dhūmasiha to leave. The events of the present day, correctly deduced by Gomuha from the footprints, were the consequence of this enmity. Amiyagatī asked Carudatta whether there was a favour he could do in return for his help, and, please to let him go quickly because he feared for Sukumāliyā's safety. With that, he flew away.*

Carudatta and his friends returned to Aṃgamaṃdira park, worshipped the Jina in his temple there, and set off back to the city. On the way they discussed what had happened.

Harisītha: by saving Amiyagatī's life, Carudatta has attained dharma.
Gomuha: yes, but Amiyagatī will be killed by Dhūmasiha.
Tamāntagā: Carudatta at least has gained a friend in Amiyagatī.
Gomuha: yes, but he has gained an enemy in Dhūmasiha.
Harisiha: then what has he gained?
Gomuha: love — because love is desire, he desired that Amiyagati
live, and that has been attained.

In this way they passed the time.

One day Carudatta's mother asked her brother Savvattha to
marry his daughter Mittavati to Carudatta. She did not tell her
husband about this at the time, because he was living in the king's
household. When he returned, he was surprised to find himself
congratulated as a future father-in-law. He protested that

Cărudatta's education would be wasted if he were initiated into the
life of the senses just then, but he gave in to his wife and
Cărudatta was duly married to Mittavati. The servants told
Cărudatta about these discussions. Once when Mittavati went to
her parents' on a visit, she and her mother exchanged ornaments.
Mittavati's father was indignant when he found out about this; he
was afraid that the transaction might be construed as a reflection
on the generosity of his daughter's dowry. He sent his wife to
recover her ornaments early next morning. When she arrived,
Cărudatta had already left the house to study with his teacher.
Surprised to find Mittavati still in bed, alone, and with her
make-up intact, she asked if everything was all right between her
and Cărudatta. When pressed, Mittavati admitted that Cărudatta
behaved strangely:* a man who, all alone, dances, sings, applauds
and laughs — is he normal (sabhāvio, 141.15)? Cărudatta's mother
was furious at the aspersions on her only son, and threatened a
terrible revenge on her relatives.

1 The source of the first-person narrator's knowledge is carefully
given, 141.1; compare 141.24, 142.1-2, and below, page 78, note 1.
2 Presumably the model student Cărudatta was doing his homework.
She summoned Gomuha and the other friends and told them to take Cārudatta to a bawdyhouse (*ganiyaghāre*, 141.26). They tried to dissuade her, but she insisted: her one desire, she said, was that her boy should enjoy his wealth (*atthaparibhotta ... bōjja tti*, 141.30).

Some days later Cārudatta's friends came to fetch him, proposing that they go to a park for a picnic. Cārudatta was surprised by this invitation at short notice, but the others reassured him and they all set out for the park. When they arrived, Cārudatta was hot and thirsty, so he stayed in the shade of some trees. Harisiha jumped into a lotus-pond not far away. After a moment he called to Cārudatta, "Come and see something marvellous!" He showed some lotuses, saying, "Look, in these lotuses there is a juice which I have never seen before, the colour of lotus pollen. What can it be?" Gomuha examined the juice and pronounced it to be blue-lotus honey (*pokkharamadhu*, 142.12), a treat even for the gods. They collected it carefully in the hollow of a leaf and discussed what to do.

Harisiha: we will offer it to the king and win his favour.

Varāha: it is difficult to get to see kings, and once seen they are hard to satisfy; we will give it to a minister.

Tamantaga: ministers are only interested in presents of money.

Maruhūi: we will give it to the chief of police.

Gomuha: Cārudatta is our king, minister and magistrate. We will give it to him.

---

1 Cārudatta has in fact been forewarned by a servant, 142.2; this however is a momentary lapse on the author's part. Cārudatta does not act on this foreknowledge of his, and indeed if he were to do so it would spoil the telling of the story.
Then with one voice they said to Cārudatta, "Here's luck! Drink up!" Cārudatta reminded them that he came from a teetotal, vegetarian family. They reassured him. He drank.

\[ \text{tam ca savvagattapalhāyanam pīyassa tuṭṭhī jāyā} \]

When I drank it, it gladdened my whole body, and I experienced pleasure. \((VH\,142.27)\)

The companions said, "Now you go and rest while we pick flowers."

Cārudatta staggered off towards his trees, dimly suspecting a trick. He saw, leaning against an asoka tree, a beautiful and expensively dressed young woman, who beckoned to him. He went up to her. She explained that she was an apsaras sent by the king of the gods to serve him, Cārudatta, in recognition of his father's virtue. To prove this, she said that not everyone is capable of seeing apsarases; for example, his friends were incapable of seeing her, and if Cārudatta was silent they would not be able to see him either. And indeed his friends were just then running about looking for him in vain. At a word from the apsaras, they saw Cārudatta again, but not her. Everyone went to eat at the place where the servants were laying out the lunch, the apsaras supporting Cārudatta as he stumbled. After eating he lost consciousness. He thought he heard the words "We've got him", and felt himself being bundled into a carriage. The carriage stopped at a building; the apsaras helped Cārudatta down and said, "This is my heavenly palace, here enjoy the pleasures of the senses without misgivings." A crowd of young girls was there to bring this offer to fulfilment. Then Cārudatta fell asleep.

When he awoke, he found himself in a strange but quite earthly house belonging to a young woman called Vasaptatilayā, the "apsaras" of the day before. She told him the truth of the matter: his
mother and friends had conspired to trick him. She was a gaṅikā's
daughter,* skilled in the arts, not mercenary, an admirer of virtue
and above all an admirer of Cārudatta, to whom she offered her
maidenhood¹ and whom she promised to obey so long as she lived.
Cārudatta willingly accepted to be her lover. He enjoyed with her
the gaṅikā's art of love which is passed on from mother to daughter,
and for this paid her 8000 on ordinary days but 800,000,000 on
holidays. And so twelve years passed.

Early one morning Cārudatta awoke after a night of love and
drinking to find himself in the street, cold and alone. He
realized that he had been abandoned by the gaṅikā,* and decided to go
home under the cover of darkness. When he reached his house, the
porter refused him entry; he learnt that his father, distressed by
his behaviour, had left to wander as an ascetic, and when the money
ran out, his mother had sold the house and left to live with her
brother. The present owner sent Cārudatta away lest he bring bad
luck. He went to his uncle's house; there was a tearful reunion
with his mother and wife, both reduced to misery. Cārudatta
decided to win back his good name and fortune in a distant place.
His mother protested that she and her daughter-in-law could support
him, but he was firm. She gave him leave to go, and arranged with
her brother Savvāṭṭha to help.

So Cārudatta set off with his uncle,* thinking much on the
vice of lechery. They reached the outskirts of a village

¹ kao... vatthapariyaṭṭo... eyañi vo khomañi kaṇṇābhāvadamaṃsiyāni,
"she changed her clothes [and said] here for you is my dress
signifying maidenhood", 143.29-144.1, with which compare 228.22-23
and note 2, page 70 below. The BKSS agrees that she was a virgin,
though a gaṅikā by birth: kanyāsaśāraṅa⁰; 18.75.
Usirāvatta, and there Savvatttha left him while he went to fetch suitable clothes. After bathing and worshipping the Jina, Čārudatta entered the village with his uncle. It was as busy as a city, with its market and public garden. There they stayed the night, Čārudatta still deep in thought. Next morning Savvatttha pointed out the advantages of the town: it was the granary of the district,1 business was good, and there were old associates of his father who would buy from him. Čārudatta agreed, and set up as a trader in cotton, using his ring to gain credit from his father's business associates.2 One night a thief set light to the shop, and it was badly damaged. Čārudatta once again built up his stock and set off with a caravan bound for Tāmalittī. The caravan was intercepted by bandits, who scattered the people and looted and burnt the merchandise. In the confusion Čārudatta was separated from Savvatttha, and he fled from the place, resolving still not to go home before he had repaired his name and fortune.

He wandered from one country to another, and one day came to Piyamgupāṭṭana. In that town he was recognized by a former neighbour Surimdadatta, who had heard his story up to the time when he was living with the ganikā. Čārudatta told him the rest.

Surimdadatta having put house and capital at his disposal, Čārudatta prepared a ship for a trading voyage. This voyage took him to the south, the east and the west, and he made his fortune, but as he was returning along the Soraṭṭha shore his ship was wrecked. After a

1 Or, "of the world", disāsamvāho 145.9; not a proper name as the text and index of names have it.
2 Was Savvatttha behind this good credit? I am not sure how uvachubhati bhamḍama māulo 145.12 fits in the story.
week in the water hanging to a plank, he was cast up on the beach at Umbarāvai.

A mendicant brahman (tidāmbI, 146.15) found him and brought him to his hostel. But when Āruḍatṭā told the story of how he left home and how he came to grief, the mendicant chased him out of doors, reviling him as a bringer of bad luck. Āruḍatṭā had only gone a little way when the mendicant called him back; his harsh words, he said, were meant only to teach him not to venture on the sea. He offered Āruḍatṭā wealth without risks, if he was willing to do as he was told, and gave him hospitality. Some days later the mendicant showed how he could turn an iron pot into gold by smearing it with a certain juice and putting it in the fire. This feat, he said, was nothing compared to what he could do if, with Āruḍatṭā's help, he got enough juice for a really big job. Āruḍatṭā, greedy, was eager to help. So one night he set out with the mendicant, and journeyed through a dangerous forest, until they came to a mountain ravine. There the mendicant prepared to descend into a mine. He explained that the mine was in the form of an inverted goblet, and that in the middle of it there was a jar of adamant from which oozed the magic juice. Āruḍatṭā protested that he should be the one to descend. He put on a leather cuirass, and the mendicant lowered him into the mine by a rope attached to a seat. When he reached the bottom, he saw the jar; the mendicant sent down a gourd which Āruḍatṭā filled with the juice by means of a ladle. He then put the gourd on the seat, and tugged on the rope. The mendicant pulled up the seat. Āruḍatṭā waited for the rope to be sent down again, but in vain, for the mendicant had gone, leaving him in the mine. He reflected that his greed, which had nearly brought him to his death at sea, was the cause of this new calamity.
When Cār udatta explored the mine, which was wide and dark with only a small opening overhead, he came upon a man who was mortally wounded but had enough strength left to tell him that he too was a victim of the mendicant. He added that every day an alligator came into the mine to drink; that if he were more courageous and less badly wounded, he would hang on to the alligator's tail as it went away and so make his escape. Cār udatta waited for the alligator. It arrived through a tunnel into the mine, it drank, and turned to go; Cār udatta hung on to its tail as it made its way through the narrow tunnel to the surface. Thanks to the leather cuirass he was not injured. Though it was night, he began at once to search for the opening of the mine, because he was not yet cured of his greed.*

A wild buffalo attacked him. He climbed on a heap of stones to escape it. The buffalo began to demolish the heap of stones. A huge snake came out of the stones and fastened on to the buffalo's hindquarters, which enabled Cār udatta to slip away to safety.  

Cār udatta then wandered lost in a thorny wilderness, hungry and thirsty. Seeing a crossroads, he stopped there, hoping that someone would come that way. Someone came; it was Ruddadatta.*

Cār udatta explained what had happened since they last met, then after he had eaten and drunk from Ruddadatta's provisions, they went on together to Rayapura and stayed at the house of a friend. Ruddadatta still held out hopes for Cār udatta's financial success.

---

1 Text and translation of this episode in Alsdorf, "Zwei neue Belege zur 'indischen Herkunft' von 1001 Nacht", ZDMG 89 (1935), 280-286.
2 Ruddadatta has not been mentioned before, though his name is given as a textual variant for Surimdadatta, 145.29. It is possible that Ruddadatta and Surimdadatta are the same person; Sattudamaṇa 62.17 and Amittadamana 63.15 are synonymous; see however the supplementary note.
They both joined a caravan which was setting out on a trading expedition. It crossed the sea-mouth of the Simdhu river and headed north-east through the Hūna, Khasa and Cīna territories until it reached a town at the foot of the Veyaddha.

There the leader of the caravan ordered them to tie their merchandise to their backs, and to have ready a supply of tumbaru powder around their waists. The climb ahead of them was so steep, he explained, that unless their hands were constantly covered with this adhesive substance they would not be able to maintain their grip. In this way they climbed over the Saṃkupaha mountain, and reached the Usuvega river. This river is so deep and swift that it cannot be forded. In order to cross it, the travellers held on to pliant reeds which grew on the north bank and which touched the south bank when a north wind was blowing. When the wind changed to the south, the reeds carried them over the river and on to the other bank. Then they continued their journey into the jungle where lived the Tāmkaṇas, a barbarous tribe.

The travellers traded their merchandise with the Tāmkaṇas for goats, one for each member of the caravan. Mounted on these goats, and blindfolded, they crossed a mountain path which fell away sheer on both sides, then rested on a level tract of ground. The leader explained the next stage of the journey. They were to kill their goats, eat the meat, and make the gory skins into bags. Then they were to climb into the bags, equipped with a sharp knife. Certain enormous birds called bharumdas, which nest on Rayāṇadīva, the Island of Gems, and which come regularly to that place after prey, would pick up the bags thinking they were edible, and take them back to Rayāṇadīva. Once on Rayāṇadīva the travellers were to cut their way out of the bags and collect all the gems they could find. Then
they could go on to Suvaññabhūmi near the Veyaḍḍha, and return home by the same route in reverse.

Thus instructed, the members of the caravan began to kill each his goat. Cārudatta however refused. He said to Ruddadatta that he never knew trade was like that; if he had known, he would not have come. He said he preferred to abandon his body religiously (vihīṃ dehaparicāyaṃ karissam, 149.13-14). Ruddadatta was unwilling to take the responsibility of Cārudatta's death, and with the help of the others prepared to kill his goat for him. Powerless to save the life of the goat, Cārudatta spoke to it of karma and the doctrine of the arhants. The goat paid great attention, and fell on its knees to await the death-blow. They made a bag of its skin, and Ruddadatta begged Cārudatta to get inside his bag like everyone else.

After a time the huge bharumḍa birds swooped down and seizing the bundles flew away with them. Unfortunately for Cārudatta two of them quarrelled over his bag, and he fell from their beaks into a large lake. Releasing himself with his knife, he swam to shore, and looked up to see the birds and his companions disappearing into the distance. He decided that there was no point in struggling against fate, and began to climb a mountain intending to throw himself off the top.

However at the top he saw a sādu standing in an ascetic posture, on one foot, his arms in the air, in full sun. Gladdened by this sight, he greeted the sādu, who asked if he was, by chance, Cārudatta the son of Bhānu; for the sādu was none other than Amiyagati. Cārudatta told his story, from his affair with the gaṇikā to the present, and then Amiyagati told his.
After he had been released by Cārudatta, Amiyagatī rescued his beloved Sukumāliyā from the evil designs of Dhūmasiha. He married also a vidyādharā princess called Manoramā, and had two sons, and a daughter called Gaṃdhavvadattā. When his father renounced his kingdom to go forth as a śramana, Amiyagatī succeeded him, and in his turn later set forth as an ascetic renouncing the kingdom in favour of his elder son. His two sons still visited him every day, he said; he promised Cārudatta that they would be his hosts here for as long as he cared, and that they could transport him back to Campā. Indeed the two sons arrived soon after, and treated Cārudatta with great deference. Someone else joined them, a radiant divinity, who caused a momentary consternation by greeting Cārudatta before the sādhu Amiyagatī. He was none other than Cārudatta's goat, who because he had renounced the body and revered the arhants at the moment of his death was reborn as a god.* Many births ago he had been a pupil of Pippalāya, the author of the Atharvaveda; hearing this, the vidyādharas asked for details, and the god told the story of Pippalāya [which I omit]. Afterwards, saying "think of me when you want to go to Campā," the god took his leave. Cārudatta stayed on for a while as the guest of Amiyagatī's sons.

One day, he said that he missed his mother and wanted to go. The sons of Amiyagatī told him that their sister1 Gaṃdhavvadattā, according to an astrologer's prediction, was to marry a supreme man and the future ruler of south Bharata together with the

---

1 Called by them (dhūyā) vijayaseṇādevīattiyāe, "the daughter of our [?] stepmother, Queen Vijayasena"; 153.24. JHP and HTr agree that Amiyagatī had his sons by Manoramā, his daughter by Vijayasena; poor Sukumāliyā has been forgotten.
vidyādharas, whom she would meet in a singing contest in Cārudatta's house after he had shown certain signs by which he could be recognized — those precisely which Vasudeva showed. Cārudatta agreed to provide the conditions for this meeting, and accepted the care of the girl Gamdhavvadattā. They gave him a heap of jewels and gold. Cārudatta thought on the god, and the god came at once to carry Cārudatta back to Campā. He added his contribution to Cārudatta's wealth, and left with Gamdhavvadattā and her attendants in a park outside Campā where beasts of burden stood ready, provided by him and the vidyādharas to transport the goods. This all happened at night. At daybreak, the king of Campā himself came to invite Cārudatta to return to his family house, which he the king redeemed. Then Cārudatta's uncle came to congratulate him on his courage and success. Cārudatta asked for news of his mother. The uncle told him about Vasaṃtatilayā: when Cārudatta went back to his family, she asked her servants where he had gone. They told her that her mother had drugged him and put him out, because all his money was spent. Hearing this, Vasaṃtatilayā paid back to the king all the money Cārudatta had given her — it was with this money that the king redeemed the family house — and joined Cārudatta's wife wearing the tress of separation from a husband. Cārudatta then went to his house to join his mother, his wife Mittavatī and his new wife Vasaṃtatilayā. When in due course his ward Gamdhavvadattā reached womanhood, he arranged the concert hall and the contests by means of which she was to find her destined husband.

---

1 The usual formula is "the father of the future ruler of half Bharata", for example adhaharahasāmino piussa bhajjā bhavissai, 180.24-25. Here Vasudeva himself will be master of south Bharata and the vidyādharas, savijhāharam dāhinabharaham bhocchihi, 153.25-26.
Such is Ĉārudatta's story. Vasudeva lives happily in Cāmpā and with Gaṃḍhavvadattā's permission Sāmā and Vijaya join him there.

When the vasanta season comes, Vasudeva sets out with Gaṃḍhavvadattā for a religious festival at the artificial lake which Puvvaka the king of Cāmpā had built to satisfy a dohadā of his wife. While enjoying the beauties of the season Vasudeva notices a family of caṇḍālas, and among them especially a very beautiful dark girl and a distinguished-looking old woman. Encouraged by her companions, the girl begins to dance. Vasudeva is enraptured: a pity she's a caṇḍāla, he reflects. Gaṃḍhavvadattā senses the direction of his thoughts, and goes home alone in a huff. That night Vasudeva pacifies her:

supdaria naṭṭam visesa doṭṭham mayā geyan ca suyaṃ, na mayangi tti
My lovely, my attention was all on the dance and the song, not on the girl. (156.11-12)
* in a month's time: Similarly JHP 19.127-128. In the BKŚŚ the contest is due the next day; Alsdorf, HP 105, suggests that this difference may be traced back to the ambiguity of a word like kallam, meaning either "yesterday" or "tomorrow".

* story of its origin: In the BKŚŚ Naravāhanadatta hears Gandharvadattā sing the nārāyaṇastuti (17.114), and knows that, to accompany her, he must play in the gāndhāra mode, a heavenly mode that he happens to know by family tradition (17.116). The story of Viṣṇu encompassing the universe in three steps leads to the story of the descent of the nārāyaṇastuti. In Sanghadāsa’s VH, Čārudattā asks Vasudeva to play the viṇhugīyaga (128.15); Vasudeva tells the story of its origin, and then is said to play and sing it with Gandhavavadattā. In JHP, Vasudeva asks Gandharvadattā what he should play. She asks for the story of Viṣṇu, and for the science of music (19.140-141). Vasudeva begins with the latter (19.142-262), and then is said to play and sing the descent of the Viṣṇu song (19.264). In the next sarga Ārenika asks for, and learns, the story of Viṣṇu. In HTr too Vasudeva asks her what to play; the story of Viṣṇu is, however, told elsewhere in the work (6.8.14-203) and is not repeated here. In GUP, after Vasudeva has refused several viṇās, Gandharvadattā asks him, "Well, what sort of viṇā do you want?" (70.272-273). He tells the story of Viṣṇu, then tells how the viṇā Ghoṣavatī came to be in Čārudatta's family; that is the viṇā he wants (70.273-301). This recalls how Udayana received the viṇā Ghoṣavatī from the nāgas (KSS 2.1.46-90), BKIM 2.40-66) and how Naravāhanadatta learnt the gāndhāra mode from his father (BKŚŚ, see above). On the version in Puṣpadanta's Mahāpurāṇa, apparently a misunderstanding of this last motif, see Alsdorf, HP 107.
* his singing with her playing: In the BKŚ it is a matter of the hero's being able to accompany Gandharvadatta by recognizing and playing in the correct mode. "Die oben mitgeteilte Version von Vh beruht ersichtlich auf einem leichten Missverstehen dieses Herganges", Alsdorf, HP 105. In GUP Vasudeva plays so well that Gandharvadatta chooses him as her husband: svāṃ vā mālāṃ samarpayat, 70.303. As this gesture shows, Gṛṇabhadra sees the episode as a svayamvara, compare 70.263, 267, 268.

* They did this: In JHP and HTr, Cārudatta himself released the vidyādhara.

* told his story: In JHP he first went to find his beloved Sukumārikā.

* Goripumda: Gaurimunḍa in the Sanskrit versions of the VH. In the BK Naravāhanadatta has two enemies called Dhūmaśikha and Gaurimunḍa.

* he flew away: JHP establishes Amitagati's gratitude more carefully than the other versions: 21.29-36.

* Cārudatta behaved strangely: In Rāmacandra Mūrukuśa Puyāśravakathākośa 2.13 (p. 67), Cārudatta's mother-in-law Sumitra says to his mother Devilā that her son is paṭhitanaṁrkaḥ, a bookworm, having learnt from her daughter that kadācin mama cintām api na karoti, sarvāda kīṃcid anumāṇayann eva tiṣṭhati: "Sometimes he doesn't even notice me, he is always just standing there dreaming about something."

* take Cārudatta to a bawdyhouse: In Rāmacandra Mūrukuśa, op. cit., this office is performed by Cārudatta's mother's brother-in-law (devaṇa), Rudradatta.

* gaṇikā's daughter: Daughter of a gaṇikā Kaliṅgasena in JHP and HTr. Kaliṅgasena is Madanamaṇjukā's mother in the BK; in JHP the reminiscence of the BK is even stronger, because Cārudatta goes to
see Vasantasenā dance, whereupon she falls in love with him and asks her mother to arrange a meeting. The trick of the "lotus wine" appears only in Saṅghadāsa's VH and in Budhasvāmin's BKŚŚ.

* abandoned by the ganikā: In JHP and Rāmacandra Mumukṣu (op. cit.), when the family money runs out Cārudatta's wife's jewels are used to pay the bill at the ganikā's; seeing this the girl's mother understands that there is no more to be gained from Cārudatta and orders her daughter to abandon him. She refuses. So the mother puts him to sleep with a charm, JHP 21.73, or with a drug, Rāmacandra Mumukṣu p. 68, and throws him out.

* with his uncle: and some capital as well, according to other versions: taking his wife's ornaments, JHP, HTr; an advance from his uncle, Rāmacandra Mumukṣu.

* cured of his greed: In Rāmacandra Mumukṣu, op. cit., the alligator brought Cārudatta almost to the surface, and then goatherds dug him out; this looks like an alternative development of a motif "Cārudatta searched for the opening of the cave".

* Rudradatta: In HTr Rudradatta likewise appears for the first time at this point in the story; he is introduced as a friend of Cārudatta's maternal uncle Sarvārtha. In JHP Rudradatta is Cārudatta's paternal uncle (pitṛvya, 21.40); it was he who took Cārudatta to see Vasantasenā dance (see above). In Rāmacandra Mumukṣu, op. cit., Cārudatta at this point meets Rudradatta, Hariśikha and the other friends coming from Angā.

* reborn as a god: In JHP two sūras arrived at this point; one had been the goat (21.130 ff.), the other had been the injured man in the well (21.152 ff.).
LAMBHA THE FOURTH: NİŁAJASĂ

Next morning, a servant announces that a lady has come to visit him, and Vasudeva is surprised when the old māyamgi whom he had seen the day before is shown in; even more surprised when she takes a seat and addresses him confidentially, offering him the girl who was dancing at the lake festival in marriage. Vasudeva alludes to the undesirability of mixing the castes, but the old woman explains that her family is not what it seems. Beginning with the deeds of the first Jina Usabha — which I omit — she concludes by saying that her name is Hirāṇṇamati, and that she is of royal birth; that her husband is the vidyādhara Pahāsiyaseṇa of the line of Nāmi; and that the girl in question, Nīlajasă, is their son Śiṅhadaṭha's daughter. On that occasion she had disguised herself as a māyamgi in accordance with her science.* Vasudeva brings the interview to an end with a lukewarm janīhāmo, "we shall see".

That night Vasudeva awakes to find himself in the clutches of a vetāla.* He reasons that since it is one of the cold variety, which fetch and carry, and not one of the hot, which are dangerous, he had best allow himself be taken to its master. His decision to trust the vetāla is confirmed by its scrupulosity about closing the door behind it, and by a series of favourable omens which accompany his passage through the sleeping city. At the city's cemetery, the station so to speak of vetālas, Vasudeva is met by Hirāṇṇamati, who proposes to take him to Veyaddha. As they are leaving, Vasudeva

1 The Nīlajalasă of the title is a misprint.
notices his enemy Amgāraka who having lost his science is working at its recovery. He needs only the sight of an uttampurisa like Vasudeva to perfect it, and Vasudeva resolutely avoids showing himself.

Having arrived at Veyaḍḍha, Vasudeva is taken to see king Sīhadāḍha, who at once, for the hour is favourable, gives him his daughter Nīlajasā's hand in marriage. The hospitality of the royal house is lavished upon him, and he passes the night with his new bride. The next day he hears a noise as of a crowd of people and asks an attendant the reason. The attendant explains: Nīlamjana, the wife of Sīhadāḍha, and her brother Nīla had made a pact as children that their children should marry one another. But Sīhadāḍha for his part consulted an astrologer about a suitable husband for his daughter, and the answer was that she should marry the father of the ruler of half Bharata, who at the moment was attending a festival... hence the story of Vasudeva's marriage with Nīlajasā. Thereupon Nīla came to protest, claiming a prior right to Nīlajasā as a match for his son Nīlakamtha; the elders refused to sustain this claim, saying that the father's authority over his daughter is supreme — hence the commotion.

One day Nīlajasā proposes that Vasudeva learn the sciences, so that the vidyādharas will not look down on him. He agrees, and they go together to a solitary place on Veyaḍḍha. They are distracted by a peacock, and try to catch it; the peacock seizes Nīlajasā from behind and flies off with her. Vasudeva, still earthbound for lack of science, reflects helplessly that as Rāma was led astray by a deer, so was he by a peacock; his darling has been
stolen by Nilakamtha. And he wanders off into the forest.

1 nilakamtha is a descriptive word for a peacock, as well as the name of the wronged suitor, who thereafter is Vasudeva's enemy.

* in accordance with her science: 178.20-21 vijjanuvattī; this must be intended as an explanation of māyaṃgavesā, "disguised as a mātanga girl", but it is not very clear. The reason why the girl appears to be an outcaste is crucial for the story. In JHP she is simply disguised as a mātanga girl, mātangakanyakāvesām (22.8), which is easy because of her dark colour, nilanīrājanīlābhā (22.113). In HTr (8.2.303) she is a mātanga and is dressed accordingly, but, as H.M. Johnson points out in her translation (vol. 5, 57 note 60), this is the name of a vidyadhara line, not a designation of caste. Jinasena gives a definition of a mātanga (vidyadhara) at HP 26.15.

* in the clutches of a vetāla: In JHP he is abducted by a vetāla girl (22.126)!
Vasudeva, quite lost, comes upon a herd of deer which fly up into the air and settle some distance away, like birds. He recognizes them as vāyamīga, wind-deer, and is cheered by the augury of this rare sight. A little further on, he is surrounded by a herd of excited cows, and is forced to climb a tree, from which situation he is rescued by the cowherds. They direct him to a village Girikūḍa. Vasudeva finds there a temple in which brahmans are furiously rehearsing their vedas. He asks someone the reason for this activity and is told that the village squire (gāmabhoia-, 182.14) has a daughter Somasiri who is destined to be married to an uttampurisa, and this man will reveal himself by answering questions on the veda posed by Buha and Vibuha. Since she is very beautiful and able, all the brahmans are training for the contest. Vasudeva asks for the name of the best teacher in town, and is directed to Bambhadatta. He introduces himself to Bambhadatta as Khamdila Goyama, and gives certain bracelets to the lady of the house. After a closer look at these, the master enrols him as his pupil. The first lesson is the origin of the āryaveda, which I omit.

Vasudeva learns that Somasiri cannot be beaten in veda-knowledge by an ordinary man because her father Devadeva is the hereditary ruler of the village in a line that goes back to Nārada.

---

1 193.24-25 na sakkā pagyamāṇusegā buhavibhupurao veyam samajjaṅgaṁti (read samajjium ti?). In the story, which is a replica of "Gampdhavavadattā", a contest with the girl is foreshadowed but it does not take place; why? The contest takes place in JHP 23.152 and in HTr 8.2.345, but there the bare event is mentioned without circumstantial narration.
Nothing daunted, at the contest he dares to speak out where everyone else is silent, and his practical and theoretical grasp of the vedas delights the experts. So he is duly married to Somasiri and passes the time happily in her company, now and then discussing āgama with Buha and Vibha.
One day Vasudeva sees a conjuror who is giving a show outside the village. Vasudeva thinks the man is a vidyādhara and wants to meet him. He does meet him at Buha and Vibuha's place, and the man takes him aside and offers him two sciences at once, and another if Vasudeva will meet him alone on the last night of the dark lunar fortnight. The appointed time comes, and the man takes Vasudeva to a cave in a mountainside, telling him a science on which being recited 8000 times a vimāna will appear. Vasudeva is to board the vimāna; it will rise about five feet off the ground, will move about as he wishes, and if he recites another spell it will come down to land.

Vasudeva does as he is told, and concentrates his mind on the science. We must imagine him there in total darkness. After a time he becomes aware of the presence of a gadget fitted with little bells and smelling of flowers. Finding a seat, he instals himself on it. The vimāna slowly rises up the mountainside and begins to move forward. Vasudeva notices that it follows the mountain ridge, jolted by the irregularities of the ground, and he tries to gain altitude, without success. The sound of men grunting with effort, and, when dawn breaks, the sight of the rope which draws the vimāna complete his disillusionment, and when he sees a party of men

---

1 195.1-2 tena (sc. āpdayālieṣa) nāgakumāra nāgghapāyavam assiyā damsīyā, "he showed nāga princes living in a ficus indica tree".
2 sattaṭṭhatalaggāṇi, literally "seven or eight spans", 195.14.
heading for him, he makes off at speed, on foot. He leaves his pursuers far behind.*

The next day about sunset, very tired, he reaches a place called Tilavattuga. But the gates are closed and the people refuse to let him in, saying that they are afraid of the man-eater.

196 Anyone who is abroad at night, they say, is eaten by a rākṣasa. So Vasudeva settles down to sleep in a temple outside the town. That night someone comes to the door and says in a loud voice, "Open up or I will kill you!" Vasudeva replies, "Be off or I'll teach you a lesson!" But the visitor will not go away, and Vasudeva opens the door and sees a huge shaggy being armed with a club. They fight. Vasudeva crushes the monster and then goes back to sleep.

At dawn all the townsfolk rush to the scene of the encounter and Vasudeva is treated like a hero for having rescued the people from the monster. The elders explain that the rākṣasa was a certain Soyāsa,* a king's son whose love of meat had led him to cannibalism. Banished from his home, he had come to plague this region. Vasudeva stays one night in the town, and then moves on.

At Ayalaggāma, he rests for a moment in the shop of a trader. Just then the trader makes an enormously profitable sale; thereupon he takes Vasudeva to his home and treats him like an honoured guest. After Vasudeva has bathed and eaten, the trader explains. He is a vaiśya by birth, Dhanamitta by name, and he has a daughter called Mittasiri. An astrologer predicted that this girl would marry a world-ruler (puhaipaijo, 197.28), who would reveal himself by being present when Dhanamitta made a profit of 100,000%. Hence

1 For a summary of this story, and a study of other versions of the same story, see J. de Jong, "Three Notes on the Vasudevahindi", Sanjñavyākaraṇam 1 (1954), 7-9.
Dhaṇamitta offers Vasudeva his daughter,* and she and Vasudeva are duly married. Vasudeva also cures the speech impediment of a young brahman in a neighbour's household, and is given a daughter of the family, Dhaṇasirī,* as a reward. And for a while he lives happily in the company of his two new wives.

* He leaves his pursuers far behind: The sorcerer, the trick and the pursuit occur in HTr 8.2.346-352; JHP does not have the incident.

*Soyāsa:* His story is told in JHP 24.11-23 (Saudāsa) and in HTr 8.2.353-365; in the former version Vasudeva is rewarded for his heroism with clothes, garlands and ornaments, but in the latter with five hundred maidens, whom in Herculean fashion he leaves after one night.

*Dhaṇamitta offers Vasudeva his daughter:* called Mitrasrī in HTr 8.2.367. In JHP this story is confused with the next: Vasudeva marries Vanamālā, the daughter of a caravan owner of Acalagrāma, and goes with her to Vedasāmapura (24.25).

*Dhaṇasirī:* this marriage is not mentioned in the other versions.

---

* He leaves his pursuers far behind: The sorcerer, the trick and the pursuit occur in HTr 8.2.346-352; JHP does not have the incident.

*Soyāsa:* His story is told in JHP 24.11-23 (Saudāsa) and in HTr 8.2.353-365; in the former version Vasudeva is rewarded for his heroism with clothes, garlands and ornaments, but in the latter with five hundred maidens, whom in Herculean fashion he leaves after one night.

*Dhaṇamitta offers Vasudeva his daughter:* called Mitrasrī in HTr 8.2.367. In JHP this story is confused with the next: Vasudeva marries Vanamālā, the daughter of a caravan owner of Acalagrāma, and goes with her to Vedasāmapura (24.25).

*Dhaṇasirī:* this marriage is not mentioned in the other versions.
One day Vasudeva leaves the village and the wives, and heads for Vedasāmapura, the capital of the region. Before entering the city, he sits down in a park to rest. He notices a young woman, attended by an older female companion and servants, who has a thoughtful air; suddenly, catching sight of Vasudeva, she throws her arms about his neck and addresses him as her brother-in-law Sahadeva. Her name, she says, is Vaṇamālā, daughter of king Kavilā's master of horse Vasupālia; she had been married to Suradeva, a man from Kāmarūva, but he died and now she comes to the park to distract her grief. Vasudeva says to himself:

\[\text{kayam imi\textit{e} devaranāḍayaṁ, taṁ passāmi tāva se pariṇāmaṁ.}\] (199.2)

She has made up some comedy about a brother-in-law; well, let's see how it ends.

and accepts her invitation to accompany her home. Vaṇamālā introduces him to the household as her husband's brother, and provides him with a bath and food.

Her father Vasupālia arrives, too late to eat with the guest, and explains why he was delayed: king Kavilā had heard from an astrologer that his daughter Kavilā would be the wife of the father of the ruler of half Bharata. He would reveal himself as the one capable of taming the horse Phulimgamuha; for the moment he was staying at Devadeva's house in Giritaḍa.¹ Thereupon the king sent men to capture him by the device described in \textit{lambha} 6, but as we saw, they failed. The king was at a loss what to do; and since

¹ The same as Girikūḍa.
Vasupālia was with him at the time, he was unable to get away in time for dinner.

Vasudeva, recognizing in himself the man that the king is looking for, resolves to stay on and attempt the feat. Next morning he inspects the horse Phulīpamūha and finds it a beautiful but formidable beast. He orders hobbles, fitted with spurs, to be fixed to the horse, and to the amazement of those present he manages to control its movements. This test over, king Kavila on an auspicious day gives his daughter Kavilā in marriage to Vasudeva. Vasudeva then lives happily with his new wife in the royal palace, attended by the prince Āpsumasṭa. He begets a son whom he calls Kavila.

---

1 It is never explained why Vaṇamālā recognizes Vasudeva as her brother-in-law; but see below, page 128.

---

*Kāvīlā: The next five lambhas are compressed in JHP into 11 ślōkas (24.26-36), which give little room for comparison; one interesting difference is that Vasudeva defeats king Kapila and the king of Jayapura in battle.
One day Vasudeva inspects a wild elephant that has been brought in. He approves of what he sees and decides to tame it, in spite of Ansumama's protests. The elephant, once it has Vasudeva on its back, flies up into the air and carries him off at great speed. Vasudeva thumps it on the head, and it turns into Nilakamtha who drops him and disappears. Vasudeva falls into a pool in a forest, climbs out, and wanders until he comes to a place called Salaguha.

He meets the sons of king Abhaggasena while they are doing their weapons practice. He amazes them by his own accuracy with bow and arrow, and they set him up as their teacher, neglecting their appointed teacher Punnasa. Punnasa finds out, and comes to see Vasudeva and challenge his authority; to his question, "Do you know the science of arms?" Vasudeva makes an impressive reply.

King Abhaggasena himself comes to see, and for the occasion Punnasa asks Vasudeva for the origin of bowmanship. Vasudeva recounts that in the days of Usabha men's passions were very slight and they had no use for weapons, but after Bharaha, hard-hearted men invented the arts of war. This provokes a member of the audience (we cannot understand quite why) to object that the self has no existence apart from material existence. Vasudeva replies that there is indeed a self distinct from material existence, and that is the cause of good and bad karman, and the enjoyer of the consequences thereof.

---

1 See above, page 47, note 1.
Abhaggasena then puts an end to further discussion, and asks Vasudeva who he is. Vasudeva replies that he is a brahman who left home āgama loholio, eager for the traditional learning. The king asks, "As a brahman, what have you to do with weapons?" Vasudeva replies that as a man, he is entitled to a hobby. Abhaggasena invites him to visit his palace, and Vasudeva makes a triumphal entry into the city. He is treated with lavish hospitality in the king's household. A woman doorkeeper tells him about the king's daughter Paumā, and how in the doorkeeper's hearing the king said to the queen that he had found a husband for her in Vasudeva, whom he described in some detail. Let them be married at once, the king argued. The queen hesitated; after all, what did they know of this man's family and horoscope? But Abhaggasena was firm, and the very next day he marries his daughter Paumā to Vasudeva.

Some days later a visitor for Vasudeva is announced; it is his friend Amsumamta who has followed in his tracks ever since the day the elephant took off with him, asking everyone he met if a godlike man had passed that way. So Vasudeva passes the time contentedly with his new wife Paumā and his friend Amsumamta.

---

1 203.13-14; a question more apt here than at 121.29.
Abhaggaseṇa tells Vasudeva and Aṃsumamaṭa something of his family history. His father is Subāhu, and he has an elder brother called Mehasena. Subāhu retired from the world, dividing his kingdom between his two sons. But Mehasena persecuted his younger brother. When they gambled and Abhaggaseṇa won, Mehasena refused to pay, and when Mehasena won (and Abhaggaseṇa refused to pay), he seized him and began killing his followers and oppressing his dependencies, claiming in all this that it was the right of the elder. Abhaggaseṇa finally was allowed to leave, and he fled to this place, but Mehasena wants to expel him even from here.

Soon Mehasena arrives with his army and challenges his brother. Abhaggaseṇa accepts the challenge and marches out with his army, asking Vasudeva and Aṃsumamaṭa to be witnesses. At the first encounter, Abhaggaseṇa's soldiers break ranks and flee back to the city. Vasudeva sees that Mehasena will take the city, and so, mounting a chariot with Aṃsumamaṭa as his driver, he musters Abhaggaseṇa's forces and himself encounters and defeats Mehasena. Mehasena's army surrenders forthwith, and Vasudeva once more enters the city in triumph. The defeated Mehasena puts himself at Vasudeva's disposal, and Vasudeva orders him to respect the division of the kingdom laid down by Subāhu. Mehasena goes to his own city and returns a few days later with a daughter of his, Āsaseṇā, whom he offers to Vasudeva. With Paumā's permission, Vasudeva marries her, and lives happily there in the company of the two princesses.
One day Vasudeva proposes to Aṃsumānta a change of scenery. Aṃsumānta suggests that they visit the country of Malaya which is not far away and is very beautiful. So, covering their faces, they take a side road and leave the city unnoticed; then after travelling some distance they rejoin the main road. Aṃsumānta sees that Vasudeva is tired and proposes to carry him. Vasudeva thinks that he rather should carry the delicate prince his companion. Aṃsumānta explains that the man who tells an amusing story to another who is tired carries as it were the other; and after defining the kinds of narrative he tells a number of stories abbhuyasimgāra-hāsarasabahulāṇi, in which the modes of the fantastic, the erotic and the comic abounded (209.4). The reader, unfortunately, is not allowed to share Vasudeva's pleasure.

They travel far, and when they are not far from a town, they rest a while. Aṃsumānta proposes that they conceal their ornaments and go disguised as brahmans so as to have nothing to fear. He gives Vasudeva the name of Ajjajettha, and calls himself Ajjakanīṭṭha, and ties their ornaments in his dhoti. When after travelling by easy stages they reach Bhaddilapura, Aṃsumānta leaves Vasudeva in a grove outside while he goes in to look for accommodation. He is away for a long time, and Vasudeva becomes worried, but at last he returns in a fine carriage driven by a young man, who introduces himself as Viṇādatta and invites Vasudeva to

\[1\] suhehim vasahipāyarāsēhiṁ, literally "with pleasant bed and breakfast", 209.8; compare 268.12, 350.5, 355.26, 368.28. The text at 209.8 in fact has "pārāsēhiṁ", with the variant "bāhiriṁ".
mount. The three of them drive through the city, admired by the populace (which addresses Vinadatta as a merchant's son), to Vinadatta's palatial house. There they are hospitably entertained. That night, when the rest of the household is asleep, Vasudeva asks what has happened. Ansumanta explains.

When he went in to Bhaddilapura, he found it to be a rich and cosmopolitan city. He approached a shopkeeper to ask him for a place to stay. As they were talking he heard the noise of an excited crowd; the shopkeeper said that it was a crowd of rich merchant's sons playing for high stakes. Ansumanta took his leave and went to see. The man at the door of the gaming-house was surprised to see this supposed brahman enter, but Ansumanta said that nothing prevented him from watching games of skill. At first he watched impartially, and then a certain Vinadatta, their present host, invited him to join in. Ansumanta showed them his ornaments, they let him in to the game, and he won a huge pile of wealth tumaṇ teyasā "by (Vasudeva's) power" (210.29). He then excused himself and made to leave, saying that he had to find accommodation for his master; Vinadatta invited him to his house, after which they came to fetch Vasudeva.

Vasudeva proposes that they find another place to live, because their staying in a merchant's house will cause embarrassment.1 Vinadatta is hurt when they put this proposal to him, but he finds them somewhere else to stay nevertheless. Some of the gamblers come to take their revenge, but Vasudeva defeats

---

1 Vasudeva says, houdāro vinādatto, na me royati pīleum, 211.5. Sandesara translates houdāro as bhale udār, "very generous", that is (I suppose) as the exclamation ho followed by udāro. Vasudeva does not want to abuse Vinadatta's hospitality.
them easily. Vinādatta sends his two cooks, Nānda and Sunāmḍa, to look after Vasudeva, which they do so well that he orders Aṃsumanṭa to give them a present of 100,000. They refuse gratefully, and revere him, giving this explanation.

Their father had been the charioteer of the late king Susena. They learnt the art of cookery in another country, and went on to study medicine, on which cookery depends. Then returning to Bhaddilapura they entered the service of the present king, Puṇḍa. One day an astrologer told them that they would be well-treated by the father of the future ruler of half Bharata, whom they would recognize when he offered them a present of 100,000.

And so the time passes. One day Aṃsumanṭa dashes off in pursuit of some Jain nuns dressed in white whom they see from the terrace; when he returns he says that he had recognized a gaṇinī, a leader, among them; she is his father's eldest sister Vasumatī, whom he had not seen for many years. He has exchanged news with her. The next day, Aṃsumanṭa goes out alone again. When he returns eleven days later, richly dressed and escorted by a distinguished crowd, he says that he has been to see his aunt; there he met the śreṣṭhin Tāraga, who revealed that he had promised his daughter Sutāra as a child to prince Aṃsumanṭa. Since she was now of marriageable age, and Aṃsumanṭa happened to be there, Tāraga married them in the presence of king Puṇḍa. Vasudeva congratulates him, and gives a week-long feast in honour of the Jina. People who are skilled in music are invited to perform; Vinādatta and Aṃsumanṭa sing, and when it is king Puṇḍa's turn to sing, Aṃsumanṭa asks Vasudeva to accompany the king on the vīnā or to sing something. Vasudeva agrees to sing a song in honour of the Jina.

While he sings, Puṇḍa watches him entranced.
At the end of the festival Vasudeva falls ill. Not even the skill of Nāpda and Sunapda can persuade him to eat. He confides to Amsumānta that he is sick from love for the king. Preposterous, says Amsumānta, and brings in spirit-doctors (bhūyatigicchayā, 213.9). Vasudeva sends them and their hocus-pocus packing, and demands the king. Pumda comes and persuades him to eat, but then Amsumānta asks him to go. That provokes angry words from Vasudeva, and Amsumānta leaves in tears.

Several days pass. Tāraga the ēresthin comes to tell Vasudeva that Pumda is in fact a woman, Pumdā, in disguise, and proposes that, since she loves him, he should marry her. Vasudeva agrees, and the couple are married. Only the thought of what has become of Amsumānta troubles his happiness. However he finds him in the city surrounded by an escort, and greets him ironically, saying that he Vasudeva has attained his desire without the other's help. Amsumānta replies that they both owe their success to himself, and explains:

He took refuge from Vasudeva's anger in Tāraga's house, and there Vasumati assured him that his friend's sickness was for the best. As she explained, she herself is the wife of the old king Susēna; Pumda is her son. On the occasion when the mendicant monks Cittagutta and Samahigutta attained enlightenment, Vasumati happened to be there with her lady companions. Likewise attracted by the splendour of the occasion, a couple of vidyādharas flew down and were consecrated; the vidyādhari of the couple, Cittavegā by name, was entrusted to Vasumati as a pupil, and told her this story:

In a previous existence she Cittavegā had been a woman called Hatthinīgā who lived with her husband Temdua in a forest, not far from the Veyadhā mountain. Once she and her husband were piously
attending on a pair of ṛṣis when they were struck by lightning and died instantly. She was reborn as a king's daughter Cittavegā, but by virtue of a plant which was put between her legs\(^1\) she passed for a boy and was brought up as one. However she fell in love with a prince called Garulavega, and he with her, for he recognized her as a girl. In the company of the same ṛṣis, they acquired the memory of their anterior existence: Garulavega had been her husband Temdua. At the same time they became vidyādhāras. Having inherited the kingdom from his father, Garulavega in due course renounced it in favour of his son and "went forth" with his wife as a wandering devotee; on the occasion described above he was made a monk and Cittavegā became the pupil of Vasumati. She gave Vasumati one of these virilizing plants.

One day Pumda was called upon to settle a dispute about an inheritance. There were three brothers, all businessmen. The eldest went on a trading voyage and never returned. He had left no will; his wife was pregnant; the two remaining brothers demanded a share of the property; she refused. Pumda referred the case to Tāraga, and Tāraga pointed out that the succession of property would be assured if the eldest brother's posthumous child was a son. Pumda reflected on the advantages of having a son, for he had none himself. He noticed in his queen the signs that she was longing for children. Once a tāpasa and his wife visited the royal palace; Pumda admired the love they felt for their four sons, penniless as

\(^1\) The narrative here is extremely compressed. It was predicted that she would be the wife of a great man, who presumably would reveal himself by seeing through her disguise. I suppose that Cittavegā's parents were responsible for the plant; apparently her nurse (ammadhāi, 215.9) told her the secret when she reached young womanhood (jovvaṇḍadė, ibid.).
they were, and reflected that he the king was more deserving of pity than they. At last the queen produced a child — but it was a girl. Vasumati used the plant which Cittavega had given her to change the baby into the long-awaited son. Ajjajeththa proved himself a great man by recognizing her true sex.

Such is Vasumati's story which Vasudeva hears from Ansumamta. 217 He considers the blessings which await those who respect the sadhus, and lives contented in the company of his new wife Pumda.* She gives him a son whom they call Mahapumda.
that is to say, Purnda, the present king of Bhaddilapura,
has a daughter Purnda. However we only hear of Vasudeva falling in
love with the king; the occasion when he met the daughter who was
disguised as a man is not described.

The story is summarized in Jinasena *HP 24.31-32* thus:

\[\text{sākam aśsumatā yāto bhadrilākhyapuram param/} \]
\[\text{paundraś ca nṛpatiś tatra duhitā cāruhaśini}/\]
\[\text{divyauṣadhiprabhāvena sa yuvaveśadhāriṇī/} \]
\[\text{tena vijñātaivṛttāntā pariṇātātihāriṇī/} \]

With Amśuman he went to an excellent town called Bhadrila; the king there was Paundra, and his daughter, Cāruhaśini. By the power of a divine herb she wore the disguise of a young man; when [Vasudeva] found out her story he married the very charming girl.

Hemacandra (Tr 8.2.381-382), like Sanghadāsa, gives the girl the same name as her father, but as in the story of Priyadarśanā in the *BKŚS* (24 ff.) the father is dead and the daughter, disguised as a man, has inherited his authority. Notice the similarity between the names Priyadarśanā and Cāruhaśini.
One night Vasudeva is awakened from his sleep of amorous exhaustion by a voice which says, "Ah! He sleeps happily, though he is responsible for the passion of the one who loves him." He sees the female doorkeeper Kalahamsī weeping. She tells him that Sāmalī asks to be remembered to him. And how is Sāmalī getting on? Kalahamsī says that the wicked Amgaraka had attacked Kinnaragīya city, but the king managed to beat him off, and Sāmalī would be pleased to receive Vasudeva there. "Take me to her," says Vasudeva, and Kalahamsī flies up into the air with him. But Vasudeva sees that she is not on the right course for Kinnaragīya and thumps her on the head, at which she turns into Amgaraka and disappears. Vasudeva falls into a lake, or rather a big river, and swims to shore. At dawn, having recovered his forces, he makes for a nearby town.

The river, he learns, is the Gaṅgā and the town is called Ilāvaddhana, a busy commercial centre. In the market place a trader invites him to sit down and immediately afterwards makes a sale worth 100,000. Delighted, the trader invites Vasudeva to his house. "Stay here for a moment," he says, "there is something I must go and do. I will be back." During the trader's absence Vasudeva cures his shop assistant, a pretty slave-girl, of bad breath. The trader returns, takes Vasudeva to his home, and lavishes hospitality on him. After dinner he tells this story.

---

1 We must suppose that it was Kalahamsī who uttered that sentence, odd as it seems in the mouth of a doorkeeper. It is more appropriately uttered by Prabhavatī in BKM 13, KSS 14, on whom see below, pages 256-258. In JHP (24.33) and HTr (8.2.383) he is simply carried off by a hamsa.
His name is Maṇoraha, he has a daughter Rattavati. In his household there is the slave girl whom Vasudeva cured, known because of her bad breath as Lasuṇikā, "Garlicky". Once he asked an omniscient mendicant Sivagutta (at the cost of a sermon on karman which I omit) why the girl stank of garlic. Sivagutta explained that in a former birth Lasuṇikā had been a queen who behaved arrogantly, demanding that her maid-servant not speak to her directly but avert her face and cover her mouth. For that she was reborn as a slave with a foul mouth, but her servant, who had submitted patiently to her mistress's maltreatment, was reborn as the trader's daughter Rattavati. This Rattavati will marry the father of the ruler of half Bharata. Hearing this, Maṇoraha asked the mendicant how this man was to be recognized. The answer was that in his presence Maṇoraha would make an enormously profitable sale, and that this man would cure Lasuṇikā's reek.

Vasudeva duly marries Rattavati.
One day Mañoraha proposes to Vasudeva that they go to see the festival of Indra at Mahāpura. Vasudeva accepts. As they approach the city they see on its outskirts a number of palaces.

The trader explains that they were built for the svayamvara of Somasiri, the king of Mahāpura’s daughter, to house the kings who assembled for her choosing; but she when the moment came fell down in a swoon and has remained dumb ever since.

Vasudeva and Mañoraha enter the city and perform their devotions at the festival. Suddenly their attention is attracted by a disturbance in the crowd. They see that an elephant is running amuck and smashing everything in sight. Vasudeva rescues a young girl from its fury and calms it. The crowd applauds, and the girl is taken by her attendants to the royal palace.

Vasudeva enjoys the hospitality of Mañoraha’s uncle Kuberadatta, a rich citizen of Mahāpura. A woman doorkeeper of the household tells Vasudeva more about Somasiri, for it was none other than Somasiri whom he rescued from the elephant. She is the daughter of Somadeva, king of Mahāpura. Somadeva gave her a svayamvara, but at the critical moment she saw the radiance emitted by the gods who had assembled for the mendicant Savāṇu’s enlightenment, and fainted, and even afterwards remained speechless. The doctors were powerless to cure her. However, Somasiri revealed to the doorkeeper that she was only playing dumb, and, making her swear to secrecy, she told her this story.

In a previous birth she had been the goddess Kañagacittā, the lover of the god Sayampabha. One day she lost her lover between one kalpa and another, and she spent her time looking for him.
everywhere in the threefold world. Once in Jambuddīva, desperate, she was worshipping the Jīna when she saw two wandering ascetics and asked their advice. They told her that her husband had been reborn as a man, and that she too should have a human existence as the daughter of king Somadeva of Mahāpura. Her husband would reveal himself by rescuing her from an elephant. In due course she was reborn as Somasiri. It was when she swooned at her svayamvara that she attained knowledge of her former birth. Once in possession of this knowledge she could not choose one of the assembled kings as her husband, and so she feigned dumbness.

After Vasudeva had saved her life, Somasiri told the doorkeeper that she had met her destined husband. The doorkeeper told the king and queen and they acknowledged Vasudeva's claim to her. The next day Somadeva gave Vasudeva his daughter's hand in marriage.

1 The other versions add that her husband-to-be is of the harivamsa, JHP 25.26, HTr 8.2.405.
Several years pass. One night Vasudeva wakes up and finds himself alone. The servants do not know where Somasirī is; Vasudeva concludes that she must be angry with him. Next morning a search is made but she cannot be found anywhere. The king suggests that some aerial being has abducted her. Vasudeva hopes that she may be playing a game, and goes towards a garden-house where she may be hiding, addressing her all the time as if she were present. The servants restrain him. He is inconsolable, and cannot eat or sleep. On the third day he decides to go to the aśoka-grove hoping to find comfort in the place where she and he had been together, and sure enough he finds her there.

He begs her not to be angry, but she replies that that is not the problem. She had, she says, undertaken a vow of self-restraint, part of which was her self-imposed silence, in order to meet the man who was to be her husband. To discharge this vow she must repeat

1 bhogaṇaparirṇāmeṇa, "by the digestion of his food" (224.21; cp. 226.14).

2 The passage 225.2-3 is difficult. The context demands that Vasudeva persist in thinking that Somasirī has left him of her own will, and has not, as king Somadeva thinks, been abducted. Vasudeva decides to look in the garden and in her friends' house (pamayavaṇe sahiṃhe pamaggaṃi), in case she is occupied with one or the other (taggayaṇamaṇe) and is for a joke not replying to his call (pariḥāsena... paḍivayaṇaṃ). The problems are matipuvvavirahakite and sahi (followed in the text by the editors' query) avakase. Konow omitted the former, and understood the latter as "in a place where she could meet female friends". Perhaps the former means "deliberately for the sake of separation", i.e. Somasirī may have left him in a fit of pique; in the latter the word sahi could be a correction meant for the word sahihe which is recorded as a variant for sahihe in what follows.
the marriage ceremony. Willingly, says Vasudeva, and she and he are married again with the full ritual.

That night, when they are alone in the bedroom, Somasiri pours a cup of wine and invites him to drink. Vasudeva protests that he must not drink wine without the guru's permission. Somasiri insists, and he drinks. He is unused to wine, and he has not eaten, so the effect is powerful. His eyes whirling with passion, he sweeps her up and lays her on the bed, and they embrace as if for the first time. Afterwards she changes her dress and hangs the other on a peg. Several days pass in this way.

One night Vasudeva wakes up and finds in the bed beside him a strange woman, as beautiful as a goddess. But not a goddess, he reasons, because her eyes are closed, nor a piśācī or rakṣasī, because she is of normal size, nor again a casual visitor from the harem, because her face betokens virtue. He notices that on her hands and feet she has the marks of royalty — and just then the woman herself awakes. She gets up, pours a jug of water over herself (but not a drop of it stays on her body!) and tells him her story.

On the south plateau of the Veyaddha, in a town called Suvaṇṇābha, lived king Cittavega of the vidyādhāras. He had a son Mānasavega and a daughter Vegavati — the narrator herself. King Cittavega went forth as an ascetic, leaving the greater part of his kingdom to Mānasavega, but keeping a portion for Vegavati. He

1 mao ( = madaḥ) is surely the right reading, 226.7.

2 Why does the narrator insist on this detail? Vasudeva is too sleepy to notice it, 226.10 sumipam iva passamūno pasutto mhi, but it signifies that the woman has abandoned kannabhāvasūyagāṃ vattham, "the dress signifying maidenhood" (228.22-23).
stipulated that Māṇasāvega must impart the sciences to Vegavatī. Māṇasāvega did not do so; Vegavatī was granted the sciences by her father.

One day Māṇasāvega abducted an earthling woman. Now it is a law of the vidyādharas¹ that anyone who offends against a mendicant or one who has taken refuge in a Jain temple, or who embraces a young woman belonging to another against her will, shall lose his science. So Māṇasāvega has not added the young woman to his harem. He asked Vegavatī to talk to her and try to win her over to his affection. Vegavatī went to the young woman and sang the praises of her brother and argued the advantages of marriage with him. She replied that she already had a husband, and that she was duty-bound to serve him alone; a person like Māṇasāvega, capable of abducting a sleeping woman, did not deserve Vegavatī's praise. Somasirī — for it was she — went on to praise her husband with impassioned eloquence. Vegavatī begged her pardon for having pleaded her brother's cause out of sympathy for him, and proposed to go to her husband and bring him there. Somasirī accepted this gratefully.

Vegavatī thought that the best way at once to win Vasudeva's confidence and bring him consolation in his distress would be to adopt Somasirī's form. Thus disguised, she arranged for Vasudeva to marry her.² In that way she violated Somasirī's bed... but Vasudeva agrees that her arrival saved his life. The rest of the night passes while he and Vegavatī are talking.

---

¹ See above, page 20, note 1.

² niyamavasena, "because of a vow", 228.22. The sense seems to demand "avaesena, "pretending [that the marriage was necessary because of] a vow"."
Next morning the servants come in as usual and are amazed to see Vegavatī. They go and tell the queen that there is a strange lady in Somasirī's room. Vegavatī tells the king and queen the reason for her presence, saying that by her promise of co-operation Somasirī has been saved from despair. They make her welcome. Vegavatī's good breeding wins over the servants and Vasudeva lives happily in her company.

* Several days pass in this way: In JHP "Somasīri", when Vasudeva asks her why she left him (read soditā, 24.64), answers that she went outside because she was too hot. Thus the motif of the vow is absent, and so is the motif of the drink: in preparation for Vasudeva's discovery the narrator merely says (24.66) that she always goes to sleep after Vasudeva and wakes up before him, but one day "somehow" (katham api, 24.67) he sees her sleeping.

* She violated Somasirī's bed: JHP explains Vegavatī's action by vicitrās cittavṛttaḥ, "the affections of the heart are fickle" (24.74), with which compare HTr 8.2.422.
One night Vasudeva is awakened from his sleep of amorous exhaustion by a cold wind. Someone is carrying him off. He tries to identify the abductor; from his resemblance to Vegavati he decides that it must be her brother Maṇásavega. Vasudeva thumps him with his fist, and he disappears. Vasudeva falls to earth, and lands on the bank of the Ganga. There a man wearing the simple cloth of an ascetic is standing in water up to his waist, meditating. It is on him that Vasudeva ends his fall, like a missile. The man is delighted; he is a vidyādhara, this encounter has perfected his science. How can he return the favour? Vasudeva asks him for the science of flight. The vidyādhara warns him that this will involve meditation. Success depends on his resisting supernatural women who will try to distract the concentration of his mind. Vasudeva agrees, and the vidyādhara leads him into an acchara, sets him up for the exercise, and departs, saying he will return after a day and a night.

Vasudeva perseveres with the exercise all day. That evening a beautiful and expensively-dressed woman stands in front of him and waits for him to notice her. "Help me to make good a promise," she says. Reflecting that she is not without promise herself, Vasudeva agrees. She flies up into the air with him, and leaves him on a mountainside. Not long after two handsome youths come to meet him. Introducing themselves as Dahimuha and Čandaivega, they

---

1 Meaning? 229.25, 27.
2 230.8-9 ja maggiyavvā varaṁ sā mamaṁ paṇayati.
conduct him to a city on the top of the mountain, to the royal palace, where he is treated with lavish hospitality. He is married to Mayanavega. Dahimuha explains why he was asked to make good a promise by her.¹

The stories which follow take us far away from the subject of Vasudeva's wanderings. I give a very compressed version.

A certain Meghanāya was king of Ariṃjayapura on the south plateau of the Veyaddha. He had a daughter called Paumasirī. An astrologer told him that his daughter must be married to a cakravartin.

The king of Divitilaga, Vajjapāṇī, demanded the hand of Paumasirī. When Meghanāya refused, he invaded Ariṃjayapura and forced him to take refuge in the Veyaddha.

Meghanāya asked a kevalin why it was that his daughter was destined to marry a cakravartin. The kevalin explained that in a former birth she had been Susena, a wife of the cakravartin Sanāṃkumāra.

Meghanāya then asked the kevalin where the destined husband of his daughter was to be found. In the āśrama of Kosiya, was the reply; there lived Subhoma (or Subhūma), son of king Kattavirīya of Hatthiṇapura, the enemy of Rāma son of Jamadaggī; Rāma had killed Kattavirīya in a family vendetta and taken possession of Hatthiṇapura, but Subhūma would shortly kill Rāma and become the lord of Bharata.

¹ Only this phrase identifies the woman who put an end to his exercise as Mayanavega. The other versions are more explicit.
Hearing this Meghanāya went to the āśrama and was present when Subhūma killed Rāma. He married his daughter Paumasirī to Subhūma, and Subhūma in time conquered all Bharata. He restored the realm-less Meghanāya, making him the lord of both plateaux of the vidyādharas.

In the line of Meghanāya there was a king called Bali. Remotely descended from Bali was a certain Dassaggīva, better known as Rāmaṇa (or Rāvana). Rāvaṇa had a daughter called Sītā, whom Rāma the son of Dasaraha married. Rāvaṇa abducted Sītā; Rāma recovered her with the help of Rāvaṇa's brother Vihīṣaṇa. Vihīṣaṇa was made king of Arimjaya.

........................

In the line of Vihīṣaṇa there is a king called Vijjuvega, who has three sons, Dahimuha, Damḍavega and Camḍavega, and a daughter Mayanavega. An astrologer told Vijjuvega that his daughter was destined to marry the father of the lord of half Bharata, and that this man would reveal himself by falling on Damḍavega while the latter is on the point of mastering his science.

Dahimuha continues: there is a vendetta between his family and that of king Tisehara of Divitilaya, inherited from olden times. Tisehara has a wife called Suppanahī, and they have a son Hepphaya. Tisehara seized Arimjaya and imprisoned Vijjuvega; the latter's children came to live here on the mountain. They see in their sister's union with Vasudeva a way to freedom.

---

1 Here begins a version of the Rāmāyaṇa, on which see V.M. Kulkarni, "The Rāmāyaṇa version of Sanghadasa as found in the Vasudevahipṇḍi", Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, 2 (1952), 128-138; J. de Jong, op. cit., 9-12.
After a few days Tisehara hears that Mayanavegā has been given to an earthling, becomes very angry, and arrives with his army. Vasudeva goes out to encounter him in a kind of armoured car, followed by the rest of the forces in exile. The two sides exchange insults, then the arrows begin to rain down. Tisehara singles out Vasudeva and discharges his most fearful weapons at him; Vasudeva dodges them and hits Tisehara in a vital spot with his arrows. Tisehara falls and his followers flee. Arimjaya is recaptured and Vijjuvega is released. Vasudeva and Mayanavegā live there happily, and she becomes pregnant.

One day, after being carefully dressed by her servants with jewels and flowers, Mayanavegā comes to Vasudeva in all her loveliness. Ravished, he exclaims, "Vegavati! You have taken the banner of beauty!" Mayanavegā angrily accuses him of infidelity and leaves. Vasudeva is sure that her anger will pass.

---

1 We have not been told that Hepphaya or Hephaga was a suitor for her hand, but in these stories the pattern is so well established that such matters go without saying. Suppanahī and Hephaga will be Vasudeva's enemies as Sūrpanakhā (or Sūrpanakhi) the sister of Rāvaṇa is Rāma's enemy in the Rāmāyaṇa; compare VH 142.31 onwards.

2 246.6 apegapaharaṇabharīyaṁ raham ārūḍho.
LAMBHA THE FIFTEENTH: VEGAVATI

After a while Mayanavega returns smiling. Vasudeva conciliates her. Suddenly there is a noise. She jumps up exclaiming, "The palace is on fire!" and Vasudeva indeed sees a mass of flames. She flies up into the air with him intending to dash him to the ground. He sees Manasavega with hands outstretched as if to seize him. Mayanavega drops Vasudeva and goes to hit Manasavega. He escapes, but Vasudeva falls on to a grassy slope. He is not hurt.

He hears a man singing the praises of Jarasamdha and learns from him that the country in which he finds himself is Magahā, the city is Rayagīha, and its king is Jarasamdha himself. Vasudeva decides to pay the city a visit. He is impressed by its opulence. He enters a gaming-house and joins in a game with a group of young businessmen, staking a diamond ring which he happens to be wearing. He sweeps the board. While the others are counting out his winnings, Vasudeva calls a man over and tells him to announce to the people that any unfortunate pauper need only come to the gaming-house and wealth will be given to him. An immense crowd assembles, and Vasudeva gives away all his gold, precious stones and pearls. The city resounds with his praises.

1 In fact a continuation of lambha 13, hence the name is the same.
2 Not knowing which country one is in is a common complaint of air-travellers, then as now. Usually Vasudeva explains his ignorance by saying that two yakṣinīs were fighting over him in mid-air and that he fell from their grasp; here he simply says to his interlocutor, "What business is it of yours?"
Just then, some of the king's men arrive and march him off to the palace. Behind closed doors, they begin to tie him up. Vasudeva demands to know why he is being punished. They explain that Jarāsandha's astrologer had predicted that the father of his enemy would arrive this day, would win a large sum of money gambling, and would distribute it among the people. Spies were placed in the gaming-houses, and when a man fulfilled these conditions, he was arrested. Vasudeva is now powerless to escape, and resigns himself to the pains of the samsāra. Then men load him on to a cart with instructions that he is to be taken out of the city secretly and killed. They stuff him into a bag and, with expressions of regret at the injustice of the astrologer's calculations, push him over a cliff.

As Vasudeva falls, he hears his executioners say, "Someone has picked him up!" He wonders if, like Cārudatta, he has been picked up by the bāhumūḍa birds.1 Something carries him a long way and then puts him down and unties the bag. As he crawls out, the first thing he sees is a familiar pair of feet; and when like a moulting snake he is free of the bag, he recognizes Vegavatī. She weeps bitterly for his misfortunes, but he reassures her that such is the action of karman; the true man does not wallow in happiness or sink under sorrow.

Then Vegavatī explains how she found him. When she awoke in her bed in Mahāpura alone, she suspected that her brother Mānasavega had abducted Vasudeva. The king and queen consoled her and advised

1 A cross-reference to Lambha 3. Notice how here and at 149.26-27 the author anticipates the objection, how could he have known about being picked up if he was inside a bag?
her to consult her science. The science confirmed her suspicion and revealed that he would marry Mayanavega. She passed a certain time in the loving care of the king and queen, not daring to go alone in search of Vasudeva; but finally she set off and came to Arimjaya city. She was delighted by Vasudeva's slip of the tongue when he addressed Mayanavega as Vegavati. She saw Mayanavega leave angrily, and Suppanahi take her place. Suppanahi, creating the illusion that the palace was on fire, flew up with Vasudeva intending to kill him. Vegavati intervened, and stood underneath with arms outstretched. Suppanahi dropped Vasudeva and (to prevent him from falling into Vegavati's hands) by her science gave Vegavati the appearance of Manasavega. Then she destroyed Vegavati's sciences and left. Vegavati wandered aimlessly in her distress. A voice from the sky told her where to find her husband; she went there, collected the bag, and brought it here.

She and Vasudeva wander together from āśrama to āśrama, immersed in the beauties of nature and in love for one another.

---

1 The wife of Tisehara, lambha 14. In principle this passage elucidates the mysterious events at the beginning of the lambha, but it is so laconic that at first sight the mystery only deepens.

2 Vegavati has lost her sciences. Who, or what, caught the bag when it fell? How did Vegavati find it? The VH's answers are bhāviyavvāye, 248.28-29, and āgāse vāyaṁ, 250.10. Hemacandra's answer to both (Tr. 8.2.458, 473) is: Vegavati's nurse. In JHP she does not lose her sciences, so there is no problem.
One day Vegavati and Vasudeva see a woman perched on a stone under an asoka tree. She is tied up in a nagapāśa, a complicated knot, in a position that endangers her life. Vegavati recognizes her as a friend, Bālacāndā, daughter of king Candākha\(^1\) of Gaganavallabha on the north plateau of the Veyaddha, and says that she is undergoing an initiation (puraccaraṇa\(^2\), 251.10) into science. Vasudeva by his skill releases her. When she revives she says that in her family attaining the sciences involves great suffering, but by his intervention she has succeeded; then she explains why this is so.

A former king of Gaganavallabha, Vijjadāha,\(^*\) once ordered his vidyādharas to destroy a mendicant, seeing in his extreme renunciation a danger to himself. They were prevented by the Nāga king Dharana, a brother of the mendicant. Dharana took away their sciences, and gave them back subject to certain conditions;\(^2\) but for the family of Vijjadāha he was more severe, decreeing that only the women could attain to the sciences, and then only at the cost of great suffering, except that the sight of a god, a sādhu or a great man (mahāpurisa, 264.23) should suffice instead. Bālacāndā is of the family of Vijjadāha; the appearance of Vasudeva cut short her painful meditation.

There is, moreover, a precedent for a vāsudeva releasing a woman in her family from a nagapāśa, after which the woman became his

---

1. Arunacamda, 264.27.
devoted servant. Bālacandā asks what she can do for Vasudeva in return. He asks that she give her sciences to Vegavatī. Bālacandā agrees, and flies off with Vegavatī.*

* Vijjudāda: in JHP the story of Viṣṇuddāmśtra is given in the next sarga, 27, in response to a question of king Śreṇīka; compare the story of Viṣṇu, sarga 20.

* Flies off with Vegavatī: to Gaganavallabha, as we learn from the other versions.
Vasudeva sets off alone in a southerly direction. Thanks to Bālacakṣaṇa's influence, he travels a long way through forests, rivers and mountains without becoming tired. He enjoys the hospitality of an āśrama, where he learns about Eniputta the king of Sāvatthī, who gave his daughter Piyambusumārī a svayaṃvara. But she refused to choose one of the assembled kings. They became angry and attacked Eniputta. He chased them all away; the ascetics of the āśrama are some of these fugitives. In return for this story Vasudeva teaches them the explication of the Great Vows (mahāvayānāvakkhaṇā) and the perfection of the soul in the vegetable world (vanappatiye jīvasiddhi); then travelling by pleasant stages he reaches Sāvatthī.

Sāvatthī is a rich and beautiful city. Vasudeva enters a magnificent temple and finds himself in a maṇḍapa decorated with 800 columns and carved stonework of all kinds. He sees a statue of a three-legged buffalo executed in precious stone, and asks a brahman the reason for it. The brahman tells him this story, which I give in a very compressed version.

A certain ēreṣṭhin of Sāvatthī, Kāmadeva, had a buffalo called Bhaddaga which possessed the memory of its former existences. Hence it feared for its life. The king of Sāvatthī gave it the freedom of the city but one of his sons, Migaddhaya, cruelly mutilated it by cutting off one of its legs, and it died. Later, Migaddhaya attained enlightenment as a mendicant, and knew the
reason for his action; in a former birth he had been Āsagga, son of Maūragga king of Camaraçcā city on the north plateau of the Veyaddha. The buffalo had been a minister of his father's who held heretical opinions, a certain Harimaesa. The buffalo was reborn as the god Lohiyakkha; as such he gave Kāmadeva the funds necessary for building a temple to house statues of Migaddhaya, himself Kāmadeva, and the three-legged buffalo.

There lives in Sāvatthī now a śreṣṭhin Kāmadeva, descended from the other, and he is a dear friend of king Enipputta. He has a daughter Bandhumati, beautiful and much sought-after; but he will only give her to the man indicated by his ancestor.* The brahman concludes his discourse by saying that if Vasudeva wants to inspect the shrine,¹ he should wait because Kāmadeva will arrive in a moment.

Vasudeva however being curious lets himself in. He prostrates himself before the statue of the sage. Just then he hears the śreṣṭhin arrive, and he hides behind the statue of Kāmadeva. The present Kāmadeva prays to the image of his ancestor to indicate a husband for Bandhumati. Vasudeva thrusts forth his hand, which of course bears auspicious signs. Kāmadeva, delighted, grasps him by the hand, and news gets about that the god has found a husband for the girl. Vasudeva is escorted in triumph to the śreṣṭhin's house and arrangements for his marriage are made at once. The officiating priest points out that Kāmadeva is a vaisya, but says

---

¹ As I understand it, Vasudeva in the maṇḍava (268.18) sees the statues through a lattice (jālagihamaajjhāgam, 268.19); they are in the pāsāya (279.17).
that as a mark of special favour he will marry Kāmadeva's daughter to Vasudeva with the fire ceremony nevertheless. And the marriage duly takes place.

On a suitable day Vasudeva is, after suitable preparation, taken with Bandhumati to see the king. The opulence of his train and his own beauty astonish the town. The women of the royal palace watch from the windows. Ministers greet the couple, and usher Vasudeva into an inner room. There he receives blessings and presents from the king, after which he and his party return to Kāmadeva's house.

* The man indicated by his ancestor: In JHP and HTr, the test is that her fated husband will open the door of the temple. Jinasena suggests that the door was exceptionally difficult to open (*dvāram ... dvātrimśadargalādurgam, 29.9).
One day while Vasudeva is sitting with Bamdhumati in her father’s house, eight dancing girls arrive and introduce themselves to him. Bamdhumati explains that they are companions of the king’s daughter, Piyamgusumdarī. She and they exchange some polite phrases which seem to mean more than they say, then she takes her leave, saying that she will visit Piyamgusumdarī. Vasudeva and the dancers go to an aśoka grove where a musical spectacle has been prepared for his distraction. They take their instruments and perform this story: some men gathered together to defend themselves against a lion. But then a jackal came along and began to live with the lion. After that the men were no longer afraid; a lion who cohabits with a jackal has nothing of the lion about him.

Vasudeva understands that they are laughing at him, for the lion signifies himself, and the jackal, Bamdhumati. He makes a cutting remark about their story; they appease him by their playing; he asks what he can do in return; they ask for the story of his life, which he tells. When he has retraced his adventures all the way back to the time he first set off from Soriyapura he realizes that the dancing girls have probably been sent by Piyamgusumdarī to find out more about himself. They take their leave of him and depart.

That evening when he rejoins Bamdhumati Vasudeva is surprised to see that she is wearing more ornaments than usual; in particular a jewelled girdle. He asks her how the day went. Bamdhumati says that, after greeting the king and his queens, and hearing from two ladies in the queens’ company the reason why they had decided to adopt the vow of mendicancy (which I omit), she went to
Piyamgusumdarī. Her friend embraced her again and again, sighing deeply.\(^1\) Then after offering her the usual hospitality, Piyamgusumdarī pressed on Bamdhumatī a handful of jewels and insisted that she wear a certain girdle belonging to her.

Thus Bamdhumatī concludes her account of the day. For her part, Piyamgusumdarī, having heard about Vasudeva's origins...\(^2\)

A few days later a doorkeeper comes to visit Vasudeva. He introduces himself as Gamgarakkhia, son of GaMPapālia the doorkeeper of king Eniyaputta, and tells this story about himself:

Once he was sitting with his friend Vīṇāḍatta, when a servant of the courtesans Ramgapadāya and Raśeníya invited Vīṇāḍatta to go and watch a cockfight. Gamgarakkhia, ignorant of these pleasures, was all on fire to go along too. The fight was between two cocks belonging to the courtesans; Vīṇāḍatta took Ramgapadāya's cock and prepared it,\(^3\) and it won. In the second Gamgarakkhia took Raśeníya's cock and prepared it,\(^4\) and it won. Raśeníya gave him a share of her winnings, and he stayed there for twelve years, taking no account of the passage of time. During his absence his father died, and he returned sobered by grief to live with his mother.

\(^1\) \(288.24-28\) are obscure. A gāhā verse giving a third-person account of the events is quoted, and this is explicated still in the third person to form part of Bamdhumatī's story. For avatāsiyā \(288.23\) read avayāsiyā, "embraced".

\(^2\) Apparently a portion of text is missing here; see the footnote to page 289 of the printed text. Or it could be that the text preserves a false start in the narration of the story; the sentence may be completed "... sent the doorkeeper" (compare \(JHP\ 29.17\)), but the author wants to keep this piece of information for later, \(291.32\) ff., in order to surprise the reader.

\(^3\) apahāli, \(289.19\), apparently "secured it from injury", rather than "made it fight" (laiāvyo), Gujarati translation.

\(^4\) tejāvio, \(289.20\), compare teyasā, \(210.29\).
One day the wife of his childhood friend Makkadaya saluted Gamgarakkhia's mother with the words, "Hail, mother of the great doorkeeper!" His mother took offence at suffering such indignity because of her son, and when Gamgarakkhia heard of the incident he regretted the prodigality of his youth. But soon after, the king, summoning him through Makkadaya, appointed him doorkeeper in the royal palace. He took up his post and discovered the disadvantages of service: he resented being called like a dog to eat by a servant. But he stuck to it, thinking what a hard life his father's had been. Once he prevented a certain slave girl Uppalamālā from entering where she had no right to enter; as it turned out she was engaged in some secret mischief. The king noticed Gamgarakkhia's meritorious action and rewarded him with the office of doorkeeper of the maidens' quarters.

The girls in his charge, notably Piyamgusumdarī's companion Komuiyā, tempted him into indiscretion. They offered him food, and mocked his manner of eating, saying, "What skills one learns in the company of courtesans!" They induced him to declare that he would let his head be cut off for his mistress' sake. Then having aroused his interest in a jewelled necklace they threatened to compromise him by planting it in his apartment. Finally, Kiṇṇarī

1 Textually a difficult passage. He expresses his rage (for āṭṭho, text, read kohāīṭṭo; Gujarati translation krodhāvīṣṭa) with the words bhīṇḍāmi te nallayaṁ ayaṁ sīse, 290.6-7, "I will break this bowl on your head", followed by the meaningless words makkadapayammi diṭṭho; do they conceal a word for "head", mastaka?

2 pacchaṁṇaṁ angabhānjaṇaṁ kuṇamānā, 290.14; meaning? The Gujarati translation gives ekāntmāṁ angaceṣṭā kartā, which is no clearer. Apparently it means "causing bodily pain"; or perhaps "breaking a secret, spying".

3 Not mentioned apart from 291.20; presumably one of Piyamgusumdarī's retinue.
by causing a distraction led him to a private interview with Piyāṃgusundarī, who pressed him for the fulfilment of his promise:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{jam bhaṇai sāmiṇī taṃ karehi ahavi vi mariyavam//} \\
joe esa ajjautto jaṃ jāgasī taṃ tahā ihaṃ ḍane/ \\
jaṃ natthi so imā natthi ettha hu tumaṃ pi natthi tti//
\end{align*}
\]

Do what the mistress says, or die. You know that noble prince; bring him here. If he is not [here], she is not [able to live] — and in that case neither are you.

(VH 291.32-292.2)

So, Gaṃgarakkhia concludes, Vasudeva must go to the princess for his the doorkeeper's life depends on it.

Vasudeva wonders what to do, because intercourse with the king's daughter is most unlawful. His mind is made up when he sees a play on the subject of Vāsava the vidyādhara, who, while wandering about Bharaha, came upon Goyamarisi's hermitage; he made love to Goyama's wife Ahallā, and when they were disturbed by Goyama, he disguised himself as a bala,¹ but Goyama recognized him and killed him. Vasudeva resolves not to go.

One night, in the middle of the night, he wakes up and sees a goddess who beckons to him, and he goes out with her to an aśoka grove. There she gives him the following information (which I give in outline only): the wife of a royal ascetic, who observed continence because of a curse, became pregnant* as the result of wearing her husband's bark loincloth; she bore a daughter whom they called Isidattā or Risidattā. This girl became a lay-disciple in an āśrama. Her father gave her in marriage to his nephew. Risidattā became pregnant; her husband left her; she died in

¹ balarūvam karei, 292.28: meaning? Traditionally, it is a cat, bidāla, compare KSS 3.3.140.
childbirth and was reborn as a forest-deity (*vāñamaṭṭarī, 298.30*) which nourished the child in the form of a doe. This deity is none other than the narrator herself,\(^1\) and the child she reared is king Enīputta.

(300.10-305.31 I omit entirely)

306 Enīputta became king of Sāvatthi, and held — as we know — an unsuccessful *svayamvāra* for his daughter; unsuccessful because Piyāngusumdarī had been advised by the goddess not to choose any of the assembled kings, destined as she was to be the wife of the father of a king of kings, *savvanarimādhiva*\(^0\) (306.19). The goddess recognized Vasudeva as this man and sent Gamgarakkhia to summon him to the women's quarters. Vasudeva refused, and so the goddess has come in person to summon him.

The goddess tells Vasudeva, therefore, that he may without fear go to meet Piyāngusumdarī in the women's quarters; she will inform the king, and Gamgarakkhia will see to everything. She bids him farewell, inviting him to make a wish; he asks that she remember him when he needs her. Next day Gamgarakkhia comes for his instructions, and Vasudeva asks to meet the princess in the palace garden. This is arranged. Then Gamgarakkhia advises Vasudeva to disguise himself as a woman and come secretly to the women's quarters.* This Vasudeva does, with great reluctance, but once united with Piyāngusumdarī he takes great pleasure and passes three weeks there. Gamgarakkhia is terrified that news of this will get about because he, unlike Vasudeva, is unaware of the king's complicity in the affair; however he has been corrupted by one of

\(^1\) She is the wife of Jalaṇappaha the nāga, 305.15; compare *JHP* 29.20 and *HTr* 8.2.544.
the girls and his protests are short-lived. In the end all is
revealed, and the king gives his daughter to Vasudeva in a wedding
fit for a king.

* became pregnant: In JHP and HTr she is already pregnant when the
curse is pronounced.

* secretly to the women's quarters: This aspect of the story is
omitted in the other versions.
"Then Pabhāvatī took me away from Piyamgusumdarī to Somasirī in the city of Suvaṇṇapurī. While I was staying there in secret, Mānasavega saw me. He imprisoned me. All of Vegavatī's people took my side and asked why I was held captive. Mānasavega said, 'That man took possession of my sister, no less.' The other [sc. Vasudeva] said, 'You stole my wife.' Mānasavega said, 'She had already been given to me; let a trial be held.' And he engaged in a lawsuit with me in Balasīha's city Vejayantī. A fight with Amgāraka, Hephaga and Nīlakaṃtha broke out. With the help of Paṇṇatti, given to me by Pabhāvatī, I beat all four of them together with their followers. But Mānasavega abandoned his army and used Somasirī as his protection. His mother asked me to spare her son. After drawing blood to make him surrender Somasirī, I let him go. Thus defeated, he attended me like a servant. Somasirī said to me, let us go to Mahāpura. And in the vimāṇa built by Mānasavega we went to Mahāpura. I dismissed Mānasavega."

1 In all the manuscripts, the nineteenth and twentieth lambhas are missing (editors' note). The other versions do not notice a lacuna.

2 This passage, essentially the same as the trial-scene in the BKM (13) and the KSS (14), is in such a terse style that I have included it entire in translation. In the printed text of the VH, it (and a brief passage which follows, here omitted) is enclosed between brackets; the editors explain that its authenticity has been doubted on the grounds that it is a transition written to accommodate the later madhyamakhaṇḍa, but that it appears in all the manuscripts. The majjhimakaṇḍa is a work by Dharmadasa that picks up Vasudeva's story at the twenty-first lambha and continues it for another 71 lambhas; the first lambha in the continuation gives the story of Pabhāvatī. I owe this information to Dr J.C. Jain.
One day while Vasudeva is riding a horse he finds himself being carried away by Hephaga. Vasudeva thumps him, is released and falls into a lake. He swims to shore. While trying to find his bearings, he sees a pair of wandering monks flying through the air. They descend and accompany him to an āśrama. There the two monks tell their story, which I omit.

In the āśrama Vasudeva sees a woman who, though youthful and beautiful, appears miserable and in a poor state of health. She wears a chain of bones around her neck. Vasudeva asks the ascetics why she is there and why she is suffering. They tell this story: There is nearby a town called Vasaṃtapura. The king there is Jıyasattū. Jarāsamudha gave him one of his daughters, Īmdasena, in marriage. Now Jıyasattū was devoted to mendicants, and they had the freedom of his harem; one of them, Sūraseṇa, abused this privilege and seduced his wife. Jıyasattū found out and had the man put to death. Īmdasena lost her reason. Doctors locked her away and tried all manner of remedies without success. Her father demanded that she be released and allowed to live in an āśrama. Jıyasattū released her, showed her the bones of her lover, which she now wears as a necklace, and brought her here. But she refuses to eat. Can Vasudeva do something? Vasudeva can, and he cures the queen, we are not told how. In gratitude Jıyasattū gives him his daughter Keumati in marriage.* The time passes happily for him in Vasaṃtapura.

One day the king tells him that Jarāsamudha is intent on meeting the man who cured his daughter. Vasudeva agrees to go and meet Jarāsamudha, assuring Keumati that he will return as soon as possible.

---

1 Literally, "was leapt upon by a piśāca", 348.23; compare 350.21.
* Keumati in marriage: In JHP it is Ketumati that Vasudeva cures; he does not marry her.

Vasudeva was not for Maya on the company of Saketantra at the time. They travel by pleasant ways enjoying the scenery and places of Liyagita. When they enter Maya to marry him by the king to meet them later than quickly to the capital Liyagita. On the outskirts of the city they are stopped by a party of soldiers about noon, and told to wait there for the king's answer. While Vasudeva is engaged in conversation with the messenger, the men spring into action, tie him hand and foot and start easily with their weapons. Why? asks Vasudeva. The messenger, realizing impossibility, says that an astrologer had told Saketantra that the one who bound his daughter would be the father of his enemy, and that Saketantra has decided to nip this future enemy in the bud. The men take Vasudeva, still struggling, to a deserted place and the mortal wound is given.... But just as they are lifted up into the air, carried some distance, they dropped on the ground. There he saw a beautifully dressed old woman. She explained that she is Māyā, the mother-in-law of her friend Vasudeva. Vasudeva has a daughter Patañjali who is in love with Vasudeva. Vasudeva the has found restingplace of psychedelic, and he accompanied Patañjali to Patañjali. Patañjali is immediately encountered, and married the girl.
Vasudeva sets out for Magaha in the company of Jarasandha's messenger. They travel by pleasant stages enjoying the scenery and places of interest. When they enter Magaha a carriage sent by the king to meet them takes them quickly to the capital Rayagiha. On the outskirts of the city they are stopped by a party of sixteen stout men, and told to wait there for the king's envoy. While Vasudeva is engaged in conversation with the messenger, the men spring into action, tie him hand and foot and stand ready with their weapons. Why? asks Vasudeva. The messenger, disavowing responsibility, says that an astrologer had told Jarasandha that the man who cured his daughter would be the father of his enemy, and that Jarasandha has decided to nip this future enemy in the bud. The men take Vasudeva, still struggling, to a deserted place, and the mortal sword is drawn... But just in time he is lifted up into the air, carried some distance, then dropped on the ground. There he sees a beautifully dressed old woman.\(^1\) She explains that she is Bhagirathi, the mother-in-law of Gamdhara king of Pukhalavati. He has a daughter Pabhavati who is in love with Vasudeva. Vasudeva too has fond memories of Pabhavati,\(^2\) and he accompanies Bhagirathi to Pukhalavati, is luxuriously entertained, and marries the girl.

---

1. \(vuddha\)juva\(m\), 350.26. The word seems to mean "grown up girl", which is an odd description for a grandmother; does it represent a confused recollection of another version of the story in which the young girl is there accompanied by her grandmother?

2. Presumably the same Pabhavati who took Vasudeva to Somasiri in lambha 21, though this connection is not made in the text; see below, page 258.

* Bhagirathi: In JHP the rescuer is Prabhavati's grandfather, Bhagiratha.
One night Vasudeva falls asleep while passing the evening with music and wakes up to find himself being carried through the air by a woman of hostile appearance. Deciding that it is an enemy in disguise he thumps her on the head and she turns into Hephaya. Vasudeva falls into a big stretch of water, a river as he judges by the scent of vegetation. He swims to shore.

Next morning he makes his way to an āśrama. The ṛṣis tell him that he is in Seya on the Godāvari. He notices one man, distinguished by his fine white robe, who is counting off on his fingers something that he has on his mind. This man in turn notices Vasudeva, identifies him by his auspicious marks as a great man, and asks for guidance. He tells this story.

He is the minister of Vijaya king of Seya, Sucitta by name. The king has asked him to solve this legal problem: a rich trader of Poyaṇa, the capital, had two wives. One day he died, leaving one son. His wives are disputing the succession of his goods, each one saying that she is the boy's mother. The boy does not know which woman is his mother. Sucitta cannot solve the problem; the king, feeling that his own standing among his neighbour kings is at stake, has ordered him to leave and not return before the problem is solved. Vasudeva agrees to help, and Sucitta and he go to Poyaṇa, where he is well received.

The two women wait for the judgement. Vasudeva takes two swordsmen aside and says that he will ask them for a frightening show which will not hurt the boy. Before the women he says that to end the dispute the boy shall be divided equally between them, and gives orders to the swordsmen accordingly. They put a sword to the
boy's head. He begins to struggle and cry. One of the women looks pleased at the prospect of at least half the inheritance; the other renounces all claim to the boy, provided that his life be spared. Vasudeva concludes, among general acclamation, that the latter is the mother.\footnote{On the judgement of Solomon in Indian literature, see Winternitz, \textit{A History of Indian Literature}, volume 2, 544.}

In recognition for this feat, the king marries his daughter Bhaddā and his purohita's daughter Saccarakkhiyā to Vasudeva. He passes the time contentedly in their company.*

\*\* in their company: These two wives do not appear in \textit{JHP}. In \textit{HTr} we have instead Sukosalā and other \textit{vidyādhara} women, whose stories are merely mentioned and not told, and Kanakavatī, whose story includes a long version of the adventures of Nala and Davadantī.
One day Vasudeva, eager to visit Kollaira, slips away unnoticed by his wives and heads in a south-westerly direction. Enjoying the scenery as he goes, by pleasant stages he reaches the town, and before entering sits down to rest in an asoka grove. Some garland-makers, busy at their craft, invite him to stay with them. A girl in the family happens to mention that she is taking flowers to the princess; Vasudeva asks, "Which princess? What is she like?" The answer is that she is the daughter of king Paumaraha, and that she is beautiful and accomplished. Vasudeva asks for flowers of various colours and weaves with them a siridāma, a garland fit for Śrī herself. The girl takes this to the princess, and returns saying that she has been honoured by her. She explains: When she presented the garland, the princess asked whose was the skill that made it. The flower-girl replied that it was a stranger, young and beautiful as a vidyādhara or a god. The princess was delighted, and sent her off loaded with presents.

Later that day a minister of king Paumaraha comes to invite Vasudeva to his home. Vasudeva accepts, and is lavishly entertained. The next day, the minister asks him about the harivamśa, the family of Hari; Vasudeva gives a full genealogy, which I omit. Delighted, the minister says that the hospitality of poor folk is not enough for such a man, and presses him to stay. Several days pass, then on a suitable day king Paumaraha marries his daughter to Vasudeva.

One day Vasudeva asks his new wife why her father gave her away without knowing her future husband's family or character. She explains that Paumaraha had asked an astrologer what sort of husband his daughter would have; the astrologer told him that the man would
be a king of kings, and that he would be recognized when he sent a 
siridama to her and proved capable of accurately describing the 
harivamsha.

Once while bathing in a river Vasudeva catches a 
kaṭṭhalahamsa bird. The bird flies up with him. He thumps it 
and it becomes Hepphaya. Vasudeva falls back in the river.¹

And so the time passes happily for him.

¹ This incident looks like the false start of another lambha.

From this point onwards the other versions are extremely compressed,
and only the svayamvara of Rohini is developed at length.
One day Vasudeva is playing hide-and-seek with Paumāvatī in a pleasure garden. Suddenly she seizes him and flies up into the air. Already surprised by this, Vasudeva is more surprised when she takes the wrong direction; he decides that it is an enemy in disguise. He thumps her, she turns into Hephaṭa and disappears.

Vasudeva's fall is broken by creepers. When he has struggled free, the thought occurs to him that his Paumāvatī must have been stolen. In his distress, he apostrophizes the cakravāka, the hamsa and the wild deer, whose fidelity, gait and eyes respectively recall her to his mind, asking if by chance they have seen her. Such behaviour attracts the attention of some inhabitants of the forest. They hear him calling "Paumāvatī!" whereupon they run off together somewhere, and return to tell him that Paumāvatī is there. A crowd of villagers comes to greet Vasudeva; they escort him to the palace of king Amohapāhārī, and there the lady Paumāvatī is pointed out to him. He sees a certain resemblance, but it is not his Paumāvatī. Nevertheless he allows himself to be married to her.

Vasudeva asks the girl why she was given to him, though he was a stranger and evidently mad. She explains that her grandfather had been forced to take refuge in this remote place. The local kings had sued for her hand, but her grandfather refused, because he had no intention of becoming a yokel (mā gammo boham ti, 360.1-2). However some villagers who had previously seen Vasudeva in Kollayara, and knew him to be the son-in-law of Paumāraha, reported his

---

1. piyāmaho, 359.28. The absence of her father in all this is not explained.
presence; the king seized this opportunity to make a good marriage for his daughter.

Paumasiri, for that is the girl's name, bears Vasudeva a son whom they call Jara.
One day Vasudeva quits the forest kingdom, leaving behind Paumasiri and the boy. He reaches Kamcanapura. In a garden outside the city he sees a mendicant in a posture of meditation. Vasudeva and the mendicant engage in an instructive dialogue on pagai and purisa, which I omit, and then he invites Vasudeva to his place. After they have eaten, the mendicant tells Vasudeva this story.

His name is Sumitta. He is himself a bhikkhu of exceptional virtue, but Vasudeva, he thinks, may be interested to know about a courtesan's daughter called Laliyasiri who is not only beautiful but also has the auspicious marks which make her the destined wife of a great king. However she hates men. Once she confided to Sumitta the reason for this hatred. In a previous birth she had been a doe, the favourite of a kanayapaṭṭha buck. When the herd was pursued by hunters the buck abandoned her and she was shot. The memory of this betrayal, which came to her when as a child she was looking at a fawn, prevents her from putting her trust in or even tolerating the sight of men. In conclusion, Sumitta suggests that Vasudeva find a way of overcoming this.

Vasudeva paints a picture representing the herd being attacked, but shows the kanayapaṭṭha buck searching for the doe, and not having found her, with his eyes full of tears, seeking his death in a forest fire. He stays there looking at this improved version of the story. A servant girl from the courtesan's house asks for the painting. Vasudeva says that it represents his own experiences,

\[ \text{avāyavimaddacakkhuramanāpaṁ, "pleasing to the eye because of the rubbing-out of faults", 362.20.} \]
that he painted it merely for diversion, but that she may borrow it. The next day the servant returns and tells Vasudeva that her mistress was moved to tears by the painting. She reproached herself and her sex because she in her ignorance thought evil of her loved one; and with her mother Sumittasiri's consent, she instructed her servant to invite Vasudeva to stay with them. On Sumitta's advice he accepts, and Sumitta himself accompanies him to the courtesan's house. There Vasudeva enjoys the hospitality and charms of Laliyasiri. Having won her away from her aversion to men, Vasudeva tells the truth about himself.\(^1\)

\(^1\) I suppose that is the meaning of *sovakkamāveṇa ... appa*, 363.19-20. The story resembles that of Karpūrikā, *BKM* 14, *KSS* 7.9. In the *VH*, however, the lying hero, the pandering mendicant (is he one of the family, as his name suggests?) and the absence of a marriage all seem incongruous.
One day Vasudeva leaves Laliyasīrī and goes to Kosala country. There an invisible deity tells him that he is the destined husband of Rohinī, daughter of king Ruhira, and that he should attend her svayamvara and play a drum. Vasudeva enters the city of Ritṭhapura unnoticed among the actors and musicians. The svayamvara of Rohinī is announced, and while the royal suitors mount the dais set up for them, Vasudeva, drum in hand, mounts a dais with the drummers. Rohinī in all her beauty enters, and the scribes tell her the names of the suitors. These include Jarāsaṃdha and Kaṃsa; Paṇḍu and Damāghosa, the husbands of Vasudeva's sisters Kumtī and Maddī; two of Vasudeva's fathers-in-law, Kavila and Paumaraha; and a host of others. Rohinī inspects all these candidates, all of the utmost breeding, education and beauty. Just then Vasudeva beats his drum. Rohinī comes to him and awards him the garland.

The other kings are perturbed, and demand that a kṣatriya be chosen, not this person of unknown family. King Ruhira is unmoved by their protests, but Vasudeva replies hotly and proposes a trial of arms. In effect the kings besiege Ritṭhapura. Ruhira and his son Hiraṇṇanabha are forced to flee, but Vasudeva stands his ground, assisted by the vidyādhara Dahimuha. He meets the challenge of the kṣatriyas one after the other, and defeats them. The last is Samuddavijaya, Vasudeva's eldest brother. Vasudeva writes his own name on an arrow and aims it so that it falls at his brother's feet. When he sees it, Samuddavijaya throws aside his weapons and comes to embrace his brother. The kings return to their realms, and the wedding takes place with a great display of wealth.

1 See lamhā 14.
After a year has passed, a deputation from Vasudeva's family comes to ask him to return and bring with him all his wives, who should not be left where they are in their paternal homes. Vasudeva agrees, but will stay with Ruhira a while yet, out of politeness. He asks Rohini one day why she chose him at her svayañvara. She explains that a (or the) divinity of science told her that she would be the wife of Vasudeva the tenth Yadava, and that he would make himself known by playing a drum.

Rohini becomes pregnant and in due course gives birth to a son whom they call Rama. The sight of him delights Vasudeva's heart.
Once when Vasudeva is peacefully sleeping he is awakened by a voice calling to him softly. He sees a goddess beckoning to him and he goes over to her. She introduces herself as Dhanavatī the mother of Bālacandā. Vegavatī, she tells him, has regained her science and Bālacandā would like to see him. He agrees; Dhanavatī takes him to the Veyaddha; there he is married to Bālacandā.

Vasudeva proposes to Vegavatī and Bālacandā that, since he has promised his family to return to Soriya, they should go with him. They are pleased at the idea, asking only that first the other vidyādhāris whom he has married should assemble there in the vidyādhara territory. This is done. Then on a certain day they all go to Soriya in a vimāna, and there they are joined by all the other wives and their children.

The Devākī of the title is the future mother of Kaṇha. The lambha describes how Vasudeva wins her at a svayamvara, and how as the result of a rash promise he is committed to giving Kaṁsa his seventh child to be killed; here we are back in the harivamśa proper, and Vasudeva's wanderings are at an end.
THE STORY OF

NARAVĀHANADATTA

Though the As represent Vraja-bhakṣya people as far surpassing his father's, Udayana's fame is widespread in Indian folklore, feudal and fction, whereas his son is unknown outside the As. So far as Udayana is known to have had a son, the Vaiṣṇava tradition calls him Pratibis, the Purāṇa call his Vaiṣṇava, 1 but when an author calls the son Naravāhanda, he describes him as the king of the vaidikas, moves in a world that is similar to that he is referring to the As.

The case of Vasudeva is similar but inverse, in that he is not the son but the father of a divine hero. It may be that his very name is a backformation from a designation of Prajan, Vasudeva. 2 Both he and Naravāhanda are seen to belong to that fring of literary invention that surrounds the legends of great heroes, like the father of Achilles or the son of Ogyenes. Nevertheless such is the case of Prajan that his father still enjoys his reflected glory, and Vasudeva lives on in the minds of the people 3 while Naravāhanda's exploit are confined to books.

In the As Naravāhanda's story touches the legend of Udayana at many points. He inherits his father's skill in poetry and in elephant lore. His companions are the same of his father's; similarly his first adventures are not against the backdrop of the glory at Kāśī, but in Brāhma. He lives his early periods in the caves near

2 L. W. Hasell, 17.
3 See the examples in Arthur, Kāśīkatha Yātrācāra, Pātha 18 under "Vaiṣṇava".

Naravāhanda. His father's followers and other religious system. See also Varaha.
HOW THE STORY WAS TOLD

Though the BK represents Naravāhanadatta's deeds as far surpassing his father's, Udayana's fame is widespread in Indian folklore, fable and fiction, whereas his son is unknown outside the BK. To be sure Udayana is known to have had a son: the Pāli tradition calls him Bodhi, the Purāṇas call him Vahīnara. But when an author calls the son Naravāhanadatta, or describes him as the king of the vidyādharas, there is no doubt that he is referring to the BK. Naravāhanadatta is not a figure from popular tradition, his story is a literary creation. The case of Vasudeva is similar but inverse, in that he is not the son but the father of a famous man. It may be that his very name is a back-formation from a designation of Kṛṣṇa, Vāsudeva. Both he and Naravāhanadatta seem to belong to that fringe of literary invention that surrounds the legends of great heroes, like the father of Achilles or the son of Odysseus. Nevertheless such is the fame of Kṛṣṇa that his father still enjoys his reflected glory, and Vasudeva lives on in the minds of the people while Naravāhanadatta's exploits are confined to books.

In the BK Naravāhanadatta's story touches the legend of Udayana at many points. He inherits his father's skill in music and in elephant lore; his companions are the sons of his father's ministers; his first adventures are set against the background of the court at Kauśāmbī. Not so Vasudeva, who owes his easy successes in love not

References in Adaval, The Story of King Udayana, 231-238.
2 Lacôte, Essai, 17.
3 Bhandarkar, Vaisnavism Śaivism and minor religious systems, 11.
4 See for example in Archer, Kalighat Paintings, index under "Vasudeva".
to his father Andhakavyasi but to his previous incarnation as the ever-hopeful suitor Nandisena. Even the inverse relationship is not a formative element in the story, because his destiny as the father of a man who will rule over half Bharata could as well be any other mark of distinction. The VH is the story of a man who wanders alone from one encounter to the next. So far as the plot is concerned, his family knows nothing of him, nor he of them, from when he stages his disappearance from Bāravati to when he confronts his brothers at Rīṭṭhapura. We should therefore expect that the incidents in the BK that correspond to incidents in the VH would come from that time when Naravāhanadatta too wanders alone, and this is largely so. It is true that Madanamañjukā and Vegavatī have their equivalents in the VH, as we shall see, but they are only apparent exceptions, for it is not Vasudeva who marries the equivalent of the former, and though he does marry a Vegavatī, he marries her far from the bosom of his family. Her story is merely another stage in the hero's progress from one wife to the next, not a unique formative element, as in the BKŚŚ, namely the beginning of his wanderings. There are two other motifs from Naravāhanadatta's childhood or earlier, Udayana's desire for a son and the discovery of Amitagati, that have equivalents in the VH, but again they are not part of Vasudeva's own life. This being so, since on the one hand there is a coherent sequence, the family background of Naravāhanadatta in the BK, and on the other hand there is a scatter of narrative elements found in a number of different stories in the VH, it is easier to suppose that the author of the VH included fragments of the BK in its fabric than that the author of the BK saw how certain blocks of the VH could be fitted end to end to form a story. But the question shall remain open for the moment. Let us note merely
that it is a question of bits and pieces; the BK as a whole has its peculiar unity, and so has the VH; the VH as a whole is not literally a version of the BK.

Besides the stories and story motifs that occur in both works, there are also certain structural similarities between them, of which the most important is the framing of the story by the occasion on which the story was told. In works like these telling a story is an event in itself, and every story is potentially an event in a larger story, an event that occurs in a certain place for a certain reason and between certain characters, namely the narrator and his audience. Now the BK tradition is unanimous in making Naravāhanadatta tell his own story. Like the VH, the BKŚŚ is actually a narrative in the grammatical first person; the BKM and the KSS give the story of Naravāhanadatta in the third person, and yet they respect the tradition in presenting the hero as a narrator. Naravāhanadatta "on one occasion" early in the KSS begins to tell the story of his life:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ityādīdivyaritām kṛtvātmānaḥ kilānyavat/} \\
prāptavidyādharaiśvayo yadā mūlāt svayaṁ jagau// \\
naravāhanadatto 'tra sapatākair maharṣibhiḥ/ \\
prśāḥ prasaṅge kutṛāpi tadidām śṛṇutādhanā// \\
\end{align*}
\]

Now hear the heavenly adventures which Naravāhanadatta, speaking of himself in the third person, told from the very beginning, after he had obtained the sovereignty of the vidyādhāra, and had been questioned about the story of his life on some occasion or other by the seven śāsīs and their wives.

KSS 6.1.3-4

There is nothing corresponding to this in the BKM; as Lacôte said (Essai, 115), "Kṣemendra néglige d'avertir qu'à partir de cet

---

1 Tawney's translation; but compare KSS 17.1.6: munibhiḥ sapatākair aprṛcchya, quoted below, where sapatākair certainly refers to Naravāhanadatta's wives, and is so translated by Tawney.
endroit, c'est Naravāhana [sic] lui-même qui raconte son histoire."

But its presence is hardly an asset to the KSS, because the hero is introduced as the narrator of his adventures in the third person, which makes his introduction unnecessary. On another occasion near the end of the work he tells a part of his story, this time properly in the first person; the occasion is this.

Some time after his accession to supreme power over the vidyādhāras, Naravāhanadatta has a premonition of misfortune involving his father, which he investigates further by means of his science. The full story proves to be this: Candamahāsena, king of Ujjayinī and Udayana's father-in-law, had died. His two sons Gopālaka and Pālaka had been residents at Udayana's court since Udayana's marriage with their sister Vāsavadattā. Udayana urged Gopālaka to take up the sceptre at Ujjayinī, but he preferred his younger brother Pālaka. Udayana himself,

\[\text{āloka} \text{cāsthira} \text{m sarva} \text{m virako viṣayeśu saḥ/}\]

reflecting on the instability of all things, became disgusted with the objects of sense... (KSS 16.1.66)

and resolved to go to Mount Kālamjara and abandon this life, leaving Gopālaka to rule at Kausāmbī. On the top of Kālamjara, he took his beloved lyre in his hand and threw himself over the precipice, followed by his queens and ministers. A radiant vimāna carried them all to the sky. At this Gopālaka likewise felt the instability of all things (adhruvam matva sarvaṃ, ibid. 91), and retired to a monastery on Asitagarī. Pālaka's son Avantivardhana is now king of Ujjayinī and Kausāmbī.

Hearing this news, Naravāhanadatta goes to visit his uncle. Gopālaka invites him to spend the rainy season on Asitagarī. One
day, a scandal is announced: a vidyādhara, Ityaka\(^1\) by name, had been caught in the act of abducting Suratamañjarī, the wife of Avantivardhana. Ityaka claims that Suratamañjarī's mother\(^2\) had promised her to him in marriage. The case is put before Naravāhanadatta. He summons Pālaka and Avantivardhana from Ujjayinī, and hears the background to the case from their minister Bharataroha:

At a feast called the udakadāna at Ujjayinī, the oblation of water in honour of the dead Caṇḍamahāśena, an elephant ran wild and menaced the crowd. A caṇḍāla girl approached it alone and calmed it. Avantivardhana fell in love with the girl at sight. His friends recognized her as Suratamañjarī, the daughter of the mātaṅga Utpalahasta; they warned Avantivardhana that she was untouchable (nopabhogakṣemaṃ vapuḥ, \textit{KSS} 16.2.82). Avantivardhana was convinced that her caṇḍāla state was only an appearance hiding her real origin, and Pālaka agreed; else surely the prince would not have fallen in love with her. So he approached Utpalahasta to ask for Suratamañjarī on behalf of his son. Utpalahasta agreed, on condition that the future husband invite eighteen thousand brahmans to eat in his, Utpalahasta the mātaṅga's, house. By the miraculous intervention of Śiva, all the brahmans of Ujjayinī consented to this. Then Utpalahasta explained that he had been a vidyādhara and a follower of Naravāhanadatta's enemy Gaurīmuṇḍa, and that because he had attempted to harm Naravāhanadatta, Śiva had sentenced him to

\[^1\] Ityaka, \textit{BKM} 18.98. He is none other than Kaḷiṅgasena's and Madanavega's son, the one for whom Madanaṁcaukā was substituted at birth; see below, page 136.

\[^2\] In the \textit{BKM}, Suratamañjarī's father promises her to Ityaka; neither version gives the circumstances of this match: \textit{BKM} 18.99, \textit{KSS} 16.2.210.
become a mātāṅga; this sentence was to end when eighteen thousand brahmans consented to eat in his house, and when his daughter married the man who brought this about. Avantivardhana had fulfilled the first condition, and Utpalahasta gave him Suratamaṇjarī in marriage.

The court decides in favour of Avantivardhana. Naravāhanadatta is in favour of punishing Ityaka, but the others prevail on him to let Ityaka off with a reprimand for his bad conduct.

While Naravāhanadatta is staying on Asitāgiri, the hermits and his wives ask him to tell, not the story of his life — Somadeva still avoids making his hero recount his own adventures — but the stories which were told to console him during his separation from Madanamaṇcukā.

Naravāhanadatta was attended by various vidyādhara princes and accompanied by his twenty-five wives. As he was telling stories he was asked by the sages and his wives to tell them who entertained him and how, impatient as he was of his separation, when Manasavega had stolen away by magic his queen Madanamaṇcukā.

In the BKM it is indeed the story of his life that he is persuaded to tell, but it amounts to an appendix of only twenty-one ślokas. The general title of the passage, BKM 19.1-41, is upasamhāra, the summary. Ślokas 4-21 summarize the hero's own part in the story, leaving out Lambakas 1-4 which tell the origin of the BK and the
story of Udayana, and *lambaka* 18 which is composed of events supposedly known to all present.  

In these different ways Kṣemendra and Somadeva respect a tradition of first-person, retrospective narration, though it has no proper place in their third-person, chronological account of events. The *BKŚŚ*, on the other hand, introduces the mature hero and makes him tell his own story. Budhasvāmin describes the occasion as follows.

King Mahāsena of Ujjayinī died and was succeeded by his elder son Gopāla; Pālaka the younger son is crown prince. Gopāla becomes aware that the people of Ujjayinī believe he killed his father. His ministers reveal that Mahāsena had showed signs of insanity towards the end of his reign; to conciliate the people they spread the rumour that Gopāla in his love for his subjects had imprisoned him. Gopāla then abdicates in favour of Pālaka, saying that he cannot disregard this evil rumour, and leaves the city. Grieved by separation from his brother, Pālaka neglects his duties. His subjects report menacing omens. Shocked, he shows himself a king again. One day he asks the priests to tell him what is pure religious duty (*dharmam... suddham*, 2.11). That which is prescribed by the Vedas, they reply. So he devotes himself to vedic rites, to the detriment of his duty to his subjects. His ministers persuade him to pay more attention to pleasure and profit.  

---

1 Lacôte (Essai, 121) was inclined to attribute the *upasampāra* to the sole authorship of Kṣemendra; Alsdorf ("Eine neue Version", 347-348) regarded the occurrence of the word in the *VII, in the patthāvanā* 1.18 and as a heading on page 104, as evidence that it was a feature of the original *BK*, but there seems no reason to suppose that either instance is attributable to Saṅghadāsa.
(kāmārthau, 2.17); and he devotes himself to private and public entertainments.

Another day he reports a dream to his courtiers: a strange great elephant drives away the royal elephant. The priests vainly attempt a flattering interpretation; his ministers advise him to consult an expert, and the expert tells him that he must beware of being toppled from his throne. Before Pālaka even decides what should be done, Gopāla's son Avantivardhana tips him off his throne as he fetches a ball from under it. Seeing this as the best possible fulfilment of the omen, Pālaka consigns the kingdom to Avantivardhana, and

\[ dhārnārthakāmānām mātram ākhyaṇāya \]

having had his measure of duty, profit and pleasure

BKŚŚ 2.92

he goes as an ascetic to the hermitage of Kāśyapa on Asitaqīrī.

Avantivardhana's reign is a happy one. On one occasion he sees a girl on a swing, and the sight of her makes him lose interest in duty and profit (mandadharmārthacintasya, 3.7). Another day, from the terrace of the royal palace, he sees her calm a furious elephant in the mātaṅga quarter of the city. She greets him. He asks his minister who she is. "Surasamañjarī, daughter of Utpalahastaka, king of this community of mātaṅgas," he replies. The minister sees that Avantivardhana has fallen in love and confides this to Aṅgāravatī, Pālaka's mother. She goes to Utpalahastaka, and dismissing the differences in caste

\[ caṇḍālisparśanam rājā nārhatīty evaṁdibhiḥ/ na ca grāmekālāpais tvam māṁ bāḍhitum arhāsi// \]

and please, don't bore me with village gossip about how a king must not touch a caṇḍāli and so on

BKŚŚ 3.37
she asks for Surasamañjarī to be her grandson's wife. The father agrees, and the marriage duly takes place.

One day Avantivardhana and Surasamañjarī see that the mātanga quarter is empty. She is upset because in the absence of Utpalahastaka she feels threatened by Ipphaka, a candāla among the vidyādharas, to whom she had been promised by her father. Her father, she reveals, is a vidyādha who became the mātanga Utpalahastaka as the result of a curse, a curse which was to end when she married Avantivardhana. Ipphaka indeed abducts both Avantivardhana and Surasamañjarī while they are watching a yātra; Aṅgāravatī sends to Asitagiri to tell Pālaka. A vidyādha Divākaradeva, servant of Naravāhanadatta, brings Ipphaka in chains to Asitagiri. He has seen the incident and had arrested the culprit and brought him before Naravāhanadatta, who decreed that Kāśyapa's court should judge whose wife Surasamañjarī would be.

Naravāhanadatta himself, supreme ruler of the vidyādharas, arrives the next day, in a fleet of vimānas, accompanied by his twenty-six wives. Utpalahastaka explains to the court that when he offered his daughter to Ipphaka, he refused to accept her:

\[
\text{kāḥ sacetanaḥ/ kanyakāṁ upayaccheta śāpadagdhat kulād iti/}
\]

what sensible person would accept a girl from a family ruined by a curse?

Kāśyapa decides in favour of Avantivardhana.

Kāśyapa asks Naravāhanadatta to tell the rṣis, Pālaka, friends and wives how he won his kingdom and his wives.

Naravāhanadatta is embarrassed by the request:

\[
\text{trāsāt pṛthutarākṣasya jātam acchāyam ānanam/}
\]

his face grew pale, and his eyes opened wide with alarm.
How can he tell stories of love to gurus, stories of heroism to heroes? But if he refuses, he risks Kāśyapa's curse. He makes a mental appeal to Gaurī, and she reassures him that each member of his audience

śrotum yad ucitam yasya sa tathā syati netarāḥ//

for whom it is fitting, will hear what is fitting, and no one else will. \[BKŚŚ 4.11\]

Sarasvatī then manifests herself in his mouth, and begins the marvellous tale (caritam... citram, 4.12) of the cakravartin, his autobiography.

In sum, the hero's adventures are formally attached to the legend of Udayana which has an independent existence of its own. The obvious point of departure for narrating the life of a man is his birth. Since a man is unlikely to remember this event in his own life, it will be narrated in the third person even when the rest of the narrative is in the first person; there are other possibilities, but Indian stories do not favour them, preferring a scheme something like this: "There was a man X who had a wife Y. They had a child Z. This child grew up in such-and-such circumstances. Z is none other than myself. Now one day I..."\[1\] The BKŚŚ illustrates this scheme; the KŚŚ at the appropriate moment mentions a change to first-person narrative but in fact pursues the story throughout in the third, like the BKM (except BKM 19.4-21).

Another point of departure, one especially suited to the life of a great man's son when the father's legend is invoked, is the death of the father; the BKŚŚ makes no allusion to this,\[2\] whereas in the

---

1 Maten (BB 68) calls this scheme the "autobiographical flashback".

2 See Lacôte's note to the text at 4.14.
other versions it is part of the texture of the plot. The death of Vāsavadattā's father is the first link in a chain of events that brings Avantivardhana to the throne of Ujjayinī and Naravāhanadatta to Asitāgiri. In the BKŚŚ Udayana presumably still rules at Kauśāmbī; in the BKM and the KSS Udayana has abandoned his throne and his life, leaving Gopālaka in his stead. The motif of Udayana's friendship with Pālaka and Gopālaka comes into play here. No other version of the legend mentions this friendship which united the two kingdoms even during the life of Vāsavadattā's father in spite of the surreptitious way in which Udayana won her and brought her back to Kauśāmbī.1 The Kashmiri versions make Candamahāsena consent in secret to the union, which was cemented by the presence of Pālaka and Gopālaka at Udayana's court. That and Udayana's death may well have been innovations, the one designed to legitimize Udayana's marriage with Vāsavadattā, the other to emphasize Naravāhanadatta's succession to his father as a ruler, though a ruler in a higher realm than Kauśāmbī.

We may say then that of the two ideal schemes, first-person retrospective and third-person chronological narration, Budhasvāmin adopted the first and executed it soundly, while the Kashmiri poets adopted the second but spoiled the execution by hesitant attempts at the first as well. Still, one instance shows the advantages of chronological narration. Avantivardhana's father-in-law suffers under different curses in the Kashmiri version, which neatly link his state to the story of Naravāhanadatta, and in the BKŚŚ which, unable to make this connection because the story has not yet been told, explains his state by a banal motif of Indian fiction, that of

1 Adaval, The Story of King Udayana, 91, 95, 229-231.
the angry ascetic.\(^1\) Not that this is an argument for the authenticity of the Kashmiri version; Lacôte (Essai, 214-217) noted the similarity between the Surasamañjarī story in Budhasvāmin and that of Suratamañjarī in Dañdin’s Daśakūmaracaritam, arguing that Dañdin found the story in the BK much as we find it today in the BKŚS, and that the BKŚS version is thereby proved to be authentic.

The relation between the two schemes can be represented like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First person</th>
<th>Third person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BKŚS</strong></td>
<td><strong>BK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hero begins story</td>
<td>narration of hero's adventures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narration of hero's adventures</td>
<td>hero begins story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vasudeva too in Saṅghadāsa’s VH on a certain occasion, namely at the request of Pajjuṇṭa and before the elders of the family, began the tale of his wanderings; this corresponds to the first-person scheme of the BKŚS. The other versions of Vasudeva’s wanderings are in the third person, but the occasion is simply the teaching of Gautama and the problem of the hero as narrator does not arise. However Hemacandra’s version in Tr 8.7.127-133 provides an interesting analogy to the BK-M-KŚS scheme: after the narration of Vasudeva’s wanderings is over, he relates an incident in which Śāmba provoked Vasudeva’s anger by boasting of his own hundred wives. The incident is sufficiently motivated as an example of Śāmba’s naughtiness, but since it leads to nothing more than Śāmba’s retraction before Vasudeva’s age and authority, the version in which the idea of Śāmba’s wives induces Vasudeva to tell his own story seems more authentic. Therefore the two versions could be contrasted as above:

---

\(^1\) On the motif, see Ruben, *Die Erlebnisse der zehn Prinzen*, 59-60.
first person | third person
---|---
Sañghadāsa: hero begins story | Hemacandra: narration of hero's adventures
: narration of hero's adventures | : (motif which provides an occasion, not actually taken up, for the hero to tell his story)

Though the VH resembles the BKŚŚ in displaying the same scheme of first-person narration and consequently bringing the narrator into the foreground as hero, it differs in one respect in which all versions of the BK agree: the modesty of the hero. Naravāhanadatta, unlike Vasudevā, and despite all that has been said above, literally does not narrate his own adventures. Even in the BKŚŚ it is Sarasvatī who speaks through the hero's mouth, a facile metaphor to be sure, but the appeal to Gaurī quoted above can be understood as standing for a sense of awe before the task. Likewise in the upasaṃhāra of the BKM it is Poetry that tells the tale.

```
paratvenātmacaritam khyāpyaṃś candramaulinā/
nibaddhakavitāvaktrakṛd vatsarājātmajaḥ svayam//
```

The son of the Vatsa king, causing his own story to be told in the third person by Śiva from the mouth of poetic composition...

*BM* 19.2

The expression paratvena seems to correspond to Somadeva's *kṛtvātmānam angyavat* (*KSS* 6.1.3), though after all a passage in the first person follows. Apparently, the station of the cakravartin imposes a certain modesty, as Kāśyapa reminds Naravāhanadatta in a different context (*KSS* 16.3.3-8), pointing to the unfortunate case of the cakravartin Jīmūtavahāna who told all and fell from his state.¹

I doubt that this instance has any value as evidence for beliefs concerning cakravartins — it has the air of being freely invented, like the rules governing the behaviour of vidyādhāras. But the persistence of the general idea in all the versions suggests that it belonged to the original BK; it may be an example of a tendency observed in other narratives which show embedding, that though the technique demands a first-person narrator in the embedded stories, the rank of the narrator precludes his use of "I".¹

Now let us consider the part of the hero's father in the narrative. Udayana is present almost throughout the BK and the KSS as a complete legendary figure, in the sense that these works tell his story in full as a preparation for the story of his son, and in the sense that his life continues to influence Naravāhanadatta's activities. By contrast in the BKSS Udayana's past appears only in allusions here and there in the text, and once his great moment of fathering the future cakravartin is over, he survives merely as a royal presence behind the scene so long as Naravāhanadatta is living in Kauśāmbī. Nevertheless the overlap of the two versions is sufficient for us to compare them schematically like this:

¹ See for example J. Rousset, Narcisse romancier, 48-54, especially page 50: "Dans le mesure où on peut reconnaître à ces exclusions [sc. of first-person narration in dependent episodes in seventeenth-century French novels] un critère constant, il semble qu'il soit lié au rang des personnages: les premiers rôles ne se racontent pas eux-mêmes... on en conclut que c'est leur haute qualité qui ne leur permet pas de se confesser en personne."
The summary that follows will make the details clear.
THE BIRTH OF THE HERO

The hero of a great story cannot arrive in the world unheralded, as if by accident. The gods must seem to conspire at his conception, his mother must be aware that the unborn child she is carrying is to be no ordinary man, and his birth must be attended by auspicious signs. For that matter, as Propp has shown,¹ the hero even of a modest folk tale usually makes his appearance on the scene according to a precise sequence of events. The time and place where he was born, and the composition of his family, are specified; his parents deplore their childlessness and pray for a son; their wish is granted in some way or another, and in due course the son is born, often in a miraculous way, and his future greatness is prophesied. All versions of the BK are true to the type of the folk tale in reporting Naravāhanadatta's birth. Still, one can observe differences in the organization and style of the narrative between the BKM and the KSS on the one hand, and the BKŚŚ on the other. In the Kashmiri poems, the prediction is made on various occasions that Udayana and Vāsavatā would have a son destined for greatness, but the effect is to establish the tone of the work rather than to advance the narrative. For example when Udayana undertakes a course of ascetic practices in preparation for his world-conquest, that conventional lap of honour in a royal career, Śiva pleased by his austerities reveals in a dream that Udayana shall soon have a child who shall be king of all the vidyādhāras. However the prediction is taken simply as a mark that the moment is propitious for the digvijaya. The narrative takes a

¹ Morphologie du conte, 146-147.
step towards the appearance of our hero only when the queen's desire for children is excited, after which comes a succession of motifs that emphasize or ornament the crucial moment; soon afterwards she becomes pregnant.

In the BKSS too the queens manifest their longing for children, but this motif is enclosed in a major motif, Udayana's desire for a son. Two incidents provoke this desire; this is the first:

One day Udayana heard the two sides of a civil dispute: a merchant had drowned on a trading voyage; his eldest son followed him and did not return. The younger sons and their brother's wife both claimed the inheritance. Now she was pregnant with the eldest son's posthumous child. Udayana decreed that if the eldest son should return, or if the sister-in-law's child should be a son, the one or the other should inherit. Otherwise the property should pass to him, the king. Later the birth of a son was announced; Udayana for his part reflected that he had no son to inherit his property and kingdom.

This story has no equivalent in the Kashmiri poems, but it is substantially the same as an episode in the VH, the story of king Pumda, page 216. The second incident concerns a certain woman called Piṅgalikā, who arrives at court and tells her story. She is an ugly woman, but Viṣṇu made her attractive to one man, who then married her, and she became the mother of children. Viṣṇu granted her the grace of appearing beautiful to her husband on condition that she should not tell him how she had earned it, namely by giving in a previous incarnation food to a brahman. One day she lost her temper and told her husband at what a cheap price she had bought him, so to speak. At once he saw her for what she really was, and fled.
This fable of married life or the need for illusion, for all its charm, is a little surprising in the context. The moral ought to be, if a woman like that can have children, why cannot I? Such a lesson is drawn in the Kashmiri poems by Vāsavadattā from the visit of a potter woman and her five sons, and she draws it in the presence of a certain Piṅgalā or Piṅgalikā, a brahman woman whose story need not concern us except in that she was destitute and had two children to support. The name and the occasion are the same, both the BKŚŚ and the Kashmiri poems are working on the same hypothesis, but the realization is very different. A more striking difference is yet to come. When in the BKŚŚ Udayana, moved by the two scenes of family life and the sight of his broody queens, announces that he wants a son, his courtiers reveal that they staged the two scenes to provoke this desire. Thus events of the plot which appear haphazard or fated are traced back to the will of individuals. Another example: Udayana worships Kubera with ascetic practices and is rewarded with a dream predicting the birth of his son and his son's qualities. In the dream he is transported to Kubera's palace in Alakā to receive the god's grace; later a minor goddess, a guhyaka who owed Udayana a debt of gratitude, reveals that she had actually transported him to Alakā.

So much for the conception of Naravāhanadatta. Now the pregnant Vāsavadattā suffers from a dohada, a craving. In the BKŚŚ she is unwilling to reveal what it is that she craves; to encourage her to tell, her mother-in-law Mrgayāvatī describes a craving that she had while pregnant with Udayana: she desired to see the city all
in red, herself dressed in red.1 She goes on to tell how she was carried away by an enormous bird, which mistook her for a piece of meat, to the hermitage of Vasiṣṭha at the foot of Udayanagiri, and how Udayana was born there. The BK and the KSS of course tell this story in its chronological order, long before the present episode, though the KSS repeats it later, when Kaliṅgasena enquires about Udayana's antecedents.

Vāsavadattā reveals at last that she desires to fly, to have the pleasure of looking down on the earth from above. In the Kashmiri poems this longing is quickly satisfied by Yaugandharāyaṇa with certain mechanical devices, but in the BKSS there is much play on the difficulty of constructing a flying machine, and on the ill-will of the craftsmen who are called on to do the job.2 Finally the machine is made by a stranger who turns out to be the same guhyaka that conducted Udayana to Kubera's court. Her dohada satisfied, Vāsavadattā has only to await the term of her pregnancy.

There is nothing peculiar to the BK tradition in the motif of the child's birth; it is an occasion for the free play of poetic invention guided only by poetic convention, to be taken or not according to the author's will. Somadeva is the most expansive, giving a description of Vāsavadattā's room, a description of the child, how he has the auspicious marks of royalty and how his birth

---

1 Maten has an interesting discussion of this motif, which alternates with a similar motif in which she wishes to bathe in blood, BB 16 note 1. More details and an account of more sources are to be found in Adaval, The Story of King Udayana, 34-35.

2 The ill-will of craftsmen is illustrated by the story of Pukvasa, with which the story of Kokkāsa in the Dhamillahārī section of the VH may be compared: see Alsdorf, "Zwei neue Belege", 294-301; Jain, "Is Vasudevahārī a Jain version of the Bṛhatkathā?", 62.
is attended by a voice from heaven predicting greatness, and a
description of the city's festivities. The other authors are more
reserved. Nevertheless all agree on certain attributes of the hero
that are established about this time. Udayana's ministers, doing
their duty by following the king in all matters, have also begotten
sons who are born either before or on the same day as
Naravāhanadatta; they are:

Gomukha son of Rṣabha (BKŚS 6.11) or Nityodyata (BK 4.133)
or Nityodita or Ityaka (KŚS 4.3.57)

Marubhūtika son of Yaugandharāyana

Hariśikha son of Rumanvats

Tapantaka son of Vasantaka

These will be the constant companions of Naravāhanadatta in
all the versions of his story. As we have seen, of the older
generation Yaugandharāyana and Rumanvats have an important place in
Udayana's household, and we should expect that the sons would inherit
the offices of the fathers, becoming counsellor and chief of the
armies respectively. In fact, according to Budhasvāmin, who alone
gives the details of their functions, Hariśikha himself is to fill
both these offices (senāpatiś ca mantri ca, BKŚS 7.25), and
Marubhūtika is to become the prince's squire (khaḍgacarmadharo,
7.26). And indeed, as Lacôte nicely observes in a note to the text
at 10.8, Hariśikha and Marubhūtika are characterized by their speech
and actions as a future prime minister and military commander
respectively, the reverse of their fathers' functions. Vasantaka
and his son Tapantaka, though securely part of the tradition, have
no special characteristics and play no significant part in the
action. Gomukha's is the strangest case, because although he is
the most prominent of the companions the tradition does not know for
certain whose son he is. The Kashmiri poets describe his father as
the doorkeeper, pratīhara; Somadeva strangely calls this man first
Nityodita (4.1.38), then when he is identified as Gomukha's father
he calls him Nityodita or Ityaka, and afterwards always Ityaka.
Budhasvāmin did not exert himself to find a name: Gomukha, Cowface,
is the son of Kṣabha, Bull. These differences enable us to
distinguish between the areas of the story where tradition is
inviolable and those where the authors are free to invent.
Yaugandharāyaṇa is present in all Udayana stories where at least one
minister is mentioned. When three are mentioned the other two are
Rūmapat and Vasantaka. But beyond three tradition is no guide;
and since Naravāhanadatta's companions are always the same four, a
father had to be invented for the fourth.

According to the KSS, when Naravāhanadatta is born the above-
mentioned voice from heaven announces:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kāmadeva} & \text{vāyuo } 'yām \text{ rāja}ḥ \text{ jātas tavātmajah/} \\
naravāhanadattaḥ & \text{ ca jānīhu enam ihākhyayā/} \\
anena bhavitavyaḥ & \text{ ca divyam kalpam atandriṇā/} \\
sarvavidyādharendraṇām & \text{ acirāc cakravartinā/}
\end{align*}
\]

King, this son that is born to you is an incarnation of
Kāma; know that his name is Naravāhanadatta. He will
soon become cakravartin of the kings of the vidyādharas,
and maintain that position unwearied for a kalpa of the
gods. \text{KSS 4.3.73-74}

This version, then, makes Naravāhanadatta an incarnation or
embodiment or portion of Kāma. The \text{BKŚŚ}, while often comparing
its hero to Kāma, never, at least not in the surviving fragment,
identifies him explicitly with the god of love; though Lacôte
believed that Budhasvāmin in fact intended Naravāhanadatta to be an
incarnation of Kāma, as his note on the text at \text{BKŚŚ 12.60} shows.
It may be that the \text{BKM} and the \text{KSS} in this matter take literally
what was originally intended as no more than a metaphor, but since in spite of their unambiguous identification of the hero with Kāma the Kashmiri versions never use this as a motif in the action, it hardly matters whether we call it a metaphor or a fact. It is easy to imagine how the identification could be the basis of a plot; indeed the VH provides an example of such a development in that, while for the most part Vasudeva is merely compared to Kāma and his wife of the moment to Ratī as the emblems of love in enjoyment,¹ in the seventh laṁbha his resemblance to Kāma, a generic resemblance that he shares with another handsome man, motivates the action. There Vanaṁālā mistakes Vasudeva for her brother-in-law; she had never seen her husband’s brother, because her husband was from Kāmarūva. He had himself been kāmarūva, “as handsome as Kāma” (198.26), and Vasudeva is just as handsome, hence she takes him to be her late husband’s brother. The motive would, of course, be more convincing in a story of Naravāhanadatta as Kāma incarnate.

But one should not expect of any version a greater precision on this matter than the material allows; in this respect the BK resembles an epic, of which genre it is typical that the hero should have a two-fold genealogy, a royal human family and a divine parent, which coexist in the story and act in their own different spheres, undisturbed by the contradiction that they embody.²

Whatever his relation to Kāma, Naravāhanadatta is destined to be, as cakravartin of the vidyādharas, a master of the sciences, and to have the power of flight, a power often associated with royal

¹ e.g. VH 194.24, 213.26.
² See Grintser, Drevneindiiskii epos, part 2, chapter 3, section 1.
majesty. In the BKŚŚ he makes his first appearance on a lotus-
chariot with twenty-six petals, one for each of his wives; the KŚŚ
grees with this by making Śiva give him the lotus-chariot of
Brahma.¹ Vāsavadattā's dohada, which anticipates the special power
of her unborn son, is a desire to fly and look down on the earth
from above; even before his conception, her and Udayana's dream
foresees his fleet of vimānas. Later, the king of a nation of
automata, an inventor called Vajradhara in the BKM and Rājyadhara in
the KŚŚ, comes to Kauśāmbī to construct flying machines by royal
command; one of his machines enables Naravāhanadatta to go to
Karpūrasambhava. Budhasvāmin's attitude to craftsmen is quite
different, as the story of Pukvasaka shows. He is not sure that
men are capable of constructing flying machines, but of this he is
sure, that those who claim to know how are rogues and deserve
whipping. For him, vimānas are superhuman marvels; the force which
the idea of flight exerts on his imagination may be seen in the
remarkable passage in BKŚŚ 20.132-137, where he visualizes the disc
of the earth as seen from a great height through the flotilla of
beautiful aircraft that are always moving to and fro up there, driven
by the gods.

In the VH, the hero's power of flight is not a stately or a
lyrical but a frankly comic theme. Vasudeva is eager to learn to
fly, and co-operates with anyone who promises to show him how.

Fearing the scorn of the vidyādharas, he allows Nīlajasā to carry him

¹ cakravartimahāpadmavimānam brahmanirmitam, 14.3.133; plainly this
vehicle is the same as that of Kubera in the Rāmāyana, which was
called Puṣpaka and was made by Brahma (6.127.30); stolen from Kubera
by Rāvaṇa, it was made available to Rāma by his enemy's brother
Vibhīṣaṇa (6.121). This is a rare instance where the BKŚŚ agrees
with the Kashmiri versions on an allusion to the Rāmāyana.
off to Veyāḍḍha to learn the sciences — but she is stolen from him. He approaches a conjuror for help in this matter, but the man proves to be a fraud. Offered a wish by a vidyādhara, he at once chooses the power of flight, but is distracted by a pretty girl. His hopes are always dashed; fate has not marked him out to be an aviator.

Now to return to the question of structure: it is possible to continue the analogy, established above, between the BKŚŚ and Saṅghadāsa's VH on the one hand, and the Kashmiri versions of the BK and Hemacandra's version of Vasudeva's wanderings on the other:

Saṅghadāsa: Vasudeva begins his story
Hemacandra: previous incarnation story of Vasudeva
previous incarnation story of Vasudeva
(Vasudeva begins his story)

As it happens, the VH and the Kashmiri versions make an explicit statement about their structure by the use of titles for the different parts of the story. In the BKŚŚ and the KSŚ these parts are:

kathāpīṭha, the base of the story: containing the descent of the BK and the story of Udayana

kathāmukha, the mouth of the story: containing the story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā

The parts that follow have names descriptive of their contents, such as Lāvāṇaka, the place where Udayana married Padmāvatī, Naravāhanadattajanma, the birth of Naravāhanadatta, and so on. Lacôte claimed that the word mukha was properly used of an introduction to a work in which the principal narrator is introduced, and that it remained the name of a book of the BK even when the contents
of that book had so been changed that it no longer introduced the narrator, and for that matter even when it no longer stood at the head of the work.¹ He suggested that the word pItha came to be used of the descent of the story after that section had been added to the BK, considering it a priori impossible that the author of the original would have mythologized himself as the Gunadhya of the BKM and the KSS: whoever added the title pItha chose it because the obvious word, mukha, had already been usurped for another section.² He therefore offered a reconstruction of the BK along the lines of the BKSS, that is to say, first the introduction of the hero-narrator, called according to his principle the kathāmukha, then the story of Udayana, named after its contents, then the birth of Naravāhanadatta, and so on.

Alsdorf adduced the titles given to the different sections of the Vī, namely:

kahuppattI, the origin of the story: Goyama Suhamma's teaching
dhamillahimI, the wanderings of Dhamilla: a sequence of stories in no way connected with Vasudeva
peqhiyb, the base: the story of Pajjunṇa
muhaṃ, the opening: the story of Samba
paqimuhaṃ, the complication: introducing the hero-narrator sarIraṃ, the body: the former incarnation of Vasudeva, then Vasudeva's wanderings

as evidence against Lacôte's conclusion that there was no kathāpItha in the original BK:

¹ Essai, 71-72.
² Essai, 68. In the Sanskrit version of the BK that Bhoja knew, the story of Udayana was told in the kathāmukha, and a story that appears in the kathāpItha of the KSS was told in the kathāpItha: Raghavan, Bhoja's Srngāraprakāśa, 839.
Die Pīṭhikā der Vh zwingt uns, ihm ein solches trotzdem zuzuerkennen. Was aber soll dann darin gestanden haben? ... die Udayanageschichten in der alten BK in einem Kathāpīṭha dem Kathāmukha vorausgingen.1

His suggestion then is that the story of Udayana, presumably told in the third person, preceded the introduction of Naravāhanadatta and the narration of his own adventures in the first person. In the light of the schemes we have been studying, this seems an unlikely combination, though it must remain a possibility. The question is difficult to resolve above all because of the nature of the evidence. How closely are these titles attached to the sections of the work that they designate? Especially the three titles in the VH pedhiyā-muham-pādīmuham seem to have been applied with no regard for the contents; in particular, the muham does not introduce the narrator. If we could be sure that the titles are Saṅghadāsa's own, and not by another hand of uncertain date, and if we could be sure that in choosing them he was inspired by the BK and not simply using terms from poetic theory (mukha, pratimukha) or ready-to-hand metaphors (pīṭha, sarīra), the argument would be more persuasive.

---

1 "Eine neue Version", 348.
Naturally there is not much to say about the infancy of our hero. He passes his eighth year uneventfully, surrounded by his loving family and friends, and people begin to take thought for his future; his education, his consecration as crown prince, his marriage. Still, this phase of the story is interesting because the very paucity of good narrative material sharpens the contrast between the two branches of the BK tradition. The BKM and the KSS fill out the material with subsidiary stories that are only formally connected with the main story. For example, we learn that Udayana is worried about the safety of Naravāhanadatta, since the vidyādharas are a mischievous race and resent the threat of this future new ruler over them all. Yaugandharāyāṇa reassures him, having heard from Nārada that Śiva will protect the future king. Just then a vidyādhara arrives and professes friendship. Udayana asks him how one becomes a vidyādhara. Śaktivega, for that is his name, explains how he, formerly a brahman youth called Śaktideva, acquired the sciences; his story occupies nearly all of lambaka. Again, as the Kashmiri poems relate the story of Udayana from the beginning before introducing his son, so before introducing Madanamañcukā they give the complete life of her mother Kaliṅgasena. Then follow Naravāhanadatta's meeting with Madanamañcukā and his consecration as crown prince, which the BKŚŚ gives in reverse order; it will therefore be convenient to summarize the Kashmiri version of their courtship and marriage as a whole before turning to the other.

The king of Takṣaśilā has a daughter called Kaliṅgasena, of great beauty. On separate occasions, two celestial beings recognize her as an apsaras who has been born into a mortal family.
as the result of a curse. The first is Somaprabhā, a daughter of the asura Maya and the wife of Nalakūbara the son of Kubera. Somaprabhā becomes Kaliṅgasenā's friend and confidant. The second is a young vidyādhara king Madanavega. He is struck by her beauty; he reflects:

haṭhād yadi harāmy etām tad etan me na yujyate/
strīnāḥ haṭhopabhoghe hi mama śāpo 'sti mṛtyudahḥ/
tad etatprāptaye śambhur ārādhyas tapasā mayā/
tapo'dhīnāni hi śreyāṁsy upāyo 'ryo na vidyate//

It is not fitting for me to carry her off by force; for the possession of women by force is, according to a curse, fated to bring me death. So in order to obtain her, I must propitiate Śiva by asceticism, for blessings derive from asceticism, there is no other way. KSS 6.4.9-10

Śiva advises him that since Kaliṅgasenā will soon want to marry Udayana, he Madanavega should assume the form of Udayana and marry her in the gāndharva fashion first. Somaprabhā is the means by which Kaliṅgasenā hears of Udayana and desires to marry him, and not the old king of Śrāvastī, Prasenajit, whom her parents have chosen as her husband; and Somaprabhā conducts her to Udayana.

Yaugandharayāna is against the match, fearing that the family will be disturbed, and he resolves to procrastinate. The royal astrologers, on his orders, fix a date for the wedding six months hence, and a spy is sent to watch over Kaliṅgasenā, in the hope that she will give cause to have the wedding cancelled. Somaprabhā is annoyed by these stratagems, but cannot stay to help; her husband resents her absence. Udayana tests the mood of his two queens on the matter of his proposed marriage with Kaliṅgasenā, but, well-schooled by Yaugandharayāna, they make diplomatic replies.

Yaugandharayāna, the consummate schemer, persuades Udayana that their resignation is the sign of suicidal despair, and Udayana
returns to Vāsavādattā to test her mood again. He apologizes to her for having received Kaliṅgasena — who knows what may happen if one rejects a strange woman out of hand?

\[
\text{prasiddhaṃ cātra yad rambhā tapaḥsthenā nirūkṛtā/}
\text{pārthena śaṅdhataśāpaṃ dadau tasyai haṭhāgataḥ/}
\]

And this is well known, that Rambhā, who came to visit Arjuna of her own impetuous will, having been rejected by him, as he was engaged in austerities, inflicted on him a curse which made him a eunuch.

\[\text{KSS 6.7.90}\]

— and promises not to do anything against Vāsavādattā's will.

Her flush of emotion (or was it the wine?) at this moment convinces him that Yaugandharāyaṇa had been right. Meanwhile Madanavega visits Kaliṅgasena bearing the appearance of Udayana, and made her his wife in the gāndharva fashion. This is reported by Yaugandharāyaṇa's spy, and Udayana is confronted with the evidence of her unchastity. Unable to propose marriage to Kaliṅgasena, Udayana proposes his love:

\[
\text{trīyaṃ puruṣaṃ prāptaḥ yatas tvam asi bandhākī/}
\text{paradāragato dogo na me tvadgamane tataḥ/}
\]

Since you are unchaste as having resorted to three men, I shall not by approaching you incur the guilt of adultery.

\[\text{KSS 6.8.4}\]

But Kaliṅgasena regards herself as married chastely to one husband, Madanavega, and repels Udayana's advances. She lives on in her palace as the guest of Udayana, and Madanavega visits her regularly. She becomes pregnant, at which Madanavega abandons her — such is the law of the vidyādhāras. Meanwhile Śiva orders Rati, the wife of Kāma, to join her husband in a mortal incarnation, saying that Kaliṅgasena shall give birth to a son, and at the moment of birth
the reincarnated Rati shall be substituted for him. And so it happens; Kalīṅgasenā, to all the world, gives birth to a daughter.\footnote{In the BKM Kalīṅgasenā gives birth to a daughter for which Rati incarnate is substituted; though the text at the crucial moment is uncertain: 7,540 tato 'sūta sutā (v.l. ॐ) ... pūrṇalakṣaṇām (v.l. ॐam). Compare BKM 18.98 aham madanavegasya putro... It seems that Kṛṣemendra was not sure of the story at this point.}

Udayana, inspired by Śiva, declares that Kalīṅgasenā is an āpsaras, and that her daughter shall be the first queen of his son Naravāhanadatta. Vāsavadattā is amazed:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mahārāja kim evam tvam akasmād adya bhāṣase//} \\
\text{kuladvayaviśuddho 'yaṁ kva putras te bata kva sā/} \\
\text{kaliṅgasenātanaśā bandhakīgarbhasaṁbhava//}
\end{align*}
\]

Great king, why do you suddenly say this now? What similarity can there possibly be between this son of yours, of pure descent by both lines, and the daughter of Kalīṅgasenā, a girl whose mother is unchaste?

\text{KSS 6.8.54-55}

But Yaugandharāyaṇa confirms that as Naravāhanadatta is Kāma, so Kalīṅgasenā's daughter is Rati, his destined bride. The girl is named Madanamañcukā after her father Madanavega. As soon as she sees Naravāhanadatta, she becomes inseparable from him and in the course of time preparations for their marriage are made. First Naravāhanadatta is consecrated as crown prince, and his companions, the sons of the ministers, are appointed as his attendants; a voice from heaven announces

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sarvārthasādhakā ete bhaviṣyanty asya mantriṇaḥ/} \\
\text{śarīrād avibhinno 'syā gomukhas tu bhaviṣyatī//}
\end{align*}
\]

These ministers shall accomplish all things prosperously for the prince, and Gomukha shall be his inseparable companion.

\text{KSS 6.8.118}
Somaprabha, with the encouragement of her husband Nalakūbara, now makes another visit to Kaliṅgasena, and adds her testimony to the belief that Naravāhanadatta is an incarnation of Kāma who shall become king of the vidyādharas, and that Madanamañcukā his destined wife is an incarnation of Rati.

The Sciences and the Arts visit Naravāhanadatta in bodily form, and he becomes, allegorically speaking, their master. The first manifestation of the sciences in him is his perfect ear for music; later he proves superior to the best teachers in all the arts, and he himself teaches Madanamañcukā to dance. Once Naravāhanadatta asks for a summary of rājanīti, the policy of princes, which his companions, give, concluding:

\[ \text{evaṃ vicāraś cintā ca sāraṃ rājye 'dhikaṃ nu kim/} \]

Thus discernment and reflection are the main things in governing a kingdom; what is of more importance?

\[ \text{KSS 6.8.213} \]

But:

\[ \text{naravāhanadattas ca teṣāṃ śraddhāya tadvacaḥ/} \]
\[ \text{cintye puruṣakartavye 'py acintyaṃ daivam abhyadhāt//} \]

Naravāhanadatta, approving that speech of theirs, though he knew that heroic action is to be thought upon, still placed his reliance upon destiny whose power surpasses all thought.

\[ \text{KSS 6.8.214} \]

---

1 Tawney reads abhyagāt for abhyadhāt. His translation, which I give here, agrees very well with the passive rôle which Naravāhanadatta plays in the action of the BK. But it is difficult to see any relationship between the absolutive phrase cintye puruṣakartavye and the verb abhyagāt. Perhaps the point may be rendered "considerable as was manly action, destiny was indubitable in his estimation", a play on the two connotations of cintya, "worthy of thought" and "dubious".
One day, a *vidyādhara* king called Mānasavega asks Kaliṅgasena for Madanamaṅcukā's hand in marriage. 1 Kaliṅgasena answers that the gods have chosen Naravāhanadatta as her daughter's husband, and that he shall be the king of all the *vidyādhara*. Gomukha, learning of this, observes that the *vidyādhara* must be hostile. Kaliṅgasena presses the king for his consent to the marriage. Udayana however fears that the people may consider Kaliṅgasena to be unchaste, and proposes a marriage in the gāndharva fashion for her daughter. Yaugandharāyana argues against this, and everyone's doubts are resolved by the voice of Śiva, which rehearses once again the origins of Naravāhanadatta and Madanamaṅcukā, and Naravāhanadatta's destiny to rule over the *vidyādhara*. Preparations for the marriage are made; the astrologers are summoned, and they declare that Naravāhanadatta will have to endure a separation from his wife. 2 The marriage takes place with all due ceremony and magnificence and general rejoicing, and Naravāhanadatta

\[
\text{bhajate s ma sucirakāṅkṣitam udayaiśī jīvalokasukham//}
\]

... enjoyed, though intent on glory, the long-desired pleasures of this world.  

KSS 6.8.265

---

1 The appearance of Mānasavega is a necessary part of the plot, and yet the *BKM* has only the śloka 7,605:

\[
\text{atha mānasavegākhyo vidyādharpātiḥ svayam/}
\text{kaliṅgasenātanyāālābhe cakre manoratham//}
\]

Then a *vidyādhara* king called Mānasavega for his part conceived a desire to win the daughter of Kaliṅgasena.

The text is corrupt. Śloka 606 has three padas; and, obvious errors of transcription apart, pada 604b = 606b, and 606a-a' = 607a-607b. Probably 605 and 606 were inserted later; it is possible that 605 is an editorial or even authorial afterthought.

2 Not in *BKM*. 
In the BKSS too this section of the story serves to raise Naravāhanadatta from a cherished infant to a character in his own right, and indeed to a future ruler of all the vidyādharas. In another sphere, he now meets and is united with his first love. The BKM and the KSS by their ordering of events associate the theme of power with the theme of love: knowledge that Naravāhanadatta and Madanamaṁcukā are avatars of Kāma and Rati and knowledge of his destiny as ruler and hers as his queen, the meeting of the couple, his consecration as crown prince, his acquisition of the sciences, succeed one another as if all were equally homely events, or equally fantastic. The BKSS renders these events in the perspective of the first-person narrator, describing the hero's childhood purely in terms of family life, the life of a royal family to be sure but not one for which supernatural beings are regular visitors. No doubt because the hero's destiny will take him far beyond the family circle, he encounters presages of this destiny while away from the family, in the company of Gomukha and the others.

Passing over Naravāhanadatta's infancy, the BKSS first relates an incident which shows how he left behind the promiscuous comrade-ship of childhood for the dignity of a new station. One day, while playing at ball with his four companions, he snatches the ball and runs to his father. Marubhūtika pursues him in a rage. Udayana gives Marubhūtika another ball and warns Naravāhanadatta not to tease his friends. On another occasion Naravāhanadatta spoils Marubhūtika's aim while they are playing with bow and arrows, and Marubhūtika again pursues him into the audience hall, whereupon Yaugandharāyana urges Udayana to perform the royal baptism; as things are, he says, "over a trivial matter they forget themselves, and, their faces red with passion, they try to attack their master,
as monkeys a lion" (6.31). All applaud this advice. Udayana bestows the royal baptism on the prince, and it is now that he assigns to his companions those offices that were discussed above. The prince then pays his respects to family, court and people. In this way his growing up is established, and his consecration is motivated, without recourse to prophecies or other forms of authorial comment.

Because the narrator, in spite of the first-person medium, is recitent about himself and only rarely reveals his own feelings, rarely expresses his motives for a speech or action, indeed rarely speaks or initiates an action, the companions from now on become prominent as the vehicle for such expressions. They become the means by which Naravāhanadatta understands the world. So for example when Rumanvat invites Naravāhanadatta to attend the nāgavanayātra, a procession to the wood sacred to the nāgas, Hariśikha, Maribhūtika and Tapantaka advise against attending for fear of leaving the city unguarded. Gomukha however argues from his precocious experience that theirs is the age for pleasure, not affairs of state; the prince agrees.

They go in procession across the Yamuna to Nāgavana, and there enjoy the yātra. Next day, at Naravāhanadatta's request, Rumanvat takes him, his companions and the young people of the town hunting. He entrusts them to the care of the chief of the Pulindas who inhabit the forest, then returns to the court. Gomukha expresses his pleasure to be relieved of parental supervision; this marks an important stage in the existence of the prince and his companions as characters in their own story. While hunting they see a herd of deer of peculiar appearance, and Hariśikha and friends ask the Pulinda chief about them. He replies that they appear when a
cakravartin arises in the world, and that if a cakravartin shoots an arrow at them, it circles them in a pradaksīna and returns to the quiver.¹ Naravāhanadatta is not present to hear the explanation, having gone off by himself to chase the deer. When the others catch up with him, he reports a frustrating experience like that described by the Pulinda. At this the others revere the arrow.

The next incident in the story also has to do with Naravāhanadatta's destiny. It begins abruptly, without transition from the preceding events; Lacôte supposed that there was a lacuna in the text (note on 9.1). Suddenly we are told that the hero and his companions are resting by a river. Gomukha takes a lotus leaf and makes with it a toy boat; to his admiring companions he gives a brief exposition of the art of pattraccheda. Suddenly Marubhūtika rushes up to Naravāhanadatta and cries out that he has seen a marvel: a sandbank with footprints on it. Hariśikha is sceptical, but Gomukha agrees that it is indeed a marvel, because there are just two isolated footprints. Eliminating other possibilities by argument, he deduces that they were made by a vidyadhara carrying on his right arm a vidyadhari, whose science was not complete. Everyone looks for more traces; they find a row of footprints along the river bank. Gomukha interprets what passed between the lovers as they walked that way.

This is an especially appealing passage. The European reader thinks of Zadig, who like Gomukha deduced with amazing accuracy from a set of footprints the most intimate details of their maker.

¹ The deer are "swift as the wind" (vātamajā mṛgāḥ, BKŚS 8.42) or simply "wind deer" (vātaharipā, 8.52; marunmarga, 9.108); compare the wind deer which Vasudeva meets, VH 181.27.
Voltaire was of course consciously using an "oriental" motif, for documentation of which one may look to Penzer's article on the eleventh vetāla story in the KSS, especially the section entitled "The 'Quintessence' motif".\(^1\) It is in fact a universal motif of popular romances; Lacôte's comparison\(^2\) with Indian tales from Chinese buddhist sources is geographically and chronologically more apt, but the way in which Gomukha applies his method of detection, correcting all the while the suggestions of his less intelligent companions, irresistibly calls to mind Sherlock Holmes and Dr Watson.

The footprints end at a bower made of mādhavī. Gomukha advises against disturbing the lovers. But then a peacock and hen walk calmly out of the bower, proving, as Gomukha points out, that it is unoccupied. Nearby, on the branches of a tree, the prince and his companions see a necklace, ankle rings, a belt and a red garment. They also find a vidyādhara's shield (varmaratnam, 9.55). Gomukha concludes that the couple was abducted by an enemy.

At last they find the vidyādhara himself, immobile, tied by five unbreakable chains to the trunk of a tree. Naravāhanadatta recalls that the shield should contain five magic plants; one of these should serve to revive the vidyādhara.\(^3\) Gomukha sees to this, and reports that the vidyādhara, being revived, begged to see the

---

1 Ocean of Story, vol. 6, 286-288.
2 Note to text, 9.21.
3 We should expect another of the five plants to be the specific for releasing the vidyādhara, but this is not so. In the VH, Amiyaagati is nailed to the tree, and one of the simples in his shield serves to remove the nails from his wounds: VH 138.24-25.
prince. This request is granted; the vidyādhara introduces himself

vidyādharo 'mṛtagatiḥ kauśikasya muneḥ sutaḥ/
sarvavidyādhareśena praṇaman dṛṣṭatāṁ iti//

May the lord of all vidyādhara look upon the vidyādhara Amṛtagati,1 son of the sage Kauśika, as he bows before him.

BKŚŚ 9.78

and begins to tell his story.

On a peak in the Himalayas lives a sage Kauśika, who gratified the patient wish of his servant, the apsaras Bindumati, with two children, Amṛtagati and a girl of the same name. Amṛtagati the son learnt his father's sciences, and so became a vidyādhara. His father warned him that he would be the subject of another, a cakravartin, whom he would recognize by this: when one day he is chained by enemies, his master will save his life.

One day the vidyādhara king Vayupatha took Amṛtagati to Kāśyapasthalaka, and there he fell in love at first sight with a young girl, Kusumālīka. He caught a friend of his, Āṅgāraka, making amorous eyes at Kusumālīka; Āṅgāraka was ashamed at being caught, and Amṛtagati, afraid of what this embarrassment might lead to, left with Kusumālīka for a solitary and pleasant place. The rest of the story is as Gomukha deduced.

Amitagati offers his services and his science to Naravāhanadatta. The prince refuses, and urges him to go in search of his lover. Amitagati says that from now on he will be Naravāhanadatta's untiring bodyguard, day and night; and so saying, he flies up and away. The omen of the arrow and the deer is confirmed.

1 "Amṛtagati" and "Amitagati" are variant spellings.
In the Kashmiri works there is no hunting party. The nāgavanayātrā is however mentioned in the KSS; it is in this context that Gomukha first warns the prince about the infidelity of women, which frequently recurs as the subject of an instructive and entertaining story in these as in all story books. The story which Gomukha tells is motivated by an incident that takes place at the Nāgavana: a merchant's wife falls in love with him, and, being refused, tries to poison him.¹ Nor is there anything corresponding to the discovery of Amitagati, though a vidyādhara Amitagati will later become one of Naravāhanadatta's most important allies.

In the VH a certain Amlyagati is discovered by a character-narrator with his four companions whose names are those of Naravāhanadatta's companions; but he is the merchant's son Cārudatta, whose story we shall examine in due course. Now this poses the question, which of the two, Naravāhanadatta or Cārudatta, more logically discovers Amitagati. It is interesting to note that the apparent lacuna at the beginning of the story in the BKŚŚ does not occur in the VH because there the pattraccheda incident arises naturally out of a visit that the young men are making to a park, during which they pick flowers to offer to the Jina; it occurs with an explicit transition, and without the sense of anti-climax that follows the conclusion of the hunt in the BKŚŚ. But more of this later.

There is a curious parallel to the story of Amitagati in a drama by the Jain author Rāmacandrasūri, a pupil of Hemacandra.

¹ KSS 6.8.175-176; BKM 7.586-588, where however it happens kadacit, without reference to a yātrā.
In the second act of his *Kaumudīmitrāṇandam*, a merchant called
Mitrāṇanda earns the everlasting gratitude of a siddha called
Anāṅgadāsa by releasing him from the tree to which he has been
nailed. He was a lover by nature as well as by name; he says
iyantam kālam aham anāṅgadāsah/ sāmpratam punah prāṇadāna-
vetaṅkrītah kalpasahasrāvadhi mitrāṇandadāsah/

For so long a time was I the slave of love. Now however
I will be the slave of Mitrāṇanda for a thousand kalpas,
purchased by the pay that was the saving of my life.

*Kaumudīmitrāṇandam*, pages 22-23

He had been wandering at night on Varuṇa's island when he was
cought and cruelly punished in this way by the jealous Varuṇa.
The main plot of the play has no connection with the BK, but
Anāṅgadāsa's plight clearly owes something to Amitagati's. It is
conceivable that the story of the vidyādhara nailed to a tree belongs
to a Jain tradition of narrative; it certainly lends itself to a
moralizing interpretation. If so then perhaps Budhasvāmin
borrowed it from such a source and did not inherit it from the BK,
which would explain firstly why it comes a little awkwardly in his
narration and secondly why it is absent from the other versions of
the BK; but on balance this will be seen to be less likely than
that Saṅghadāsa and Rāmacandrāsūri had it from the BK.

Having studied Naravāhanadatta's first taste of power in
different manifestations in the BKŚŚ, let us turn to the theme of
love, his meeting with Madanamaṅjukā. This occurs immediately after
Udayana decides on his consecration as crown prince, a juxtaposition

---

1 Summarized by Hultzch, "Neue indische Dramen", 63-66. Mr K. Shah of the Gujarat Vidyapith Library, Ahmedabad, kindly provided me with a photocopy of the relevant pages of the *Kaumudīmitrāṇandam*. 
to which the narrative attaches no weight, though it is possible that it would have been recalled with a new significance if Budhasvāmin had taken the story as far as the hero's final victory. Madanamañjukā is brought to visit Udayana by her mother Kaliṅgasena, a woman of remarkable appearance, seeming bold, aged and talkative, but in fact modest, young and taciturn; a mystery. Udayana's question "Who is her father?" (7.16) reveals that the mother of the girl is a gaṇīkā, but further details are reserved for later, when Mudrikālatikā tells Kaliṅgasena's story, 10.182-191. Lacôte convincingly demonstrated that Kaliṅgasena ought to be, as the BKŚŚ has her, a gaṇīkā; though the Kashmiri poets present her as a princess they have not eliminated the most important consequences of her being a gaṇīkā from their expurgated version.¹ So it is that Yaugandharayana makes moves to prevent her from marrying Udayana, and Udayana (in the KŚŚ only) proposes, until a voice from heaven makes him think better of it, that his son should unite with her daughter in the informal gāndharva marriage; to which we can add the unusual insistence in the BKM and the KŚŚ that Madanamañcukā came with her nurse, not her mother, on the day when she met the hero, and the consternation of all concerned when she is declared to be his queen. Finally, the VH gives its support to the BKŚŚ in this matter. Lacôte also deduced from the casual way in which Kaliṅgasena appears in the BKŚŚ that she was a figure so well known to the literary public of the time as to need no introduction. This may be true, but one should also take into account Budhasvāmin's liking for mystification.

¹ Lacôte, Essai, 81, 83, 211.
The Vī of Saṅghadāsa has a version of the courtship and marriage of Naravāhanadatta and Madanamañjukā, but while mostly it is Vasudeva who corresponds to Naravāhanadatta, here his part is taken by Samba, the son of Kañha and Jambavaī, that is, the grandson of Vasudeva. Consequently this episode falls outside the tale told by Vasudeva himself, and I summarize it separately here.  

Once when he was very young, Samba was taken to see his father. At the same time, a certain Kālimdaseṇā had brought her daughter Suhirāṇṇā to visit Kañha. The two infants played together with such affection that Kañha agreed to Kālimdaseṇā's request that the girl should be his son's future bride. 

Now one day Samba's companion Buddhiseṇa takes him to a display of dancing given by Suhirāṇṇā and Hiraṇṇā, daughters of courtesans. On the way they meet a broken-down carriage. As they pass it, Buddhiseṇa by a trick makes Samba put his joined hands to his head, and this gesture is answered by a laugh from the other carriage. At the display, Buddhiseṇa stands in front of Samba while Suhirāṇṇā...

---

1 Hemacandra alludes to, but does not narrate, this story: "Śāmba sported with King Hemāṅgada's daughter, named Suharini, borne by a courtesan" (Johnson's translation, volume 5, page 217).

2 A gaṇikā, as two details already show: Suhirāṇṇā is the daughter of Hemāṅgaya, who is not Kālimdaseṇā's husband, and Kañha must command the domestics to show respect to the girl, Vī 98.17-18. Later Suhirāṇṇā is called gaṇiyadariga-, 101.4.

3 magge jāpassa akkho sajjijjai, “on the way the axle of a carriage is being fitted”, 101.5; not Samba's vehicle, as line 8 shows.

4 hasasaddo, "the noise of a horse", 101.8; a girlish giggle would suit the context better, compare BKSS 8.19. Read hasasaddo; for the confusion of य and य, compare above, page 23, note 1.
is dancing, but when her dance is finished he stands aside, and Samba and the girl exchange affectionate glances.

On the way home, Samba and his companions quarrel with one another. Buddhiseṇa, under provocation, enunciates a ninefold typology of men: the highest, the middling, and the lowest under the headings of artha, dharma and kāma. He, Buddhiseṇa, is of the highest class in kāma, because he is both loving and loved, whereas Samba is only middling, because he is merely loved without loving. And who loves Samba? With Samba's consent, Buddhiseṇa tells the whole story.

One day he came across some men with notebooks in their hands who said that they were making a list of the learned men and the fools of Bāravati for the king. Pointing to a carriage, they said that if Buddhiseṇa boarded it, they would put him down as a learned man, but if not, then as a fool. So Buddhiseṇa climbed on. After going some distance the driver changed his route to avoid an elephant, being warned by the mahout that the beast was dangerous. The new route was through the gaṇikās' quarter. The carriage stopped at one house, and Buddhiseṇa was told to dismount and go in. In the house a girl received him graciously, addressing him by name. She asked him how he passed his days; "In the practice of the arts", he replied, but his gaze followed a beautiful handmaid who entered just then. His hostess proposed a change from the company of his teachers. The handmaid, Bhogamālinī by name, escorted him to a bedroom and initiated him into the pleasures of love. Since then Buddhiseṇa has been a constant visitor to the house.

On one occasion Bhogamālinī explained why Buddhiseṇa had been brought to the house. Her mistress Suhiranna was promised as a child to prince Samba (on the occasion described above). Once her
mother, when setting out to see the king, had refused to take Suhiranñā with her,\(^1\) and she, left alone, had tried to kill herself.

Rescued in time by Bhogamāliṇī, she said she had been afraid that the prince did not want her any more. Bhogamāliṇī had told Kālīṃdaseṇā about this, and she had arranged to have Samba's friend Buddhiseṇa brought to the house by means of a trick involving the men with notebooks and the mahout, in the hope that he would plead Suhiranñā's cause to the prince.

"In case it seems strange that she is a gaṇīka's daughter," Bhogamāliṇī continued, "here is a story about the origin of courtesans." She told how king Bharaha was faithful to his one queen, though his neighbour kings kept sending him girls as presents; to allay the anxieties of his queen he married them off to his attendants (gaṇāṇa, 103.21) — hence the term gaṇīyā. In conclusion, Bhogamāliṇī asked Buddhiseṇa to see that the prince knew about Suhiranñā's feelings. He agreed. He took presents of flowers, perfumes, clothes and pān to the girls. Suhiranñā was the girl whom Samba saw in the carriage.\(^2\) When at the dancing display Buddhiseṇa stood in front of Samba, it was so that Suhiranñā would not be distracted from her performance by the sight of him. And with the telling of this story the friends arrive home.

Next day Samba asks Buddhiseṇa to go and summon Suhiranñā, but the other says that the girls do not trust him, and asks that another of the prince's companions, Jayaseṇa, accompany him.

Buddhiseṇa announces the prince's desire to the girls, and Jayaseṇa

---

\(^1\) In fact the king wanted Suhiranñā to attend him in a more private place, presumably a mark of distinction (102.26-27).

\(^2\) Reading jāṇe for ujjāṇe, "garden", 103.25.
confirms the truth of this. The girls tell Kālimdaseṇa; she tells Saṃba’s mother Jaṃbavaī, and she in turn tells Kaṇha. Kaṇha declares that Suhiraṇṇā is to be treated as a princess, and gives permission for her to be Saṃba’s consort. Buddhisena announces her arrival to the prince, adding “be skilful” (niṇṭha hojjha, 104.7). “Why?” Saṃba asks, “the definition of love is compliance (anuvatti, ibid.).” And when he is alone with Suhiraṇṇā in the bedroom he imitates her every action.

Next morning Saṃba asks Buddhisena to smuggle Suhiraṇṇā back to her house without his parents’ knowledge. But the arrival of servants bringing the couple presents of clothes from the queen makes this precaution seem unnecessary. So he passes his time in Suhiraṇṇā’s company.

Obviously, this is a version of the story found in the BKSS concerning the young love of Naravāhanadatta and Madanamaṇḍukā; there is nothing corresponding to this in the BKM or the KSS. Now the most remarkable feature of Budhasvāmin’s style, here and elsewhere, is his use of what Maten (BB 67-68) called the “flashback”, a term borrowed of course from the cinema. In a flashback the progress of the narration is halted while a segment of action from the past is given, with the purpose either of providing the spectator with information necessary for his understanding of the present action, or of providing him with a different point of view from that which he has enjoyed so far. This is an apt enough term for what

1 Reading se for me, 104.11.
happens in the text of the BKŚS, but I prefer to use the term "retrospective motivation" because "flashback", in traditional language a consequence of beginning a story in medias res, is one technique among others used in the development of a story and is not an aesthetic end in itself, which I believe retrospective motivation to be for Budhasvāmin. In his narrative he loves to mystify the reader deliberately by describing incidents that are meaningless or inconclusive until given an adequate, if sometimes surprising, motivation in retrospect through the speech of a character. His aim in using the flashback is not so much to conduct the reader to the logical conclusion of the plot as to give him the pleasurable surprise of a revelation. Gomukha so to speak embodies this pleasure when he prepares to deliver the speech that will reveal the motivation of his strange behaviour:

athanandasrutimire netre saṃmṛjya gomukhaḥ/
 saṃkasya Āṣuddha kanṭhaḥ ca raṃyām akathayat kathām//

Then, wiping his eyes that were swimming with tears of joy, Gomukha coughed and cleared his throat and began to tell a charming story. BKŚS 10.29

The essence of his story is this. Madanamañjukā had fallen in love with Naravāhanadatta at first sight, and to save her from despair at not seeing her love, her friend Mudrikālatikā arranged with queen Padmāvatī, by the mediation of Kaliṅgasenā, to entice Gomukha to the gaṇikās' house so that he might bring the prince to meet Madanamañjukā. Padmāvatī tricked Gomukha by playing on his ignorance and pride; she aroused his curiosity about the meaning of cetasyatā, the quality of a wit, and he, determined to make a show as a cetasya, accepted a ride in a strange carriage that brought him as if by accident, or rather a series of accidents, to Kaliṅgasenā's
house. There he took the bait that was dangled before him, in the form of a beautiful girl, Padmadevikā, who seduced him. Padmadevikā's duty was in fact to reveal the plan to him, but being afraid of losing him she put off the execution of this duty and Gomukha came to visit her time and time again. At last Mudrikālatikā intervened and told Gomukha what they expected of him. Gomukha however did not dare to tell the prince outright about the plan, and to sustain Madanamañjukā's hopes, he brought odds and ends from the prince's apartments, pretending that they were presents. On one occasion he contrived that Naravāhanadatta greet Madanamañjukā as their carriages crossed in the street by telling the prince that his crown was slipping, upon which the prince put his two hands to his forehead in a gesture resembling that of aṅjali.

In context this speech is the key to a number of incidents that punctuate the account of Naravāhanadatta's early years. The first is when for the first time he meets Madanamañjukā (7.4-22). Next, Gomukha does not turn up for breakfast with his companions, and is found looking at himself in a mirror, rolling his eyes, his mouth smeared (as Tapantaka reports) with beeswax and pān. He is in fact practising amorous glances in private, ashamed to appear with his mouth swollen from Padmadevikā's passionate bites.¹ On several occasions he arrives late for a meal, seizes a sweet or an ornament or some other token, and makes off again; these are the "presents" mentioned above. And lastly Gomukha scandalizes his companions by calling himself a man of the first class according to

¹ Not, as Lacôte thought, pretending to "s'exercer aux pratiques préliminaires du yoga" (Note to text at 7.41). nighṛṣṭau should be read for nīghṛṣṭau. Why he was sharpening his teeth (ibid.) remains a mystery.
those who know the art of love, while the prince is of the second class; he explains that those of the first class love and are loved in return, while those of the second class are loved but do not love, and his justification of this leads naturally to his account of how he met the ganikās.

Now the *VH* version of the young couple's meeting resembles that of the *BKŚS* not only in story material but also in style. Sanghadāsa must have known a version of the story very much like Budhasvāmin’s; he attempted to imitate this sophisticated intrigue based on retrospective motivation, but was not altogether successful. Let us examine the evidence for this. Sanghadāsa begins his story with this brief paragraph:

Sambo kalāo āgamei savayamṣo. kameṇa ya patto jovvaṇaṃ bitiyavāśudevovamo. Buddhisena ya parivāsiyaṃ pupphasehara-gam kumārasaṃtiyaṃ maggiṃaṇa ṇe kahiṃ pi, tabā vatthapariyaṭṭāṃ, modake ya bhuttasese egate khāissam ti. evam vaccai kālo.

Samba studied the arts with his companions. In due course he attained young manhood, looking like a second Kṛṣṇa. Buddhisena got a perfumed garland of flowers from the prince and went off with it somewhere or other, just like that, wrapped in his clothes; and sweets left over from the meal, saying that he would eat them in private. And so the time passed.

*VH* 100.28-101.2

Now when Buddhisena in the *VH* explains his actions, he does mention that he took presents to the girls: pupphagamdhavatthatambolani, "flowers, perfume, clothes and pān", 103.25. The reader who has prior knowledge of the *BKŚS* will understand that this is an explanation of these raids, but the unprepared reader will not, because Buddhisena nowhere mentions that he was using these presents to hide his procrastination and that they are supposed to come from Samba; besides, the list of presents is not even the same in the
two occurrences. Another example: although Buddhisēpa retrospectively identifies the carriage which he and Saṁka saw on the way to the dancing display as Suhiṁpaśis', he does not explain why at that moment he told the prince to adjust his crown. Gomukha in the BKŚŚ explains that Madanamañjukā was in the carriage; she greeted Naravāhanadatta hoping that he would return her greeting, and Gomukha was forced to use a subterfuge to make the prince put his hands to his forehead. If one has read this version one can understand the significance of the gesture in the Vī, but not otherwise.

Gomukha, as we have seen, tells his story with self-conscious skill, recreating the events as they appeared to him and postponing their interpretation so that everything will fall into place later for the pleasure of his audience. This narrative irony, by which the first-person narrator stands at one remove from the story he tells, manipulating the characters, of which he is one, with a view to a surprising conclusion, is of course repeated in the wider frame of the BKŚŚ, the narration of Naravāhanadatta himself. As Maten says (BB 70-71), "though he knows the story's course and outcome, he does not let this knowledge obtrude upon his narrative". The most surprising revelation from this quarter is that Naravāhanadatta has been in love with Madanamañjukā ever since he first saw her. Gomukha's story has served to free him from his shyness about confessing his love (10.266), and, incidentally, from the reproach of belonging to the second class of lovers merely.

This comparison of the two versions has so far passed over a basic difference which now becomes important. Gomukha tells his story as he and the prince and the other companions are returning from a hunting party, after which Naravāhanadatta asks Gomukha to
arrange for him to see the girl. Gomukha says that, as it happens, she will be taking part in a dancing contest before king Udayana the next day; he may see her then.\(^1\) The prince and his companions duly go on the next day to the king's apartments, dressed as \textit{nāgarakas}, men-about-town.

Gomukha's conduct of the dancing contest causes some surprise. He invites Madanamañjukā's rival to dance first, and when it is her turn to dance, he distracts the attention of the prince, so that she leaves accompanied by the audience's applause, but despondent because the prince has not seen her perform. Next, Naravāhanadatta accuses Gomukha of neglecting him. Lacôte (Note to text, 11.21) noticed a gap in the narration here and proposed that there was a lacuna in the text. The missing development, the hero's asking for the girl to be brought, is given in the \textit{VH}, 103.29. However Naravāhanadatta's expression of impatience may be due not to a refusal on Gomukha's part but to the fact that he is not satisfied with the brief glimpse he has had of Madanamañjukā at the contest, and takes the incident as another example of Gomukha's procrastination.\(^2\) Gomukha proposes that someone else be sent to win the trust of the girl, because she will not trust him after the trick he has played on her. Finally he agrees to go if Marubhūtika accompanies him. As we learn from Marubhūtika's account of the events on their return, his fears were justified; the girls were angry at his

\(^1\) Two dancing-masters are quarrelling about their respective eminence, and the dispute is to be solved by a contest of their pupils; compare Kālidāsa, \textit{Mālavikāgnimitram}, act 1.

\(^2\) If Gomukha's refusal to go and fetch the girl was contained in one or more lost \textit{Ślokas} immediately preceding \textit{Śloka 21}, as Lacôte proposed, it is unlikely that 21 would begin with the words \textit{gomukhaṃ ca}; we should expect \textit{taṃ ca}, or the like.
treatment of Madanamaṇjukā at the contest. However Gomukha gives a reasonable explanation for his actions, saying that if Madanamaṇjukā had danced first, Udayana would not have waited to see the second performer, and that would have been taken as partiality. But after seeing her rival dance first, Udayana would not have waited for another performance by anyone, not even Urvaśī; so Gomukha arranged for Madanamaṇjukā to be defeated by her own despondency.

In the VH it appears that Sanghadāsa has combined two episodes, the hunting party and the dancing contest, into one, as a table of comparison will show.1

**BKŚŚ**

- Gomukha's curious behaviour
- hunt; water games; Amitagati
- return journey: Gomukha's explanation
- Naravāhanadatta asks to see Madanamaṇjukā
- the dancing contest
- Naravāhanadatta presses Gomukha
- Gomukha's apprehensions
- Gomukha's explanation of the dancing contest

**VH**

- Buddhiseṇa's curious behaviour
- the dancing contest
- return journey: Buddhiseṇa's explanation (also of his conduct of the dancing contest)
- Saṁba asks Buddhiseṇa to bring Suhiraṇḍā
- —
- —
- Buddhiseṇa's apprehensions
- —

But in so doing he has not changed the motivation of the story to suit his shorter version, because, like Gomukha, Buddhiseṇa insists that a friend, in his case Jayasena, accompany him for the girls will not trust him alone. But whereas in the BKŚŚ the courtesans'...
attitude to Gomukha, a kind of teasing affection mixed with distrust,¹ has already been established, there is no such preparation in the VH. Saṅghadāsa has compressed a longer version of the story by omitting the characterization of the girls. He does not mention that they were annoyed by procrastination on Buddhiseṇa's part, nor in particular that they were indignant at his conduct at the dancing contest; it is to Samba, and not to the girls, that Buddhiseṇa justifies this conduct. Saṅghadāsa has retained the retrospective motivation, but without the element of the girls' opinion of Buddhiseṇa and his awareness of their opinion, this figure of style is empty of meaning.

Having followed events in the BKŚŚ as far as the sequel of the dancing contest, one is liable to forget that Udayana and his court are still at the yātra, and yet the festival is important for Budhasvāmin's rendering of the episode because Naravāhanadatta's encounters with power and love take place away from his usual environment in an atmosphere of fantasy and irresponsibility; he and his companions are for the first time free from adult supervision. The end of the festival brings a confrontation with the real world. Briefly, Gomukha accomplishes the union of Madanamaṇjukā and Naravāhanadatta; the king announces his departure for the city; the prince elects to return a day later with the gaṇikās. He is disturbed to find his beloved in tears; an attendant explains.

\[\text{gaṇikāsabdadoṣas tu nainām adyāpi muñcati//}\]

Even now, the name of prostitute is a blemish that does not leave her.

\[\text{BKŚŚ 11.86}\]

¹ For example, BKŚŚ 10.156, 11.34.
He also learns that a wife has been chosen for himself: the daughter of the king of Kāśi, presumably Bhagīrathayaśas, of whom more later. After he and the companions return to the city, no one dares to make representations to the king to persuade him to change his mind. Only Gomukha is sanguine about the future, but for the moment Naravāhanadatta is happy with the nightly company of Madanamañjukā.

It is necessary to recall here two essential differences between the Bṛhadāyam and the Kāraṇī version. Firstly, in the former the heroine is a prince’s daughter who visits the hero nightly, whereas in the latter she is a princess’s daughter and is selected by the hero; secondly, in the former she is abducted early in the hero’s economic-political career, whereas in the latter many matrimonial interventions between Madanamañjukā’s wedding and her abduction. Three differences are important in the discovery of Madanamañjukā’s abduction, and in the possible actions that are advanced for her absence. In the Bṛhadāyam she does not live with Naravāhanadatta; hence he is brought to RIP of her disappearance from her mother’s house by Gomukha. Gomukha also brings the news in the Kāraṇī, but from the abhirupa, the female escort, where she lives with the other wives. In the Kūṇāl, however, Naravāhanadatta himself discovers that she is missing from the abhirupa. All versions, then, agree that she was not taken from the abhirupa bed.
THE ABDUCTION OF MADANAMAṆJUKĀ

The BK is, among other things, the story of Naravāhanadatta's love for MadanamaṆjukā first and foremost among his wives. We have seen that, because there is no place for such a long and tentative courtship in Vasudeva's wanderings, Saṅghadāsa attributed the story of the winning of MadanamaṆjukā as told in the BKŚŚ to Vasudeva's grandson Samba. Consequently when the VH comes to the abduction of MadanamaṆjukā, we find her under another name, that of Somasiri, a girl who does not have the peculiar antecedents and history of her equivalent in the BK.

It is necessary to recall here two essential differences between the BKŚŚ and the Kashmiri versions. Firstly, in the former the heroine is a gaṇīkā's daughter who visits the hero nightly, whereas in the latter she is a princess's daughter and is married to the hero; secondly, in the former she is abducted early in the hero's erotic-political career, whereas in the latter many marriages intervene between MadanamaṆcukā's wedding and her abduction. These differences are important in the discovery of MadanamaṆjukā's absence, and in the possible motives that are advanced for her absence. In the BKŚŚ, because she does not live with Naravāhanadatta, news is brought to him of her disappearance from her mother's house by Gomukha. Gomukha also brings the news in the BKM, but from the antahpura, the female quarters, where she lives with the other wives. In the KŚŚ, however, Naravāhanadatta himself discovers that she is missing from the antahpura. All versions, then, agree that she was not taken from the hero's bed.
Only in the *VH* does the hero wake up to find that his beloved is no longer in bed beside him. But there is something odd here; Vasudeva is awakened *bhoyaparipārāmeṇa*, "by the digestion of his food". This is not surprising in itself, for it is a realistic motif quite common in Indian stories, but it is wrongly used in the present context. It should lead to a revelation about what goes on while the hero is normally asleep, as it does later in the same *lambha*. If Vasudeva had woken up at the usual time he would still have found his wife missing — there is no need to invoke peristalsis. *Sanghadāsa* recuperates the story as best he can by making his hero worry until dawn (224.26-27), but he surely started it on the wrong foot. For that matter there is something odd about the *BKŚŚ* version too. There *Madanamañjukā* disappears in mid-morning after Gomukha has taken her home, and the manner of her disappearance is unknown because the other members of the household were put to sleep by some supernatural perfume (*gandho... amānuṣaḥ*, 12.8); which is much less natural than if she were simply found to be missing one morning. It looks as if *Budhasvāmin* were straining to accommodate to his version of the story the fact that *Madanamañjukā* does not live with the prince. The lady has disappeared; the question is, why? In all the BK versions, when the news that *Madanamañjukā* is not to be found reaches Udayana's chief of staff Rumaṇvat, he declares that since all exits and entrances of the palace are guarded her abductor must have left by air, and also that she may have hidden herself somewhere — in the garden, for example — in a fit of anger due to a lovers' quarrel. A quarrel about what? Only *Kṣemendra* explicitly mentions jealousy (*BKM* 8.65), implying that *Madanamañcukā* resents Naravāhanadatta's latest wife *Jinendrasena*, and has Rumaṇvat
suggest that Naravāhanadatta in a passionate moment must have called Madanamañcukā by another girl's name (gotraskhalana, 13.8).\textsuperscript{1} The story of Sāvitrī which Rumaṇvat in the BKM and KSS and Marubhūtīka in the BKŚŚ tell makes the same point implicitly. Of course in the BKŚŚ Madanamañcukā has no reason yet to be jealous; moreover, as soon as Kaliṅgasenā in the BKŚŚ hears that her daughter is missing, she names a certain Mānasavega as the probable culprit; the motif of jealousy seems quite out of place.\textsuperscript{2}

Rumaṇvat's deduction, that either Madanamañcukā has been abducted or she has hidden herself, though contradictory, certainly represents the authors' intention in that, as Maten points out (BB 79), it prepares the reader for both solutions to the mystery: the finding of the false Madanamañcukā in the garden, and the pursuit of the vidyādhara who abducted the real Madanamañcukā. In the VH, king Somadeva suggests that his daughter Somasiri must have been stolen by a flying creature, and Vasudeva is inclined to agree, but decides nevertheless to look in places where she may have gone to sulk.

\textit{evam tiyā buddhī, taha vi mādamohiyam maṇe tiyām... pamayavaṇe... pamaggāni... pariḥāseṇa na me deti pādīvayaṇaṇaḥ.}

That was my conclusion, but even so I decided vainly and foolishly that I would search in the garden, [thinking that] she might as a joke be refusing to respond to my calls.\textsuperscript{3}

\textit{VH 225.2-3}

\textsuperscript{1} For the motif compare VH 246.26-247.1.

\textsuperscript{2} We can imagine that Madanamañcukā would be jealous of the king of Kāśi's daughter, but there is nothing in the text to support this.

\textsuperscript{3} On the difficulties of this passage, see above, page 69, note 2.
The difference is that Saṅghadāsa locates the conflict between two possible explanations in Vasudeva's mind instead of in the minister's speech, and his version of the story is better for that. Vasudeva recognizes that Somasiri must have been abducted, yet hopes to find her somewhere; a painful state of mind further described in what follows.

Naravāhanadatta too on hearing the news is tossed by violent emotions. In the BKŚŚ he is above all angry at Mānasavega, the vidyādhara named by Kaliṅgasena, and impatient with the world of nature for concealing what it knows about the incident:

\[
\text{prcchāmi sma priyāvārttaṃ sākṣiśakhamṛgāṇḍajān//}
\text{kebhyaścit kupitaḥ śāpān kebhyaścid vitaran karān/}
\text{vidāmbayann aśāstraṇāḥ atyutkātarasaṃ nāṭam//}
\]

I asked the monkeys and birds as witnesses for news of my darling; to some, angry, I held out curses, to others, my arms; I resembled an actor who had not learnt his art but was full of intense passion.

\text{BKŚŚ 12.63-64}

The allusion to the theatre is a nice ironic touch; the forlorn lover's appeal to nature recalls, as Lacôte observed in his note to the text, Purūravas's despair in Kālidāsa's Vikramorvasiyam.\(^1\) In the BKM the sight of natural beauty reminds Naravāhanadatta of the girl he has lost;\(^2\) in the KSS mute objects seem to try to communicate with him in his grief; in the VH the hero in his misery apostrophizes the absent Somasiri. Each version is slightly

---

\(^1\) It is in fact a commonplace found in kāvya and itihāsa as well as in drama; see, e.g., C. Vaudeville in Esnoul, L'hindouisme, 442.

\(^2\) Another commonplace; see, e.g., Rāmāyaṇa 4.30; Ingalls, An Anthology of Sanskrit Court Poetry, section 23. A combination of these two figures appears at VH 359.9-13.
different from every other, and represents the author's free
invention within the limits of poetic convention on the given theme,
the hero's reaction to his loss.

His misery, fortunately, is not prolonged. The girl is found
soon after, in the garden. In the VH she explains that her absence
was due to a vow which she had made, and that the same vow obliges
her to marry the hero with due ceremony a second time; for the
moment he must not touch her. The other three versions agree in
making Madanamañjukā say that she had promised oblations to a yakṣa
(or the yakṣas) and that these oblations must be performed on her
wedding day. In the BKŚŚ this implies that Madanamañjukā must be
married to Naravāhanadatta without delay; in the KSS, that they
must be married a second time in order to make good her forgotten
promise. In the BKM the vow to the yakṣa explains her absence but
is not said to entail a re-enactment of marriage.

Not a great deal is made of this second marriage by the BKM and
KSS. In the BKŚŚ marriage with Madanamañjukā has been a question
ever since it was announced that the king of Kāśi's daughter had
been chosen to be the prince's bride, much to the prince's distress.
No one dared ask Udayana to change his decision on this matter, but
no sooner has Madanamañjukā reappeared and announced her obligation
to marry Naravāhanadatta than a decree of Udayana is published that
raises the gaṇikā's daughter to the rank of a woman of good family,
a kulastrī. She is not in fact overjoyed by this decree, because —
as is shortly to be revealed — she is not Madanamañjukā after all
but a noble vidyādharī who had no need of elevation; however the
marriage follows closely on the decree to the satisfaction of all
concerned. Now the real Madanamañjukā has already lost her maiden-
hood to the hero, but the bride at this wedding is the maiden
Vegavati. Budhasvamin's narrator makes the reader understand that on her wedding night she feigns virginity (BKŚŚ 13.16), without saying exactly how; later of course when the identity of the bride is revealed the reader understands in retrospect that it was no feint. This is another example of the first-person narrator deliberately withholding information so as to surprise the reader. In the VH the author plays fair with the reader by giving him enough clues to reconstruct the situation after he has read to the end of the story but still not enough to anticipate the conclusion. If the hero-narrator had been wily enough he would have known at the time that his bride was a virgin trying to dissimulate her state in order to pass for his wife Somasiri; the evidence that is available to him is also available to the reader, which is not the case in the BKŚŚ. However Vasudeva at the time is in no state to reason because he is drunk. His drinking therefore plays a vital part in the organization of the intrigue. In the BK versions too Naravāhanadatta drinks, but there his drinking is no more than the motif, often repeated, whereby wine and love combined stand for the pleasures of the senses. In the case of the BKŚŚ, how much the sensuous aspect of the incident prevails over the logical aspect is shown by a bizarre pendant, the second marriage of Vegavati (15.11-34), after which Vegavati feigns virginity, and this time it is a feint.

Reviewing the different versions of this episode one has no hesitation in picking the VH as the best. Taking full advantage of the first-person narrative form, Saṅghadāsa locates the doubt about the missing girl's fate in the mind of his narrator instead of in a desultory speech of a minister; and when like Budhasvāmin

1 BKŚŚ 13 at some length; merely mentioned BKM 13.13, KŚŚ 14.1.58.
he elaborates on the theme of the virgin posing as a wife, he does so in a way that does not seem to cheat the reader. The BKŚŚ is the worst from the point of view of narrative technique. Budhasvāmin's account of Madanamañjukā's abduction is made extremely awkward by his desire to fit into the story the fact that she does not live with the prince. And when Rupavat offers his contradictory hypotheses about the abduction, one of these hypotheses is absurd, because no stories about the hero's other marriages have preceded.

These maidens that the hero wins in the Kashmiri versions after his marriage with Madanamañcukā but before her disappearance posed no problem for Lacôte, who did not hesitate to declare on the authority of the BKŚŚ that "la plupart des épisodes de l'histoire de Naravāhanadatta compris entre son mariage avec Madanamañcukā et la descente de Vegavatī sont apocryphes" (Essai, 213). The ideal story, pruned of all irrelevant episodes, would be this:

— Naravāhanadatta marries or otherwise unites with Madanamañjukā
— He gives her cause for jealousy
— She disappears
— She reappears, or so it seems; in fact she has been replaced by Vegavatī.

Neither in the BKŚŚ nor in the KSS, however, is her jealousy mentioned, though in both a motive could easily have been found: in the former the king of Kāśi's daughter, in the latter the many marriages that intervene between lambakas 6 and 14. In the BKM Madanamañcukā is jealous of Jinendrasena, the one wife whom Naravāhanadatta acquires between her marriage and the first mention of her disappearance, 8.72. However, because this happens early in the book her disappearance for the moment is left, as it were, up in the air; life goes on as usual for the hero until Udayana learns of
his distress at 13.3, and the motif of her disappearance is then pursued in earnest. As Lacôte said, "La disparition de Madanamañcukā qui en forme la fin [i.e. of the eighth book of the BKM, Velā] se trouve séparée de ses conséquences immédiates..." (Essai, 117).

Here then is a dilemma: the one version that establishes Madanamañcukā's jealousy commits an absurdity of another kind. Kṣemendra seems to have had two possible developments of the story in mind: the one in which the hero's intimacy with his first bride is such that her attitude to a rival matters, and the other in which she has been joined by so many other wives that to stress her jealousy at such an advanced stage of the story would be absurd; respectively, the versions of the BKŚŚ and the KŚŚ. Hence he planted the seed of her abduction early in his book and returned to it only much later.

But why is the motif of jealousy absent from the BKŚŚ? The explanation is probably that as a gaṇikhā's daughter Madanamañjukā would have no right to be jealous of the prince; this right is accorded only to the vidyādharīs Gandharvadattā and Vegavatī,1 and is denied to the merchant's daughter Priyadarśanā.2 No doubt for the same reason she is not permitted to live with the hero.

Whether or not the hero has other love adventures after his union with Madanamañjukā and before her disappearance, as soon as the court takes notice of her absence and Rumanvat announces his interpretation of what has happened, another story is under way; in the BKM these details could not have come at the end of Velā because,

1 Gandharvadattā is jealous of Ajinavatī, and Vegavatī of Gandharvadattā; see BKŚŚ 19 and 20 respectively.

2 In the story of Bhagīrathayaśas, BKŚŚ 28.
as Lacôte said, "ils sont l'amorce de l'aventure de Vegavatī, inséparable elle-même des aventures subséquentes" (Essai, 117).

The story of Vegavatī is inseparable from those that follow not in any ideal scheme, for there is no necessary connection between them, but in the consensus of all versions of the BK. The sequence of names in the BKŚŚ and in the Kashmiri versions is this:

**BKŚŚ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegavatī</th>
<th>Gandharvadattā</th>
<th>Ajinavatī</th>
<th>Priyadarśanā</th>
<th>Bhagīrathayaśas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BK/M/KŚŚ**

| Vegavatī | Gandharvadattā | Ajināvatī | —             | Bhagīrathayaśas |

The omission of Priyadarśanā in the right-hand column is significant and will be examined in due course, but apart from her the correspondence is perfect, and it surely implies that the hero in the original BK met and married these maidens in this order. In studying the structure of the different works in the tradition these wives must be treated as an indivisible block, and Lacôte so treated them (Essai, 227-228), giving a reconstructed plan of the BK in which the wives from Madanamaṇjukā to Bhagīrathayaśas follow in an unbroken sequence. In other words, all but six of the twenty-six wives of the hero that the BKŚŚ promises to the reader (4.3) must have been won after Bhagīrathayaśas, the last in the fragment that survives.

That poses a problem concerning the arrangement of Naravāhanadatta's adventures in the BKŚŚ, to which we shall return later. Here let it suffice to note that Vasudeva in Saṅghadāsa's VH marries twenty-seven wives, a total very close to Naravāhanadatta's
twenty-six in the BKŚŚ; among the other versions of the Vṛ, Jinasena in his HP names or otherwise qualifies twenty-three, though to this total an indeterminate number of others must be added. 1 Somadeva at KSS 17.1.5 gives Naravāhanadatta’s score as twenty-five, though like Kṣemendra he only names twenty-three in the course of the work. From this a kind of consensus emerges that the hero marries about two dozen maidens in the course of his career, a figure which must be regarded as traceable to the original BK.

1 HP 31.8, जिवधाःशत्रुतिम् उपायमपराः जा.
VEGAVATI

Our hero, then, without knowing it, has acquired a new wife. He discovers this one night when he wakes up and looks at the woman sleeping beside him in the bed: she is not his wife Madanamañjukā/Somasiri, but the vidyādharī Vegavatī.1 Here in the VH Vasudeva awakes, more appropriately than before, bhoya-apari-ame-a; but again this misses the point, though more narrowly; a point that the BKŚŚ neatly scores. Budhasvāmin's Naravāhanadatta wakes up with a thirst, as well he might after the drinking bouts of the night before. This incident is in fact over-motivated, because in all the BK versions the disguised Vegavatī has asked Naravāhanadatta not to look at her while she is asleep, which implies in the logic of narrative that he will not fail to do so; this is expressed in the other versions by the hero's desire to satisfy his curiosity which has been aroused by her precautions,2 but in the BKŚŚ, as we learn retrospectively (14.120), her precautions were designed just to arouse his curiosity. The difference corresponds to a different concept of Vegavatī's motives: in the BKM and KSS she hopes that the prince will not find out the truth, because as soon as he finds out she sets off with him, as we shall see, to rescue Madanamañcukā, and that puts an end to her tenure of him, whereas in the BKŚŚ, once discovered, she lives happily with Naravāhanadatta who is not over-anxious to rejoin his other wife. The VH hesitates between these

1 The vidyādharas, when they have assumed a false form, which is one of their special powers, revert to their true form while asleep.

2 BKM 13.33, KSS 14.1.61.
two versions. Vegavatī does not will Vasudevā's discovery of her identity. Discovered, she tells of her promise to bring Vasudevā to Somasiri, but she makes no move to fulfil this promise; her purpose tacitly changes to one of saving his life by consoling him for Somasiri's absence, first in Somasiri's form, then in her own.

Vegavatī tells her story to the hero in very much the same terms in all four versions. The plot demands that the heroine be in the power of Vegavatī's wicked brother Mānasavega, but propriety demands that her virtue remain intact. The latter demand is satisfied in the VH by invoking a law of the vidyādharas, but in the other versions by a curse laid upon Mānasavega himself: if ever he touch an unwilling woman he will die at once.1 The difference is due to Mānasavega's greater prominence as an individual in the BK, where he plays an important and continuing role in the main plot, whereas in the VH he is merely one villain among others, distinct only in name. Vegavatī describes how she gained her sciences, much against her brother's will, thanks to the intervention of her father; the VH and the KSS do not elaborate, but the BKŚś and the BKM here include a story concerning a peacock. The essence of the BKŚś account is that Vegavatī won the innocent affection of the ascetics in her father's hermitage by her services and her girlish charm. Once she was frightened by a peacock which she mistook, seeing only its neck, for a snake; reassured, she made the bird dance, to the amusement of the hermits (BKŚś 14.63-73). In the BKM too she made the bird dance; a rākṣasa took its shape2 and laid hold of her; the ascetics were


2 Reading barhirūpaṃ vidhāya for bahu°, BKM 13.47.
angry at this licence, and their anger put an end to a curse laid on
the rākṣasa by Kubera. The two versions resemble one another in
their most abstract form, involving a creature whose changed shape
posed a threat and a peacock that danced, so that it is unlikely
that Budhasvāmin and Kṣemendra invented the passage independently.¹

Naturally the relationship between Vegavatī and Madanamañjukā/
Somasirī is delicate. Does Vegavatī help her brother's prisoner,
or does she simply help herself to the hero? And how does the
prisoner feel about this? Each version offers its own solution to
this problem. In the VH Somasirī wins Vegavatī over to her side by
refuting her arguments when she pleads her brother's suit.

Vegavatī, repentant, offers her help, which Somasirī gladly accepts.
In the BKŚ Somavatī knows that she is destined to marry the ruler of
the vidyādhāras; when Madanamañjukā happens to mention that her
lover will surely attain to that dignity, Vegavatī is interested and,
deciding to visit Naravāhanadatta, offers to take word of
Madanamañjukā to him. Madanamañjukā recognizes that this visit is
also in Naravāhanadatta's interest and does not express her opposi-
tion, but her speech of farewell seems to contain veiled threats.²

Vegavatī for her part does not hesitate to press her advantage over

¹ Even without the support of the BKŚ Speyer deduced from the BKM
that the incident must have been in the original BK (Studies, 40,
note 1); though it is an exaggeration to call the incident "a
detailed account of how this [i.e. Vegavatī's getting the sciences]
came to happen".

² See Lacôte's note to the text at 14.110-114. Madanamañcukā in
similar words reminds Naravāhanadatta of his task of killing
Mānasavega, by swearing by her tress, veṇī, the emblem of fidelity
in separation, KŚ 14.2.114. This formula evidently expresses her
apprehension that Vegavatī will not return at once from
Naravāhanadatta.
Madanamañjukā, whom she considers to be her inferior. She offers to bring Madanamañjukā to Naravāhanadatta (14.122; not the contrary, as in all the other versions), an offer which, when it is made to him, the prince is reluctant to accept because of her station:

... na nyāgyam praśaṇīyajanocitam/
bhartuḥ kārayitaḥ karma bhāryam tuṅgakulodbhavām//

[he thinks] it is not proper for a husband to make his wife, whose family origin is elevated, perform a duty suitable for the servant class.

BKŚŚ 14.123

In the BKM and KSS Vegavatī is destined to be married to the man the mere mention of whose name suffices to make her fall in love with him. The fatal event happened when Madanamañcukā mentioned the name of Naravāhanadatta. She left Madanamañcukā in her brother's power, making no promises, and came to marry her destined husband by the artifice of the other's form; but no sooner is the artifice discovered than she offers to take Naravāhanadatta to Madanamañcukā, and he accepts.

Vegavatī's destiny is thus brought in to justify her morally reprehensible act, her betrayal of friendship, in taking another's husband for her own. Still, is such a woman a suitable wife for Naravāhanadatta? The problem is least in the VH because of the distinct articulation of the episodes — Somasirī is one wife among many and she drops out of sight with the introduction of a new one. Vegavatī saved Vasudeva from dying heartbroken, and the rest is forgiven (VH 228.25). The BKŚŚ implies that Madanamañjukā is beneath consideration, so that Vegavatī can do no wrong in respect of

---

1 See Lacôte's notes to the text at 14.115 and 121.
her. The BKM and KSS attenuate the difficulty by passing over the encounter of Madanamañcukā and Vegavatī in as few words as possible, but Madanamañcukā in the BKM will say that Vegavatī wronged her when she asks Prabhāvatī not to do likewise (13.107).

According to the BKM and KSS, then, Vegavatī flies off at once with Naravāhanadatta intending to reunite him with his beloved Madanamañcukā in Mānasavega's palace. In the KSS Mānasavega learns of this and attacks them. Vegavatī puts Naravāhanadatta in the care of a science, and joining battle with her brother defeats him. She then takes Naravāhanadatta to Gandharva city and puts him in a dry well for his protection while she leaves to repair her sciences, damaged by the encounter. The BKM's version is peculiar: first Vegavatī puts Naravāhanadatta down on Kanaka mountain by the ocean's shore while she goes to see Madanamañcukā, then she drops him into a dark cellar ([? ] andhagrhe, 13.68). In the BKŚŚ it is the enemy, Mānasavega himself, who carries off the hero, and it is Vegavatī who attacks when she comes to the rescue. Mānasavega releases Naravāhanadatta, and he falls to earth gently, protected by Vegavatī's science. The comparable passage in the VH is to be found not in the sequence of this story, but at the end of ḽambha 2, where Amgāraka plays the part of Mānasavega and Sāmalī that of Vegavatī.

In all versions this passage serves as a transition to the next episode by taking the hero immediately to the city where he will meet Gandharvadatta. But first he has to get out of the well. Vasudeva simply waits until morning and climbs out, whereas Naravāhanadatta in the BKM and the KSS is pulled out by a certain Vīnādatta, who has a part to play in the following episode. In the BKŚŚ the problem is not so easily solved: the well is deep, and nobody is about. Naravāhanadatta recalls the story of the three
brahman brothers, Eka, Dvita and Trita. Because Trita annoyed them by reminding them of their duty, they left him at the bottom of a well. So Trita mentally offered the māhendrī sacrifice. At once, a rainstorm filled the well with water, and Trita floated to the top. But Naravāhanadatta, a kṣatriya, cannot sacrifice unaided. He remembers Amitagati's promise of help, but shies away from the thought of incurring a debt of gratitude. Then simultaneously he perceives that he is standing at the foot of a tree growing in the well, and sees Amitagati standing before him, summoned by the mere thought. He sends Amitagati to the aid of Vegavatī and, we are left to suppose, climbs up the tree and out of the well unaided. ¹

¹ Compare svavīryāt, BKŚS 20.310. Maten (BB 36) gives the correct interpretation of this incident which both Lacôte (Essai 169) and Alsdorf (HP 102) misunderstood.
The well into which Vasudeva falls is very near Campā. He has only to ask a bystander to find out where he is, whereas Naravāhanadatta wanders for a time in a forest before he comes upon a certain Dattaka in a rural pavilion some distance from the city. Dattaka, known as Viṇādatta because of his fondness for the viṇa, is an extremely elegant gentleman (nāgarakeśvara, BKŚ 16.9) whose presence gives the note of exquisite opulence so typical of the settings of stories in the BKŚ. Dattaka's wealth, good taste and courtesy are summed up by the food which he offers to Naravāhanadatta, prepared by gastronomic cooks (annasaṃskāraśāstraṇāṇā, 16.60). Now our hero, like Vasudeva, is posing as a brahman, something that in stories one usually does when in a strange country to ensure one's safe passage; Naravāhanadatta will adopt the same disguise in Vārāṇasī. To the despair of the cooks he has asked for a mere handful of boiled rice to eat so as not to give away his pose, but at dinner Dattaka's tact enables him to enjoy his usual fare of spiced meats and wine. There is no such character in the VH. It may be that Sanghadāsa simplified the story by omitting Dattaka, or by

---

1 Hence the motif of the light in the window of a house.

2 Sānudāsa, as we learn later, has a son called Dattaka; according to Lacôte's index of proper names he is not the same as this Dattaka, but I see no reason to suppose that there were two Dattakas at Campā.

3 There is a Viṇādatta in VH lambha 10 who, though he has nothing to do with Viṇās, is the rich and hospitable son of a merchant; his name suggests that Sanghadāsa has taken him from the present context. The presence of the hero in Dattaka's company excites the curiosity of the populace, BKŚ 16.43 ff.; likewise in Viṇādatta's company, VH 209.23 ff. Sanghadāsa uses the name again in VH lambha 18 for Gamgarakkhia's friend of the cockfight.
After dinner, Naravāhanadatta asks his host why all Campā is furiously playing on vīṇāś. Dattaka explains that the chief of the merchants at Campā, Sānudāsa by name, has an exquisite daughter called Gandharvadattā. Though besieged by suitors for her hand, he for some reason is reserving her:

\[
\text{apūrvaṁ kīla gāyantyāṁ tasyāḥ kim āpi gītakam/}
\]
\[
yo 'nuvādayītā vīṇāṁ pariṇetā sa tāṁ iti//}
\]

The man who can accompany [Gandharvadattā] on the vīṇā when she sings a certain strange song shall be the one who marries her.

\[BKŚŚ 16.85\]

There is to be a concert the very next day for those who wish to try. Naravāhanadatta asks for a music teacher to be summoned, but he finds the man uncouth and behaves disrespectfully towards him with simulated ignorance. He even breaks the strings of the instrument, but then, as if forgetting his disguise, he plays sweetly for an instant. The music teacher leaves in confusion. Again, when he wakes in the middle of the night, he plays a little in practice for the following day, but his playing arouses such excitement outside his apartment that he leaves off and goes back to sleep.

Alsdorf pointed out (HP 105) that the VH is better and more effective in its treatment of this incident. Vasudeva's music teacher, unlike Naravāhanadatta's, is not a fool, even if he is swayed by his venal wife. He runs a regular school of music, and he has no patience with Vasudeva so long as he shows himself incapable of learning. Vasudeva conceals all this time his consummate knowledge of music, so that his performance at the concert is a surprise to all. This surprise is indeed essential to the story, yet in the BKŚŚ Naravāhanadatta on two occasions lets
slip his secret; Budhasvāmin cannot resist having him show his talent, but does not draw any consequences from these lapses. Of course a story can be emotionally right even if it is logically faulty; one could say that the point of this episode is to give the reader the satisfaction of seeing his expectations, based on information not available to some of the characters, fulfilled when the hero wins the bride; the author by titillating the reader with demonstrations of the hero's powers which evoke the admiration of onlookers in the story heightens these expectations. Consequently the onlookers are merely part of the scenery and remain capable of being surprised by each new demonstration as if none had preceded. Budhasvāmin's high-handed treatment of such characters as pawns in the narrative corresponds to the disdainful attitude of his hero towards characters of lower standing than himself, for example the music teacher in this story. By contrast, the tone of the VH is comic here, with touches of realism and sympathy: it is fairly represented by the passage in which Vasudeva, without a word spoken, overcomes the music teacher's reluctance by handing a bracelet to his wife, upon which she sees that he is accommodated.

It is after all not possible to contrast the two versions by saying that the one maintains suspense while the other does not. In the BKŚŚ, when Naravāhanadatta goes with Dattaka to the concert hall, he notices that there is no seat provided for him in the vestibule. This apparent slight causes a certain amount of suppressed laughter among the others present (the reader of course thinks, "soon the laugh will be on them") but Dattaka offers the hero his seat and goes to fetch another. In the VH Cārudatta himself offers Vasudeva a seat as soon as he enters, a mark of special favour that amazes the gathering, for he is unknown to all except his
teacher and fellow-pupils, and they refuse to recognize him. This can only mean that Čārudatta already recognizes Vasudeva's special quality. Both versions of the incident are meant to strengthen the irony of the narrative, but here it is Saṅghadāsa who anticipates the hero's success, and Budhasvāmin who maintains the suspense.

Moreover, only Saṅghadāsa gives the incident of the elephant calf in the painting, though one would expect to find it in a version of the BK; it seems to belong to the story of Naravāhanadatta who, like his father Udayana, excels in his knowledge of elephants and music. Recognizing the age of the elephant is in fact a test by which the destined husband of Gamdhavvadattā will be found, as Čārudatta reveals at the end of his story (VH 153.28). The choice of a vīṇā is also a test, as we learn from VH 153.29-30: the destined husband will ask for a vīṇā with seventeen strings. Vasudeva does not, in the event, ask for it. After he has rejected three others, the right vīṇā is brought to him, in the same way as in the BKŚŚ, after Naravāhanadatta has rejected two instruments, Sānudāsa himself brings a third which is tuned in the gāndhāra mode and so is capable of being played to accompany the nārāyaṇa-stuti. The chief merchant has, therefore, already deduced that our hero is the right husband for the girl; later we learn that Gandharvavadattā's true father had foreseen all the details of Naravāhanadatta's behaviour at the concert hall (BKŚŚ 18.577). So the musical performance which follows is not the crucial test after all.

What then is the point of this musical performance? As we have seen in the āloka (BKŚŚ 16.85) quoted above, the man who is to marry Gandharvavadattā must accompany her singing by playing the vīṇā, and at the end of Naravāhanadatta's attempt the chamberlain says to the company:
Gentlemen, learned sirs: without envy, speak the truth. Did this man accompany the song that she sang, or not?

All agree that he did. The VH differs in one important respect:

Vasudeva is told that

tam ca jo jinai sikkhiṁ tassa bhajjā hohiti

[Garndhavvadatta] shall be the wife of the man who defeats her after studying [music].

Carudatta uses the same terms when he enumerates the tests as told to him by the girl's father at VH 153.26. In the event, though, there is no question of Vasudeva defeating Garndhavvadatta; after the concert the judges declare that her singing was in perfect accord with his playing, and his singing with her playing (132.7-8). In short, Budhasvāmin is consistent in presenting the concert as a means of recognition, the last in a series, whereas Saṅghadāsa hesitates between this version and another in which the hero wins a bride by his art. There is even a third version, favoured by Guṇabhadra, in which the concert is a svayāmpvra, an occasion for the girl to choose a husband.1 In each of these versions the author gives his own emphasis to one or more of three elements inherent in the story: the first, that a husband must be found for the girl, the second, that the hero is fated to be her husband, and the third, that the hero is chosen for his talent, which if emphasized give respectively stories of a svayāmpvra, of destiny (daiva) and of human excellence (pauruṇa).2

1 See above, page 43.
2 On daiva and pauruṇa, see below, pages 222-223, 238-239.
The *BKM* and the *KSS* too favour the *svayamvara* element. It is Gandharvadatta's decision that she will marry the man

\[
yo \text{vādayati \ } \text{vīṇāyām \ tribhir \ grāmaś ca gāyati/} \\
gāndharve kovidaḥ samyag vaiśṇavaṃ stutiṃtakaṇṭaḥ/
\]

who, outstanding in his knowledge of music, can correctly play on the *vīṇā* and sing in three modes the song in praise of Viṣṇu.

The *KSS* reinforces this interpretation by describing the tender glance which she throws to Naravāhanadatta, when he has satisfied her requirements, as like the garland of blue lotuses with which a girl at her *svayamvara* signifies her choice of husband.\(^1\) It is of course no accident that the *svayamvara* motif is prominent in precisely those versions of the story from which Cārudatta/Sānudāsa's story is absent, the *UP* of Guṇabhadra and the *BK* versions of Kṣemendra and Somadeva. They all emphasize the encounter between the girl and the hero and derive the intrigue from a special wish of hers, whereas the others trace the intrigue back to the adventures of her adoptive father. In other words the presence of the merchant's tale implies that the contest is held in order for the merchant to choose a husband for his adopted daughter, and not for the daughter to choose on her own behalf.

Two other motifs that occur in this passage are of interest to the folklorist: firstly, the jest with which the natives of Campā greet the stranger who asks where he is: "Have you fallen from the air, that you do not know where you are?", rather like the jest

\[
\text{taṃ \ vavre \ phullanīhījālamālayevāstayaḥ \ svayam, 14.2.29;} \quad \text{however} \\
\text{Viṣṇudatta does notice the auspicious marks of a cakravartin on the stranger whom he rescues from the well, *ibid.*, 6.}
\]
which the Ithacans in Homer's *Odyssey* addressed to new arrivals on their island:

\[ \text{ou mèn gár tí se pezòn ofomai enthád'hikésthai} \]

For I do not think you could have travelled on foot to this country.  

The *VH* gives the jest its full value. In reply to Vasudeva's question, the native of Campā replies:

\[ \text{bhaddamuhā! kameṇa jaṇo jaṇavayāo jaṇavayaṁ saṁkamai,} \]
\[ \text{tumāṁ puṇa kiṁ ągāsāo pādio?} \]

My good sir, people make their way from country to country one after the other, but you — have you fallen from the sky?  

*VH* 126.12-13

The *BKŚŚ* retains the jest but gives it a different context, indeed two different contexts. Naravāhanadatta first asks a gardener who is the owner of the garden; the answer is brisk and unhelpful:

\[ \text{kiṁ ca devakumāro 'pi divyajñānāmaśayaḥ/} \]
\[ \text{asmadādān abodhāndhān saṁdihann iva pṛcchati//} \]
\[ \text{atha vā kiṁ na etena mahātmāno hi mādṛśaiḥ/} \]
\[ \text{kriḍanti tena devena svayaṁ vijñāyatām iti//} \]

What! A heavenly prince, whose thoughts shine with divine wisdom, asks people like us blind in spirit, as if he were perplexed? The great make sport of my kind, so let my lord find out for himself.  

*BKŚŚ* 16.10-11

Naravāhanadatta thereupon approaches the owner, whom he finds in the luxurious pavilion, and on being hospitably received asks him which city he has come to. The other, before replying, echoes the observation of the man of Campā in the *VH*:

\[ \text{atha tena vihāsyoktam saṁbhāvyā nabhasā gatiḥ/} \]
\[ \text{tvādṛśām devapatrāṇām ajñānaṁ tu na yujyate//} \]
\[ \text{yo hi deśāntaram yāti mugdho 'pi dharaṇīcarāḥ/} \]

---

Laughing, he replied, "A journey by air one must suppose; for ignorance on the part of sons of gods like yourself is impossible. After all, even a fool who goes by land to another country does not set out without first knowing what country he has in mind."

BKŚŚ 16.26-27

and concludes that the stranger is mocking him. The simple jest has acquired several ironic overtones, in that Dattaka, for it is he, clearly implies that the stranger is a fool and a liar, and yet he treats him as an honoured guest, recognizing him as an exceptional being. With similar irony, but in a less sympathetic way, the gardener contrives to be at once subservient and hostile. In Budhasvāmin's narrative the folkloric material and the realistic rendering of character thus fruitfully interact.

The motif is absent from the BKM and survives only as a vestige in the KSS: the city of Campā has been elevated into the city of the gandharvas, and Viṇādatta the merchant's son becomes one of their number.¹ The jest then is no jest but a question needing an answer: how did Naravāhanadatta a man come to this place inaccessible to men? Naravāhanadatta answers not with a tall story about a yakṣī as in the BKŚŚ and like Vasudeva in the VH, but says truthfully that he was brought by a vidyādhari.

Secondly, the hero's ear for the qualities of the vīṇā. We have seen that one of the signs which Gandharavadattā's destined husband will give is his rejection of several instruments that are not suited to the task. Only then is he offered the vīṇā that has the right number of strings or that is tuned in the right mode. But his reason for rejecting the instruments has nothing to do with

¹ Lacôte, Essai, 212.
the number of strings or the tuning; he rejects them because his ear can detect faults that no one else's can. In the BKŚŚ there are spider webs inside the body of the first vīṇā, and there is a hair on the strings of the second. In the VH the sound of the first is spoilt by a hair, and the second and third are made of wood that has been vitiated in some way. The version of the motif that involves his detection of a single hair is the most constant, since it appears in the Kashmiri versions too, but in them the hero detects the fault when Gandharvadattā plays her vīṇā; there is no question of his choosing an instrument.¹

¹ On this motif Penzer's article on the "quintessence" motif, referred to on page 142 above, is useful.
THE MERCHANT'S STORY

The hero has established his claim to Gandharvadattā. Her father, who we will soon discover is only her guardian, and who is called Sānudāsa in the BKŚŚ and Cārudatta in the VH, begins at once to make arrangements for a wedding. Vasudeva has no objections to this; if Naravāhanadatta hesitates, it is merely so as not to seem too eager (BKŚŚ 17.168). Nevertheless he raises a question of propriety, and this question will motivate the merchant's telling his story. The hero, as we have seen, is a kṣatriya posing as a brahman. Gandharvadattā, the daughter of a merchant, would normally be a vaiśya; but the merchant, in answer to the hero's scruple about marrying outside his caste, says that she is equal or even superior to the hero in caste, a statement which he later justifies in his autobiography. Naravāhanadatta decides to accept the bride, adducing the Mānavadharmāśāstra on intermarriage between the twice-born and remembering that in a sense his father Udayana has chosen her for him, because she was won by playing the vīṇā, a skill which Udayana had passed on to his son. Thus while the run of the story demands that the merchant clear up a misunderstanding about his adopted daughter's origins, the narrative by distinguishing between the hero's real and his expressed reason for hesitating to accept the girl in marriage avoids putting him in the wrong for making a mistaken judgement about her origins. Vasudeva does not even raise the question of caste, he merely registers surprise, firstly at Cārudatta's claim and secondly at the usage of the fire sacrifice at the marriage ceremony, and it is Cārudatta himself who alludes to
the laws of Manu. Apparently this matter of tolerance among the twice-born castes is a literary motif which can be invoked or ignored at will. Vasudeva marries three vaiśya girls, Mittasiri, Rattavati and Bamdhumatī (lambhas 6, 11 and 17 respectively), and only in the case of Bamdhumatī is the question of caste mentioned. There the officiating priest makes a special concession and performs her marriage with the fire ceremony. Even Naravāhanadatta marries the "merchant" Priyadarśanā, though as will be seen there are perhaps mitigating circumstances.

Then one day the merchant tells the story of his life, leading up to the account of Gandharvadattā's origins. From the beginning one senses that in the VH Cārudatta's adventures make up a teaching story which, both in itself and by the occasions it offers for instructive digressions, tends to illustrate Jain doctrine, whereas in the BKŚŚ Sānudāsa's adventures are a romance motivated in part by opposition to the ideas of the heretical sects. Like many stories of its kind, it begins with the motif of a couple's childlessness. In the VH Cārudatta's parents were devoted followers of the Jina, and their devotion was duly rewarded by the birth of a son. Sānudāsa's parents were also rewarded, but not for their devotion. One day a Jain mendicant called Sānu, exhausted by a three-day fast, came to their door to beg for food:

\[ \text{dampatibhyām asau tābhyaṃ prītābhyaṃ prīṇitas tathā/} \]
\[ \text{apṛśto 'pi yathācaṣṭa dharmān ṛṣabhabhāṣītān/} \]

He was so pleased by the cheerful couple that, even without being asked, he taught them the laws pronounced by Ṛṣabha.

\[ \text{BKŚŚ 18.8} \]

---

1 See Alsdorf, HP 106.

2 kṛtābhyaṃ, text. Lacôte translated: "content du dévouement de ces deux époux".
He predicted that they would have a son; in stories of course such predictions entail their own fulfilment. Budhasvāmin is careful not to say that the couple were adherents of the Jina or that they willingly earned the monk’s favour; his plot depends on this. Nevertheless when in due course a son is born to them they call him Sānudāsa, Servant of Sānu.

Cārudatta grew up in an unexceptional way, surrounded by the affection of his family and carefully educated. Sānudāsa however tells the reader that he was brought up in such ignorance of youthful amusements that he regarded even his own wife with timidity, to the dismay of everyone:

\[
\text{tenātivinayenāsya lokabāhyena pārthivah/} \\
pitarau suhūdo dārā na kaścin nākulikṛtaḥ/\
\]

the king, his parents, friends and wife, all were disturbed by his excessive virtue, not of this world.

BKŚŚ 18.13

How Sānudāsa acquired this wife whom he regarded with timidity we do not know. In the VH however Cārudatta’s betrothal is narrated at length. The story is in a low or comic mode, like that of Vasudeva at the music teacher’s, and the exponent of this mode is here too a woman who dominates her husband. Saṅghadāsa in this story shows a high degree of narrative skill in creating an intrigue from banal material, namely the relations between members of a family and between one household and another, and in making this intrigue develop out of what the characters say and do without intervening as the author to explain or anticipate its development. An example: Cārudatta’s mother wants to marry him to her brother’s daughter. This is how she gets her way.

Now one day my mother went to her brother Savvattha’s house. He had a daughter called Mittavatī, a beautiful girl. At dinner time, they wanted mother to stay, but she made to go
home, saying "I have too much to do." My uncle said to her, "Why this coldness? Please do, for my sake, even if you have not come to an agreement with your niece."

"If you give me your daughter, you can count on my kindness, otherwise it is cut off here and now," she said.

"Who has authority over my daughter if not yourself?" he said, inclining his head. "If you are well-disposed to me, then she is yours."

VH 140.21-26

The absence of such a passage from the BKŚ is significant, because it illustrates the difference in tone between the two works, and also the difference in plot. Both versions tell how the young man gave his family reason to be alarmed about his behaviour, but Sañghadāsa emphasizes the part played by Cărudatta's mother in the affair. In fact all the Jain versions of the story lay the blame for the corruption of his innocence on his mother. As soon as Cărudatta is shown to be somewhat backward in the ways of the world, she makes arrangements for his dépucelage in order to bring him to his senses, as it were. Sañghadāsa is more subtle than the others; he has the mother, outraged by her sister-in-law's aspersions, let fly with an inconsequential menace: jaha ciram socihisi taha karemi, "I will see to it that you will suffer for a long time" (VH 141.19). This leaves it an open question whether she was more intent on bringing up her son to enjoy his wealth (141.30) or on revenging herself on her sister-in-law, which is more in character, and less brutal, than if she had calmly organized her son's corruption. Even so her rôle in the plot is inspired by Jain misogyny;¹ by contrast Budhasvāmin had the greatest respect for the traditional

¹ On misogyny in Jain literature, see J.C. Jain, Life in Ancient India, 152 ff. The story of Cărudatta is found with other stories warning against the untrustworthiness of women in the 23rd chapter of Nemicandra, Ākhyānakamaṇikośa.
place of women in the family. Powerful in their own domain, they may arrange matters for their menfolk by plots and confidences but they are never a bad influence.\(^1\) Budhasvāmin also wanted to postpone any account of the mother's motives in order to surprise the reader by the conclusion of the story. For these two reasons he passed over Sānudāsa's marriage and its consequences.

Sānudāsa's story, then, moves rapidly from his birth to the time after he was married, five ślokas in all (BKŚŚ 18.10-14).

Cārudatta's story is vastly longer, not only for the reasons suggested above but also because it includes an episode which plainly has the same origin as an episode from Naravāhanadatta's life in the BKŚŚ, the meeting with Amiṇagati, described above, pages 141-145. There we noticed that the sequence of events was better rendered in the VH: the excursion to the park to collect flowers for the temple, the walk to the river, Gomuha's warning not to swim, the water games (less dangerous than swimming) that lead to the discovery of Amiṇagati; everything follows plausibly, in contrast to the brusque change of scene in the BKŚŚ. This raises the possibility that the VH version is more authentic. However in its actual context in the VH the episode reveals certain incongruities.

Firstly, in the BKŚŚ the incident is followed by a transitional passage in which the companions discuss the merit accruing to the hero by the release of Amitagati. Gomukha turns this discussion to the subject of love in order to tell Naravāhanadatta about Madanamaṇjukā. Saṅghadāsa has retained this transition, giving it a jinistic colour of ahiṃsa in the objection that Amiṇagati may be

\(^1\) Maten, BB 93-94.
killed as a result of Carudatta's intervention, however kind it may have been in itself; but the dialogue still ends by introducing the subject of love, kāma, which comes to nothing because love has not yet entered Carudatta's life; the family scenes which lead to his mother persuading his friends to seduce him only take place after this excursion to the park. The proper sequel to the discussion about merit is the dispute between the companions about the different grades of men, which in the VH forms part of the story of Samba and Buddhisenā.

Secondly, the companions show an inexplicable deference towards Carudatta, who is nowhere represented as being their superior. As Gomuha follows the footprints of the vidyādhara, he calls out each new discovery to Carudatta, who remains in the same place until Gomuha reaches the end of the trail. Then he joins Gomuha and gives authoritative instructions about what to do with the vidyādhara's ornaments, how to revive him and so on. It is Gomuha who does all the work, yet it is Carudatta whom Amiyagati comes to thank. This pattern of behaviour is appropriate to Naravāhanadatta who as a prince has the ministers' sons to serve him and takes no active part in events, though as is fitting he receives Amitagati's homage. But it is surprising to find Carudatta, though he is merely the son of a śreṣṭha, doing nothing except give words of advice, even retiring to a safe distance while his friends revive the vidyādhara, and yet getting all the credit.

In discussing the story of Samba in the VH we found that Saṅghadāsa made his narrative incoherent by changing the order of events; the motive for the change was to combine two events as one and so abbreviate the episode. Certain events that are found in the story of Naravāhanadatta's meeting with Madanamañjukā are thus
missing from Samba's story. Now precisely these events appear in
the story of Cārudatta, as a table will show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BKŚŚ</th>
<th>VH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naravāhanadatta</td>
<td>Cārudatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. companion's curious behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. water games</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Amitagati found</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. merit of helping Amitagati</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. types of men</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. companion explains his behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. dance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. reluctance of companion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the story of Cārudatta has revealed a fault that
occurs at the end of stage 4 in the above table, confirming that a
mechanical displacement of the story material has occurred.
Instead of the attractive and coherent sequence in the BKŚŚ\(^1\) of
Amitagati's release, followed by Gomukha's discourse on the aims of
life, including love, which leads to his revelation about
Madanamañjukā, the VH has an inconclusive passage which serves only
to introduce a character for the sake of his appearance later in the
story. Moreover Amitagati and the companions of Naravāhanadatta
are so much a part of the BK that it is difficult to imagine how an
incident in the subsidiary story of Cārudatta in the VH, which uses

---

1 A good appreciation of this passage is given by Ruben, Die
Erlebnisse der zehn Prinzen, 82-83.
these names, could have been their source. The influence must have gone the other way. It is certain that the \( VH \) has made two episodes out of one in the \( BK \) as represented by the \( BKSS \); the lack of transition from the hunting party to the water games in the \( BKSS \), and the absence of the whole sequence from the Kashmiri versions, are the only arguments to the contrary, and they carry little weight by comparison.

To resume the progress of the narrative: after the briefest of introductions in the \( BKSS \), and after some long but interesting genre scenes in the \( VH \), the reader comes to the passage in which Sānudāsa/Cārudatta is seduced by his friends with the help of a \( gaṇikā \). The \( BKSS \) gives a more "literary" version of the events. As usual there is narrative irony in that the main character is unaware of the others' motives; this irony is reinforced on the level of verbal style, as an example of which we may note the description of — that favourite topic in Sanskrit poetry — the park in springtime, 18.39-41. The details are not otiose, because Nature, in sympathy with man, anticipates the events of the day: in the park the bees, adulterously flitting from one flower to another, have short noses, as if they had been cut off (\( lūnanāsā ivalināḥ \), 18.40), which is the conventional punishment of adulterers; and of all the trees it is the sapless bush that yields the most savour:

\[
\text{asārasya hi jāyante naṭasyātyutkaṭā rasāḥ}/
\]

the saps of the dry \( naṭa \) bush are extremely piquant

\( BKSS \) 18.41

— a reference to Sānudāsa, typical of Budhasvāmin even in its double meaning of "actor's emotions"; Naravāhanadatta at a moment of crisis is compared to an actor, and a bad one at that (12.64).
When Sānudāsa’s friend Dhruvaka invites him to the picnic, he persuades him with philosophy: as often, with the desirable balance of dharma, artha and kāma (18.18). He adduces a verse from the Mahābhārata to this effect: Sānudāsa, always the serious student, refutes its application in the manner of the schools. This contributes to the picture of a young man whose well-ordered ideas have never been perturbed by contact with real life. Comparison with the passages in the VH that have the same purport, the scene in which Cārudatta’s mother-in-law is scandalized to find that her daughter has not been used like a wife, and the motif that the young bride mistakes Cārudatta’s literary exercises for the ravings of a madman, will point up the difference in tone between the two narratives. Each is good in its own way, but the VH gives a better realization of the episode as a whole, especially in what follows.

A crucial point of comparison is this: the friends of the merchant trick him into drinking and into lusting after the ganikā. The next morning he will wake up in her bed. What happens between-times? The BKŚŚ rushes him off to her house for a quick tumble before the scene in which the friends mock him for believing that he is invisible, and reveal that everything was staged to cure him of his virtue. It is a moving scene in its way, a joke through which Sānudāsa acts out his awakening to wisdom and shame together. But this piquancy has been attained at the cost of narrative coherence. It matters more to Budhasvāmin to establish this change in Sānudāsa’s character symbolized by his entering a bawdyhouse than to establish where the house was and how he travelled there and back. By contrast the VH never leaves the reader in doubt about the characters’ movements. Cārudatta sits down in a shady place alone; his friends call him over to see the "lotus wine"; when he has drunk
it they advise him to go and rest. We may suppose that he heads for the same spot again, where in the meantime the gaṇikā has prepared herself to meet him. His friends pretend they cannot see the woman holding him up as he comes to join them for lunch. After lunch, he passes out, is loaded on to a carriage and taken to her house.

Neither the VH nor the BKŚŚ describes the merchant's manner of life in the gaṇikā's house, except to mention that he spends huge sums of money, sums which the VH gives with quaint precision. The VH also gives the duration of his stay, because Čārudatta will later meet his friend the vidyādhara Amiyagati's daughter, who is born and grows up during this time. The merchant's father disappears from the story at this point; in the VH, he goes forth from home as a wandering ascetic because of his sorrow at the behaviour of his son; in the BKŚŚ he dies, which introduces a complication: Sānudāsa inherits his position of chief-merchant (śreṣṭhipada, BKŚŚ 18.98).

The king of Çampa warns Sānudāsa on the occasion of his investiture to reform his life, and Sānudāsa obeys. But his friend Dhruvaka once again seduces him from virtue by pleading the gaṇikā's case: she is, he says, distressed by separation from Sānudāsa. Giving in to his inclinations, Sānudāsa goes to her house, where she receives him like a faithful wife. Her mother induces him to drink, and he stays there surāsmaraparāgaṇa, "entirely given over to liquor and love" (BKŚŚ 18.120).

This passage has no equivalent in the VH. It is in fact a gemination of the incident we have just been studying; the pattern of events is the following:

Sānudāsa's rigid morality
Dhruvaka's proposal
Sānudāsa succumbs to drink and love.
The first time around Sānudāsa is a student, and Dhruvaka proposes amusements suited to his age and station; the second time Sānudāsa is a householder and a community leader, and Dhruvaka appeals to his sense of responsibility. Already in Budhasvāmin's narration of Naravāhanadatta's wedding with Vegavati we have noticed his tendency to repeat especially piquant scenes; there the married woman who appears to be a virgin, and now here the man of stern principles who falls into the clutches of a prostitute. There is something musical or balletic about this technique which cannot be analysed from the point of view of narrative logic alone. In terms of the story, the motives of those concerned in the deception of Sānudāsa a second time are inexplicable, or at any rate unexplained by Budhasvāmin, who at the end of the story when the truth comes out does not allude to the second temptation (compare BKŚŚ 18.641-642). In defence of the passage one can point to the impression it gives of a deeper layer in the story. Deceived once, Sānudāsa leaves behind his naivety, but he leaves it for a new kind of moral rigidity, the consciousness of his place in the community. The second deception brings out his compassion, and establishes the gaṇikā's attitude to him as that of wifely love. Indeed both versions emphasise that Gaṅgadattā/Vasamṭatilayā deserves to be the merchant's wife, for in both she comes to him as a virgin and remains faithful until his return.

One day the gaṇikā's mother made the merchant leave the house, using a series of tricks to persuade him to leave of his own accord in the BKŚŚ, or in the VH using a drug to put him to sleep and then carrying him out. He found himself in the street and alone, an object of scorn to all. His family home was occupied by a stranger, and his mother and wife were living in misery. Unkindest cut of
all, they offered to work in order to support him. Having received all these blows to his self-esteem, Sānudāsa/Cārūdatta decided to go away and not return until he had recovered his good name and his fortune.

In this section, from his departure for the Land of Gold (Suvarṇabhūmi, BKŚŚ) or the Island of Gems (Rayanādīva, VH), the two versions differ both on the surface, that is, the succession of events, and on the level of moral interpretation. The superficial differences are mostly due to the BKŚŚ version's being much longer than the other, and I will not treat them exhaustively. Let us note merely that in each version the merchant makes three attempts to repair his fortune that end in failure. He is frustrated successively by brigands, shipwreck and fire. The VH narrates a fourth false start, the story of the wicked mendicant who knew the secret of making gold, a story of exceptional interest to the historian of fiction¹ that has no equivalent in the BKŚŚ. On the other hand Budhasvāmin has in addition the romance of Samudradinnā, a shipwrecked girl whom the shipwrecked Sānudāsa met. Later they were shipwrecked together, but as fate would have it both survived and though they had been parted in the wreck they were reunited at Campā on Sānudāsa's return.

There are two aspects of the story in this section which will bear a moralizing interpretation, the hero's desire to go out into the world and make his fortune, and the troubles that he encounters while carrying out his resolution. The active pursuit of wealth,  

¹ It is one of the stories treated at length by Alsdorf in his "Zwei neue Belege".
as J.C. Jain points out,\(^1\) was by no means despised in Jain literature. As Buddhiseṇa puts it,\(^2\) in terms of artha, the best of men is he who increases his father's wealth by his own efforts, and the worst is he who uses up the family's wealth. Even dishonest or unscrupulous activities may be considered as means to the end of getting or multiplying wealth.\(^3\) But a story of easy or uninterrupted success is no story, so the pursuit of wealth even where it leads to a happy ending is bound to be full of traps, like the robbers and shipwrecks mentioned above. It is tempting to suppose that the quest, though it is directed towards material gain, is important also for the spiritual development of the hero; J.A.B. van Buitenen said that in Indian stories a journey undertaken in search of gold often acquires a higher significance, becoming a search for a kind of paradise as well, the paradise of success; a shipwreck or other accident along the way is a purgatory from which the seeker may emerge more likely to succeed.\(^4\)

Unfortunately the stories, if one takes them literally, will not easily yield such an interpretation. To be sure, the merchant-hero is determined not to return before he has succeeded. After losing everything when his caravan was set upon by robbers, Cārudatta says to himself:

\[
na \text{ sakka apariccaenam giham daṭṭhum, ucchāhe sīrī vasati,}
\]
\[
dariddo ya mayasamo, sayaṇaparibhūo ya dhī jīviyaṁ jīvai,
\]
\[
seyaṁ cīṭthum ti
\]

\(^1\) "Stories of trading merchants and Vasudevahīṇī", 73.
\(^2\) VH 101.21-22.
\(^3\) J.C. Jain, op. cit., 74.
\(^4\) Tales of Ancient India, 7-8.
I cannot face my home without a fortune, prosperity resides in effort, the poor man is as good as dead, a man despised by his relatives lives a wretched life, better keep going.

VH 14.23-25

The BKŚŚ has the further refinement that Sānudāsa will not accept an easy success. When his maternal uncle Gaṅgadatta offers to give him all the wealth he needs, his reply is:

$mātulād dhanam ādāya yo jīvati samātṛkah/
nanu mātulamātraiva klībasattvah sa jīvaye//$

Surely a man who lives with his mother on the money of his uncle is no man at all, being supported by uncle and mother.

BKŚŚ 18.242

The role of Gaṅgadatta here is rather curious, however. Sānudāsa's mother has already warned him to avoid his father's relatives and to apply only to her relatives for help:

$naraṇāḥ hi vipannānāḥ saraṇaḥ mātṛbandhavah/
vyājyāḥ tu nijāsatrutvāt prājitena pitṛbandhavah//$

A mother's relatives are the refuge of men in distress; but a father's relatives are to be avoided, if one is wise, because they are the enemies of their own kin.

BKŚŚ 18.177

Indeed Gaṅgadatta does all he can to prevent Sānudāsa from venturing forth by himself, whereas the merchants in whose company he meets disaster are always friends of his late father. The explanation, as we shall see, is that Gaṅgadatta is co-operating with Sānudāsa's mother.

Sānudāsa undertakes one stage of the journey entirely on his own initiative, and, significantly, there is a slight hitch in the story. At BKŚŚ 18.427 Gaṅgadatta advises him again to return home, yet in the next sloka Sānudāsa begins the story of his expedition to Suvarṇabhūmi:¹

¹ Similarly in the VH a certain Ruddadatta suddenly appears and invites Cārudatta to accompany him to Rayaṇadīva; see above, page 44.
One day I saw a certain merchant, Acera by name, who was going to Suvarṇabhūmi with many other merchants; I went with them...

Maten in his summary of this passage supplies the missing motivation of Śānudāsa’s decision (BB 43):

Although he was admonished by his uncle Gaṅgadatta and reminded again of his obligations to his family Śānudāsa was determined to stick to his aim of making his own fortune.

Here again we may admire his determination, yet this is not the whole story. Let us take the case of Cārudatta. During the tīdaṃḍī episode he regrets in no uncertain way that his lust for wealth repeatedly leads him into danger (147.10, 22). Worse, in both versions this desire leads to the taking of life. Both Śānudāsa and Cārudatta find out in the course of their respective journeys that in order to get rich they must kill. In the BKŚŚ when the party of travellers on their way to Suvarṇabhūmi crosses the ajapatha, mounted on goats, they must kill any other travellers who are crossing in the opposite direction or be killed themselves, because on the “goat path” there is room for one file of traffic only between the side of the mountain and a precipice. Afterwards they must kill the goats which have carried them in order to use their skin to attract the bhārunḍas, the great birds which will transport them on the last stage of their journey. Śānudāsa deplores these expedients, but his companions overcome his resistance. On the first occasion they argue the case for action as Kṛṣṇa did to Arjuna in the Bhagavadgītā, and on the second they take away his goat and kill it without letting him see what they are doing. Cārudatta in the VN is only faced with the killing of his goat. A true Jain, he says that he
prefers to die rather than to commit such a crime, but seeing that he
cannot prevent the others from killing his goat, he does what he can
for the poor beast and reveals to it the teaching of the arhants,
after which it dies without a struggle.

Unlike the physical suffering, the mental anguish which the
merchant suffers in both stories cannot be regarded as a good
influence in the formation of his character. Rather, what the hero
endures is to be understood as the evil consequences of desire.
Wealth as such is not an evil, indeed (as Jain remarked, op. cit. 75)
without wealth one could not be sufficiently charitable to attain
dharma. But aspiring after wealth is vain, and brings in its train
such evils as the stories describe. The point is made with
allegorical simplicity. Sānudāsa failed to reach the Land of Gold.
After wandering lost in the wilderness he came upon a hermitage where
he was hospitably received. Near the hermitage there was a river
that flowed between banks of gold and precious stones. One night
Sānudāsa's cupidity was aroused by the sight of these riches glowing
in the dark, and he collected a huge heap of them. But in the
morning they proved to be stones, merely. The head of the hermitage
explained that their golden glamour came from the light emitted by a
certain plant and that Sānudāsa's perception of it was like that of
one suffering from jaundice (BKŚŚ 18.568); he added that he would
give Sānudāsa all the gold he wanted. Even more neatly, in the VH
Cārudatta obtained his wealth not from trade or travel but from
Amiyagati, and obtained his safe passage home with the wealth from
the goat reincarnate, and so reaped the fruit of his compassionate
behaviour towards them in the past.

Still, this literal interpretation does less than full justice
to the stories. The reader cannot help sympathizing with the
determination of the main character, and if this is so, then his final success must be felt as a well-deserved return for his having braved so many dangers. Indeed the stories as literature are all the better for not declaring unambiguously the superior merit of dharma or artha. In this they are perhaps a better mirror of life. As Jain charmingly expresses it (op. cit., 73):

Restrained by a proper respect for religion and an eventual turn towards renunciation in old age, the active pursuit of wealth by young men was considered [by the Jains] more than honourable; it appeared often to be viewed almost as a supreme moral duty.

One could say that the different attitudes of young and old are combined in the merchant's story by means of the narrative technique, in which the established and now virtuous Sānudāsa or Cārudattā recalls the adventures of his lustier youth, with the irony that the medium of first-person narration practically imposes on the material.

The head of the hermitage mentioned above will turn out to be the father of a beautiful girl who is of course Gandharvadattā. In the BKSS he is Bharadvāja-of-the-vidyādharas, who like his namesake in the Mahābhārata made the gods so anxious by his austerities that they sent a divine woman to seduce him. She was Suprabhā, daughter of the king of the gandharvas. Bharadvāja knew that the fruit of this union, Gandharvadattā, would marry the future king of the vidyādharas, and he entrusted her to Sānudāsa as his ward, with instructions how such a man was to be identified. In the VH the chief hermit and father of the girl is, as already mentioned, Cārudatta's old friend Amiyagati. He has a rather banal tale to tell: he married once, and then again; his father left him the kingdom, and he in turn left it to his sons. There is a certain lack of continuity with what we already know of Amiyagati,¹ and to

¹ See above, page 39, note 1.
complete the impression of patchwork in the narrative, the names of
his wives Sukumālikā and Manoranā seem to have been borrowed from
the story of Nalinikā, BKŚ 19.61 ff.

The merchant's return to Campā draws the threads of the story
together. As we have seen, Sānudāsa's virtue is excessive not in
the eyes of his mother alone. His parents and everyone else in Campā
were displeased by his devotion to the Jain and Buddhist teachings,
so the community worked together to put an end to this devotion by
means of an elaborate charade to shame him into leaving home; a
network of communications ensured that his movements from place to
place were constantly reported back to Campā. On his return these
matters are revealed to him; his reaction to the revelations is not
described. If the reader has retained the impression that
Sānudāsa's success is his just reward for resolution in the face of
misfortune, this development will dissipate it for good. But again,
a too-literal reading of the moral of the story is inappropriate.
The sudden turn of events reminds us that Budhasvāmin's intention is
to write a romance, not a cautionary tale. The sense of mystery
that is typical of the romance is largely due to the author's mani-
pulation of his characters' motives, by leaving them unexplained or
by giving them a surprising explanation after the event, as here.

By contrast, Cārudatta's virtue was excessive only in the eyes
of his mother; she alone was responsible for having him seduced.
Her plan rebounded on her because Cārudatta spent all the family's
money on fleshly joys; her poverty was no charade. The conclusion
of the story does reserve one surprise for the reader: Cārudatta on
his return learns that the gaṇīkā is indeed as loving and
disinterested as she professed to be when she told him that his
mother had consented to his seduction. But this is the only
unexpected revelation about the characters' motives, and it does not affect the interpretation of the story, except perhaps by checking its generally misogynist tendency.
After the interlude of the merchant’s story, the BKŚŚ returns the reader to the main story with an episode concerning Vikacika, a vidyadhara. Naravāhanadatta is living happily at Campā in the company of Gandharvadattā. One day they are approached by a man of extraordinary appearance: dressed as a woman, with a skull in one hand and a peacock’s tail feather in the other. Gandharvadattā treats him like an honoured guest, much to Naravāhanadatta’s disgust. Sensing this, the stranger turns upon him with an angry glare and throws the feather like a weapon, but it merely grazes his hair. Despondent, the stranger drops the skull he was holding and leaves. Gandharvadattā approaches Naravāhanadatta, who is surprised that she dares; is she not aware that he is angry with her? She is aware, but she asks him to hear her out. The stranger, she says, is Vikacika, Gaurimunda’s brother. We shall learn more about these two later in the episode. Gandharvadattā explains the stranger’s behaviour as follows:

\[
bhūtavrataṁ ca nāmedam bahuvighnaṁ caraty ayaṁ/
\text{samāpte 'smīn avighrena vandhyāḥ syur no manorathāḥ}//
\]

he practises this cult, known as the cult of the ghosts, which is liable to many hindrances; but if it were accomplished without hindrance, we should have to say goodbye to our desires.

BKŚŚ 19.15

He was at the stage of doing devotions to Gaurī (hence his feminine dress) and to frustrate him would have entailed the anger of the goddess. So Gandharvadattā honoured him, thus at the same time placating Gaurī and angering Naravāhanadatta. The latter’s anger called forth an angry response from Vikacika, which spoilt his devotion. Gandharvadattā’s words assuage Naravāhanadatta’s anger,
and with magic spells she arouses in him the spirit of resolution (saṃjanitotsāhas tayā... mantrasādhanaīḥ, 19.22).

This episode has no equivalent in the VH, which goes straight on to the spring festival in the park outside Campā, giving a very compressed account of the yāträ. What happens during the hero's expedition to the festival with Gandharvadatta is essentially the same in both: he sees a beautiful dark girl, falls in love with her, and tries unsuccessfully to hide his new passion from Gandharvadatta. In the VH, Vasudeva watches the girl dance at the park where the festival is held; in the BKŚ Ś Naravāhanadatta catches sight of the girl playing on a swing while he is on his way to the festival; consequently the hero is accused either of having paid too much attention, or not enough, to the attractions of the festival. The VH version is built around that well known display piece, the description of a dance; the BKŚŚ version is remarkable for the variety of incident and the witty evocation of the hero's thoughts that it contains.

Naravāhanadatta and the girl exchange loving glances:

cintitam ca mayā kāntā yadi me kālikā bhavet/
iyam eva tatas tātī kṣiptauḥkumagauratā//

[he thinks] if I were to fall in love with a black girl, then it would be with this slim girl who beats the pallor of kunkum.

BKŚŚ 19.35

He regrets his obligation to attend the yāträ, and at the yāträ his thoughts are elsewhere. When the day ends, he hesitates: should he leave Gandharvadatta for the dark girl? His decision is expressed by a charming conceit arising out of the time of day; the sun, our king, leaves the eastern maiden for the western — like king, like subjects? Or again ought he rather to follow the course of mortal lovers (19.42-44)? That is to say, the course of
hypocrisy, professing love for one woman while brooding inwardly on his love for the other. Later Naravāhanadatta hypocritically (jihmam, 19.203) disavows his passion for anyone except Gandharvadatta, in fact finding that, like wine, his new love, delicious as it is, is so much more delicious on Gandharvadatta’s lips, when she talks about it.

He decides, then, to be more cautious, and finds an excuse to send Gandharvadatta home with Sānudāsa. But she has anticipated his thoughts. Two servant girls arrive at her orders to distract him. In the event it is he who distracts them, with drinks and presents, and hurries off in the direction of the dark girl. As he drives slowly past her village, his eyes fixed on her, the two servant girls relentlessly catch up with him. He concedes defeat and returns to his wife.

That night he falls asleep hoping to be united with the dark girl in his dreams. Gandharvadatta rises at midnight and interrogates the servant girls about his behaviour. They confirm her suspicions. She turns to Naravāhanadatta who pretends to be asleep, but she insists,¹ and confronts him with a story which illustrates

¹ tataḥ prākpratibuddham mām apṛcchat suprabhāsutā/
jāgratha svapithety uccair jāgramīti maṇoditam//

I was already awake. Then the daughter of Suprabha asked me in a loud voice, "Are you awake or asleep?" I replied that I was awake. (BKSS 19.59)

Lacôte translated prākpratibuddham as "je m'éveillai de bon matin". But does prāk ever have this sense? It is better to understand that Naravāhanadatta is listening to all that goes on without showing that he is awake. Besides, he must be awake in order to know about this nocturnal interrogation of the servants and to narrate it as it happened; an important consideration in Indian storytelling.
her situation, the story of Nalinikā whose husband was carried off by a yakṣī. In the VII too Gamdhavavadattā reproves the hero for his wandering attention, and Vasudeva is to a certain extent subject to contrary impulses; he is lajjo, "feeling ashamed", 156.5, and he says mayā sā sasavahaṁ pasāhiya, "I pacified her, scolding her at the same time", 156.11; but her reproaches and his introspection are not developed beyond the minimum that the reader needs to understand what is happening.

Budhasvāmin's Gandharvavadattā goes on to say that the dark girl is not what Naravāhanadatta thinks, namely a caṇḍālī or outcaste (19.201), indeed she could not be, for princes do not fall in love with caṇḍāla girls. The girl in question is a māṭaṅgī.1 The words caṇḍāla and māṭaṅga are treated as synonyms in the dictionaries, and are often used interchangeably. The dark girl who brings the parrot to king Śudraka in Bāna's Kādambarī, for instance, is called indifferently caṇḍālī and māṭaṅgī. But here, whereas the word caṇḍāla is used as an execration (e.g. BKŚS 3.61 and below, 20.203), the word māṭaṅga, though it equally carries connotations of colour or caste, is not so used. The māṭaṅgas in the story of Avantivardhana (BKŚS 3) are vidyādharas suffering under a curse; in the present story they are a race of siddhas. That is, they have the appearance of outcastes but are not. Now although, or perhaps because, sexual contact between the aryan and the non-aryan castes was forbidden, there existed fantasies about the desire of aryan men for non-aryan women; Śudraka in the case mentioned above finds the dark girl attractive and reflects aho vidhātur asthāne

---

1 Consequently one should not use the word caṇḍāla in translating pakkaṇa (19.31, 50) as Lacôte did.
saundaryaniṣpādanaprayatnaḥ, "alas for the creator's labour in bringing forth beauty in an appropriate place" (p. 24). His desire comes to nothing; the extravagant description of the dark girl's charms has no issue in action. Another way of exploiting the peculiar charm of such a situation is to have the hero, who desires this forbidden fruit, attain her without troubling the orderly separation of castes, not however without titillating the reader with the risks he is running; to make the desired union take place but first to reveal by a surprising turn of events that the laws of varṇa will not, after all, be broken. That is what happens in the BKŚŚ and the VH, though Budhasvāmin makes much more of the mātaṅga girl's ambivalence as both desirable and contaminating; the tension of his plotting corresponds to the moral tension of the situation.

In both the VH and the BKŚŚ an old lady comes to propose her daughter for the hero to marry. In the VH she is granted an interview with Vasudeva, and he recognizes her as a mātaṅgī whom the hero had seen in the company of the dark girl the day before. He refuses her offer, saying that learned men frown on a mixture of colours. Budhasvāmin keeps a greater distance both between the events of the gātrā and the appearance of the old woman, and between the hero and the old woman. She comes, not the next morning but merely "one day" (ekadā, 20.2) after the spring season is over; she speaks with Dattaka, who reports the conversation to Naravāhanadatta; he mentions the supernatural aspect of her appearance, her radiance, but not her dark skin. They find her amusing but not wholly convincing. All this is in preparation for the shock of discovering her identity, an effect quite absent from the VH.

The next development in the story is that this old lady, not pleased by her reception at the hero's palace, sends a corpse to
bring him to her. Saṅghadāsa postpones this by making the old lady justify her standing as a relation by marriage to the family of Nami and a vidyādhārī by recounting the deeds of Usabha. Budhasvāmin, in order to distract the reader and prevent him from connecting the old lady’s visit with the intervention of the corpse, here introduces an episode on the theme of Gandharvadatta’s jealousy. Her fear of losing Naravāhanadatta brings on a severe fever which resists the usual cooling remedies. It is the rainy season now, and so Naravāhanadatta has the roof of the palace made into a lake by blocking the gutters, and there, cooled by the west wind, she watches an aquatic spectacle provided by the servants. Then in both versions, that same night, our hero is awakened by something which feels not at all like Gandharvadatta; it is a vetāla, an animated corpse, which carries him off, putting the guards to sleep and closing the door after it. Does our hero resist? Not Vasudeva; he reasons that a cold vetāla will do him no harm, and that since it took the trouble to close the door it cannot be all bad. He is curious to know who sent it. Naravāhanadatta too notices that the corpse is cold, without however drawing any conclusions (the rules about hot and cold vetālas are probably an ad hoc invention of Saṅghadāsa’s); at first he refrains from struggling so as not to wake Gandharvadatta with a fright, and then he finds the corpse so hard that his efforts to escape are fruitless.

Next follows the description of this strange pair’s route through the dark streets of Campā to the cemetery outside the walls. Vasudeva observes a number of favourable omens: a garland catches on his foot as he is dragged out of the house, he sees a friendly white bull and an elephant lying down, and he hears the words sobhitā and sahu. These omens, he concludes, promise a happy
outcome for the expedition. Naravāhanadatta similarly knows that the corpse means him no harm because it takes the north gate to leave the city (20.69), the north being the quarter of the gods, whereas the south is the quarter of the dead. However what he sees and hears on the way is of quite a different order. The corpse, being a gentleman (kulaputraḥ, 20.37), stops in order to let its passenger enjoy such interesting sights and sounds as they encounter. Each sight or sound presents a problem of interpretation: what meaning can he discover in, what context can he recreate for, the impressions he receives from place to place during the journey?

He sees leopard skins in great quantity spread out on the street, and recognizes this as an impression produced by lights behind the shutters of the houses.

He hears a voice somewhere saying to a servant, "reward that owl!" Then the cry of a peacock; then the same voice saying "cut off its head!" He understands that the voice belongs to a cuckolded husband. His wife, frightened by the owl, turned to her husband for comfort, but the peacock's cry reminded her of her lover and she turned away again.

He hears the voices of a woman and a man; she has been docked of her nose and ears as a punishment for adultery, he of a hand and a foot for the same offence; they regret their days of glory, and blame each other for their present state.

He hears the voice of a poet calling for a pen to write down the verse which has just occurred to him.

1 Lacôte, note on text at 20.69.
He sees the corpse of a small boy, and diagnoses the malady of which he died, reflecting that he Naravāhanadatta could have saved the boy's life by a magic formula that he knows.

He sees the corpse of a man on which no cause of death is discernible, and deduces that he died by accident,¹ and that his faithless wife had the body thrown away. Again he reflects that he could have saved the man's life by a magic formula.

He sees the corpse of a beautiful woman who has hanged herself, leaving her jewels nearby. Naravāhanadatta deduces that she had been jealous of her husband because he accidentally mentioned another woman's name,² and deplores that the husband was so uxorious as to permit his wife to take amiss his suspected infidelity. The jewels were to distract the attention of robbers from her corpse — but there are no robbers in Campā! The selection of incidents which make up the passage does not seem to have been determined by either their relevance to the story as a whole or any kind of symmetry or internal relationship, except the last, that of the woman who hanged herself, which is like a recapitulation of the hero's habitual conduct. Naravāhanadatta is then contemplating a picture of himself, and we note his reaction: he deplores in the husband not his cruelty, but his indulgence.

¹ The man woke up with a thirst and drank water in which a snake had spat its venom. Compare the well-known fable about causation in which an eagle drops a snake into a water jar or into food which is then given by X to Y; who is responsible for Y's death? References in Penzer, Ocean of Story, volume 7, 212-215, on the thirteenth vetāla story in the KSS(12.20); and Perry, "The Origin of the Book of Sindbad", 42. Penzer, loc. cit., refers to a story more like Budhasvāmin's in the Bahār-i-Dānish of 'Inayatu'-llāh.

² For the motif, compare above, page 161, note 1.
Our hero arrives at the cemetery and meets the old mātaṅga woman. Vasudeva knows about her family already, having spoken to her the day before; Naravāhanadatta is now told. In the VH, the old woman takes Vasudeva directly to the Veyaṅga, and there he meets the girl Nilajasa and receives her hand in marriage. In the BKSS the old mātaṅga Dhanamati summons her daughter Ajinavati and has Naravahanadatta and her join hands then and there — he sees in his hand the mixture of colours (varṇasaṁkaram, 20.121). Then she points out a vidyādhara who is sacrificing to Gaurī in the company of friends; he is Gaurimunḍa, who with his brother Vikacika has taken sides against Naravāhanadatta on behalf of his dependents Angaraka and Vyālaka, enemies of Amitagati and therefore of Naravāhanadatta too. She reminds him that Mānasavega too is his enemy, and that he will acquire more enemies as he goes; he is pleased by the thought that he now has other powerful allies besides Amitagati in Dhanamati and her son Candāsimha. This is an important passage for understanding the BKSS version of the plot so far as the pattern of Naravāhanadatta's alliances is concerned, and we shall return to it later. It is also important because it brings together two themes which are manifested in various narrative forms throughout the work, the risk of impurity and the desire for power.

The hero's contact with a woman who is apparently an outcaste, and his presence in a burning-ground, are simply different aspects of the former theme. Candālas and corpses are two of the objects, contact, even indirect contact, with which demands purificatory measures. However the outcome of this perilous situation is advantageous to Naravāhanadatta in that he will have gained a new

---

1 Kane, *A History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. 4, 114.
wife and valuable new allies. The key to this paradox is to be found in the sights and sounds of a frenzied activity in the cemetery: besides the usual furniture of corpses, jackals, dogs and witches, there is here a man with a sword in one hand and a skull in the other

mahāmāṃsāṃ mahāsattvāḥ kṛṣṇatām iti vādinam/
calling "Courageous ones, buy human flesh!"

and

sādhakaṃ siddhinistriṃśam utpatantaṃ nabhaḥ kvacit/
there a magician with his magic sword flying up into the air

Dhanavati tells Naravāhanadatta not to be apprehensive; the cemetery is a place favoured by Rudra and the deities associated with him, namely his wife, Ganeśa, the Mothers and the gaṇas (20.104), and she concludes

mokṣasvargārthakāmāś ca śṛgante bahavo dvijāḥ/
prāptāḥ pratavane siddhiḥ...

Many of the twice-born, according to tradition, have attained fulfilment of their desire for liberation, heaven or worldly success in a cemetery.

That is to say, Naravāhanadatta watches a scene in which a number of elements from tantric rites or at any rate from tantric folklore are represented. I use the word "tantrism" in the sense of the pursuit of power or success by spiritual means which may include the discipline of embracing what is forbidden. Naravāhanadatta embodies success, of a kind: his final situation as cakravartin of the vidyādharas will bring him all the joys of which men dream. His progress is measured by the acquisition of wives, and several of
these are, at first sight, for various reasons, untouchable: one is
the daughter of a prostitute, another is black, a third is a man.
In the same way Vidyumālin and his brother Megharatha in Hemacandra's
Pariśiṣṭaparvan marry cāndālīs, because this is the way to acquire
science.¹ Still, it would be an exaggeration to call the work
really tantric, because these tendencies are checked by the drift of
the narrative. Naravāhanadatta himself does not pursue success by
his own spiritual resources — rather success is thrust upon him —
and the risk of contamination is always averted by the discovery of
some detail about the wife which puts her in a different category.
The apparent exception is Madanamaṇjukā; we shall return to her case
later. The scene in the burning-ground sums up the part which
tantrism plays in the BKŚŚ: Naravāhanadatta is a spectator of, not
a participant in, these rites which, performed both by his allies
and his enemies, will affect his life. Nothing of this appears in
the VH, of course. Vasudeva too sees his enemy, in his case
Aṅgāraka, engaged in magical rites in the burning-ground, but the
implications of this are evaded when he responds simply with a "get
me out of here!" (179.19).

To resume the thread of the narrative in the BKŚŚ: after
Dhanamatī has caused her daughter and Naravāhanadatta to join hands,
and has pointed out Gaurimūḍa and the others, a vimūna arrives to
take them all to Candāsinha's city in the land of the siddhas.
There, when the auspicious hour comes, the couple are married, and
there they spend the rainy season.

Let us at this point compare the version of the story in the
BK and the KŚŚ. One day while Naravāhanadatta is living with

¹ Pariśiṣṭaparvan, 2.647.
Gandharvadatta in the city of the gandharvas, he goes to visit a park outside the city. A certain aerial being called Dhanavatī arrives and offers her daughter Ajināvatī, whom she has brought with her, in marriage. Dhanavatī is a vidyādharī, and she has come to ally herself with the future cakravartin, and at the same time to warn him against the enmity of the other vidyādharas. Only, he must wait for an auspicious day to marry Ajināvatī; for the moment she takes him to king Prasenajit's city Śravasti. Then the episodes of Bhagīrathayāsas, Prabhāvatī and the hearing in Vāyupatha's court of the dispute between Mānasavega and Naravāhanadatta intervene, after which, when the auspicious day arrives, the couple are at last united. The motif of contamination is quite absent: Dhanavatī is not even apparently a candāli, and there is no mention of a cemetery. The story is one of a type frequent in the Kashmiri versions, in which a bride is offered to the hero, he accepts, and then he marries her, the only complication being that he must wait for an auspicious time; we shall examine this story type later on. So tenuous a plot will not stand by itself, and such stories are always either interwoven with other episodes (as here), or filled out with literary ornaments of one kind or another. The plot of the BKŚŚ version is richer, but still its affinity to the other is apparent in the motifs of the visit to the park, the delayed marriage, and the pattern of alliances. It is typical of Budhasvāmin that the motif of waiting for the right time is manifested in a monologue in which the hero deduces from the evidence available to him which day must be the one everybody is waiting for.

The next episode in the VH and the BKŚŚ concerns the abduction of Ajinavatī/Nilajasā. Vasuđeva the very next morning hears that Nilajasā had been promised to her cousin Nilakaṃṭha, that Nilakaṃṭha
has come, presumably on that same morning, to protest about her marriage to Vasudeva, and that he has been non-suited by the elders. Budhasvāmin's version is rather more circumstantial, and I will examine it in detail.

One day Ajinavatī is tearful. Naravāhanadatta asks why; a servant girl tells him. Some time ago Vikacika — the intruder whom Gandharvadattā cleverly dispatched a while ago in Campā — was staying here in Caṇḍasimha's city. He asked Caṇḍasimha for Ajinavatī; the other put him off, saying that she was only a little girl. Vikacika, not taking this for a refusal, boasted to everyone that Ajinavatī was promised to him, and when he heard of her marriage with Naravāhanadatta, he reproached Caṇḍasimha with this. They agreed to a lawsuit, and (the servant concludes) they have gone to put the case before Vāyumukta, the chief justice at Saptaparṇapurā. At the servant's suggestion, Ajinavatī and Naravāhanadatta go there too. She leaves him in a garden while she goes to greet her parents. He amuses himself there by making chains of flowers. At last she returns, announces that Vikacika has been defeated in the lawsuit, and tells what she has heard.

She was in the apartment of her friend Vāyumuktā, daughter of the judge, when the conclusion of the case was announced by a drum; they sent a servant to find out the news. The report was that Vikacika and Caṇḍasimha had given each his side of the story, and Vāyumukta had pronounced in favour of the latter. Vikacika had left in disgust, calling the court corrupt caṇḍālas, and uttering a vague menace:

1 A polite skill of the nāgaraka, one of the sixty-four listed in the Kāmasūtra. Compare VII, lambha 24.
aham eva hi kartavye kartavye buddhivān iti//
I in any case know what duty I have to do.  

Naravāhanadatta decks Ajinavatī with his flower chains, but she shakes them off; she is jealous of the other women in his life with whom he learnt such skills. He reflects to himself that this display of bad temper

upāyair durnivarttyaiva prāṇāmaśapathađibhiḥ//
difficult to eliminate by such methods as getting down on one's knees or giving one's word

is due to his staying in the house of his parents-in-law, presumably because his respect for them prevents him from taking appropriate measures with their daughter. He says nothing, and takes her in his arms.

This last passage is a striking example of the first-person narrator's point of view, in that it gives his, the principal character's, discursive thoughts about a situation, drawing a clear distinction between what happens in the story, that is to say what could equally well have been observed by another character, and what goes on in the mind of the narrator. It links this story with the preceding by returning to the theme of jealousy, although Ajinavatī's jealousy, unlike Gandharvadatta's, is unfounded; here again Naravāhanadatta's knowledge of the science of love prompts him to be cautious.

Suddenly Ajinavatī/Nilajasa is abducted by the disappointed suitor, Vikacika or Nilakantha. This occurs without transition in the BKŚŚ; Ajinavatī, having recovered her composure, is standing by a pool when he swoops down and carries her off. In the VH Nilajasā and Vasudeva are in an isolated place, and she becomes separated
from him while she pursues a peacock, so that the surprise attack of
Nilakamtha is better motivated. In either case the passage as a
whole is a transition to the hero's next adventure. Naravāhanadatta
can do nothing but hurl angry insults at Vikacika as he flies away
with Ajinavatī; then he wanders off by himself and loses his way —
and loses his sorrow too (dīnāhmūṣītasmṛtih, BKŚŚ 20.229). Like
Vasudeva he comes upon kindly cowherds, one of whom offers him
hospitality for the night. His wife attends graciously on
Naravāhanadatta, the cowherd himself not hesitating to leave her
alone with our hero, who reflects that though she is a cowherd's
wife, unsupervised, beautiful and young, she is virtuous: other
people are inscrutable (durboḍhah parabuddhayah, 20.259)! Her
presence enables him to overcome the grief of separation from
Ajinavatī. In the morning the cowherd shows Naravāhanadatta the way
to the nearest village, which is called Saṃbhava, and he makes his
way there, admiring the autumn landscape as he goes; this too makes
him forget his love. Notice the passage of time, from the rainy
season which provided a distraction for Gandharvadattā in her sickness
to the autumn of the present. Budhasvāmin provides the reader with
a transition from Ajinavatī to the next adventure that is much less
startling than the previous transitions effected by the intervention
of superhuman beings; it is a change in the hero's mind, accom-
panied, as psychological descriptions often are, by a sense of the
landscape. Hence the sentimental picture of rural life, the emphasis
on such things as are capable of distracting his mind from Ajinavatī.
Instead of this the VH gives us a comic scene: Vasudeva up a tree
surrounded by angry cows (laṁbha 5).
Naravāhanadatta as he approaches the village sees a man coming towards him; this man says:

\[ citram \text{ āryakaniśṭhasya yugam susadṛśā iti/} \]

It's amazing how you look like Āryakaniṣṭha [or: your elder brother]

*Narāvāhanadatta understands that the man must be thinking of Gomukha, and asks him where this Kaniṣṭha is and what he is doing. The man says that a certain person arrived at the village, introduced himself as a brahman and won the friendship of a brahman householder called Prasannaka. He said he was expecting his elder brother (meye jyeṣṭho, 20.275) who was away at a yātra. And, concludes the villager, while waiting for Āryajyeṣṭha, he has established for himself a reputation as a learned man. Soon after, Gomukha and Naravāhanadatta are reunited, to the delight of all, and while they are both staying at Prasannaka's, Gomukha tells the prince all that has happened since he was abducted by Mānasavega.

In the *VH*, the character who corresponds to Gomukha is Aṃsumamṭa, the son of king Kavila, who is introduced in *lambha* 7.

They are separated when Vasudeva is carried off by Nīlakaṇṭha from Kavila's city Vedasāmapura in *lambha* 8, but Aṃsumanṭa catches up with Vasudeva later in the same *lambha*. The two versions march in step again when, in the *BKŚŚ*, Gomukha proposes to Naravāhanadatta that they leave the village and go to the holy city of Vārāṇasī, which is only a yojana away, in the hope of hearing news of Hariśikha and the other companions; and when, in the *VH*, Aṃsumanṭa proposes that Vasudeva and he visit the beauties of Malaya country. On the way Gomukha makes a request which, at first sight, seems to lack respect:
he asks the prince to carry him. In fact that is only his way of asking for a story to help pass the time. The VH has the same exchange, but there the friends are on equal terms, so the effect of a shock followed by an explanation is absent. Finally it is the companion who tells the story, or rather examines the species of story; Amsumanta divides the genre into the historical and the imaginative, and subdivides these according to the sex and quality of the principal character; Gomukha notices five possible subjects, viz. religion, wealth, happiness, extinction and cure (dharmartha-sukhanirvanacikitsaḥ, BKŚ 21.13), and gives a brief and commonsense recipe for the attainment of each. We are told that Amsumanta went on to tell stories, but in both cases the reader is cheated of the stories themselves.

Budhasvāmin has already established for Naravāhanadatta and Gomukha the aliases of [Ārya]jyeṣṭha and [Ārya]kaniṣṭha, two brahman brothers (literally Elder and Younger), though in such a sly fashion that this aspect of the story completely escaped the notice of the first editors and translators of the BKŚś. The words jyeṣṭha and kaniṣṭha of course, with or without the honorific ārya-, mean "elder brother" and "younger brother" respectively, and they were so translated by Renou. Naravāhanadatta knows that the man in question is not his younger brother because he has none, and deduces that it must be Gomukha because no one in the world resembles him so much as Gomukha, the son of his father's minister and his friend since childhood. In labha 23 of the BKŚś, when the hero and Gomukha have

---

1 cariyā ya kappiyā ya, VH 208.30; see Raghavan, Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa, 627.
reached Vārāṇasī, we learn that Gomukha repeated the story that he and Naravāhanadatta were brahman brothers, both to the chamberlain (23.23) and to Punarvasu, their host in Vārāṇasī (23.76). Now, having studied the VN version, the reader understands that the pair have in fact adopted the false names [Ārya] jyeṣṭha and [Ārya]kanistha as part of their disguise, but that Budhavāmin has suppressed the scene in which the companion proposes the disguise to the hero. Naravāhanadatta is quick-witted enough to perceive from the first that Gomukha has in his absence invented these names on their common behalf, and falls in with his design. The very transparent alias is a joke at the expense of the people of Sambhava and Vārāṇasī — and at the reader's expense too. Instead of sharing the narrator's privileged view of events, he is left to find out for himself sooner or later about the trick, just like the other characters.

Sanghadasa demands less of the reader. He has Vasudeva and Apsumaṇta decide to take the names of Ajjajettha and Ajjakanittha, brahman brothers, to protect themselves against molestation, and they use these names throughout the episode, not only in public but also in private, when addressing one another.

In both versions, when the city is in view, the companion takes the hero's jewels in the interests of safety — the jewels which he will put up as a stake in the game of dice¹ — and leaves the hero outside the city while he goes to find a place to stay.

Naravāhanadatta waits in the porch (maṇḍapa, BKŚ 21.22) of an

¹ An intelligent use of an old motif, that in which a character about to enter a town hides his precious ornaments in his turban or elsewhere; this is called vaṇīgaḍāra, "the habit of merchants", BKŚ 22.166.
unfrequented temple. Gomukha has warned him that Varāṇasī is infested with religious cranks who are great thieves, the kind that gathers around places of pilgrimage; Aṃṣumāṭa, of course, does not repeat this sentiment unbecoming to a Jain text, but mentions only the dangers of a big city.

Next comes an episode that is peculiar to the BRŚŚ. No sooner has Gomukha left than, precisely, a wandering ascetic and a student come and sit in the porch. While Naravāhanadatta is reflecting that it would be unmanly on his part to attack them on the suspicion that they are thieves, and besides, he is unarmed and they are possibly armed, the ascetic begins to speak. He complains that mokṣa, the liberation he has been seeking, is either so easy to have that it is not worth having, or so difficult that struggling after it is a waste of time. The existence of another world is proved by the word of the omniscient; but proof of the existence of the omniscient is asiddhāruddhāśūśāśīvadūśītat, "blighted by the venomous serpent of faults like insufficiency or contradiction" (21.39). His conclusion: let us devote ourselves to the pleasures of the senses, and have no more to do with viṭavācāṭaghatiṭaiḥ kāvyakarpaṭaiḥ, "patches of poetry botched by talkative triflers" (21.40).

The student will not accept this, and adduces against it the unanimity of all the schools. But, he asks, what does the other mean by his disparagement of literature? The ascetic replies that from such works he has learnt the signs that mark a great man, and according to them the person before them (that is, Naravāhanadatta) ought to be the future chief of the vidyādharas, which is plainly

1 Not, as Renou has it, "une maison vide".
absurd. If the treatise on the marks of a great man is false, so
probably is all the rest. In defence of the scriptures the student
says that destiny (daivam, 21.54), which is apparent in these marks,
comes to nothing without personal effort (apauruṣam, ibid.); the
young man in question, for all his beauty, is of a low order because
he lacks this effort. The ascetic retorts that destiny is more
influential than personal effort, and tells a story to prove it;
then the student in his turn tells a story which illustrates the
contrary. After which they both leave, and just then Gomukha
returns.

Before following the main story any further, let us examine
the implications of this episode. As far as one can judge, it is
an invention of Budhasvāmin’s, though the frame, in which the hero
waits outside the town while his friend goes in to organize things,
is probably traditional. There are several ways of looking at the
episode. Firstly, it represents the passage of time while Gomukha
is away and the hero is alone with nothing to do; an authorial
phrase could have performed this function ("and after some time had
passed my companion returned"); Sanghadāsa suggests the passage of
time in the VII with a description of the aśoka grove; but
Budhasvāmin had more elaborate plans for this juncture in his story.
The ascetic’s story and the student’s story also constitute a
paradigm of the Indian romance, indeed of all romances, which combine
the marvels of fateful or fortunate events with exemplars of brave
and independent action. Bhoja¹ distinguished these two factors as
daiva and pauruṣa, using the same vocabulary as Budhasvāmin used in
these stories. The citation and illustration in the text of these

¹ Raghavan, Bhoja’s Śṛṅgārapākaśa, 598.
terms of Indian poetics exemplifies the self-consciousness of Budhasvāmin's narrative; he is a critic as well as a poet. Finally, the episode stops the progress of the story and turns the reader's attention to the narrator himself. Through the eyes of the two strangers the reader contemplates this paradoxical being who bears signs foretelling grandeur yet who is from all other evidence worthless. The student and the ascetic give different explanations of the paradox: which must the reader believe? The ascetic is cynical about traditional wisdom, which makes his argument a priori the worse, though he develops it with an eloquence that the author does not allow to his opponent. Moreover it is the student who has the last word in the pauruṣa-daiva debate, which suggests that the author is on his side. Apparently we should understand that Naravāhanaḍatta's future success will be due more to his destiny than to his manly qualities; we shall return to this question below.

Gomukha/Amsumantta, then, returns to the hero and introduces a young man whom he has apparently met in the city, and who is soon qualified as a rich merchant's son. In the VH he bears the name of Vinādatta, whereas in the BKŚŚ he is called Punarvasu. This man offers them hospitality at his house, and that night in private the hero asks his companion for the events of the day. In outline, the accounts of Gomukha and Amsumantta are the same: having first approached a man, who then invited them to his home, they left him as soon as they heard of a gaming-house nearby; in the gaming-house they acted as impartial judges in a disputed fall of dice, and then

1 See above, page 175, note 3.
on their own behalf played and won with the hero's jewels; this earned them the respect of the rich merchant's son who had their winnings taken to a safe place and invited them to stay with him. Only the figure of the first man whom the companion approached needs further discussion.

In the *BKŚŚ*, Gomukha decided that the best place to find a patron would be the royal palace, and made his way there. He weighed up in his mind the potential of this or that important person whom he saw in the crowd. Then he saw the chamberlain (*pratīhāra*, 23.15), and recognized in him the man he wanted. Gomukha followed him to his home, and made his request, referring to himself and Naravāhanadatta as two brahman brothers. The chamberlain bade him welcome. But in the event Gomukha preferred to look for Punarvasu, after the chamberlain had mentioned the prodigality of this man:

\[
yāḥ samāṇavayāḥśilo muktahastah sakīṃcanaḥ/
vyanantarā ca so 'smākam adhunā suhṛt//
\]

A man who has the same age and habits as ourselves, who is generous and rich,¹ a gambler and independent; that is the friend for us. *BKŚŚ* 23.33

In the *VH* Aṃsumānta approached a trader's shop and bluntly asked the proprietor for accommodation, saying that if it was not clean enough for his master he would go elsewhere. The trader said, "Take a look"; then, as in the *BKŚŚ*, the noise of the gaming-house attracted the companion's attention. So then Aṃsumānta turned down the trader's offer of a place to stay, giving no reason, simply saying to him *pasattho saupo* (210.18), meaning roughly "thank you

¹ *sakīṃcana*, text. I take it to be the antonym of the adjective *akīṃcana*, "poor"; Renou translated it adverbially as "à tout propos".
all the same". We have the impression that Saṅghadāsa has lost his
grip on the material here, for this first interview is both inept
and pointless. What then of Gomukha’s interview with the
chamberlain, which similarly comes to nothing? I suggest that the
chamberlain is none other than Gaṅgaraṅkṣita, of whom more later; if
so then this passage can be seen as serving very neatly to introduce
this character.

The question of accommodation is however not yet settled.
Naravāhanadatta says to Gomukha that they should not impose upon
Punarvasu for anything but shelter:

\[ \text{parānnaṃ hi vṛthaḥbhuktaṃ duḥkhāyaiva satām iti} \]

For those who are good, casually eating others’ food leads
to misfortune.

\[ \text{BKŚŚ 23.81} \]

And Gomukha says to Punarvasu:

\[ \text{parāpākaniṇvṛttā hi sādhuṇvṛttā dvijātaḥ} \]

Well-behaved brahmans abstain from eating others’ food.

\[ \text{BKŚŚ 23.84} \]

— a polite way of declining his hospitality, with reference to the
practices of the caste which they have assumed. This excuse leads
naturally to the episode of Nanda and Upananda, two cooks of super-
lative talent whom Punarvasu sends to prepare the food for his
guests. Vasudeva for his part wants to leave the house altogether,
his reason being that Vinādatta is houdāro (211.5). Vinādatta
then sends Naṇḍa and Sunāḍa, for such are the names of the cooks in
the VH, to cook for Vasudeva and Aṃsumañṭa in their new apartment.
In both versions the function of the cooks is to recognize the hero
as a man of destiny, and in both they reappear in the context of the
hero’s sickness. The resemblance is very strong, but we notice that
in comparison with the BKŚŚ, the VH is laconic to a fault.
The events that follow are so complicated that I propose first to summarize them in five steps:

1. The hero, Naravāhanadatta/Vasudeva, shows signs of falling in love with a man, Priyadarśana/Pumḍa. Let us, for brevity's sake, refer to him as P.

2. The hero becomes sick with love, and only the attentions of P can cure him.

3. The companion, Gomukha/Amśumānta, objects to this affair; he leaves the hero.

4. Tārakarāja, the spokesman of king Brahmadatta/the śreṣṭhin Tāraga explains to the hero that P is not a man but a woman in disguise; he brings them together in marriage. We shall refer to this man as T.

5. The companion returns and claims responsibility for the success of the affair.

To this must be added a sub-plot, in which the companion meets and marries a woman whom her father promised to him long ago.

The realization of this plot differs in the BKŚS and the VH by a multitude of details which seem at first to be random variations but which can be related to the general tendency of the two works. The most obvious difference is that P is apparently a śreṣṭhin in the BKŚS, apparently a king in the VH; it is not however the general tendency in the VH to ennoble characters. The reason for the difference here is the splitting of the character in two, Pumḍā and Bahḍhumati (for whom see lambha 8). The former retains Priyadarśana's ambiguous sex and the latter her station in life. For some reason all the Jain writers attached the story of the girl who looked like a boy to a king; now both versions postulate a king and a śreṣṭhin, and a secret known to one and not to the other; the
intrigue is resolved when the secret is revealed. Hence there is a chiastic relationship between the plots of the two versions:

**BKŚŚ**

| T: agent of the king | Āladdin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F: Āladdin</td>
<td>king</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sub-plot of the companion's marriage is the means by which the secret is revealed. The companion finds, to his surprise, that there is a female relative of his living in the city where he thought he was a complete stranger. This relative is the only one apart from P herself who knows P's secret, and when the companion goes to her in distress, having been dismissed in anger by the hero, she tells him the secret. Since both authors take great care to establish this relationship, on which indeed depends such plausibility as the stories have, I give a family tree for each version.

**BKŚŚ**

Padma = (1) Sumanas

? = Mahādinnā

Sumanas (female) = Kaliya

Ṛṣidatta

Priyadarśanā

Padma = (2) Mahādinnā

Sumanas (male) Mahādinnā = Ṛṣabha

Gomukha

That is to say, Padma had two wives, Sumanas and Mahādinnā, and by each wife he had a son and a daughter who bore each the name of one of his wives; but the daughter of each wife was called after her
mother. This scheme is riddling in its elaboration and symmetry, but it fits well with the story: Gomukha meets his relative Rśidattā unexpectedly, marries her, and learns from her the secret of their common relative Priyadarśanā.

In the VH Aṃsumanṭa is related to Pumḍā through his aunt Vasumati, but he marries someone outside the family, the merchant's daughter Sutārā. The reason for this will become apparent as we examine the details of the two versions.

To begin with the BKŚŚ: while they are staying at Punarvasu's, Naravāhanadatta and Gomukha one day see from the roof of the house a nun accompanied by a crowd of pupils. The narrator regrets that so beautiful a woman as she has been blighted by such vows as hers, an abuse of nature. Punarvasu says that she is of the Jain faith and that her name is Rśidattā. He greets her. She replies — unexpectedly¹ — with an invitation for him to visit her with his guests. Gomukha is all eagerness. He, with Punarvasu, Naravāhanadatta, Nanda and Upananda, goes to the Jain temple, and

¹ Her affability is so surprising that Renou tried to mitigate it by translating suhṛdbhīh kupitais tasmād asambhāgyaḥ kṛto bhavān, "so you have become not-for-speaking-to by your friends who are angry" (24.16) — i.e. since you are so miserly as to keep your interesting guests to yourself — as "je ne puis donc m'entretenir avec vous sous peine d'irriter vos amis".
there attracts attention by singing the praises of the Jīna.

Upananda proposes a vīnā contest, to which we shall return later;

let us jump ahead to the day when Gomukha fails to appear for lunch.

That evening he returns and says that he saw one of Harisikha's

servants in the street. This probably looks forward to a reunion

of the friends in Vārāṇasī which does not take place in the

surviving fragment of the Brūs. Gomukha adds that he lost this man

in the crowd, and asks leave to go and look for him. It is fully a

week later when he returns, and worse, he is apparently drunk. Not

really drunk, as he explains to the angry prince, but feigning

drunkenness makes it easier for him to tell a story which is not

above reproach (sadoṣam tu vaco vaktum, 25.11). It is the following.

Since the first time he saw Rṣidattā, Gomukha had her on his mind. He could not understand why, and went to see her in the hope of finding out. When during the conversation he mentioned Kauśāmbi, Udayana's city, Rṣidattā showed great interest. Did he know, she asked, a certain Gomukha who lived there (Gomukha, we must remember, has assumed the name of Kaniṣṭha)? She explained that her parents had promised her in marriage as a child to this Gomukha. When her grandfather Padma died, the family fell on hard times, and her father sent her to live with her aunt Sumanas. She fell ill, and a Jain nun called Śrutadhāra cured her of her illness; Rṣidattā then against the will of Sumanas1 entered the community of nuns. On the
death of Śrutadhāra, the community elected Rṣidattā as its leader,

but her thoughts stayed with her promised husband.

---

1 I would translate durmanāḥ (25.50) in this context as "with heavy heart" rather than, as Renou, "qui avait l'âme rude".
Alas, she had recently heard of Gomukha's death.¹

Gomukha said to himself:

svair iyan gurubhir dattā madīyair api cārthitā/²
kumarī sāṇurāgā ca tasmān na tyāgam arhati/

This girl was given by her parents and accepted by mine, and she is in love with me, so I must not abandon her. 

BKŚŚ 25.65

and tried to think of a way to separate her from the community. He won the goodwill of its members by presents and constant attention (hence his mysterious absences),³ and once, feigning illness, he was put to bed in Rśidattā's room, looked after by her. They then satisfied their mutual passion, in consequence of which Rśidattā was expelled from the community, and she and Gomukha were married before Priyadarśana and Sumanas.

Needless to say, the Jain version has it otherwise. The VH splits the Jain nun Vasumati and the promised bride Sutarā into two characters, with the result that the Jain community is untouched by any breath of scandal, and Amsumanta's wife is given to him by her father, as regularly as could be wished. That is to say, the BKŚŚ is a scandalous narrative which does not so much satirize the Jains as take them for fair game in a comic-erotic tale, in the same way as in the story of Sānuḍāsa at the beginning they provide the slightly ridiculous aspect of the main character, from which he gradually recovers.

¹ She had heard how Naravāhanadatta's friends, on their way to Campā to rejoin him, were attacked by a band of pulindas and scattered; for this episode, which has no equivalent in the VH, see BKŚŚ 20.418 ff.

² yārthitā, text.

³ The sequence of events recalls BKŚŚ 7.
Obviously the Jain characters are a necessary part of the story. Is it then in origin a pro-Jain story which Budhasvāmin has altered in order to make fun of the heretics, or is it an anti-Jain story which Sanghadāsa has rescued for the use of his fellow-adherents? Apparently the latter, if one can judge by the quality of the intrigue. The Vī version works much less well: the character Sutārā is unnecessary once she has been distinguished from Vasumatī. Aṣumamta meets, not her, but her father, and quite by chance, at Vasumatī's — surely a romance can do better than that! — and after their marriage she fades out of the story. Censorship has spoilt the plot. But there is worse: Sanghadāsa also split the character Priyadarśana/Pumḍa into two, father and daughter, bearing the same name, no doubt in the interests of decency. He wanted to avoid any overtones of homosexuality in his version of a story that made the hero fall in love with a woman who looked like a man, and so he divided the ambiguous character. Or did he simply fail to understand, or to reproduce adequately, the involved motivation of the plot? In either case the result is disastrous: Vasudeva is so attracted to the king that he falls ill with frustrated desire, but he marries the king's daughter. The fact that she underwent a change of sex plays no part in the story, and the division of the character produces the reverse of the desired effect. The BKŚŚ is after all more decent, because it is plain from the first that Naravāhanadatta perceives Priyadarśanā as a girl.

Yet another difference between the two versions comes out in favour of the BKŚŚ, but this time the Vī's deviance is more surely due not to prudery but to incomprehension, of the same kind as we noticed in the story of Samba and Buddhisena. Let us consider stages 4 and 5 in the schematic summary given above. According to
the *BKŚŚ*, Naravāhanadatta is summoned to the palace of king Brahmadatta. In the king's presence, but in the words of the chief of staff Tārakarāja, he hears this story.

There was a *sreṣṭhin* of great wealth and virtue, a close friend of Brahmadatta's, called Kaliya. He died while his wife was carrying a child; the child was announced in due course as a son, Priyadarśana. One day a certain Kaliya came to see the king; he said that he was indeed the king's late friend, reborn in another body, that of a crippled boy. He said further that his wife Sumanas had in fact given birth to a girl which she passed off as a boy, and asked that the king look after this girl and find a suitable husband for her. The king was incredulous, and put all kinds of questions to the boy about the Kaliya he used to know, but the boy answered them all correctly and the king finally believed him.

Naravāhanadatta hears that he is pleasing both to Priyadarśana and to the king; so, Tārakarāja concludes, let him marry her at once. Naravāhanadatta, after only a token protest, accepts.

He lives happily with Priyadarśana and his friends. Only the absence of Gomukha troubles him, so he sends Nanda and Upananda to bring him back. Then he taunts his companion laughingly with:

\[
\text{kim gomukhaḥ sakha yasya prājñāḥmānyo na vidyate/}
\text{tasya sādhyānī kāryānī na sidhyantītī...}
\]

Have my affairs not come to a successful conclusion without the help of Gomukha, who thinks himself intelligent?\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Literally, "are not the affairs that were to be concluded, successfully concluded, of a man whose friend Gomukha, who thinks himself intelligent, is absent (na vidyate):" I cannot understand Renou's insistence on "personne" (ne se juge intelligent, etc.) in the notes and translation at this place. Compare *VH* 214.1-2.
However Gomukha has the last laugh. He was, he says, responsible for the outcome of the affair, and explains: Rsidatta exacted from him the confidence that he was, after all, Gomukha the companion of Naravahanadatta. In return she told how Priyadarśanā's mother disguised her daughter as a son — for, having just lost her husband, she badly wanted a man-child to mind the family's wealth — with the help of an amulet given to her by a vidyādharī. So long as Priyadarśanā wore it, she would appear a male to all the world, except to a future cakravartin. Rsidatta had noticed that Naravahanadatta greeted Priyadarśanā as a woman. It was up to Gomukha, she said, to find a way of bringing them together. Gomukha, eager to make up for his unjust opinion of the prince's love for Priyadarśanā, invented the comedy of the false Kaliya. He bought a cripple boy from his father who was ill-treating him, and with Rsidatta's help taught him all about the late Šreśṭhin, all that Sumanas had told Rsidatta. Then he sent the boy to the king with a story that was designed to bring about the marriage of Priyadarśanā and Naravahanadatta.

We recognize here a narrative strategy typical of Budhasvāmin, the "remotivation" of an episode. Apparently the story has reached its logical conclusion, but no: another character's speech gives a new and surprising view of the events. Saṅghadāsa obviously knew the story in more or less this form, but when he came to tell it in his own way, he reproduced all the apparatus (so to speak) of the surprise ending but could not make it work. In his version Tāraga tells Vasudeva the truth about Pundā; the couple are married; Vasudeva claims before Āmsumamta to have done it alone, but Āmsumamta in turn claims that it was his doing. So far so good, but then he
proves his case by giving what is, apart from Cittavegā's story and certain circumstantial details, a recapitulation of Tārāga's account of the affair: a disastrous anticlimax.

Now let us return to the viṇā contest. In the BKŚS, Gomukha's singing the praises of the Jina at the Jain temple earns him the gratitude of the worshippers who greet him as a new follower (ṣrāvaka, 24.22). He touches the feet of Rṣidattā (a less reverent action perhaps than the onlookers think), and she calls for an expression of welcome:

\[ \text{tayā tv asya prayuktāśīr asmākaṃ laghuśāsane/} \\
\text{ṣrāvakasyāpi saṃvādyā pratipattir bhavatv iti//} \]

She said, "for this follower, let there be a welcome, consisting of a benediction, to be pronounced in our little sect."¹

whereupon Upananda suggests the concert. The Jain context of this passage is then not an imposition of the VH, although naturally that work goes further than the BKŚS in making the occasion a festival of the Jina, and the songs, offerings in honour of the Jina. An odd but unimportant difference between the two versions is that in the BKŚS Gomukha's marriage follows the concert, whereas in the VH Aṃsumaṃta's marriage is narrated before the concert; unimportant, because the sub-plot is independent of the main plot until after the hero's illness. Also, the VH puts the concert, during which Vasudeva falls in love with Pumḍa and he with him, immediately before Vasudeva's mysterious illness, which is in fact caused by his love;

¹ *asmākaṃ laghuśāsane* is difficult to translate; Renou suggested "en ce qui concerne mes faibles ordres". Plainly it expresses a charming self-depreciation; perhaps it refers rather to the company than to the exhortation.
but the *BKŚŚ* separates the concert from Naravāhanadatta's illness, giving as the immediate motivation of the illness another incident in which the hero sees "Priyadarśana" undressing.

Indeed the concert has a quite different function in the two works: in the *VN* it establishes the love of Vasudeva and Puṇḍa, but in the *BKŚŚ*, though it is the occasion of Naravāhanadatta's first meeting with Priyadarśana, it serves principally to introduce him to Gaṅgarakṣita the chamberlain, whom Gomukha has already met (if my argument above is correct), and who, as we shall see, must have played a part in the next episode, which is missing in the work as we have it.

Gaṅgarakṣita's presence also provokes the hero to one of those introspective speeches that are so interesting for the study of narrative technique: hearing the bystanders compare him Naravāhanadatta with Gaṅgarakṣita in beauty, he reasons to himself about his appearance:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{āsīc ca mama yatsatyaṁ satyam evāsmi rūpavān/}
gaṅgarakṣitarūpena rūpaṁ me sadṛśaṁ yataḥ//
yadīyaṁ etadiyena rūpenāpy upacaryate/
upamānānam upādeyaḥ so 'pi rūpavatāṁ iti//
\end{align*}
\]

I thought, indeed I am really beautiful, because my beauty is like Gaṅgarakṣita's: one who serves as a term of comparison with such beauty must himself be accepted as one of the beautiful.

*BKŚŚ* 24.29-30

Budhavāmin is here consciously exploring the implications of the first-person narrative by making his hero ask, in effect, "Who am I? What am I like?" Naravāhanadatta's thoughts here display a charming simplicity, but he is not always so sympathetic in this episode. For example, when he accepts to play, in order to avenge Gomukha's defeat in the concert competition, he does so with very bad grace:
nagnaśramanapakānām ca kirāṭānām ca samnidhau/
vīṇāḥ vādayamānasya mādṛṣṭaḥ kīḍasam phalam//

What is the use of a person like me playing the vīṇā in the company of naked ascetics and merchants?  

Lacôte in his study of Naravāhanadatta's character (Essai, 279-80) admitted certain vices, but regarded him as "non pas méchant cependant"; he saw in him an "égoïsme naïf en voie de développement", meaning, let us hope, a change for the better. Maten too hesitated to condemn the hero: "Naravāhanadatta is sometimes a little disdainful or condescending" (BB, 97), comparing this incident with that of the music teacher in labha 17. The point is though that Naravāhanadatta is a prince, and his contacts with common folk are not on a basis of equality.

Of course not every incident shows him asserting his dignity so strongly. He admires the community of cowherds in labha 20, and, when confronted with the ascetic and the brahman student in 21, he prefers a prudent reserve. This we know because the narrator there gives his private thoughts; conversely his fits of self-assertion are seen only from the outside. Lacôte interpreted this duality more generously. He noted that Naravāhanadatta behaves like a spoiled child, adding, "ce qui ne l'empêche pas de se montrer aussi à l'occasion tendre et plein de tact" (Essai, 280), but his examples of this fact are the inward reflections of the prince that Ajinavatī's name sounds doubly sweet when pronounced by the jealous Gandharvadattā, and that a prudent silence is preferable when faced with the angry tirade of the jealous Ajinavatī; reflections which perhaps strike a sympathetic chord in the reader, but are hardly tender, unless the hero can be called tender for not communicating them to his interlocutors. It would be more accurate to say that
Naravāhanadatta displays arrogance when seen from the outside, and a 
disarming frankness about his motives when seen from the inside. 
Princely dignity, as we noticed when discussing the introduction of 
the narrator, is difficult to reconcile with the inner movements 
of the mind. Once indeed we find the hero both intransigent and 
self-conscious, when to his shame he speaks angrily to Gomukha who 
is blameless: 

\[ \text{athācīrāgataśrīko yathā bālaḥ pṛthagjanaḥ/} \\
\text{tathājñāpītavan asmi gomukhaṁ rūkṣayā girā/} \]

Then, like a stupid newly-rich upstart, I ordered Gomukha 
in a harsh voice... 

BKŚŚ 26.13

His narration shows no such delicacy of feeling where the merchants 
of Vārāṇasī are concerned. His appointment by the king of Vārāṇasī 
to the office of chief merchant in succession to "Priyadarśana" 
provokes this wry reflection:

\[ \text{... lokoktir iyam mayy eva samprati/} \\
\text{vardhamāno yathā rāja śreṣṭhī jāta iti sthitā/} \]

That popular saying, "having been brought up like a king he 
became a śreṣṭhin", is now true of me. 

BKŚŚ 27.58

Then as soon as the occasion arises he disburthens himself of this 
office on Gomukha, no doubt to tease him for his connections with 
Jains and traders through Śrīdattā. 

Though in the light of this it can hardly be maintained that 
Budhasvāmin's hero "ne se trouva pas déshonoré de devenir chef de 
guilde à Bénarès" (Lacôte, Essai, 230), it remains true that 
Naravāhanadatta marries Priyadarśanā the daughter of a merchant in 
the BKŚŚ, whereas no such person exists in the Kashmiri versions. 
Lacôte's argument (Essai, 212-213) that the author of the work that 
served as the common source of the BKM and the KSS had eliminated 
this character, finding it impossible to accommodate her, as he had
accommodated others, to the dignity and pretensions of his narrative, still holds. But I would contest his further argument that the BK's in this and other incidents faithfully reproduces the popular flavour of the original BK, an argument which he took to the point of defending Budhasvāmin against the suspicion that he had wilfully introduced "un caractère populaire, voire vulgaire" into the tradition (Essai, 218). The popular flavour of the original BK may be taken as a plausible hypothesis, but as to Budhasvāmin's version, it seems truer to say that he chose not to ennoble Priyadarśanā in the same way as Gandharvadattā is ennobled, by a revelation about the identity of her true parents, but made it plain nevertheless that the incident is a comic diversion and not a step in the hero's ascent to the throne of the vidyādharas.

The false name which Naravāhanadatta adopts is the most obvious device by which his marriage with Priyadarśanā is marked off from the others. She always knows him as Jyeṣṭha, and probably never had time to discover his true identity, because hardly are they married when another wife beckons in the distance. Another distinctive feature is the rôle of Gomukha in this story. In this connection, let us return to the question of the hero's pauruṣa and daiva. Bhoja (loc. cit.) noticed a third type of plot which combined these factors, namely ubhaya. With this in mind it is interesting to consider Lacôte's argument that the plot of the BK represented a combination of active and passive qualities:

La vie de Gomukha est étroitement liée à celle de Naravāhanadatta; de leur association naît le succès. Pour réussir, dit Gomukha, il faut un bon karman antérieur — de cela nous ne sommes pas maîtres — et de plus une volonté agissante. Dans l'association, Naravāhanadatta apporte le premier élément, Gomukha le second. 

Essai, 280
Here he refers to *BKŚŚ* 27.66 ff., Gomukha's answer to the taunt of Naravāhanadatta quoted on page 232 above. Maten also adduced this passage, arguing that "the *BKŚŚ* is an illustration of the idea that the course of a man's life is determined by both destiny... and human effort. Its two main characters, Naravāhanadatta and Gomukha, each embody one of these two constituents" (*BE*, 110).

This interpretation of the events is very plausible, though the *pauruṣa* that Gomukha embodies is of a very urbane kind. His qualities are those of the *cetasya*, "wit" and the *nāgaraka*, "man-about-town". I would suggest that Gomukha's and Naravāhanadatta's qualities do indeed complement one another, but the events which tend toward the elevation of the hero are predestined and need no human initiative to bring them about, while his companion's initiatives provide a kind of comic relief. The *vidyādharīs* Vegavatī, Gandharvadattā and Ajinavatī are part of the hero's destiny, and Gomukha has nothing to do with the hero's winning them. But by exercising his *cetasyatā* and his *nāgarakatā* he does win for Naravāhanadatta the mortal maidens of no family, Madanamañjukā and Priyadarśanā. We have seen that Madanamañjukā's status as a possible wife for the hero is an illusion, because the woman who enjoyed that privilege on that occasion is in fact Vegavatī in the shape of Madanamañjukā; the story of the prostitute and the prince is thus made innocent of any elevation of the former (at least for the present), or degradation of the latter. Budhasvāmin chose not to protect his hero in this way when he treated the story of Priyadarśanā, but the prominence he gave to the false names, the hero's disdain for the company, and Gomukha's urbane but undignified talents show that he needs no defence against a charge of bringing the prince down to the level of the people.
BHAGIRATHAYASAS

One day Naravahanadatta receives a visit from some young ladies. First he hears a clatter on the staircase: swans? No, the noise of women's ankle ornaments. What is the meaning of this sound which is appropriate only for the feet of women who inhabit the royal harem and for courtesans (antaḥpurasaṃcāravārastri, BKŚŚ 28.6)? The women enter his apartment, and, addressing him as Āryajyeṣṭha yaśobhāgin, offer him a gift from the princess Bhagirathayaśas. He accepts, and they depart, leaving him troubled on two counts. He is surprised by being called yaśobhāgin; though he does not say why, we can anticipate and explain that it is a mode of address suitable to a warrior, a kṣatriya, in spite of his posing as a brahman. There may even be a double entendre in the choice of epithet, because yaśobhāgin, "possessor of glory", suggests also "possessor of [Bhagirathayaśas]." Moreover he is puzzled by such audacity on the part of the princess. She must be in love with him to care so little for reputation! Gomukha warns him against such women. Another day passes, and the courtesans return, sent — as Kumudikā, one of their number, explains — to apologize on the princess's behalf for having called him, Jyeṣṭha, yaśobhāgin (28.28), the name (she said) a worthless woman calls her husband. We must understand that her excuse is disingenuous; no doubt she had

1 Or, "for courtesans of the royal harem". But do courtesans inhabit royal harems? The women in fact refer unambiguously to themselves as gaṇikājana, 28.39; but the question then remains, were Kumudikā and the others antaḥpurasaṃcāra women? Perhaps the rôle of Kalingasena and her daughter in the BKŚŚ is a parallel for a special relationship between royalty and prostitutes in these stories.

2 I owe this suggestion to Professor F.B.J. Kuiper.
imprudently but deliberately dictated her message to Naravāhanadatta in these terms, and has now sent back the messengers to underline, by seeming to repair, the error which revealed her private thoughts. Her words imply not only that she is in love with him, but also that she considers him as her husband. We have already noticed the possible implication of yaśobhāgin; the princess's speech as reported by Kumudikā continues:

yah śreṣṭhiduhitur bhartā so 'smañcam api dharmatah/
priyadarśanayā sārdham abhinnaiva hi me tauḥ/
aryaputras tvayā tasmād aryaputreti bhāgyatām/

The śreṣṭhin's daughter's husband is also mine, by right; my body is undividedly one with Priyadarśanā. Therefore, you must call my lord, My Lord. BKŚŚ 28.30-31

As we shall see, Bhagīrathayaśas's sense of physical solidarity with Priyadarśanā goes beyond the bounds of the simple friendship which she proclaims here, though in terms which anticipate the later scene. Here she plays on the use of the word āryaputra both in general as a respectful form of address, the omission of which hurt Naravāhanadatta, so that he considered the one who omitted to call him thus, "unpleasant" (paruṣām, 28.16), and as the title which a wife gives her husband.

The courtesans also convey an invitation to Priyadarśanā to attend a festival. Another insult, thinks Naravāhanadatta; is my lady to go visiting like a housewife? But on Gomukha's urging he gives his consent, Priyadarśanā is taken away in a magnificent car, and returns later that evening.

When she returns, Priyadarśanā is wearing a new girdle. The prince asks her how she came by it, and she tells this story. On entering the maidens' quarters of the palace she was told that the
princess was in the garden. The doorkeeper gave her instructions how to find the princess, to follow this path and avoid that, in particular warning her against the bees:

\[ bhṛmāgyānmaḍhukarastenasenaṁbāḍhāpadapam/ \\
bhṛṇgadamaḥbhayāt kasyaṇmānaḍrāmattas tyajed iti// \]

Anyone with presence of mind would avoid a tree infested with an army of thieves — the hovering bees, for fear of their stings.

*BKŚŚ 28.55*

As Priyadarśanā made her way through the garden, she thought:

\[ ... aho śaktir dohadasya varīyasi/ \\
anṛta vapi yenaite jṛmbhitāḥ pādapa iti// \]

Ah the mighty power of desire, which has made these trees blossom even out of season.

*BKŚŚ 28.57*

She found Bhagīrathayaśas lying down, cooling herself though the weather was mild, as if she had a fever. Bhagīrathayaśas asked after Priyadarśana’s husband: did feeding him pose any problems? Naravāhanadatta, of course, is posing as a brahman. Priyadarśanā explained that Nanda and Upananda looked after that matter. "Why did they leave a king’s service for the service of your husband, a poor man and a stranger of unknown family?" asked Bhagīrathayaśas. Priyadarśanā answered that they have supernatural insight, so their predictions come true, and besides:

\[ jyeṣṭhasya ca guṇā jyeṣṭhas tābhyaṁ kasyeti mānuṣaṁ/ \]

Men say that an excellent man (or Jyeṣṭha) has excellent qualities, and ask which of the two (Jyeṣṭha or the king) has the better.

*BKŚŚ 28.70*

Hence they decided in favour of Jyeṣṭha—Naravāhanadatta.

Let us now retrace our steps to where the princess first manifested her interest in the hero, for that is where the corresponding story in the *VH* begins. At the beginning of
Vasudeva has just married Bandhumati, the daughter of Kāmadeva, Āresthin of Sāvatthi. One day while Vasudeva is sitting with Bandhumati in her father’s house, eight dancing girls arrive and introduce themselves to him. They are servants of Piyāngusumdarī, the daughter of Āṇiyaputta, king of Sāvatthi. Bandhumati says to them, “It’s a long time since I saw you. That was not friendly.” They laugh and reply, “True, and our mistress is longing for the loved one [dhaṇīyaḥ, 282.6: meaning either Bandhumati or Vasudeva]. Does one who has a friend abandon another friend [annam piyaḥ, 282.7: again either masculine or feminine]?” Whatever Bandhumati makes of the sentence, she decides on hearing it to go and visit Piyāngusumdarī, and while she is away the dancing girls entertain Vasudeva.

The two versions have this in common, that by clever and indirect means the hero’s future bride, Piyāngusumdarī or Bhagirathayaśas respectively, communicates with the hero. Vasudeva is tricked into telling her through her servants the story of his life, but does not receive any messages from the princess. Naravāhanadatta on the other hand receives information from Bhagirathayaśas without giving away his true identity — we must remember that he still goes by the name of Jyeṣṭha. Priyadarśanā herself is the unwitting messenger who tells the hero about Bhagirathayaśas’s love, when she describes the garden in which she found the princess. Nature, as often in Indian poetry, serves to reflect human passions: the bees which flit from one flower to another, and the trees in blossom, are symbols of the hero’s fickleness and the princess’s desire. Priyadarśanā does not understand Bhagirathayaśas’s illness, but it is no mystery to the reader (nor to the hero); her unseasonable fever is unfulfilled love.
The messages which the śreṣṭhīn's daughter carries between the princess and the hero are not only of a verbal kind. Bhagīrathayaśas, on hearing the name Jyeṣṭha on Priyadarśanā's lips, searched her for the nail-marks left on her body by the amorous hero — though Priyadarśanā in her description of the afternoon still sees nothing but innocent solicitude in the princess's action. Bhagīrathayaśas then loaded her friend with gifts, in particular taking her own girdle off and fastening it around Priyadarśanā's hips, not without difficulty because it was too big.

Having heard that from Priyadarśanā, Naravāhanadatta deduces that the princess is in love with him

\[
\text{tāyā yad guru samdiśṭam upalabdhaḥ ca yat tāyā/}
\]
\[
\text{etad eva suparyāptam anurāgasya laksanam/}
\]

The very fact that she gave this pressing message and made this enquiry is a certain proof of her love

\[BKŚŚ 28.87\]

and from the girdle and the way it was tied he further deduces that her forms are opulent, that she is dark in complexion, and that she wishes him to know all this. Priyadarśanā then perceives that she has been used by Bhagīrathayaśas, but that does not prevent her from being used again: the next time she goes to visit the princess, the princess accompanies her back to Naravāhanadatta's door, and he understands that the passionate embraces which Bhagīrathayaśas in his sight gives to Priyadarśanā are really meant for him. He passes the night trying to devise a way of winning the princess — and here the manuscript breaks off.

Rather than leave Naravāhanadatta in this state of frustrated desire, let us see what light the VH can throw on the possible development of the intrigue. Obviously the hero will sooner or later marry the princess who is sending these messages; but how has she conceived this passion for the hero, and through what complications
will the story move to its conclusion?

When in the *VH Bandhumati* visits the princess Piyamgusupdarī we already know something about the latter. The author has mentioned her *svayaṃvara*, at which she declined to choose a husband, and which set her father Eniyaputta in conflict with the disappointed candidates. Thereby the pattern of the story is established: she is to have no ordinary king but a supreme man for husband — fate will manifest itself in the person of Vasudeva.

Budhasvāmin does not show his hand so early. No doubt he intended to reveal this pattern only at the end of the story, and in so doing to give a plausible explanation of a series of marvellous events. This is the narrative style that he has displayed in the story of *Vegavatī*, for example, when Naravāhanadatta finds that his new bride Madanamañjukā has changed into a strange woman, or in the story of *Ajinavatī* when the hero is carried from his bed one night by an animated corpse, or in the story of *Priyadarsana* when the king of Vārāṇasī receives a message from his dead friend Kaliya concerning the marriage of the girl, Kaliya's daughter. In all these instances there occurs a chain of apparently meaningless and inexplicable events which later are revealed to have been arranged by someone for a certain purpose. Here the marvel is that Bhagirathayaśas is in love with the hero, as he and we are made to understand by the arrival of presents sent by her, and by Priyadasanā's description of the garden and the princess's condition; and yet, as far as we know, she has never seen him. How can it be that she is in love with him?

Inevitably the answer will seem rather limp without the tension of Budhasvāmin's ingenious plot construction, but it is this: Bhagirathayaśas loves Naravāhanadatta because she knows that she is destined to marry a supreme man, the future cakravartin of the
vidyādharas, who will reveal himself when Nanda and Upananda prefer serving him to serving the king, and who will call himself Jyeṣṭha. How she came to know this hardly matters. Probably, as in the case of Vegavatī and Ajinavatī, a deity who attended her birth favoured her with this prediction: in other words, a character who corresponds to the VH's vāṇamaṃṭarī. As in the VH this goddess promises to remember the hero if ever he need her, she probably was to make the same offer in the BKŚŚ, rather as Dhanamati promised Naravāhanadatta her assistance in lābha 20. Vasudeva never in fact enjoys the goddess's promised assistance, but we may suppose that her offer is a vestige of the motif so important in the Ṛṣhakathā as it survives in the Uṛṣhakathāmaṇjarī of Kṣemendra and the Kathāsaritsaṅgara of Somadeva, the hero's forming alliances against the day when he must confront the hostile vidyādharas.

Since Bhagīrathayaśas is the king's daughter, and the king has recently lost his two cooks to a newcomer called Jyeṣṭha with whom he has since had an audience, she is well placed to know that her husband has arrived. She tries to attract his attention by the means that we have noticed, and her efforts are not lost on Naravāhanadatta. She asks Priyadarśanā questions which are designed to elicit confirmation that this man really has the qualifications of her husband-to-be, or perhaps to repeat the pleasure of contemplating the fulfilment of her desires; her reaction when Priyadarśanā responds with his name Jyeṣṭha suggests rather the latter:

\[
\text{bhagīrathayaśaḥ śrutvā niśgampākṣī kathāṃ imām/}
\text{tanūruhavikārena sāṣrunālingī balāt/}
\]

When Bhagīrathayaśas had heard this story through with untrernbling eyes, she was gripped in spite of herself by gooseflesh and weeping.

BKŚŚ 28.71
and so do her pretended reproaches against Naravāhanadatta when she studies the nail-marks he has left on Priyadarśana's body, referring to his might and pride (prabaladarpeṇa, 28.77) and comparing him to a ruttish elephant (dantineva madāndhana, 28.78).

The next development in the VH is Gāmgarakkhīa's visiting Vasudeva, and no doubt in the BKŚ it was to have been Gāngarakṣīta's visiting Naravāhanadatta, to invite him to join the princess in the maidens' quarters of the royal palace. Vasudeva at first rejects the invitation, having weighed up on the one hand the argument that Gāmgarakkhīa's life depends on his accepting, and on the other hand that to accept would violate the laws of good behaviour (VH 292.7-10), and coming down in favour of refusing after he has seen a play about the story of Indra and Ahalyā in a typically jinistic version, which warned of the dangers of fleshly pleasure. Naravāhanadatta would be more strongly motivated to accept since he knows more about Bhagīrathayaśas's passion than Vasudeva is allowed to know about Piyamgusumdarī's. He may have had a reason for hesitating, not like Vasudeva's which is so contrary to the spirit of the BKŚ, but like that which prevented him from accepting at once Dhanamatī's offer of her daughter Ajinavatī, namely that the girl was apparently untouchable, being a mūtampa; however Bhagīrathayaśas is not even apparently an unsuitable match for him, and it is difficult to imagine what his scruple might have been. More probably he accepted at once. It is logical that the hero hesitates to accept an unexpected offer; the way in which he is persuaded to accept is then a vital part of the plot. But here the expectations of the hero are given prominence, so that his decision would be of no narrative interest.

1 mahā°, text.
There is no internal evidence for what was to happen between Naravāhanadatta's accepting the proposition and his marriage to Bhagīrathayaśas. The VH gives a version of these events that is not at all alien to the BKŚS manner, especially the scene in which Gāmgarakkhia is terrified of being held responsible for the presence of a strange man in the women's quarters, though in fact everything has been arranged by the king. The dressing-up of the hero as a woman in order to smuggle him into the women's quarters is less like the BKŚS so far as it goes, but the motif itself is common enough, and even Naravāhanadatta, according to Somadeva (Kathāsaritsāgara 14) and Kṣemendra (Bṛhatkathāmañjari 13), lived with Madanañcukā in Mānasavega's harem disguised as a woman.

Without the support of internal evidence, however, the VH can offer only the possibility, not the certainty, that the BKŚS was to continue in the same way.

The character Gāmgarakṣita is quite another case. If we look back to earlier episodes of the BKŚS, we can see how his intervention has been prepared. He was the first contact that Gomukha made in Vārāṇasī; his entry on the scene of the vīṇā contest is dramatic; everyone is waiting for him, describing him as a great musician and a man of great beauty. When he arrives, Naravāhanadatta, in a brief interior monologue, measures himself up to the new arrival, a powerful device for concentrating the reader's attention on him. Surely this is the same man whom Gomukha describes in labha 23, and his two appearances on the fringe of the action foreshadow a more important role in what is to follow.

In the VH Gāmgarakkhia is more than a go-between. His function in bringing Vasudeva to Piyāṃgusumāndarī is one which an anonymous
servant could have performed, but his character is developed beyond the needs of the simple plot. He tells Vasudeva the story of his life; like the merchant of Campā in the Gandharvadatta story (Śānudāsa in sarga 18 of the BKŚŚ, Cārudatta in lambha 3 of the VH), Gamgarakkhia was seduced by a gaṇika. His father, like Śānudāsa's, died during his absence from the family, upon which he returned home to his mother and the king appointed him to service in his father's profession of gatekeeper. Unlike Śānudāsa, however, he thus inherited a menial job. His first encounter with regular employment delineates his rebellious character:

When midday had passed, a slave-girl brought rice in a bamboo vessel and [taking] a cup in her hand she called me like a dog. I went over and said angrily, 'I'll break that cup on your head.' Then I was upbraided and shamed. She said to me, 'You should take it and give it to the dogs or leave it. But do not keep it, Pandit, once you have started [in the king's service], there is no leaving off.'

VH 290.5-9

When he had won the favour of the king by his zeal in the affair of Uppalamālā, and had been posted to the maidens' quarters, he found that looking after their good repute was a delicate task because they fully exploited his dislike of servitude, Komuia leading the way. When they challenged him to say what his relation with the princess was, he answered that he was her friend (291.9), and when they pressed him to explain the duties of a friend, he found himself trapped into promising his head to her — with the consequences that we have seen.

This story has a number of claims to be admitted to the continuation of the BKŚŚ. It is very probable that Budhasvāmin intended the character Kumudikā, whom he introduces in sarga 28, to play some such part in the intrigue. The relationship between Gamgarakkhia and the girls in the VH recalls that between Gomukha
and the ladies of Udayana's court and the gaṇikās of Kalingasena's house. Like Gomukha, Gamgarakkhia is eager to please women and eager to show off his accomplishments; this eagerness exposes him to ridicule or blackmail. There is indeed an element of low humour and a certain disrespect for royalty in the VH's version which would be incongruous in the BKŚŚ. There Gangaraksita's resentment of authority, if such was his motive, would have been shown in a subsequent passage of explanation to be misguided, because all would have been arranged for the common good by the king. Indeed such a story is latent in the VH. The king and queen know that Vasudeva is living in the maidens' quarters (306.29-30), and only Gamgarakkhia is worried by the thought of possible consequences. But this leaves a bad loophole: why then did Vasudeva not allay his fears? Sanghadāsa's impulse to narrate the events in chronological order has tripped him up; Budhasvāmin would no doubt have contrived to maintain both sense and suspense by keeping the information about the parents' knowledge of the affair for the end.

Gomukha's part in the adventure of Bhagirathayasas is minimal. With a sombre expression on his face (andhakāramukhena, 28.19), he warns the hero against associating with the princess's companions, while encouraging him to permit Priyadarśanā to visit the princess herself (18.35-36); and that is all. If the role of Gangaraksita was to be as important as the equivalent story in the VH suggests, then there would in fact be little for Gomukha to do. Of course there remains the possibility that Gomukha in the BKŚŚ was to play the same part as Gamgarakkhia plays in the VH, but the preparation of Gangaraksita for a leading role in the BKŚŚ, as explained above, makes this unlikely.
OTHER CONQUESTS

We cannot know what new adventures Naravāhanadatta was to have after the episode of Bhagīrathayasas in the BKŚŚ, and yet the broad outlines of the plot, namely his acquisition of twenty new wives and the empire of the vidyādharas, are clearly laid out at the beginning of the work. We must dip into the other versions of the BK in order to fill in this outline; not that such a source can deliver up a reconstructed BKŚŚ, much less a reconstructed BK, but it can provide a repertory of incidents that are not incompatible with the general plan. For example, the story of Karpūrikā may be given a place in this repertory, because of such credentials as the role of Gomukha, the partial testimony of the VH and the ingenuity of its plot.1

According to the BKM and the KSS, Naravāhanadatta once while hunting encounters a female ascetic who tells him about a woman he is to marry called Karpūrikā, whom he must first reach by completing a difficult journey; he must also overcome her unwillingness to marry. The first task is accomplished with the help of a skilled carpenter who makes him a vimāna in which he reaches the woman's city, Karpūrasambhava. There he learns from an old woman the reason why Karpūrikā hates men, namely an evil memory of her husband in a former birth; and also that she is destined to marry the future king of the vidyādharas, and that he, Naravāhanadatta, is that man. A lying speech2 by Gomukha to Karpūrikā explains away her evil memory as a misunderstanding of her former husband's motives, and the prince marries her. The hunting motif and the motif of the

1 There was a karpūrikālābha in the Sanskrit BK known to Bhoja; Raghavan Bhoja's Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, 842.

2 vaco viracitam, KSS 7.9.206; mithyāpralāpa, BKM 14.493.
destined husband belong together as one type, but the motif of the
test, here in a reduplicated form, that of reaching the city and
that of overcoming the woman's resistance, belongs to another type.
The logic of the situation is apparently at fault in that if the
hero is the destined husband of the woman he has no need to win her
in a contest, but examination of the Gandharvadatta episode has
already shown that storytellers can cheerfully pass over such
faults. All one needs is a recognition scene in which the hero
passes a test and so precisely reveals himself as the man of
destiny. The peculiarity of this story is the recognition scene in
which Naravāhanadatta passes the test under false pretences. Now
it happens that the story of Laliyasirī in VH lamhā 26 has the same
peculiarity: Laliyasirī is destined to marry a great man, but will
have nothing to do with men (though she is a gaṇikā's daughter)
until Vasudeva acting on the advice of a friend overcomes her
resistance by a trick. This coincidence does not of course prove
that the story was in the original BK, only that it was already
available to a compiler of a story-book at a much earlier date than
that of Kṣemendra or Somadeva; and yet it shares with many other
Naravāhanadatta stories the passivity of the hero and the emphasis on
techniques, in the one version flying machines and persuasive speech,
in the other version the art of painting.

Unfortunately Naravāhanadatta's marriages as reported in the
BKМ and the KSS are much less interesting in general, not only those
which are made after the stage at which the BKŚŚ breaks off, but also
those which fall within the latter's scope; for example in the
Kashmiri versions Bhagīrathayaśas is simply given to the hero by the
king of Śrāvastī. Indeed, in a number of stories women are simply
given to the hero, in recognition of his special qualities, either
powers which he presently manifests or his future powers as king of
the vidyādharas. Later, when he is closer to attaining his
destiny, women are presented to him by friends as tokens of alliance,
and by enemies as tokens of submission. Both history and litera-
ture abound in parallels for such exchanges, so they need no
special explanation, and they have no special narrative interest;
in the story, they perform the function of exclamation marks,
emphasizing the glory of the hero. Such women are, besides
Bhaṅgīrathayaśas:
    – the four apsarases given by Viṣṇu, KSS 9.4.40; compare BKM
      15.199
    – Jayendrasena (Jinendrasena, BKM)
    – Sulocanā
    – Iḥātmalikā
    – Vayuvegayasas and her four friends
    – Mandaradevī and her four friends.

Somewhat more interesting are the stories in which
Naravahanadatta gains a wife at some cost to himself. Surely no
story is more frequently told than that in which a hero overcomes
some obstacle to win a bride. The distinguishing features are the
nature of the obstacle, the means used to overcome it, and so on.
In the works under study we find these patterns:

(a)  – the hero finds himself in a strange place
    – he hears of a woman to be gained by passing a test
    – he passes the test
    – he marries the woman

(b)  – the hero encounters a strange woman; either he comes
    across her while hunting, or she is discovered in a garden
    near his residence, etc.
— the woman, or her mother, explains the reason for the meeting: she is destined to be the bride of the future king of the vidyādhāras

— the obstacle: the couple must wait for an auspicious moment for the marriage

— the moment comes and he marries the woman.

Type (a) has one exponent common to all the works under study, that of Gandharvadattā, and it is favoured by the VH, in which ṿaṁbhās 1, 5, 7 and 11 also correspond to this pattern, and ṿaṁbhās 27 and 28, being svayamvara stories, are not unlike it. The BMI and the KSS, on the other hand, favour type (b): such are the stories of

— Ratnaprabhā
— Alamkāravatī
— Śaktiyasas
— Ajīnāvatī.

The obstacle here is only the vestige of an intrigue. It prolongs the story by postponing satisfaction, by putting off the conclusion (marriage) to the premise (encounter), thereby creating an opportunity for including further stories: while the hero waits sleepless and impatient for the appointed day, his friends tell him stories to make the time pass. The episode of Karpūrikā, as we have noticed, has something of both types.

A third pattern is constituted by stories of abduction. This is an important motif in the BK, because it occurs in two places that are vital to the plot of the main story, the abduction of Avantivardhana's wife and the abduction of Madanamañjukā. For that

1 Compare Lacôte, Essai, 87: "Le mariage avec Ratnaprabhā est d'un type banal que nous retrouverons d'autres fois..."
matter it is a frequent motif in fiction of this kind generally, because it provides a convenient transition between one scene and the next and between one story and another; so for example when the time comes for Vasudeva to engage in a new adventure he is usually transported bodily to a new place. So too in the BKṣS Mānasavega’s abduction of Naravāhanadatta is the transition between Vegavatī and Gandharvadattā. However in the BKM and the KSS it is not a hostile vidyādhara but an amorous vidyādhari who carries Naravāhanadatta away through the air, and this variety of the motif occurs twice more in these works. We have already studied their version of Vegavatī; let us now turn to the others.

Lalitalocana is a daughter of the vidyādhara king Vamadatta, whose realm is on Mount Malaya. When she was born, a heavenly voice declared that she would be the wife of the future ruler of the vidyādharas. One night she comes and carries off Naravāhanadatta; he sees himself "in a dream"¹ being abducted by a divine woman. He awakes to see a beautiful woman by his side, and perceives that she is embarrassed in her inexperience. To relieve her embarrassment, he pretends to be asleep and calls out Madanamañcukā’s name as if in

---
¹ ekadā ca niśi svapne nabhasāgatya divyayā/
kayāpi kanyātmānāṁ hriyāmānāṁ dadarṣa saḥ//

One night he saw himself in a dream being carried off by a divine maiden who had come through the air. KSS 12.1.6

Somadeva’s choice of words here recalls stories in which the hero awakes to find himself being abducted, and fights back; but he reserves the awakening for the next scene.
his sleep. The woman joins in the game, assumes Madanamañcukā's form, and embraces him. When Naravahānadatta congratulates her on this move, she abandons her disguise, and they embrace in earnest. She thereby becomes his wife in the gāndharva mode. Later Lalitalocanā explains who she is and why she abducted him, and the couple live happily among the spring flowers of Mount Malaya. One day she goes to pick flowers and leaves him to wander; a friendly hermit, Piśangajaṭa, finds him and begins the enormous chain of stories that includes the adventures of Mrgānakadatta and his companions, and the Vetañapañcaviṃśatī.

The third abductress is Prabhāvatī. Her story in the KSS goes like this. After Naravāhanadatta has won Gandharvadattā in the trial of musical knowledge at Gandharva city where Vegavatī left him, he is transported by Dhanavatī, a vidyādharī with a daughter to marry off (Ajinavatī — but her story comes later), to Śrāvastī, the realm of king Prasenajīt, who makes him a present of his daughter Bhagīrathaśas. One night, waking up with her asleep beside him, he finds that he has forgotten his other wives, and attributes this to fate.1 He regrets most of all the absence of his companion Gomukha. Suddenly he hears a woman's voice outside which seems to reflect on his situation, and he goes out to investigate. It is Prabhāvatī, daughter of the vidyādhara king Pingalagāndhāra.2 She explains that she happened to visit Āgāgha and there met

---

1 Not in the BKM.

2 Or Gāndhāra, BKM 13.99.
Madanamañcukā, miserable in her solitude. Pitying her, and curious to meet Naravāhanadatta, Prabhāvatī promised to bring him to Madanamañcukā somehow, but when she found him, he was absorbed by another love-adventure. Hearing this, Naravāhanadatta indeed senses the pain of separation from his first love, and asks Prabhāvatī to take him to her. She flies up into the air with him, and contrives to marry him on the way by circling three times a sacred fire in his company. They stop for refreshment, and Naravāhanadatta tries to embrace her, but she repels him so as not to disappoint Madanamañcukā.

The intervention of Prabhāvatī after Bhagīrathayaśas in the Kashmiri poems is critical, because it is she who will succeed in bringing the errant hero to his Madanamañcukā; there follows, as we shall see, a confrontation with his rival Mānasavega, and the theme of power revives to dominate the work up to the hero's coronation. One might have supposed that Prabhāvatī, being almost a doublet of Vegavatī, was a supernumerary character of the sort in which the Kashmiri poems abound, but her authenticity is strongly

---

1 In the BKM, the motivation of Prabhāvatī's intervention is summary; she says to Naravāhanadatta that she is *tubhyam dhātra digśā tvayi priya*, 13.100: "Designated by Fate for you, and in love with you." Sloka 107 implies that she had visited Madanamañcukā, who had asked her not to follow the example of Vegavatī and seduce him.

2 The BKM stresses the effect of this news:

\[priyām smṛtvā śucāṃ lajjāṃ utkanṭhaṃ ca samāṃ yaṃ au//\]

[hearing this, Naravāhanadatta] remembering his darling, was overcome by sorrow, shame and longing all at once (13.102)

and does not make explicit whose idea it was to go and see Madanamañcukā.
supported by lambha 21 of the VH in which not only does Pabhāvaī appear but also her story follows on from that of Piyamgusumdarī, who is the equivalent of Bhagīrathayaśas in the BKŚŚ.

It must be admitted that the beginning of lambha 21 of the VH is anomalous and may even be much later in date than the rest of the text, if indeed it was written to accommodate the madhyamakhaṇḍa as the editors suggest. But it is only the trial scene, not the presence of Pabhāvaī, that is of doubtful authenticity. We know that the story of Pabhāvaī occurred in the missing lambhas 19 or 20 of the VH because of the cross-references to her previous meeting with Vasudeva that occur in lambha 22. Even the trial scene would only be disqualified as evidence for the present purpose if it had been adapted precisely from the Kashmiri tradition: and the naming of Piyamgusumdarī as the woman from whom Pabhāvaī takes the hero argues against that, because while Piyamgusumdarī's story is that of Bhagīrathayaśas in the BKŚŚ she has nothing in common, neither her name nor her story, with the Bhagīrathayaśas of the Kashmiri works.

That is to say, if we accept the authority of the VH in this matter, Prabhāvatī was to succeed Bhagīrathayaśas in the BKŚŚ as she does in the BKM and the KSS. Budhasvāmin's Naravāhanadatta was to have been awakened one night by a whispered reproach, like his namesake in the Kashmiri poems, or like Vasudeva, who was reminded of Sāmalī by the doorkeeper Kalahamsī, VH 217.17 ff.; he would have left Bhagīrathayaśas asleep and gone outside to find Prabhāvatī, who would have taken him to Madanamañjukā in the women's quarters of Mānasavega's palace, and so on.

1 351.2-3 sā tubbaṁ saramāṇī, "she remembering [Vasudeva]; 351.5 pabhāvaī me piyahiṇyakāriṇī, "Pabhāvaī is [Vasudeva's] kind benefactor".
The episodes of the three abductresses are similar in inspiration.\(^1\) The story of Lalitaločanā, like those of type (b) described above, is based on the fulfilment of a prediction that the woman would be the wife of the future vidyādhara ruler. But the woman in question behaves wantonly, carrying off our hero without the consent of her parents, and marrying him in the gāndharva fashion. In other words, the issue of her parents' consent to and presence at the marriage is not raised, whereas in the marriages discussed above the network of alliances that arise therefrom is the better part of the story. In this sense, Lalitaločanā more resembles Vegavatī and Prabhāvatī, especially the Vegavatī of the BKM.\(^2\)

These women however share a function, one that obviously belongs to the basic plot of the BK: they bring or intend to bring Naravāhanadatta to Madanamaṇcukā who is in the evil clutches of Mānasavega. Lalitaločanā has no such function. Nevertheless the hero senses his separation from Madanamaṇcukā in Lalitaločana's company, or rather during her absence. While waiting for her to return from picking flowers he bathes in a lake, and the sight of the water and the birds and animals around it recalls to him his distant first love, and he faints with the pain of separation. As Kāsemendra puts it:

\[\textit{ramaṇīyeṣu yat satyaṁ smaryate dayito janaḥ//} \]

The saying is true, that among lovely things you remember the one you love.

\[\textit{BKM 9.61} \]

---

1 Lacôte (Essai, 213) compared Vegavatī with Ratnaprabhā, and Lalitaločanā with Prabhāvatī.

2 See above, page 173.
This and the conclusion of Piśāṅgaṇaṭa's stories

tasmāt sōḍhakleśo mṛgāṅkadatto yathā śaśāṅkavatīṃ/
prāpa purā putra tathā prāpsyasi tāṃ madanamaṅcukāṃ tvam api//

So, my son, as Mṛgāṅkadatta once gained Śaśāṅkavati after enduring affliction, you also will regain your Madanamaṅcukā

KSS 12.36.243

confirm that Lalitalocana has after all a function like Prabhāvatī's, to confront Naravāhanadatta with his duty to Madanamaṅcukā. Lacôte rightly noted (Essai, 99) that this episode makes better sense if she has already been abducted by this stage as in the BKM.

Three characters, then, share the function of reuniting the hero with his first love, by reminding him of her, by transporting him to her, and by confronting him with his chief enemy. Vegavatī and Prabhāvatī are inseparable from our concept of the BK; the former has her place in the BKŚŚ and the latter was most likely meant to have a place;¹ what of Lalitalocana? The answer may lie in the beginning of KSS 13, when Naravāhanadatta is still "afflicted with separation" (virahasāmtapta, 13.1.4):

\[
gacchan kramaṇa ca prāpa kathāciḍ devatāsakhaḥ/
gangāgāmipathāḥbhyaṁpavanāntaśarasas tatam //
\]

And as he journeyed bit by bit, accompanied by a goddess, he happened to come upon the bank of a lake on the edge of a forest near a path that led to the Ganges.²

KSS 13.1.10

There he meets two brahmans, who greet him as the god of love, to which he replies that though not Kāma himself he has lost his Rati, and asks to hear their story. Each then relates his part in a story of love and separation and final reunion. When their stories

¹ See above, page 258.
² At the bank of the Ganges, bhagīrathītātām, BK M 11.4.
are told, Naravāhanadatta's companions, who have been looking for him, arrive, and so apparently does Lalitalocana, for they are all said to return to Kausāmbī, prince, companions, Lalitalocana and the two brahmans. In the BKM too the reappearance of the girl is not realized: Naravāhanadatta, seeing her fully occupied with her flower arrangements (puṣpoccyakṛḍāvīyāgrām, 9.59), left her to bathe in a lake; there follow the stories of Piśangajaṭa, and Lalitalocana is not heard of again. But as in the KSS he meets his companions at the river, and likewise returns with them and the brahmans to his city:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pranayavibhātamaulīnau samānaya} & \text{ viprau} \\
\text{vīraḥavādhaṁ hiṁśaṁ samānasya vallabhāyaḥ} & \\
\text{praviśithilam ayāṣīt svāṁ purīṁ rājaputraḥ}
\end{align*}
\]

The prince went slowly [?] to his own city, resolute in his distress at separation and thinking of his beloved, taking along the two brahmans whose crowns glittered with [their bows of] reverence.

\[BKM \text{ 11.83}\]

This incident plainly has some connection with Naravāhanadatta's solitary wandering after his unsuccessful pursuit of Vikacika the abductor of Ajinavatī in the BKSS, lābha 20. We have seen how he is reunited with Gomukha (who is alone, having been separated from the others while they were searching for the prince); how he and Gomukha decide to go to Vārāṇasī; how the prince hears the stories of the two brahmans while waiting outside the city for his friend. Lacôte insisted that these passages "n'ont aucun rapport avec les récits des deux brahmanes dans le livre de Madirāvatī du K.S.S. et de la B.K.M."

(Essai, 183), but that is an overstatement. We have, in the two

\[1 \text{ The text gives pranayavibhat maulitau samānasya.}\]
branches of the tradition, two very different developments of the same basic datum, a reunion at the Ganges after a search, and of a supplementary datum, the stories of two brahmans. In the Kashmiri poems the story of Lalitalocana leads to the reunion, in the BKŚS the reunion leads to the story of Priyadarśana; the two ladies do not appear together in any one work. It appears that these two developments were exclusive alternatives; and in fact Hertel recognized the stories of Priyadarśana and Lalitalocana as equivalent when he noted: "Finden wir nun bei Som. und Ksem., nicht aber im nepalesischen Text, in diesen Abschnitt [i.e. BKŚS 20-26] die Vpv. eingeschoben..." and concluded that the Vetalapancavimsāti was "ein späterer Einschub in der Brhatkathā".1

1 My citation comes from F.D.K. Bosch, De Legende van Jīmūtavāhana in de Sanskrit-Litteratuur, 45-46; I have not been able to consult the original.
Let us now return to Prabhāvatī, whose intervention marks a decisive step in the story of Naravāhanadatta, from carefree love to the responsibility of power. She brings him to Madanaṁcukā in the palace of Mānasavega on Mount Āśāḍha, introducing him under the cover of invisibility and later giving him her own shape so that his presence would not excite suspicion. He offers to untie Madanaṁcukā's ekaveṇī,¹ the single braid of hair worn by women separated from their husbands, but she resists, saying that she will wear it until Mānasavega is killed, or until her own death. One day, in Prabhāvatī's absence, her form fails him, and he is discovered in all his masculinity in the female quarters. Mānasavega and his army surround the suspected adulterer, but Mānasavega's mother Prthivī intervenes on Naravāhanadatta's behalf, and the case is taken to the vidyādharas' court of justice, over which Vāyupatha presides. Mānasavega alleges that Naravāhanadatta has seduced his sister and violated his harem; Naravāhanadatta replies that Vegavatī seduced him, and that he entered the other's harem in order to visit his own wife: what harm is there in that? Vāyupatha awards the case to Naravāhanadatta. Mānasavega, infuriated, makes as if to attack his opponent; but Śiva himself intervenes, and warns against any interference with justice. He transports Naravāhanadatta to Mount Ṛṣyamūka for his safety; Mānasavega returns home to Āśāḍha, despondent, with Madanaṁcukā.

¹ KSS 14.2.114, a detail not in the BKM. For Madanaṁcukā's ekaveṇī in a different context, compare BKSS 14.112-113; BKM 13.58; and see above, page 171, note 2.
This intervention of Śiva is difficult to defend, if not to explain. Inasmuch as the main story is about the loss and recovery of Madanamañcukā, all that follows the reunion of the two lovers and the victory of their suit in Vāyupatha’s court must seem an anticlimax. However the other theme in the main story, Naravāhanadatta’s winning of an empire, needs more space and a bigger cast of characters, so the conclusion is postponed in this schematic way. Madanamañcukā’s refusing the symbol of reunion, the untying of her ekaveṇi, looks in the same direction. The transition is not implausible on the level of human motivation, because the hero is not yet in a position of sufficient power to press his legal victory, and must leave his beloved in the possession of the enemy for the moment; only the intrigue is inadequate, in that one would expect divine intervention to have come down on the side of justice rather than expediency.

In fact, as Prabhāvatī reveals when Naravāhanadatta rejoins her, Śiva was none other than herself in disguise, but that does nothing to improve the intrigue. After an interlude in the wilderness with her, during which Rāma’s story is told for the second time with obvious reference to the present events, Naravāhanadatta returns to Kauśāmbī. There his wives and their fathers assemble for review and counsel. Those present, apart from the king Udayana, his chief wives Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī, his ministers and their sons the prince’s ministers, were:

Ajināvatī, her mother Dhanavatī and brother Caṇḍasimha
Prabhāvatī and her father Piṅgalagāndhāra

Vegavati
Ratnaprabha's father Hemaprabha and brother Vajraprabha
Gandharvaratnupta and her father Sagaradatta
Amitagati, a relation of Dhanavati's
Vayupatha, the president of the court
Citrangada

Pingalagandhara, presiding, says that he and his fellow vidyadhara are the party which supports Naravarahanadatta, having reason to believe that he is destined to be the leader of all their kind. He pays special tribute to the arduous penance undertaken by Dhanavati, and outlines the campaign which lies ahead.

There are two plateaux (vedyardhau, 14.3.65) of the vidyadhara on the Snowy Mountain, the north and the south, separated from one another by its peak. Naravarahanadatta is bound to defeat Mandarađeva, the ruler of the north plateau; but Gaurimunđa, the ruler of the south and a close ally of Mānasavega, is a more serious obstacle because of his powerful science. Amitagati is here to offer his support in overcoming Gaurimunđa, in return for which he wants the south plateau for himself. Dhanavati advises Naravarahanadatta to go to the land of the Siddhas (siddhaksetra-, ibid. 73) to perfect his science (vidyāśiddhyartham), promising the assistance of all the assembled kings. This Naravarahanadatta does.

Soon the enemy forces arrive, led by Gaurimunđa and Mānasavega. The allies join battle, and there is great slaughter.

1 Not previously mentioned in the KSS. In the BKM a Citragada [sic] has been mentioned before, 7.540.
2 See Alsdorf, ZDMG 92 (1938), 475.
3 Finally Naravarahanadatta makes him ruler of the north plateau: KSS 15.2.9. In the BKM, he makes him gulikābhṛt, 17.38.
Naravahanadatta engages in single combat with Gaurimunda, and is defeated. Dhanavati saves him from death, but he is thrown down on Fire Mountain (agniparvate, 109), and his companions, Gomukha and the rest, are scattered. The forces withdraw for the time being. Mānasavega again proposes marriage to Madanamañcukā, but she is unwavering in her fidelity. A friendly vidyādha called Amṛtaprabha conveys Naravahanadatta to Kailāsa mountain to propitiate Śiva, and Śiva pronounces him cakravartin of all the vidyādhara. He then goes to Amitagati's city, Vakrapura, and there is joyfully reunited with his companions, thanks once more to Dhanavati. At Naravahanadatta's suggestion, she bestows powers of the vidyādhara on the companions; everyone is now ready for the second battle of the war.

They advance to Govindakūṭa, and challenge the enemy. Once more there is fearful slaughter. Naravahanadatta kills Mānasavega and Gaurimunda, and the rest of their forces flee in confusion. He enters the city of Gaurimunda in triumph, and causes Madanamañcukā to be brought from Āgādhapura. Thus their long and painful separation is ended, but the war is not over; spies bring news that Mandaradeva is preparing to move against the new pretender. Naravahanadatta and his forces set off to meet him.

The first stage of the journey is a lake in the Himalayas in which Naravahanadatta and his wives bathe. It turns out that this lake is the first of the seven "emperor's jewels" (cakravartiratna) which one must have to pass through the cave that forms the approach to Mandaradeva's kingdom. He stays the night in Vāyupatha's city, and then by means of fasting and penance acquires the second jewel, a sandalwood tree. He learns from the tree itself, suddenly endowed with speech, that he must return to Govindakūṭa to win the
other jewels. However no sooner does he reach Govindakūṭa than on his friend Amṛtaprabha's advice he sets off again, this time to Mount Malaya to visit the sage Vāmadeva. Vāmadeva shows him where the other jewels, the elephant, the sword, the moonlight jewel, the woman and the science\(^1\) are to be won, and Naravāhanadatta resolutely wins them. Then he returns to Govindakūṭa, musters his forces, and heads for Kailāsa, on the other side of which lies Mandaradeva's territory.

Kailāsa is the abode of Śiva, and no vidyādhara dares to fly over it for fear of losing his powers. The north plateau can only be reached by the cave Triśirṣa, which long ago Śiva created for Rṣabha, the ruler of both plateaux, so that he might pass from one to the other with impunity, a privilege since rescinded except for bearers of the seven jewels. Naravāhanadatta overcomes all the obstacles to his passage, and emerges in the north plateau. There he defeats Mandaradeva and his ally Dhūmaśikha, but spares their lives and treats their dependents with respect, thus winning the affection of all the vidyādharas. Infatuated with his success, Naravāhanadatta decides to mount an expedition against Mount Meru, the home of the gods, but fortunately the sage Nārada dissuades him.

The trial which the hero passes in order successfully to overcome his opponents suggests that his adventures were intended to have a higher significance. The cave (guhā) is guarded by, among others, a vidyādhara king called Mahāmaya, "Great-illusion", whom Naravāhanadatta must defeat; as it were, a secret way to success, guarded by ignorance, to be overcome by knowledge. This is the

---

\(^1\) The list is not the same in the BKM: flag, umbrella, moon, swords, chariot, elephant, baton (17.11). Compare KSS 15.1.17-22.
language of mysticism, but the allegory probably does not extend beyond this single event. In general, the religious elements in the poems appear as firstly a divine level of motivation, and secondly occasional doxologies. Kṣemendra and Somadeva both introduce Śiva and Pārvatī in her various forms as the sublime powers which intervene in human affairs. Kṣemendra especially is profuse in hymns of praise and sermons on the world, comprehending a variety of sectarian views.1 Budhasvāmin is less interested in divine motivation. He introduces Kubera, or Naravāhana, as the god who presides over the birth of the hero Naravāhanadatta,2 that is all.

Still, divine intervention and occasional expressions of piety are more the rhetoric than the substance of religious belief, and they belong at least as much to literature as to religion. There is another more substantial sense in which the story of Naravāhanadatta is religious, as J.A.B. van Buitenen showed. He noted that "the ideals displayed in Gunāḍhya's romance are not the hermit's serenity or the warrior's triumph; they are, frankly and in a civilized way, the ideals of success and acquisition."3 The vidyādharā is the man who attains success, but his success is not solely material:

The very human aspirations of which the Vidyādharā is the incarnate fulfilment should... not make us forget that the man who has attained this position has transcended his human limitations in a very real sense; and it is this very same belief in man's capacity to overcome his human condition which is at the foundation of Indian thinking...

"The Indian hero as a vidyādharā", 103

1 Speyer, Studies, 19-20.
2 Lacôte, Essai, 213-214.
3 Tales of Ancient India, 4.
The quest to acquire magical domination of the world by self-domination can be compared with the tantric practices that are described or suggested in all the BK works. We have seen that marriage with an impure woman is one way of becoming a vidyādhara; the eating of human flesh is another, as in the story of Devadatta in KSS 5.3. Marubhūti in KSS 14.4 tells how he acquired the ability to spit gold by eating a foetus. These motifs of course belong more to the realm of folklore than of religion, like Naravāhanadatta's experiences in the cemetery in BKŚŚ 20, described above. It is certain that our authors were not describing such practices with conviction or the intention to proselytize, because they keep them at a distance from the narrative: Budhasvāmin defuses the motif of impure sexual contact by retrospective motivation, and the Kashmiri poets restrict the "tantric" motifs to the subsidiary stories. Nevertheless they provide an atmosphere of temptation and danger which favours the development of the theme of success. Naravāhanadatta's success, unlike that of Sānūdana/Cārudatta, whose case we considered above, is unqualified by any regrets at reprehensible means used in its attainment.

The time is now ripe for our hero's coronation (mahābhīṣeka). There is some doubt whether the ceremony should be performed on Mandara, which is nearby, or on Rṣabha mountain, which is to the south; the latter prevails, and the prince and his entourage pass through Triśīrṣa cave in the opposite direction. With Śiva's encouragement, preparations for the coronation are made on mount Rṣabha. The vidyādharas ask who is to be Naravāhanadatta's consort. "Madanamañcukā", he replies.

\[ \text{iti rājñodite kṣipram dhyānam te dyuca rā yayuḥ//} \]

When the prince said this, at once the skygoers fell to thinking...
A voice from the air breaks this embarrassed silence, announcing that Madanamañcukā is no mortal but an incarnation of Rati and a fitting wife for Naravāhanadatta, who is Kāma.1 And on an auspicious day, and amongst heavenly and earthly festivities, the ceremony was performed. Udayana and his queens were present at their son's coronation, but he soon found these superhuman surroundings too rigorous, and asked to go home. He was escorted back to Kauśāmbī with all ceremony.

The events that follow this elevation of the hero to heights from which his earthborn father must retreat, namely the death of Caṇḍamahāsena and the story of Avantivarṇdhana, recall us to the beginning of our study, "How the story was told". We must now consider the probability of Budhasvāmin's having taken his hero so far. The story of Naravāhanadatta in the BKŚŚ can be reconstructed with some confidence up to the end of the Bhagīrathayaśas episode; the figure of Prabhāvatī in the Kashmiri versions is the key to subsequent developments; taking the VH as an authority for the BKŚŚ version, we may say that Budhasvāmin too must have included her and perhaps made her the step towards conflict with and final victory over the vidyādhara prince Mānasavega. Evidence within the surviving fragment of the BKŚŚ too strongly urges the conclusion that Budhasvāmin intended such a development. He mentions Naravāhanadatta's destiny as ruler over the vidyādharas in these contexts:

— The frame, 3.99, etc.

— His birth, 5.49, etc.

1 In the BKM, 17.47-48, it is a question of defending Madanamañcukā against the resentment of the other wives.
The hunt (the reference is simply to when a cakravartin arises in the world), 8.46.

Amitāgati, 9.78, etc.

Gomukha refers to his receiving the homage of the vidyādhāras of both plateaux (vaitarddhaś), 13.28.

Vegavatī, 14.9, etc.

Gandharvadatī, 18.573.

The ascetic and the brahman student, 21.46.

Nanda and Upananda, 23.120.

Priyadarśanā, 27.82.

In the BKM and the KSS, Dhanavatī the mother of Ajināvatī is a woman of great influence, and noticeably more so in the latter work; could it be that Somadeva had in mind Queen Sūryavatī to whom he dedicates his poem (prasasti, 11)? Her equivalent in the BKŚS, Dhanamatī the mother of Ajinavatī, does not have the occasion to organize the hero's affairs beyond the range of her own family, but she does allude to the hero's destiny and the taking of sides that it involves:

\[
tena mānasavegaś ca gaurimundādayaś ca te/
anantāś ca mahāntāś ca bhaviṣyantaś ca śatravaḥ//
\]

So you have Mānasavega and Gaurimunda and other enemies, and no end of great enemies to come.

BKŚŚ 20.128

The fact that she does not here explain the details of this weighty remark seems to reserve her a prominent place in the events to come.

We may suppose, then, that in outline the BKŚŚ was to have ended like the BKM and the KSS.

Speculation about the way in which Budhasvāmin would have realized the end of his version of Naravāhanadatta's story must face three further problems: the acceptability of Madanamañjukā, the
unity of the work, and the place which the rest of the hero's twenty-six wives were to have occupied. The first, happily, can be solved with a fair degree of plausibility. In the work as we have it, Madanamañjukā's status is humble, and it is made plain that the daughter of a gaṇikā is no fit consort for a prince, let alone a cakravartin of the vidyādharas. These incidents establish her position:

— She is made conscious of gaṇikāsabdadoṣa, the reproach of the title of gaṇikā, when the prince her lover is without consultation betrothed to the princess of Kāśi (11.86).

— Udayana's decree that she be numbered among the girls of noble family comes after her disappearance, and is in fact applied to her successor in the prince's favours, Vegavatī (12.83-84).

— Vegavatī speaks condescendingly to her (14.115 and Lacôte's note).

— The hero's companions disdain to speak to his concubine, until they discover that it is Vegavatī (15.1 ff.).

Lacôte took account of these humiliations in his portrait of her:

La fierté de la jeune fille, refusant de vivre dans la situation humiliée de concubine, son désespoir devant la dureté des mœurs dont elle est la victime, sa volonté de mourir, qu'elle fait partager au faible Naravahānadvatta et qui, seule, aura raison de l'opposition du roi, le contraindra à la déclasser par un décret arbitraire, font d'elle un personnage vraiment humain et dramatique...

Essai, 210

Here however he misinterpreted the author's intention in the matter of Udayana's decree and indeed in the character of Madanamañjukā as a whole. It is true that Budhasvāmin is more daring than the Kashmiri poets in having a gaṇikā's daughter as heroine. They, or the version of the story which they were following, eliminated this element "parce qu'on était choqué que l'héroïne fût d'aussi basse origine" (Essai, 211). Nevertheless
Budhasvāmin does not go so far as to present the gaṇikā's daughter as so admirable in herself that the usual considerations of class are set aside; we may imagine a character who while encountering these rebuffs in her contacts with others maintains her inner determination to succeed, but we are not shown enough of Madanamañjukā's inner life for us to know that such is her case. Moreover Budhasvāmin too elevates the status of her mother by giving her a royal lineage of a kind. This is revealed some time after Kaliṅgasena's first appearance, which is a mystification typical of the BKŚŚ: we wonder why this gaṇikā is so well received at court, and the explanation follows in due course: she is no ordinary gaṇikā, but a descendant of the supernumerary wives of king Bharata. The Kashmiri poets, in spite of making Kaliṅgasena a princess, retain a memory of her status as a gaṇikā;¹ the difference between their intrigue and Budhasvāmin's in this respect is one of degree rather than kind.

It probably does not need to be demonstrated that Budhasvāmin would have made Naravāhanadatta marry his first love in the end, since that is the most fundamental hypothesis of the BK, but since every detail in the surviving fragment is precious as a testimony to the part now lost, let us consider the evidence. After the incident² that reveals that the hero is due for responsibility, and Udayana has decreed that he shall have the dignity of crown prince, there occurs Kaliṅgasena's visit to the court and the meeting of the two children. The baptism of Naravāhanadatta as crown prince occurs immediately after that. This clearly looks forward to the

¹ Lacôte, Essai, 83-85, 210-212; above, page 146.
² See above, pages 139-140.
time when he will receive his baptism as king of the vidyādharas and name this girl as his chief queen. The BKM and the KSS in rendering this latter scene are consistent with their treatment of Kaliṅgasena, in that some apprehension is felt about Madanamañcukā's qualifications for the rank, until a voice from the sky reassures all concerned. The action in the BKSS is set to develop in the same way, but it is not Budhasvāmin's manner to have recourse to voices from the sky; here surely he would have given a retrospective motivation of Madanamañcukā's involvement with the hero, probably a revelation concerning the identity of her father, whom Kaliṅgasena avoids naming in 7.17. The chances are that her father was Madanavega as in the Kashmiri versions.

The second problem to consider is how these two themes of love and empire were combined. We have seen how in the Kashmiri versions they formally coincide at critical points. Madanamañcukā and Naravāhanadatta come into the world for a common destiny as incarnations of Rati and Kāma; it is only because of Yaugandharāyaqa's intrigues that they do not have the same father in Udayana. Naravāhanadatta comes into the world also destined to be the cakravartin of the vidyādharas. A vidyādhara called Mānasavega lays claim to the girl; his claim is frustrated by her marriage to the hero, which starts the factional struggle between the vidyādharas who oppose the hero and those who support him. The crowning event in the story is Naravāhanadatta's choice of his first and dearest wife as his queen. And yet the structure of both the BKM and the KSS is a compromise between this story of love triumphant and a typical cakravartin story, that of Brahmadatta say or Sanatkumāra in the Jain narratives, in which the hero accumulates wives and wins
battles. The combination could be represented thus, in two columns, connected by a row of dots where the two themes coincide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madanamañcukā</th>
<th>cakravartin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>she is Rati, he is Kāma</td>
<td>his destiny announced at birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage ..........................</td>
<td>dispute with Mānasavega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abduction</td>
<td>he wins many wives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reunion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he wins the battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chosen as his queen .............</td>
<td>coronation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This diagram illustrates the difficulties encountered by Kṣemendra and Somadeva in such a combination of themes. We have just noticed the awkward transition between the reunion of the two lovers in Mānasavega's women's quarters and the battles with the vidyādharas that are the prelude to Naravāhanadatta's coronation and the true climax of the story. The awkwardness of the other juncture is well shown by the diversity of treatment in the three BK versions. The BKŚŚ leaves no interval between Naravāhanadatta's conquest of Madanamañjukā (it is not yet a marriage) and her abduction, which leads to his marriage with Vegavatī. The BKM gives as it were two versions of the event: at the end of book 8 Kṣemendra mentions the abduction of Madanamañcukā, but he does not take up the narration of the event and its consequences until book 13. In the KŚŚ Madanamañcukā after her marriage stays in the background until lambaka 14, which, like book 13 in the BKM, comprehends the action of BKŚŚ sargas 12 to 28 and beyond.

The Vīh because of its different main story is of less use as a testimony to the structure of the BK than as a testimony to separate
episodes and details of these episodes. For what it is worth, however, it tends to support the BKŚŚ version by having Vegavatī follow Somasiri, the partial equivalent of Madanamañjukā, in lamhās 12 and 13, and it avoids the anticlimax of the Kashmiri versions by making the hero's victory over Mānasavega by force of arms follow immediately on his victory at law. Still, the episode is inconsequential in that afterwards Vasudeva carries on just as before. Also, the juxtaposition of Somasiri and Vegavatī and of Vasudeva's legal and physical victories is what one might expect to result from the compilation of episodes from the BK. This process could be attributed to Saṅghadāsa or a predecessor of his whom he imitated in composing the adventures of Vasudeva, or it could be attributed to a writer who for one reason or another composed an abbreviated version of the BK; Lacôte suggests what such a work may have been like in his recreation of "l'abrége de la Brhatkathā" (Essai, 137). Such an abbreviated version — it may have been for example part of an encyclopediac collection of stories — would by a kind of Gresham's law be capable of driving the more cumbersome full work out of circulation. This hypothesis is an essential part of Lacôte's reconstruction of the BK tradition, which explains how the Kashmiri versions and the BKŚŚ can be so different yet so obviously descended from the same origin.

Unfortunately there is no clue in the text of the BKŚŚ which could lead to a solution of this problem; all we know is that Budhasvāmin intended to pursue the two themes of Naravāhanadatta's marriage with Madanamañjukā and his acquisition of power over the vidyādharas to their logical conclusion. We also know that Naravāhanadatta was to marry a total of twenty-six wives in his career (BKŚŚ 4.3), which brings us to the third problem: where in
the structure of the work were those marriages to occur? The BKŚŚ, as we have seen, makes Naravāhanadatta's union with Madanamañjukā lead directly into the story of Vegavatī. After Vegavatī there occurs the same sequence of names in the BKŚŚ as in the other versions: Gandharvadattā, Ajinavatī, Priyadarśanā, Bhagīrathayaśas, except for the omission from the Kashmiri versions of Priyadarśanā, which we have discussed above. Now if, as has been suggested, Bhagīrathayaśas was to lose the hero to Prabhāvatī, who was to take him to Madanamañjukā, which was to lead to a hearing of his case before Vāyumukta, then Budhasvāmin is nearly at the end of his story and there are still nineteen wives to account for. Were they to come between the lawsuit and the great battle? This would leave the same awkward juncture as in the Kashmiri versions. Were they to come after the coronation? Then they would be redundant, as the hero would have already attained the heights of power. Perhaps Prabhāvatī was not to succeed Bhagīrathayaśas immediately after all; Budhasvāmin may have decided to put after Bhagīrathayaśas the marriages that in the other versions come between Madanamañjukā and Vegavatī. As we have seen, by omitting these marriages at that juncture he almost excludes the motif of Madanamañjukā's jealousy; by including the marriages at a later juncture he would tend to eliminate Naravāhanadatta's concern for her; that may well have been his interpretation of the story.

No solution to the problem of the multiple wives imposes itself as necessarily the best. Like the problem of the unity of the work it seems to go back to the original and peculiar plan of the BK. It would be interesting to know how Guṇādhya handled it, but it would be unrealistic to suppose a priori that his solution was better than the solutions of his inheritors.
CONCLUSION

The agreement between the BKŚŚ, the BKM and the KSS that has emerged from our comparison has confirmed that the BK was more than a legendary name. The story of Naravāhanadatta continued to live through the centuries, and has come down to us in substance if not in spirit in all the surviving versions. But how did this happen? We can only imagine how in fact such material was transmitted from one author to another. The possibilities seem to be that the author worked from a written text, or reproduced something he had heard; that he faithfully imitated the material he received, or reworked it in his own style; that the material he received was in an extensive and finished form, vistareṇa, or in summary form suitable for expansion at will, samāsena. Lacôte's comparison of the BKM and the KSS illustrates the method of investigation that is open to us. He noted that though both works are different in size and style, and organize their material differently, both give what is essentially the same material; even the names of minor characters are the same with very few exceptions. Hence both Kṣemendra and Somadeva must have based their narratives on the same written text.\(^1\) This written text, like its imitations, must have had an excessive number of secondary stories in proportion to the main story, which is hardly more than a summary. Evidently the story of Naravāhanadatta had survived as a summary when the original was lost, and a later hand or hands had added extraneous stories to this summary to swell it to a full-size work, so far disregarding

---

\(^1\) Essai, 132-133.
the relevance of these stories that they even inserted some twice in different places.¹

In other words, a model of the tradition which terminates² with the BKM and the KSS must contain at least four elements: the original, the summary, an expansion of the summary (all of these now lost) and the surviving works. It is easy to imagine what the summary must have been like by looking at Jinasena's version of the "Wanderings of Vasudeva" in his HP. Vasudeva's wives are listed twice, in sargas 1 and 48, apart from the actual narration of the marriages in sargas 19 to 32, which marriages succeed one another very rapidly in certain places, namely sargas 24 and 31, themselves becoming little more than lists of names. Obviously the bulk of the story could disappear and leave the armature, a summary of the order of events, intact. Then, to continue the analogy, a compilator like Hemacandra could restore the bulk of the work with stories like that of Kanakavatī, Tr 8.3, which is not found in any other version of Vasudeva's wanderings. Other consequences of an author's expanding a laconic text may be seen in two examples from our comparison of the different versions of the Vasudeva story: Ramacandra Mumukṣu gives an aberrant account of Ĉārūdatta's emerging from the cave where he had been abandoned by the mendicant, and yet his version of events could be summarized in the same words as the others;³ and Jinasena's Ĉāruhāsinī ("Sweetly-laughing"), a

---

¹ Essay, 136-143.
² Not quite terminates: Nilam Agrawala's Mahākavi Gunādhya viracita Brhatkathā (Allahabad, 1965), is in fact a free translation of the BKM.
³ Above, page 44.
character unknown to the other authors, may be a phantom arising from a misunderstanding of the proper name Priyadarśana
("Pleasant-to-the-sight").

In this study I have given an exposition of the VH of Saṅghadāsa so far as it bears on the question of the BK.

Alsdorf's paper "Eine neue Version der verlorenen Brhatkathā" demonstrated that the resemblance between the VH and the BKŚŚ was in precisely those points that Lacôte had advanced as reasons for the superior authority of Budhasvāmin's version over the versions of Kṣemendra and Somadeva. Alsdorf concluded:

Auch hier wird jetzt unser Zutrauen zu Budhasvāmin noch wesentlich gesteigert; denn bei genügenden Abweichungen zwischen Ślokasamgraha und Vh, um den Gedanken gegenseitiger Abhängigkeit von vornherein auszuschliessen, finden wir auf beträchtliche Strecken so genaue Übereinstimmung gerade auch in den kleinsten Einzelzügen und der ganzen Art der Darstellung, dass wir nicht zweifeln können, Gupādhya selbst auf kürzeste Entfernung gegenüberzustehen.

"Eine neue Version", 349

This is entirely persuasive, but it also throws into relief a methodological difficulty: how does one decide between the similarity that proves fidelity and the difference that excludes dependence? In what follows I will attempt a detailed examination of similarities and differences of various kinds that may be observed in the works under study, especially the VH and the BKŚŚ, summarizing the findings of the preceding sections. My aim is a restatement, rather than a definitive solution, of the difficulty.

The special interest of the VH is that it may represent an older and more authentic version of the BK than any of the surviving works that claim this title. Still, it seems self-evident that the more highly organized story of Naravāhanadatta preceded the less

---

1 Above, page 64.
organized stories concerning Samba, Vasudeva and Cārudatta which
display the same material. So where there are stories common to
all four works, we can speak of them as BK material in the VH. It
will be useful to begin with a list of this material.

pedhiyā: Marriage of Samba and Suhiranṇā: compare marriage of
Naravāhanadatta and Madanamaṇjukā.

lambha 3: Marriage of Vasudeva and Gandhavavadattā: compare
marriage of Naravāhanadatta and Gandharvavadattā.

lambha 4: Marriage of Vasudeva and Nīlajasā: compare marriage of
Naravāhanadatta and Ajinavati.

lambha 10: Desire of king Pumḍa for a son: compare desire of king
Udayana for a son.

lambha 13: Abduction of Somasiri: compare abduction of
Madanamaṇjukā. In both, a Vegavatī replaces the missing woman.

lambha 18: Marriage of Vasudeva and Piyangusundarī: compare
marriage of Naravāhanadatta and Bhagīrathayaḥas.

lambha 21: Defeat of Mānasavega by Vasudeva: compare defeat of
Mānasavega by Naravāhanadatta.

Next, a list which shows the details of the material in the
above list, and some further material, that are peculiar to the VH
and the BRŚŚ.

pedhiyā: Suhiranṇā, like Madanamaṇjukā, is the daughter of a
ganikā. With Buddhisena's role in the marriage of Samba, compare
Gomukha's role in the marriage of Naravāhanadatta.

lambha 2: Abduction of Vasudeva from Sāmalī: compare abduction of
Naravāhanadatta from Vegavatī.
lambha 3: The scene is Campā, not the city of the gandharvas as in the BkM and the KSS. The story of Cārudatta, a merchant of Campā and the adoptive father of Gandhavvadattā: compare the story of Sānudāsa. The meeting of Cārudatta and Amiyagati: compare the meeting of Naravāhanadatta and Amitagati.

lambha 4: As Vasudeva is taken to meet Nīlajāsā in a cemetery by a vetāla, so Naravāhanadatta is taken to meet Ajinavatī. Nīlajāsā, like Ajinavatī, is a black girl.

lambha 10: The marriages of Vasudeva with Pumḍā and Aṃsumānta with Sūtārā: compare the marriages of Naravāhanadatta with Priyadārśanā and Gomukha with Pūsidattā.

lambha 14: Vasudeva is abducted from Vegavatī by Mānasavega: so Naravāhanadatta is abducted from Vegavatī by Mānasavega.

lambha 18: As Vasudeva's wife, the merchant's daughter Bāmdhumatī, loses him to the princess Pīyāngusundarī, so Naravāhanadatta's wife the merchant's daughter Priyadārśanā loses him to the princess Bhagīrathayasās.

Plainly, the VH and the BKŚS in certain respects resemble one another more strongly than either resembles the BKM or the KSS, which for their part are very similar to one another. So we may think of the tradition emanating from the BK as having two branches, the one terminating in the VH and the BKŚS and the other in the BKM and the KSS. The relationship between the latter pair has been satisfactorily established by Bühler and Lacôte: they must be independent copies of the same work, because the BKM is the earlier in date, which excludes the possibility that it is copied from the KSS, while the KSS is the more explicit, which excludes the possibility that it is copied from the BKM; indeed the BKM is so laconic...
in its narrative that whole stories would be incomprehensible without the elucidation provided by the KSS. Now the relationship of the VH and the BKŚŚ is from one point of view as close as the relationship of the BKM and the KSS, in that not only do certain specific stories occur in both but also certain details that play no necessary part in the plot of the stories, and could not be imagined or supplied from tradition independently. Such details are:

pedhiya: Buddhiseṇa describes the types of men to Samika and his companions; Gomukha describes the types of men to Naravāhanadatta and his companions. Bhogamālinī tells the story of Bharata and the gaṇīkās: Mudrikālatikā tells the story of Bharata and the gaṇīkās.

lambha 5: Vasudeva comes upon a herd of wind deer: Naravāhanadatta while hunting with his companions comes upon a herd of wind deer.

lambha 10: While they are travelling Aṇsumaṭṭa entertains Vasudeva with a recital of the kinds of narrative: Gomukha similarly entertains Naravāhanadatta. Vasudeva taunts Aṇsumaṭṭa, as Naravāhanadatta taunts Gomukha, with being superfluous to the success of his enterprise; the companion refutes this.

These are the sort of gratuitous details which a summary would omit, and indeed they are not found in Jinasena's or Hemacandra's versions of the Vasudeva story, which can mean either that these latter

---

It does happen, of course, that the BKM is explicit where the KSS is allusive. Once in the latter work Naravāhanadatta cannot sleep for thinking on a slave girl (KSS 10.1.52); we are not told which or why. The BKM provides the answer: the hero and his companions have heard courtesans singing outside their apartments (16.29-30).
versions are independent of Saṅghadāsa's VH,¹ or that while they are dependent on Saṅghadāsa's VH these details were not transmitted in a summary version which was the intermediary. Yet these details occur in both the VH and the BKŚŚ in as similar a form as is compatible with the different styles of the two works. The conclusion must be that the relationship is based on an extended written text.

However the sense of this relationship cannot be established with the same certainty as in the case of the other branch. Firstly, the respective dates of the two works are uncertain, so we cannot exclude either possibility of the one having copied the other. Secondly, the criterion of explicitness does not consistently declare either one to be the model and the other to be the copy. In applying this criterion to the Kashmiri poems one has to discount the tendency of the BKŚŚ to be more prolix in passages that express religious devotion; one would similarly have to discount the tendency of the VH to enlarge on religious matters to which the BKŚŚ merely makes allusion, notably the Viṣṇu song in the story of Gandharvadatta. It is true that the VH tends to give a more exhaustive and schematic version of certain motifs beyond the needs of their narrative context,² but this too is no doubt in keeping with the nature of an edifying work. Here both the conventions of storyteling and the ingenuity of the author suffice to explain the occasionally greater copiousness of the VH, so that it is not an argument for priority. In general, both works develop their subject in good proportion and in accordance with the nature of the

¹ Compare Alsdorf, HP 97-98.
² For example, in the finding of Amiyagati, 135 ff.; the kinds of men, 101.19 ff.; the kinds of story, 206.30 ff.
whole. Yet they are different, in ways which we shall examine in
detail; putting aside the question whether one copied the other or
whether both are independent copies, can we say whether one is
inherently better than the other, and hence more likely to be a fair
representative of the original BK?

First, let us consider the tone of the narrative in the
different works; this was one of Lacôte's criteria for preferring
the authority of the BKSS over that of the Kashmiri poems. One
could summarize the difference in level between the VH and the BKSS
by saying that the one was apparently designed to be recited to a
popular audience while the other was designed to be read by an
educated public. The VH tends to be low or comic in tone whereas
the BKSS tends to be elevated and refined. This distinction can be
observed at all levels of analysis; to begin with, the one is in
Prakrit prose whereas the other is in Sanskrit verse. In the tradi-
tion of Indian poetics prose can be as highly ornate as verse, but
Saṅghadāsa's only pretention to elegance in this regard is the
occasional passage of extended description: the beauty of a woman,
the beauty of a landscape. Lacôte's impression of the style of the
BKSS is just:

Le style est simple, généralement tout uni, quelquefois un
peu plat, mais de très bonne qualité. L'auteur a peu le
goût des artifices et ne cherche pas à faire montre de
virtuosité. De temps à autre, il se permet une petite
description un peu maniérée, juste ce qu'il faut pour donner
au poème une allure littéraire, puis vite le récit reprend...
En somme, la langue, simple et agile, convient parfaitement
au récit.

Essai, 148

However Budhasvāmin's mannered descriptions tend to demand of the
reader a far more sophisticated response than Saṅghadāsa's. The
latter's simply perform the obvious functions of marking an interval
of time or adding weight to a slender intrigue. In contrast with
this, the descriptions of scenery in Budhavāmin's stories of Sānudāsa and Bhagīrathayaśas are witty and ironic in that they represent communications from author to reader in the language of poetic convention that by-pass the first-person narrator. It would be truer to say of the VH that the manner is in perfect harmony with the matter. The BKŚS is exceptional among Sanskrit verse narratives in dealing with material that includes scenes of low life and disreputable characters, but its tendency is to polish this matter for more refined tastes.

This contrast is also manifested in the characterization of the hero. Because Vasudeva travels mostly alone, without attendants, he must act on his own behalf, and he thereby exposes himself to all kinds of experiences. He begins as a fugitive, he shows himself charming to humble people like the garland-makers in lambha 24 or the girl with bad breath in lambha 11. He reveals manifold talents, ranging from the urbane to the strictly practical, as in the examples just mentioned: he makes garlands for the princess Paumavatī, cachous for the shop-assistant of Manohara. Fearless with horses and elephants, an expert bowman and strategist, he can also handle with skill a musical instrument or a paintbrush. In fact so many-sided is he in his adventures that his story would be ridiculous, his repeated successes cloying, were it not for a grain of humour in the narrative. For the European reader, Vasudeva has something of the Baron Münchhausen, but rather more of the wily Odysseus. He gains many of his successes by a cunning solution to a problem, he is always eager to set off towards new experiences. Two of his setbacks reveal the tone of the narrative, when he is taken in by the plausible conversation of people more cunning than himself: the conjuror of lambha 6 and the messenger of
Jarāsaṃdha in lamhā 22. The purpose of both these characters is to distract the hero's attention so that a band of men can seize him. The revelation of their purpose is as much a surprise for the reader as for the hero, and this surprise has the potential for either hilarity or distress. Since the hero in the former case makes off at speed, and in the latter is carried off in a bag, the incident resolves itself in hilarity; the reader feels apprehensive for the safety of the lone hero, yet at the same time is not constrained from laughing at him.

Such is not the case of Naravāhanadatta. Gomukha is usually at hand to direct his mundane affairs, and in his absence Amitagati stands ready to intervene where needed; that is established by Naravāhanadatta's meditation in the well outside Campā. So Naravāhanadatta rarely faces dangers alone, and when he does, his bravery consists in not summoning the available help. Thus the narrative presents the hero's safety as determined by a higher level of motivation. To be precipitated from one danger to another and to escape by one's wits, as in a picaresque novel, is exciting but undignified. Naravāhanadatta's adventures approach the dignity of epic or romance because while he has his own motives for acting, superhuman forces in the form of daiva or the vidyādharas intervene to give the action a larger scope than his own field of consciousness.

As we have seen, Naravāhanadatta is the reverse of charming towards people below his station in life. Whereas Vasudeva's reactions to others depend on their disposition towards him, Naravāhanadatta's are determined by their status, and this determinism is another symptom of the greater decorum of the narrative. It is true that he responds to the beauty rather than to the rank of
women. However, in the stories of Gandharvadattā and Ajinavati his taste proves to be more conventional than we at first think, for they are vidyādhārīs in an unpromising disguise; he treats Priyadarśanā with scant respect (one wonders if Udayana was ever to hear about her); only Madanamañjukā remains incongruous, but the author certainly had plans for revaluing her too.

Naturally, Vasudeva is more immediately appealing as a character. He is a ready participant in any feat of courage or skill that presents itself, but he is not foolhardy: he would rather escape than tangle with enemies that are beyond his powers, witness the incident in laṁbha 6 when a crowd of men come at him, or in laṁbha 4 when he sees Ṣaṅgaraka. He is often in love, but that does not keep him awake at nights, as it does Naravāhanadatta; once he is demented by the loss of his beloved, namely Somasīrī in laṁbha 13, but that incongruity seems to be due to an unusually faithful imitation of the spirit as well as the matter of the BK as rendered in the BKŚŚ. Naravāhanadatta is so much a passive participant in events that he is bound to be less attractive. Nevertheless his characterization deserves attention. Lacôte understood the BKŚŚ as a Bildungsroman and was inclined to forgive the hero's youthful vices. Maten (BB 95–97) traced the growth of his self-confidence, but also noticed his opportunism and hypocrisy, showing that Naravāhanadatta was ready to allege consideration for others as an excuse for his lack of initiative. Did Budhāsvāmin intend an ironical portrait of the amorous prince? That is to say, granted that Naravāhanadatta's story has a certain elevation, are we justified in thinking that his qualities are not in proportion to his destiny? If this disproportion was intended by the author, are we to interpret it sympathetically or satirically? Naravāhanadatta's
introspection is an argument for sympathy: if a character inwardly confesses his faults the reader is inclined to believe that he exaggerates, and to forgive the faults of which the character seems unaware, in this case his "egoisme naïf". A critical passage is that in sarga 20 where he admires the cowherds near Sambhava. His admiration of their simple life seems to contradict the observation that he responds to people according to their status not their qualities. Of course merely to express such sentiments is not a breach of decorum, witness Dusyanta's admiration for Sakuntalā; in Naravāhanadatta's case the sentiments do not even have an issue in action. But his thoughts take him from praise for his host to praise for his host's wife as an exception to the rules that govern the conduct of such people; this exception is incomprehensible to him. Thus the author seems to locate the sense of decorum in his hero's mind and to imply that it is an inadequate means of judging others. We cannot be sure, and perhaps we were not intended to be. It would be a mistake to underestimate Budhasvāmin's fondness for teasing the reader.

In sum, the verbal and narrative styles of the two works can be regarded as manifestations of different intentions on the part of their respective authors, and hence these differences do not prove the superior authority of one or the other version. Ultimately the originality of the BK must have been the use of an untried combination of themes: victory and love, courtly life and the life of the streets, power and private emotions. The surviving versions have these themes in varying proportions; there is no reason to assume that the more everyday version of a story should always prevail over the more pretentious.
Another criterion that Lacôte used in reconstructing the BK according to his interpretation is that of the narrative logic inherent in the stories, as it is rendered more or less well by the different versions. The purpose of the second section of this study was to discuss and compare the episodes that make up the story of Naravāhanadatta and that have their equivalents in the life of Vasudeva. No clear decision emerged. Let us recall some extreme instances where one version seemed better than another. The key to the story of Nīlajasā in the VH is that the girl looks like an out-caste but in fact is not; Saṅghadāsa failed to establish satisfactorily why this is so. The presumption is strong that in replacing a story about siddhas by the history of Nami he spoiled the motivation of the intrigue. On the other side, the story of Vegavatī, which has elements of mildly prurient fun in its motif of the virgin passing for a wife, seems to have got out of hand in Budhasvāmin's treatment. The puzzle of who is passing for what there has a derivative and secondary quality. Finally, as we have seen, the story of Ārudaṭṭa/Sanudāsa makes better sense now in the one, now in the other. Consequently neither version appears to be consistently superior in this respect, provided that we allow for the different impression created by the simplicity of the VH and the sophistication of the BKŚŚ.

So far, I have treated the VH as if it were a version of the BK. Indeed the correspondences between the VH and the BKŚŚ are remarkable, extending even to certain minute incidents and digressions, such features as one would not expect to be transmitted except through direct imitation of an extensive text. But we must take into account the fact that the main story as a whole is radically different in the VH, which nominally takes its origin from
stories about the Harivamsa and so has a different kind of plot and a different kind of hero.

The VH is essentially a story of a universal and ageless type, that in which the youngest son of the family leaves home, confronts difficulties and returns in triumph. The motivation of Vasudeva's leaving home, and his recognition of and reconciliation with his brothers, are well enough realized, but they constitute the merest frame for the bulk of the work, which is the episodic adventures he experiences while estranged from his family. To say this is not to deny the artistic skill deployed in the composition of the work. The author never entirely loses sight of the frame, the theme of his hero's estrangement. In the first laṃbha, Vasudeva is wary of being recognized; in the eighteenth laṃbha, after recapitulating his adventures up to the present, he briefly describes his immediate family; not only the material of the frame but also the act of narration itself is there recalled by the narrator's address to his audience, nattuyā (281.24, 283.3); and with the introduction of Jarāsandhi in laṃbha 21 as the father of Imdasenā, references to the family become ever more frequent. Vasudeva actually recounts the history of the harivamsakula at 356.27 ff. That is to say, Saṅghadāsa has made the transition from Vasudeva's family environment to his lonely adventures and back again with some care, and has consciously maintained the simultaneous existence of these two areas of narrative. This care is also manifested in the linking together of some laṃbhas: Sāmalī, after leaving the hero in laṃbha 2, is brought to his mind again in laṃbha 11; his companion Aṃsumanāta is the material link between laṃbhas 7 to 10; Vegavati's story is begun in laṃbha 13 and resumed in laṃbha 15; there is a general muster of Vasudeva's wives in laṃbha 27.
The author also asserts his control over his material when his hero-narrator in *lambha* 15 makes a cross-reference to a story (Carudatta's) that he has heard before during his wanderings. Nevertheless, these are only mechanical devices for unifying the narrative. Essentially, Vasudeva's adventures are separate from one another and from the frame.

In the *BKŚS* too the adventures of the hero are episodic. The motif of abduction which we examined above is a symptom of this quality, because as the hero is transported from one place to another, so the author passes from one story to another without transition, as in the *VH*. For example, the stories of Vegavatī, Gandharvadattā and Ajinavatī all end in abduction of the hero or the women, and it is significant that this series of adventures has its equivalent in the same order and without interval in the *VH*, Sāmalī-Gandhavvadattā-Nīlajasā. In the *BKM* and the *KSS*, however, the hero is based at home except during this series of abductions, and the episodic quality of the narrative consists rather in the arrivals of prospective wives and occasional expeditions on the hero's part, from which he brings back one or more wives to add to the growing total at home. The *BKŚS* as we have it is too short to enable us to be certain whether the hero was more a solitary wanderer or a home-lover, but if one may judge from the end of the twentieth *sarga*, the latter seems more probable. There Gomukha, reunited with Naravāhanadatta after the separation caused by the above-mentioned series of adventures, tells how Vegavatī and Amitagati had arrived at Kauśāmbī and had reported to Udayana that the prince was safe; Amitagati further told Gomukha in private that Vegavatī and he had been the unseen witnesses of Naravāhanadatta's affair at Campā. We have seen how the hero is mostly accompanied
by Gomukha, and how he has an established ally at his call in Amitagati; here we see how when he is absent from home his fortunes are reported to the king. Similarly in Budhasvāmin's version of the Merchant of Campā's story, Sānudāsa, while he thinks himself alone, is in fact being supervised by his family, an aspect of the story that has no importance in Saṅghadāsa's version.

Apparently, this link between the hero and his home, which goes deeper than the mechanical links we observed in the VH, was a peculiarity of the BK. This explains why in adapting BK material for his wandering hero the author of the VH was forced to make certain changes. The story of Madanamañjukā has two phases, that in which Naravāhanadatta wins her and that in which she is stolen; the former phase is so integrated with the hero's life at home with his parents that in the VH she is divided into two characters, Suhiraṇṇā, won at home by Saṁba, and Somasiri, won abroad by Vasudeva. It also explains why the story of the finding of Amitagati is transferred from the hero to a subsidiary character, because Vasudeva's story will not admit a supernatural helper. In the episode of Pumāṇa, however, the story demands the presence of a companion, and Vasudeva has the equivalent of Gomukha in Amsumānta. With the concern for unification that we noticed above, Saṅghadāsa introduces Amsumānta before he is needed, but he disappears abruptly and permanently from the narrative with the end of the episode. Vasudeva's enemies are strangely heterogeneous; Amgaraka and Mānasavega come from the BK but Suppahanī and Hepphayā come from the Rāmāyaṇa; a solitary hero needs enemies in order to perform his feats of prowess, or rather, in the case of Vasudeva, in order to be moved about from one adventure to another, but the enemies are just names taken from here and there, not leaders of factions who are
successively provoked by the threat of an intruder, as in the
BK.

However this fundamental difference between the adventures of
Naravāhanadatta and of Vasudeva as a whole will not account for all
differences in the cast of characters. For example, since in the
BKŚŚ the stories of Priyadarṣanā and Bhagīrathayāsas are continuous,
in the sense that the hero remains in the same place and the two
women interact as characters, we should expect that the author of
the VH would break them up so that they would fit in better with the
pattern of his hero's wanderings. And in a sense the two episodes
are separated, forming lambhas 10 and 18 respectively. But the
element of continuity is preserved because Vasudeva having won
Bandhumatī in the seventeenth lambha stays on in Sāvatthī to win her
friend Piyāngusundarī in the eighteenth; as in the BKŚŚ, the
merchant's daughter loses the hero to the princess. Another example:
since Naravāhanadatta experiences the loss of his Madanamañjukā and
the substitution of Vegavatī while living at home, we should expect
the corresponding episodes in the VH to be radically changed, but
they are not. Vasudeva's wife Somasiri is stolen in lambha 13, and
the story of Vegavatī follows in the next, the events taking place
in Somasiri's parents' home. Hence it seems that the splitting of
characters between two or more stories that we have noticed in the
VH was not simply an expedient to make the borrowed material fit its
new context, but served some other end; perhaps, simply, it served
to multiply the stories. A comprehensive list of examples will be
useful here:

Madanamañjukā corresponds to: 1. Suhirāppā (marriage)
2. Somasiri (abduction by Mānasavega)
Vegavatī corresponds to:
1. Sāmalī (fights the abductor of the hero)
2. Vegavatī (replaces Somasirī)

Priyadarśanā
t 1. Pundā (disguised as a man)
2. Bāṃdhunatī (supplanted by Piyagusurndarī)

Naravāhanadatta
t 1. Vasudeva (marries Gandhavavadattā et al.)
2. Saṇba (marries Suhiranṇā)
3. Cārudatta (meets Amiyagati)

At this stage the relationship between the VH and the BKŚŚ can be summarized as follows. It is obvious that Saṅghadāsa, or a prior author of the VH, knew a version of the BK very like the BKŚŚ. But his intention was not to copy out Naravāhanadatta's adventures under the name of Vasudeva; his main story was of a fundamentally different kind, he drew on other narrative material from various sources as well as on the BK, and he distributed the BK material as it suited him, neither consistently preserving the connections between the borrowed stories nor consistently breaking them. This freedom of Saṅghadāsa's treatment is a precious clue to one aspect of the relationship between the VH and the BKŚŚ that can be deduced from internal evidence. If we consider each major incident common to both works and note which minor incidents within it are also common, we notice a regular pattern emerging.

A frequent motivation for a minor story is the introduction of a new character, whose story is then told. Thus in the BKŚŚ, Gomukha tells Naravāhanadatta how Mudrikālatikā told him the lineage of Kaliṅgasenā; Gomukha deduces the story of Amitagati from his footprints, and Amitagati when found completes the story; Vegavatī tells her own story, and Sānudāsa tells his and that of his adopted daughter Gandharvavadattā. These stories have close equivalents in
the VH. Slightly different is the story of Ajinavati, told partly by her mother and partly by a servant, which corresponds to that of Nīlajāsā in the VH, except that there the mother's side of the story concerns her descent from the tīrthaṅkara Nami, passing by the deeds of Usabha. This last example shows how the Jain narrative, tending always to a complete history of the world, likes to take an occasion in the hero's wanderings for an excursus into dogma. Similarly the introduction of Mayapavega, a name known to the Kashmiri poets but not to Budhāsvāmin, leads to the story of Rāma; Amīyagati's introduction gives a home to the story of Pippalāda; and the Viṣṇu-song, which is merely alluded to in the BK versions of the Winning of Gandharvadattā, in the VH provides the occasion for telling the Jaina version of Viṣṇu's three paces. These examples could be multiplied. Briefly, the VH has all the "characterizing" stories (if one may so call them) that appear in the BKŚS, and indeed more; the stories of this kind that are found only in the VH are all expositions of the sacred history of the Jains. An exception to this rule is the characterizing story of Samudradinnā in the BKŚS, which forms part of the romantic sub-plot in Sānudāsa's story; the VH omits the sub-plot and with it the character of Samudradinnā and, of course, her characterizing story.

Another motivation for a minor story appears when one character uses the story as an example to warn, persuade, console or simply entertain another character. This is frequently a transparent device for linking together unconnected stories, so forming the nests and chains of narrative that make up the bulk of the work in the great storybooks of Europe and Asia: Ovid's Metamorphoses, the Thousand and one Nights, Boccaccio's Decamerone, Chaucer's Canterbury Tales; and, of course, the BK and the KSS, which if one
takes account of the proportion of minor to major stories in them are more story collections than lives of Naravāhanadatta. The BKŚŚ is another matter. Stories so introduced are fewer, and to the point. The intention of the narrator is always to influence in some way, never merely to entertain, his audience; let us call them "rhetorical" stories. Such are:

- Pingalikā (BKŚŚ sarga 4)
- Pukvasaka (5)
- Aṅgiras, Aṅrta and Sāvitrī (12)
- Nalinikā (19)
- the base rat (20)
- Drādhopayyana (21)
- Kundamālikā (22)

Of all such stories in the BKŚŚ, only one, that of Pingalikā, has its equivalent in the VH, in the story of Kosika and Kumdodarī, 216.16-21. The story of Kokkasa in the Dhamillahimā, VH 61.25 ff., has some elements in common with the story of Pukvasaka, but the two stories are hardly the same. In both these cases, besides, the context in which the story is told in the VH is quite different from that in the BKŚŚ.

It must be admitted that several factors complicate the use of evidence of this kind. There is the risk of begging the question in deciding which stories are about a character and which are told for effect, and the division that I have thus made is neither necessary nor sure. For example, the classification which Maten gives (BB 68-69) into autobiographical flashbacks and inserted stories, progressive and illustrative, cuts across mine and could lead to a different conclusion. Nevertheless, the distinction is clearer than one might have supposed to be due to chance, and it can
be said that in general the VH, where it has the same characters as the BKŚŚ, has the same characterizing stories, except that it adds stories from legendary history which the BKŚŚ does not have; by way of compensation the VH has none of the rhetorical stories of the BKŚŚ, though again it adds some of its own from legend, like the story of Ahallā which nearly persuades Vasudeva not to join Piyaṃkusundarī in the women's quarters. Since we have found that the VH contains material chosen apparently freely from the BK to suit the author's purpose, it seems unlikely that the author would have deliberately avoided using any of the rhetorical stories, and we must suppose that the version of the BK which he knew, though generally like the BKŚŚ, did not have these stories. What of the version that Budhasvāmin knew? The presence of two rhetorical stories, Piṅgalikā and Sāvitrī, in the BK M and the KSS argues that these at least are part of the BK tradition. As for the rest, it is impossible to tell whether they were part of the original BK but omitted from the version known to Saṅghadāsa, or whether they were added by Budhasvāmin.

It does not seem profitable to explore the idea of a descent in a single line between the VH and the BKŚŚ any further. Indeed it is only realistic to observe that a discussion of influence based on two survivors of by no means certain date from what must once have been a rich and complex tradition cannot hope to reach precise conclusions. So I propose to try another approach that the VH fortuitously leaves open, and which may give some insight into the complexity of the tradition. The procedure is the most objective of all: to search out faults in the narrative that the author could not have intended, in the sense that they arise not from conflation or compromise or change of context, which processes take place in
the creation of all story books, but from simple mechanical error. It is remarkable how all Sanghadāsa's mistakes have been reproduced intact, such is the respect of scribes for sacred books; for example, the false start in narration observed in note 2, page 86 above, or the unnecessary intervention of the villain described on page 98. But the most striking instances are in these passages in the VH where the narrative inexplicably lapses into the grammatical third person.

306.28 tao jahāgayām gayā devī vasudevavayaṭā "Then the goddess at Vasudeva's word departed the way she had come".1

307.17-20 tato sāmiṇā lavio — ambha vi dijjau sattāho tti "Then the master [i.e. Vasudeva] said to him, 'Grant me a week too'."

308.17 iyaro bhaṇai "The other [i.e. Vasudeva] said..."

369.12 vasudevo bhaṇati "Vasudeva said..."2

In another passage the first-person narrator, in this instance Bāṃdhumatī, cites a gāhā verse which is then paraphrased in the third person.3 It looks as if Sanghadāsa were engaged in turning a third-person narrative into a substantially first-person narrative. These lapses from the integrity of the narration have been faithfully preserved by the copyists; it is surely not the case that the author of the work was imitating another author's lapses. If this is so, then Sanghadāsa is shown not to be the originator of the VH, which is nothing remarkable. But it is remarkable that part of his contribution to the story was to take a text, obviously a written text (the

---

1 See the footnote in Sandesara’s translation, page 402.

2 In the text there follow the bracketed words mayā bhaṇiyam "I said".

3 See above, page 86.
gāhā mentioned above must be a fragment of this earlier text), and to recreate it making the hero tell his own story.

There are several reasons why he may have done this. He may have intended to make a true kathā of Vasudeva's adventures, though for that matter first-person narration is a form used by storytellers of all times and places, and needs no further explanation. Still, another kind of error suggests that Saṅghadāsa was at the same time imitating a work very like the BKŚŚ, and if that were the case then his reason for attempting to convert a third-person narrative to a first would be obvious. As has been demonstrated in the detailed analysis above, Saṅghadāsa apparently tried to reproduce the intricate motivation, in which the restricted point of view of first-person narration plays a vital part, of several episodes as we have them in the BKŚŚ. Sometimes he was successful — his handling of the story of Vegavatī is better than Budhasvāmin's — and sometimes he was not. We have seen that he failed to realize adequately his version of the Winning of Madanamañjukā, by not gathering up certain loose ends in the intrigue. It seems that he had simply not understood how the device of retrospective motivation worked here. Again, the author himself must be responsible for this error, which has been faithfully transmitted by copyists.

This is not a question of narrative logic, because the logic of Saṅghadāsa's version is the same as Budhasvāmin's. It is an involuntary mistake; contrast Budhasvāmin's wilful confusion of the reader in the story of Sānudāsa, where verisimilitude has been sacrificed for the surprise ending. In this case Saṅghadāsa has prudently kept to a simpler pattern of motivation: his Cārunātta is

1 Compare Lacôte, Essai, 282.
not subjected to the revelation that all his experiences of poverty, disaster and travel were in one way or another staged by his family. But the case of Suhirāṇa/Madanaṃjukā seems to prove the influence of a text like the BKŚS. Perhaps the story of Pumā/Priyadarśanā is also a proof, of a slightly different kind; I suggested above that the radical fault in Saṅghadāsa's version was due to censorship, but it may as well have been due to incomprehension, and in either case it betrays the author's use of a work more sophisticated than his own.

So much for the first-person narrative that he was imitating; now what of the underlying third-person text? We can observe that it was not simply a version of the Harivamsa cycle. The story of Piyaṃgusumdarī, from which come three of the four examples cited above of lapses into the third person, is part of the material which everything leads us to believe Saṅghadāsa inherited from the BK. That is to say, the third-person text containing Vasudeva's adventures on which he worked already contained material from the BK. In rewriting this text he was influenced by a sophisticated work very like the BKŚS that we have, from which he borrowed the devices of first-person narration and its concomitant, retrospective motivation; but this was not his primary source of BK story material. Saṅghadāsa's VH as we have it then reflects the influence of the BK tradition at two levels, matter and style, corresponding no doubt to two stages in the formation of Vasudeva's story. Indeed since the anomalous passage in a compressed, samāsena, style that appears as the beginning of the twenty-first lambha is most likely a later addition consisting of further BK material, we can even speak of three stages of influence.
Let us consider one further example of the complexity of the tradition. Subandhu in his Väsavadattā alludes to the BK of Guṇāḍhya by the name of the work and its author (pages 110, 147, Hall), and also mentions a wife of Naravāhanadatta called Priyaṅguśyāmā and a friend of hers called Priyadarśanā (pages 88, 236, Hall). Priyadarśanā appears in the BKŚŚ, but the name Priyaṅguśyāmā is not found in any surviving version. Lacôte, deploring the loss of an indeterminate number of genuine BK episodes, remarked that "nous ne possédons plus de la section Priyaṅguśyāmā-lambha que l'allusion que fait Subandhu..." (Essai, 228). He did not know that the VH has an episode concerning a girl similarly named, Priyaṅgusūpārī, whose story coincides in several respects with that of Bhagīrathayaśas in all the BK versions, and especially with her story in the BKŚŚ. Like Budhasvāmin's Bhagīrathayaśas she sends messages to the hero by means of his wife, the merchant's daughter; but like Bhagīrathayaśas in the BKM and the KŚŚ she is the daughter of the king of Śrāvasti, and she loses the hero when Prabhāvatī takes him to rejoin his lost love, Somasirī/Madanamañcukā. There are many possible explanations of this situation. Perhaps in the original BK the girl in question was called Priyaṅgu", and this was the version known to Subandhu, or perhaps the name given to her in the VH replaced her original name Bhagīrathayaśas in the version of the BK known to Subandhu. A further complication is that she is the daughter of the king of Vārāṇasī in the BKŚŚ. Though this seems anomalous in that both the VH and the Kashmiri versions set the scene in Śrāvasti, it is appropriate for the name that she bears: Glory of the father of the Ganges. Perhaps the setting at Vārāṇasī was an innovation in a branch of the tradition known to us through the BKŚŚ: a change of name accompanied this innovation and the new name
of BhagIrathayaśas then influenced the other versions of the story. There seems to be no way of deciding between these possibilities. This could be called a pessimistic view, but I believe that it is a view in the right direction for the study of the BK. A positive statement about the relationship between the VH and the BKŚŚ, and between these two works and the Kashmiri versions, must be an over-simplification. The survival of precisely these four works is probably fortuitous, and they should not be taken as necessarily representative of the tradition. To document the complications of their relationships one to the other is to throw light on a wider tradition that now has been narrowed down to them only. As to the nature of the original BK, we have studied that aspect of the narrator's art which always remains the same, within certain limits that can tentatively be defined: the story, or the raw narrative material. The other aspect, the plot, which is the raw material digested and reformed in the author's unique style, must remain beyond our comprehension. We can only turn to the surviving works and study their different individual treatments of the story.
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