Sanskrit Sub-story and Subhāṣītas in the Prakrit Paümappahasāmi Cariyam of Siri Devasūri

N. M. Kansara

The Śvetāmbara Jaina Ācārya Devasūri, who studied under Devendrasūri, was a disciple of Dharmaghoṣasūri, whose preceptorial genealogy went back to Bālacandrasūri of the Jālihara-gaccha, through Sarvānandasūri the author of the Pārśvanātha-carita, and Guṇabhaddrasūri¹. He flourished in the last quarter of the 12th century A. D., during the reign of the Caulukya monarch Bhīmadeva II of Gujarāt². In the year 1254 of the V. Era (A. D. 1197) he composed his Prakrit carita-kāvyā entitled Paümappaha-sāmi-cariya in response to a request by a Jaina mendicant named Viddaya, while stationed in a vasati of Pajjunna Seṭṭhi, in the city named Vaddhamāṇa (modern Vaḍhvān³ near Surendranagar in Saurashtra).

This work is in the form of a Prakrit biographical epic divided into four prastāvas. The First prastāva comprises 1735 gāthās, a Sanskrit sub-story in mixed prose and verse and entitled the ‘antaramā-kathā,’ followed by 37 gāthās: The second prastāva consists of 721 gāthās; the third contains 2130, while the fourth carries 1384 gāthās followed by the author’s encomium from gāthās 1385 to 1403. The manuscripts close the work proper with the words ‘Iti śrīmat-Padmaprabha-caritam samāptam,’ and mention the total number of gāthās to be 7232⁴.

As would be surprising in the case of a Prakrit work, we find in the first prastāva, a sub-story in Sanskrit containing an autobiographical account of mañcāmuni Arindama narrated by him in reply to a question by king Aparājitā⁵ who wanted to know the circumstances that led the Ācārya to
take to the Jaina monastic order and got himself initiated to that end. This sub-story starts just after the gāthā No. 1735 (p. 136) with which the story of prince Surasundara illustrating a case of bhāvanā comes to an end. It is called ‘Anta-raṅga-kathā’ (pp. 136-162).

It thus narrates the sub-story comprising the autobiography of the Muni named Arindama: Having listened to the discourse of the Muni who propounded the importance of the excellent religious duties pertaining to charity etc., the king and others readily accepted it in toto. At the end of the discourse, king Aparājita respectfully requested him to oblige him by telling him as to why did he take to renunciation in young age. The Muni asked him to come next day, since the account was expected to take some more time than was then available. The king came back the next day in the morning and repeated the request. Muni Arindama then started his narration with the remark that the reason which led him to renounce worldly life was instrumental to a similar result in the case of all other’s too, including himself, as also the king. There was a city named Asāṃvyavahāra, where lived innumerable people called Anādi-vanaspāti. Their feudal lord was named Tivra-mohodaya, and his minister who was an expert in worldly ways was known by the name Atyantabodha. Through these two, king Karma-parināma had promulgated an ordinance that people lived in such a way that it seemed they were sleeping or swooning or dead, being bereft of any activity whatsoever. Once a messenger named Niyoga arrived and informed the king about a city named Mañju-gati, surrounded by a castle called Mānusottara-naga encircled by a circular ditch in the form of oceans named Puṣkarodā etc. There were in this city temples in the form of five Meru, a number of market places named Mahāvidēha with rows of palaces named Bharata, Aiṟavata, Haimavata and others. And there were two suburbs named Jambūdvīpa and Dhātākikhaṇḍa. This was the very city in which were born all the 63 Śalākā-purusas, comprising Cakravartis, Jinas, and others. And here then ruled the king Karma-parināma. He had a queen named Karma-parināti. Both of them were engrossed in enjoying the dramatic performances and playing the parts of various transmigratory beings on the stage of the world sporting the forms of gods, human beings, creatures of hell, birds, handsome, ugly, melodious, harsh, happy, and unhappy et cetera.
Once their prince, named Mahāmoha, respectfully informed the king about the calamity that had befallen his kingdom. The calamity was that Prince Santōṣa, the son of king Čāritra had kidnapped innumerable citizens of his kingdom to his city named Śivapurī, with the assistance of his minister named Samyag-dārśana and thus though accompanied by his whole army he was defeated. Thereupon the king ordered his army to uproot the Vivekānanda fortress of king Čāritra and throw the king into the ocean. At that moment the minister named Mithyādarśana requested him to delegate Prince Mahāmoha in his company to capture Prince Santōṣa alive and bring him there. Lokasthitī, the sister of the king also supported the plan of the minister. The king, therefore, agreed and sent a messenger named Tanniyoga to fetch as many of the citizens as were led away by Prince Santōṣa. On the other hand, the Prince and the minister of king Karma-parināma camped on the bank of the river named Pramattatā in the forest named Cittavṛtti. Tanniyoga was accompanied by Tīvra-mohodaya who showed him numerous palaces in which were innumerable apartments in which were housed countless citizens. Then Tīvramohodaya asked the minister how he should attract the citizens. The minister suggested that they have a beloved named Bhavitavyatā, having numerous forms, and having full control over all of them, who should be consulted as to which of the citizens should be transported. At this, Bhavitavyatā was summoned and consulted in the matter. She advised that she would despatch Sāṁsāri-jiva and others like him. Then, she operated from the Sāṁyavahāra city and wandered in the Sādhāraṇa-vanaspati street along with Tīvra-mohodaya and Anantābodha attracting the citizens and despatched them to innumerable births of innumerable species. Now, the beloved of Bhavitavyatā, called Sāṁsārijiva, wandered from birth to birth in these innumerable species of plants and enjoyed or suffered so much that it would be beyond human calculations. When he was at last tired of all this, his wife Bhavitavyatā told him, by way of consoling, that he would have a better luck in due course and then led him in the species of cow, and he was born as a bull. He was yoked to a cart to carry heavy burdens. In due course he broke up and sank in pain. His owner, the caravan-leader Kāmadeva took pity on him, and two munis uttered the Pañca-parameśṭhi mantra in his ear; this was as per the prediction of Bhavitavyatā. Bhavitavyatā reminded him that this was the excellent mantra she had predicted about. The bull listened to the Munis
and gladly accepted the mantra. Consequently, after death, the bull was reborn as a son named Vardhanakunjara of king Vairasimha and queen Nandadevi. In this new embodiment he happened to make friends with two reliable twin brothers named Punyodaya and Dhumaadhvaja. Vardhanakunjara mastered 72 arts and crafts. In view of his progress in education and other good qualities, king Vairasimha consulted an astrologer who also was an expert palmist, with regard to the prince's suitability for inheriting the responsibility of kingship after himself. The astronomer warned that, despite all the education and good qualities, the prince was getting perverted due to the influence of his bad companion named Vaissvanara. The king was rather dejected, but the palmist assured him that the prince will part company with this companion when he is married to princess Ksanti, the daughter of king Subhaparina and queen Nisprakampata ruling in the city named Citta-saundarya. Then, the king proposed to depute the astrologer to king Subhaparinama with an offer of his daughter's marriage with his prince, but the astrologer asked him to wait for proper time and not to hurry. And, prince Vardhanakunjara used to quarrel and fight due to instigation from his bad companion. Once, when the king was about to mount an attack on a troublesome feudatory Kalaesena, the prince took initiative himself and captured the feudatory alive, who was presented before the king and the latter released him after imposing heavy fine on him. From that day, the prince regarded Vaissvanara as his well-wisher and a favourite friend.

Once the prince went to a forest named Svaheha with his twin friends and there he saw a man standing on an anthill named Ucchaya and with a noose and about to commit suicide. The man bound his head in the noose and released himself from the branch, in the presence of the prince. But the prince cut off the noose and saved him. Even then the man tried to attempt suicide once again. When asked for the reason for his rashness and desperation, the man related the following account about his misfortune.

The man, whose name was Sparshana, said: 'I had a very dear and close friend named Janru who always conducted himself in a manner totally to my liking. Once, deceived by a man named Susamaya, he began to look upon Sparshana as a dangerous person and, being instigated by Susamaya, he would resort to picking up my hair, making me sleep on bare ground,
moving in hot sunshine etc. I thought he has deserted me, but due to affection for him I continued to follow him. In due course he scolded and deserted me and went away to the city named Nirvṛti. Now, since I cannot bear separation from this friend any longer, I want to die.'

Prince Vardhanakunñjara consoled him and promised that he would make friendship with him. At that moment Sparśana entered the body of the prince by his mystic power. Vaiśvānara disliked this new friendship, while Puñyodaya recommended it. The prince returned to his palace and treated his new friend with lavish luxuries. After a few days a messenger brought the news that a princess of the king of the Kaliṅga country was seeking his permission to come to marry the prince out of her own choice, impressed as she was by the qualities of the prince. The prince asked him about the distance at which the country was situated from his place. When the messenger told that it was at a distance of 2000 yojanas, the prince challenged him to prove the statement. At this juncture it was decided to measure the distance, and one who proved wrong should be punished. The messenger told him that it was not necessary to measure the distance afresh since the milestones were already been erected on the way. The prince took it as his insult and was enraged. But king Vairasimha intervened. Even then the prince could not be pacified and in his rage he killed both the king and the messenger. There was considerable unrest in the city when this mishap was known by the citizens. When queen Nandādevī tried to ward him away, the prince tried to kill her too under the instigation of Vaiśvānara, and she was beheaded. All the feudatories and inmates of the royal household were aghast at this and they overpowered the prince and threw him in a dark room and locked it from outside. At night when the citizens and the queens with their paraphernalia were resting after performing the obsequies and profuse lamenting after the royal couple, the prince conspired with his sinful friend, broke open the doors, came out, and threw fire in every house of the city and left with a bow and arrow in his hands. After some time he reached a village named Kuśasthala, and being thirsty he went to the bank of a lake just outside the village. There he saw a beautiful Cāndāla woman taking bath. At this moment his friend Sparśa inspired him to enjoy her touch, and the prince entered into the water and started embracing her. She too got interested in him and coöperated. But, by misfortune, her husband who was a king of the mlecchas,
arrived there to join his beloved in her water-sport, and on seeing her in such a situation challenged the prince and his friends. In the end all of them died in a battle. The prince and his friends were thus consigned to the sixth hell, where he suffered for a very long time. After that their souls wandered from birth to birth in the species like fish, serpent, lion, falcon etc. At last, when his sins were exhausted, he was born as prince Mahāpadma, the son of king Ghanaratha and his queen Prabhavatī in the city of Vārānasī. There he made friendship with Sāgaraka, the son of Rāgakesarī, and was educated in a number of arts and crafts. Then, prince Vicakṣaṇa, the son of king Šubhodaya and queen Nijacārutā, too, happened to be his friend. This latter prince was married to a princess named Buddhī, the daughter of king Kalmaṣakṣaya and queen Sundaratā, by way of her own choice. Her father was much worried and sent his son Vimarśa to inquire about her well being. And, Vimarśa stayed for long with his sister. In due course Buddhī gave birth to a son who was named Prakarṣa.

Then once both Mahāpadma and Vicakṣaṇa went to a forest named Vadanakoṭara. There they saw a beautiful young maiden. Mahāpadma was spellbound, but Vicakṣaṇa led him away. Seeing them go away, her maid-servant cried that her mistress was dying for want of a resort and a master. Having heard this, Mahāpadma returned and Vicakṣaṇa followed him due to his insistence. On seeing them the maiden regained consciousness and welcomed them. They asked for her identity, and the maid-servant replied that she is the famous Rasanā and she herself was named Lalitā. Mahāpadma was happy at this and took the maiden along with her maidservant to his residence, while Vicakṣaṇa pretended that both these ladies were alone in the forest. The prince presented her to king Šubhodaya. The king consulted his family and then asked Vicakṣaṇa to test her nature. The latter suggested that his brother-in-law Vimarśa should do it, and he was allowed a period of a year to accomplish the task. When Vimarśa started to go, his nephew Prakarṣa, too, was sent with him due to the latter’s insistence to go with his maternal uncle. Both of them went to Campā, Šrāvasti, Vinatā, Rājagrha, etc., and roamed for six months but could not find her purity; hence they entered the city named Rājasa-citta, which they found almost empty. They enquired of a soldier named Mithyābhimāna why it was empty. He replied that since you are born in the island you should pursue this matter. They replied that since they were just travellers he should not be
offended. Then he disclosed the reason as follows: 'This city is ruled by the king named Rāgakesari. Once he ordered his minister Viṣayābhilāsa to manage in such a way that the whole world would accept his orders, and would never think of any other master. The minister promised to accomplish it within a few days, and ordered his five sons named Sparśana, Rasana, Ghrāna, Caksu and Śrottra to conquer the world. They implemented his orders in a few days. But after some days the officers of the king got a report that the wicked Santoṣa had defeated the king's servants and kidnapped some people to the great city named Mukti. The king was all rage and started for war and marched so long as a messenger named Viṣaya-vyāsanaṃgā met him and informed that king Mahāmoha has already started from the Karma-parināma country with a great army for punishing Santoṣa. Hence, the king Rāgakesari should immediately join the forces. At this point the king thought that he has already started, and now the country of Moharāja, too, has been caught in similar situation. Thus, Rāgakesari, too, mounted, along with Viṣayābhilāsa and started for the battle. This is why the city is empty.'

Then, Vimarśa asked as to the whereabouts of the army. Mithyābhimāna took them to be spies and replied that the king was in Tamasacitta with his army. They took leave of him and went further. While going, Vimarśa told Prakarṣa that they have found at least some purity of Rasana. For full information they should enquire with Viṣayābhilāsa. Gradually, they arrived at the Tamasacitta city. When they were entering it, they saw there a smoke-complexioned guard surrounded by a few persons named Dainya, Ākranda, Rodana, and others. When they asked as to who was the king, the guard replied that the ruler was named Dveṣagajendra, a younger brother of Rāgakesari. He also has mounted an attack on Santoṣa, and at that moment his army was camping on the bank of the river Pramattatā in a great forest named Cittavṛtti, and has attacked the enemy. Then they reached the said forest and saw the river on the bank at which the army of Moharāja was making much noise. Their eyes then fell upon a big pandal named Cittavikṣepa. And, in it they saw king Mahāmoha, surrounded by feudal chieftains, sitting on the throne named Viparyaya, possessing very fearful limbs called Avidyā, repeatedly stroking his mustache full of tufts of hair in the form of bad obstinacy, looking at the three worlds through his two eyes in the form of Rajas and Tamas, having a dark-coloured body comparable
to a multitude of Tamāla trees, given to self-possessiveness, and victor of the gods and demons. Having seen him even Vimarśa and Prakarṣa were perturbed and stood at a distance and did not enter the hall. Then Prakarṣa asked Vimarśa to describe to him the nature of each of the feudal chieftains. Vimarśa then pointed out to the highly plump queen named Mahāmūḍhatā, to the chief minister Mithyādarśana sitting close to the king on the seat of wrong apprehensions and authorised for all actions to be implemented. capable of shouldering the responsibility of inventing all the heretic and controversial tenets, raising the series of hail-storms of controversies, and observing the whole world through his cruel and crooked eyes, to Rāgakesarī sitting on a throne called Praṇaya to the right of the king, possessing the triple form of desire, affection, and love-at-first-sight, master of the city of Rajasa-cītra, and having an extremely red complexion. Then, he informed him about his prince named Lobha and princess named Māyā, both of whom absent in the hall, since they might have gone out for conquering the world. Next he drew attention to Dveṣagajendra sitting to the left of the king, to his two absent princes named Vaiśvānara and Šailarāja, to the rear bodyguard Makaradvajā, to the minister Viṣayābhilāsa the father of Rasanā, to the minister’s servants named Hāsyā, Arati, Bhaya, Jugupsā, etc., to the feudal chiefs named Jhānāvaraṇa, Darśanāvaraṇa, Antarāya, Avidya, Āyus, et cetera. At last, he advised Prakarṣa to quickly leave the place, go to Vicakṣaṇa, and report to him all that they have seen.’

The narration in prose here comes to an end, but the story continues as the metrical account consisting of 119 verses, as follows. Both Vimarśa and Prakarṣa reported to Vicakṣaṇa. He ordered that Rasanā should be appointed as a queen and put in charge of speaking truth, with the provision of restraining her from lust, so that she will not back out from her promise. Thus, prince Mahāpadma who was informed about the purity of Rasanā, could not know the true nature of things, and pleased her by enabling her to enjoy wine, meat, etc., and took only her to be the essence of this worthless, terrible, transmigratory world. He would not be satisfied with ample luxuries bestowed by the king, and was under the control of Lobha, the son of Rāgakesarī. Lobha inspired greediness in him, and Māyā entered into him. Both of them instigated the prince to kill or capture his father and snatch the kingdom from him. Thereafter, Lobha advised the prince to kill all the sons, lest they may snatch power from him in future like him.
But a far-sighted minister Taitali informed the queen Manoramā about all this, and took away a new-born son and replaced him by his own daughter named Mantrapriyā just after his birth to his place since both the queen and minister's wife gave birth to their children on the same day. Having known that the newly born child was a daughter, the king did not kill her, and his son named Padma began to grow as the son of the minister and gradually mastered all the arts and crafts in due course. The queen Rasāṇā used to fondle her son secretly, but when asked by the king Mahāpadma she spoke the truth to him. Now, once the father king Megharatha broke loose from the captivity and rushed to kill his son, and in the fight both of them killed one another, and roamed in the cycle of transmigration. Then, the Saṁsāri-jīva was born as a daughter named Lākṣmīvatī of Dhanyakā in the city of Viṣālā. But just after her marriage, she became, by ill-luck, a widow. In view of her consideration about blame and character, she studied numerous works about the Jaina tenets, and consequently the enemies like Krodha and Lobha etc., left her and she became steadfast in Samyakṛta, controlled her senses, ever enthusiastic for listening to Jainistic tenets and performing religious vows. If she continues in this way she will, after death, go to the city of Nīrvāṇa or Anuttara-vimāna.

When this report was given to king Moharāja, he strode his moustache and challenged his feudal chieftains to come forward to capture the widow and make her obedient to him. All of them remained quiet, but there arose a mystic woman named Vitatha and took up the gauntlet, and she was entrusted with the task. She went to Lākṣmīvatī and entered her body. As a result, Lākṣmīvatī was totally changed in nature, and started leaking political secrets, criticising the conduct, dress, language, environment, etc. of various countries irrelevantly and indulging in gossip. And she forgot the study of the scriptures and all knowledge that she had acquired. Once she talked about an impossible scandal pertaining to king Viṣāvaseṇa, and it spread among people. Ultimately it reached the ears of the king who traced its source to her, and the enraged king punished her by cutting off her ears and lips, and excommunicated her. While roaming in a forest, she was bitten by a snake and she died, and was born as a being in the Fourth Hell. Then, this same Saṁsāri-jīva was born as a prince named Narasundara, the son of king Śrājasimha. In young age he studied arts and having listened to religious discourse of a well-wishing preceptor, became detached and
got initiated in Jaina monastical order. He studied all the Jaina scriptures, and this pleased the preceptor who conferred on him in due course the title of an ‘ācārya’. He followed proper conduct, engaged himself in doing good to people, and defeated the debaters. Then, with all his army of religious merit, he went out of his fortress to fight out with king Moharāja to the finish. There was a fierce battle and ultimately the king was vanquished, and he accepted the life of restraint. The army of king Ċārtitra was afraid and ran away to a mountain fortress named Viveka. The Samsāri-jīva of Moharāja, on the other hand, got lazy in vows of restraint, meditation and vow of silence and neglected religious duties, thinking himself to be a learned man, an authority, a topmost poet, and took pride in having a multitude of disciples, and gradually slipped into luxurious way of living; when the disciples were sitting for listening to his discourse, he would indulge in sleep without worrying about his responsibilities. And, after some time, he lost all his knowledge of the scriptures. After death, he again subjected himself to roaming in the cycle of transmigration getting born in various species of insects, birds, and animals.

King Aparājita was highly astonished by this account of the Samsārijīva, and was curious about his whereabouts and fate at the moment. At this the Muni replied that he himself was the same samsāri-jīva. When the king asked him how he reached this state, he informed him that his soul was in due course born as Prince Arindama, the son of the Vidyādhara, king Bhānu in the city of Gaganavallabha. He mastered all lore and arts and out of curiosity went to Mahāvideha country where he happened to listen to a story of Tīrthaṅkara at the feet of Bhadraṅkara. When he came to recall his past births, he undertook a vow and, due to inspiration from his beloved Bhavitavyatā mounted an attack under the leadership of king Ċāritradharma, and routed Moharāja. Finally, the Muni revealed that all this is his own autobiographical account. And, he assured the king of his bright future on the path of Kevala-jñāna. And the king ruled for long time and prospered. Here the Sanskrit metrical narration also ends.

It is clear from the above story that the poet-author of the PPC has composed this allegorical sub-story in Sanskrit to invest it with an aura of a noble narrative related by an equally noble soul in a matching refined language, perhaps keeping in mind the ancient custom of Sanskrit-Prakrit
dramas wherein noble character speaks in Sanskrit. Further, he may have resorted to showing off his bilingual poetic skill inasmuch as such a feat was prestigious and popular among the poets and known among the rhetoricians as the Maniśravāla style, which is adopted also by our poet's predecessors like Vardhamāna-sūri and Śrī-candrasūri. In fact almost all the classical Sanskrit dramas are originally composed in this style, since different characters use different languages like Sanskrit and various Prakrits. Rājaśekhara has prescribed the mastery of various languages and skill in depiction of various sentiments as essential for a supreme poet (kavirāja)*, and all the classical poets naturally strived to exhibit their poetic competence to reach up to this standard, long before Rājaśekhara and subsequent to him. This was because both Sanskrit and Prakrit existed side by side and both generally were popular and understood by people at large and specifically the élite. The Maniśravāla style comprises in composing parts of the text of a work in different languages, here Sanskrit and Prakrit, much in the same way as a goldsmith or a jeweller would string together a necklace of coral (pravāla) by interspersing it with gems (maṇi), to enhance its beauty and charm.

The sub-story presents an allegorical narrative which is a very brief resumé of the story, much in the style, of the famous Upamiti-bhava-prapañcā-kathā of Siddhārṣi (A. D. 906), in which the author's intention is that the reader should compare himself with the hero Saṁsāri-jīva (transmigratory soul), and thus as it were be warned of the dangers lurking in transmigration. The idea is to present the vices, virtues, and neutral principles of life in typical characters, which the reader may use as a standard of comparison (upamiti) to judge his own life. The Jaina understanding of life and of the universe of transmigration is presented here and the aim is to teach the way to release (mokṣa) or bliss (nirvāṇa). It is shown further that the vices produce unhappiness and the virtues the happiness even in transmigration, besides being respectively obstacles and aids to escape from it. The idea of an allegory arises from the personification of the vices, virtues and so on as characters in the story, as for instance, here the Saṁsāri-jīva himself is such an allegorical character, being typical of all such souls?.

Now about the Subhāṣitas. Devasūri has inserted about 24 Subhāṣitas, out of which some have been authored by others and merely quoted by him.
The *Subhāṣitas* utilised in the PPC are the following ones:

1. *Pariksya satkulaṁ vidyāṁ śilam śauryaṁ surūptāṁ /
   vdhīr-dadāti nipuṇaṁ kanyāṁ-iva daridratām //1.410. p. 32.*

   This is quoted (*utkāṁ ca*) in support of the point that good people are generally very poor. (It also occurs in the *Sārvagadhara-paddhati* [405].)

2. *Aksī-pakṣma kadā luptaṁ chindyaṇe'tha śīrōrahāḥ /
   vardhamānātmanāṁ eva prasaṅginyo vipattayah // 1.672, p. 53.*

   This confirms the idea that only great men normally are subject to calamities.

3. *Yadi bhavati dhanena dhanī kṣītitala-nihītena bhoga-rahitena/
   vasmād vayam api dhaninaḥ tiṣṭhati naḥ kāṇcano Meruḥ //
   1.1038, p. 81.*

   This verse shows the uselessness of merely accumulating wealth and not using for even one’s own comforts. It occurs in the *Pañcatantram* (1.192).

4. *Rājyaṁ vā vanavāso vā dhanam vā nidhanaṁ tathā /
   jānaṁ janaśādihināṁ sarvasatputra-ceṣṭitam //1.1038, p. 82.*

   This verse is quoted in connection with the excommunication of Prince Samarasiṁha by his father king Puruṣacandra, for the former’s generous nature.

5. *Sakhyā buddhyā na yat sādhyāṁ sahasā sāhasena ca /
   tat syad vacanamātreṇa kāryaṁ punyavatam dhrvam//
   1.1053, p. 83.*

   This is quoted with reference to the incident of verbal help rendered by prince Samarasiṁha to alchemists to accomplish their task of transforming metals like copper into gold.

6. *Rājye sāram vasudhā vasudhayāṁ puraṁ pure saudhanī /
   saudhe talpaṁ talpe varāṅganānāṅga-sarvasvam //1.1136, p. 89.*

   This is quoted in support of the proposal of princess Rayaṇamaṇjarī to marry with the prince Samarasiṁha. It occurs in the *Kāvyālaṁkāra* of Rudraṭa (7.97) and has been quoted by Mammata also in his *Kāvyaprakāśa* (10.37) as an illustration of the *sāra* figure of speech.
7. Sattvānām caritāṃ citraṅg kraṇaṃ gatiḥ / 
    nārī-puruṣa-toyanām śrūyate c-antarān mahāt //

1.1155(1154 ?) p. 90.

This verse has not been quoted as somebody else’s verse, as it is not introduced by the words ‘uktam ca’, but rather as verse (siloga) uttered by a bard.

8. Bhāva-sudhir-manuṣyasya vijñeyā sarva-vastuṣu / 
    anyathā” liṅgyate kāntā bhāven duhitā ’nyathā //1.1284, p.100.

This is quoted by way of emphasising the importance of attitude and different results accruing from the same action performed with different attitudes.

9. Yat sarva-viṣayā-kāṅkṣodbham sūkham praśyate sarāgeṇa / 
    tad-ananta-koti-guṇitam mudhaiva labhate vītarāgaḥ //

1.9(1784 ?) p. 162.

This is quoted to support the superiority of detachment to attachment in point of obtaining the amount of happiness, here or hereafter.

10. Rātrau jānur divā bhānuḥ kṛśānuḥ sandhyayor dvayoh / 
    loke nītam iti śītam jānubhānuṣānubhiḥ //2.327, p. 190.

This verse is quoted in the context of describing the condition of Padmaprabha after he left home and lived like a poor man. It occurs in the Bhojaprabandha (233), with the reading ‘Paśya śītam mayā nītam’ in the third quarter.

11. Punar-api sahanīyo duḥkha-pātaś tavāyam 
    na hi bhavati vināśaḥ kraṇam saṅcitānām/
    Iti saha ganayitvā yad yadāyati samyak 
    sad-asad iti viveko ’nyatra bhūyaḥ kutas te //

2.665, pp. 216-217.

This verse is quoted to emphasise that one who shoulders the responsibility of kingship has to incur many sins and has to suffer accordingly.

12. Yadṛcchadh vipulāṃ prōṭim tṛṇi tatra na kārayet / 
    vivādam artha-samrāmbham parokṣe dāra-darśanam //

This is quoted in the context of an incident of a quarrel that arose among friends.

13. Na viśvase grāma-kūṭasya jivi(? va)to 'pi mṛtasya vā
   eka-grdhrāparādhena sarve grdhrāḥ nipātītāḥ //3.80, p. 227.

This is quoted as the essence of an animal-folklore of vultures, narrated in connection with not putting one's trust in statements that are contrary to the tenets of religious duties, the folklore runs from Gāthās 3.70-79.

14. Patitam vismṛtam naṣṭam sthitam sthāpitam-āhitam /
    adattam nādadīta svam parākhyam kvacit sudhiḥ //

3.745, p. 279.

This verse is cited in connection with the remark expressing repentance for entertaining greediness for the lost wealth.

15. Kallořād api budbudād api calad-vidyud-vilāsād api
    jimutād api marutād api tarat-tārkṣyordhva-pakṣād api
    Citram citram ayaṁ cala tribhuvane kim śrīr-na te śemukhi
    naivam kim khala-saṅgatir na na nanu śtri-jātir asyai namah //

3.1049, p. 303.

This verse is quoted in connection with a statement that even gods, who know all the arts and crafts, fail to know even the least about the conduct or character of woman-folk.

16. Ślok-āṛddhen-aiva tad vakyāye yad-uktam grantha-kotibhiḥ /
    trṣṇā ca sampartyaktā prāptam ca paramam padam //

3.1596, p. 346.

This verse is cited for stressing the supreme importance of uprooting the creeper of avidity. It is modelled on, and hence reminiscent of, the famous verse of Śaṅkarācārya the second half of which runs as 'Brahma satyam jagan-mithyā jivo brahm-aiva nāparaḥ'.

17 Saṁprāpyam mokṣa-saukhyam
    yatibhir-asilatā-vāsa-tulyais tapobhir
    matvaivam viśva-vettā nami-vinami-
    bhujā-danda-nistimśa-yaṣṭau /
    Śaṅke saṅkrānta-mūrtiś-carati gurutapo yaḥ svayaṁ mokṣa-hetum
pratyūha-ṛṇyūha-nāśaṁ diśatu (sa)

This verse is a prayer and it is introduced with the words ‘Tathā hi’. It seems to be the composition by the author himself, resorting to Sanskrit in view of the noble occasion and purpose.

18. Bhuyo yojana-bhūma-durgama-tamam nirgamya yaḥ prāntaram
pratyakṣi- kurute jagat-traya-patim viśva-priyam bhāvukaḥ /
Śrīman-Nābhi-narendra-gotra-tilakam devam dhruvam vikṣite
mokṣas tena tu (saṁ-)vyatītpa (? tya) rabhasā saṁsāra-
kakṣāntaram // 3.1758-59 (1757 ?), p. 358.

This is also a prayer in continuation with the previous verse, and clearly authored by the poet himself.

19. Hūyate na tapyate na diyate vā na kiñcana /

This verse is quoted in support of the statement that ‘siddhi’ is obtained only by equanimity (saṁabhāva), even without performing meditation, charity, yoga, or austerity.

20. Upādhyāyād daśācaryā ācāryaṇāṁ śataṁ pitaḥ /
sahasraṁ tu pitur-mātā gauravēṇātipravāya // 4.491, p. 429.

This is quoted to justify the honour given to his mother by a son. This verse occurs in the Manusmrṭī (2.145) with a slight variation, namely ‘upādhyāyān’ and ‘pitrā’.

21. Bījana eva hi bijam kṣetraṁ bhavatiha tadvatām eva /
durlalitam aḥināthe nirṇayāṁ enaṁ svayaṁ cakre // 4.547, p. 430.

This verse is but almost a Sanskrit version of a similar gāthā in which the author says : ‘Loē pasiddham eyaṁ biyam naṇu hoi biyavarṇitassa / khittarṁ tu khettiyassa ita vi iṭhaṁ vicintēha // (4.542).

22. Śreyo viśaṁ upabhokturnāṁ kṣamaṁ bhave kriḍiturī hutāsena /
saṁsārabandhana-gatair na tu pramādāḥ kṣamaḥ kartum //

23. Tasyāṁ-eva hi jātau naram upahanyād viśaṁ hutāsō vā /
These two verses are quoted in support of the statement to the effect that one should not be unwary in one’s efforts on the path of liberation.

24. Dāne tapasi śaurye ca vijñāne vinaye naye /
     vismayo na hi kartavyo bahu-ratnā vasundhārā // 4.787, p. 449.

This is quoted to emphasize that even though one may be possessed of fortitude, bravery, cleverness, and good characteristics, one should not be unduly proud of it. This verse occurs in the Śāṅgadhara-paddhati (1477).

25. Yat paraloka-viruddham yaj-laįįkāram-ihaiva jana-madhya /
     antyāvasthāyam-api tad-akaraṇīyam na karaṇīyam //
     4.1021, p. 468.

This is quoted in connection with a mental reservation on the part of a prince when a kāpālīka asks him to kill a maiden.

26. Apāya-sata-labdha-sya prāṇebhyo'pi gariyasaḥ /
     Gatir-ekaiva vitta-sya dānam-anyā vipattayaḥ //

27. Grāsadd-ardham-api grāsam-arthibhyah kim na dīyate /
     icchānurūpo vibhavaḥ kadā kasya bhaviṣyati //

These two verses are quoted in support of the Jaina vow of Atithi-samvibhāga or sharing the food with a guest or supplicant mendicant. Out of these two verses, the first is a composition of the famous Bhartṛhari9 with a slight variation, namely, ‘Āyāsa-’ at the start of the quarter, while the second verse occurs in the Pañcatantra (2.73).

28. Vayam bālye dīmbhāns-taruṇīmanī yūnaḥ pariṇatāv /
     apīcchaṁo vrddhān pariṇaya-vidhau naḥ sthitir iyam /
     Tvayā 'rabdhaṁ janna kṣapayitum amārgena vidhīnā
data me gotre putri kvacid api sati-lāṅchanaṁ abhūt //

This is quoted in connection with the incident of a maiden who has retained the memory of her beloved of the previous birth and consequently does not take interest in any young man in this birth; it is meant to denigrate the ideal of marital fidelity and promote the practice of free-love. This verse occurs in the Śāṅgadhara-paddhati (3761), with slight variation, namely, ‘bālān’ for ‘dīmbhaṁ’ in the first quarter, and ‘anenaikapatinā’ for ‘amārgena vidhīnā’ in the third quarter.
29. Asraddheyaṁ na vaktavyāṁ pratyakṣaṁ yadi drṣyate /
    tathā vānara-saṅgitam tathā tarati sā śilā // 4.1193, p. 481.

This is quoted to emphasize that one should not talk about impossible matters to elders, even though one might have seen them with their own eyes. This verse has been preserved in the Subhāṣita-ratna-bhāṇḍāgāra (p. 162, no. 416) with some variations, namely, ‘Asambhāvyam’ at the beginning of the first quarter, ‘api for ‘yadi’ in the second quarter, and ‘śilā tarati pāṇiyam’ and ‘gitam gāyati vānaraḥ’ with the exchange of the third and the fourth quarters.

30. Jivantyaṁ api yady upātti dayito manye kalaṅkas tadā
tasmin snigdha-jane viyogini katham prāṇān nidadhyaṁ aham /
Mṛtyuś-cen na hi tat-samāgaṇa-sukham tasyāpi mṛtyur-dhruvaṁ
kaṣṭaṁ tad-viraho vikalpa-bahulaṁ dolāyate me maṇaḥ //
4.1211, p. 483.

This is quoted by way of a reflection by Anaṅgasenā when her companions try to lure her to a life of a free-lancer.

31. Hasati hasati svaminy-uccai rudaty-atiroditi
    kṛta-parikaram śvedovāri pradhāvatī dhāvati /
Guna-samuditaṁ doṣopetāṁ praṇindati nindati
dhana-lava-parikritam jantuṁ praṇṛtyati nṛtyati //
4.1275, p. 488.

This is quoted to condemn those who have made their selves subservient to their masters for the sake of a few bucks.

32. Ardhaṁ bhūpatim-avāya tato dhanāṁ
    bhokṣyāmahe kila vayam satām sukhaṁ /
    Ity āśayā bata vimohita-mānasānāṁ

This is quoted in connection with the reflection of a son who finds his father suffering even after serving a king for a long time. This verse occurs in the Subhaśīta-vali (3258) of Vallabhadeva, with some variations, namely, ‘bhuiḍāmahe’ for ‘bhokṣyāmahe’ and ‘vayam iha’ for ‘kila vayam’ in the second quarter, and ‘jagāma’ for ‘prayāti’ in the last one.

33. Kartum na prakaṭaṁ sphurā-ṇava-ṇava-praṇḍhārtha-drśtiṁ mayā
    no tattvāni nivesṭum atra bhagavat-siddhānta-siddhāni vā //
Naiva khyāpayitum vyadhāyi caritaṁ rītim vidarbhdhavāṁ bhaktiṁ kintu punaḥ punar na gaditaṁ sīrī-padma-lakṣma-

This verse is meant to express the author’s intention behind undertaking the composition of this Carita-mahākāvyā, and is a part of the Praśasti composed in Prakrit Gāthās.

34. Tarkān adhītya devendra-guroḥ siddhvāntam-āditah /
Śrī-Haribhadrasūribhyaś-caritaṁ nirvāmme mayā // 4.1401.

This verse is also a sort of acknowledgement about his teachers by the author, and forms a part of the Prakrit Praśasti, which is not composed separately, but rather as a part of the Fourth Prastāva, from Gāthās 1378 to the last one, i.e. 1403. It is noteworthy that this fashion of incorporating Sanskrit Subhāṣitas was popular with our author’s predecessors like Vardhamānasūri and Candrasūri also. And, further, it is noteworthy that the poet seems to have given the colophones, marking the intervening sub-stories, in Sanskrit, as for instance ‘Iṭī dāna-dharme Harisapāla-kathānakam’ (p. 35), ‘Iṭī tapasi Rohiṅkathā samāptā’ (p. 99), ‘Iṭy-antarāṅga-kathā samāptā’ (p. 162), ‘Iṭi śrī-Padmaprabha-caritaṁ samāptāṁ’ (p. 499), etc. At the end of the work, the final Praśasti by the Saṁgha and the scribe is also in Sanskrit.

Annotations:
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   Guṇabhaddasūri gurunō ... (4.1386) ... Savvānamdaguru ... (4.1387) cariyaṁ sīrī-Pasāsānissā ... (4.1388) ...sīrī-Dhammagnosapatuṇe ... (4.1389) ... Tappaya-
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samayammi //
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