

# Sanskrit Sub-story and Subhāṣitas 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 geneology went back to Bālacandrasūri of the Jālihara-gaccha, through Sarvānandasūri the author of the *Pārśvanātha-carita*, and Guṇabhadrasūri<sup>1</sup>. He flourished in the last quarter of the 12th century A. D., during the reign of the Caulukya monarch Bhīmadeva II of Gujarat<sup>2</sup>. In the year 1254 of the V. Era (A. D. 1197) he composed his Prakrit *carita-kāvya* 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 Vaḍhvāṇ<sup>3</sup> 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 '*antaramṅga-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-caritaṃ samāptam*', and mention the total number of *gāthās* to be 7232<sup>4</sup>.

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 mahāmuni Arindama narrated by him in reply to a question by king Aparājita<sup>5</sup> 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 Asaṁvyavahāra, where lived innumerable people called Anādi-vanaspati. 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-pariṇāma 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 Mañuja-gati, surrounded by a castle called Mānuṣottara-naga encircled by a circular ditch in the form of oceans named Puṣkaroda etc. There were in this city temples in the form of five Merus, a number of market places named Mahāvideha with rows of palaces named Bharata, Airāvata, Haimavata and others. And there were two suburbs named Jambūdvīpa and Dhātakikhaṇḍa. This was the very city in which were born all the 63 Śalākā-puruṣas, comprising Cakravartis, Jinas, and others. And here then ruled the king Karma-pariṇāma. He had a queen named Karma-pariṇāti. 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 Santoṣa, the son of king Cāritra had kidnapped innumerable citizens of his kingdom to his city named Śīvapuri, with the assistance of his minister named Samyag-darśana and thus though accompanied by his whole army he was defeated. Thereupon the king ordered his army to uproot the Viveka fortress of king Cāritra 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 Santoṣa alive and bring him there. Lokasthiti, 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 Santoṣa. On the other hand, the Prince and the minister of king Karma-pariṇāma camped on the bank of the river named Pramattatā in the forest named Cittavṛtti. Tanniyoga was accompanied by Tivra-mohodaya who showed him numerous palaces in which were innumerable apartments in which were housed countless citizens. Then Tivramohodaya 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 Sāmsāri-jīva and others like him. Then, she operated from the Saṁvyavahāra city and wandered in the Sādhāraṇa-vanaśpati street along with Tivra-mohodaya and Anantābodha attracting the citizens and despatched them to innumerable births of innumerable species. Now, the beloved of Bhavitavyatā, called Sāmsārijīva, 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-parameṣṭhi 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 Vardhanakuñjara of king Vairasiṃha and queen Nandādevī. In this new embodiment he happened to make friends with two reliable twin brothers named Puṇyodaya and Dhūmadhvaja. Vardhanakuñjara mastered 72 arts and crafts. In view of his progress in education and other good qualities, king Vairasiṃha 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 Vaiśvānara. 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 Kṣānti, the daughter of king Śubhapaṇiṇāma and queen Niṣprakampatā ruling in the city named Citta-saundarya. Then, the king proposed to depute the astrologer to king Śubhapaṇiṇāma 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 Vardhanakuñjara 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 Kālasena, 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 Vaiśvānara as his well-wisher and a favourite friend.

Once the prince went to a forest named Svadeha with his twin friends and there he saw a man standing on an anthill named Uccaya 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 Sparśana, said : 'I had a very dear and close friend named Jantu who always conducted himself in a manner totally to my liking. Once, deceived by a man named Susamaya, he began to look upon Sparśana 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 Vardhanakuñjara 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 Puṇyodaya 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 Kāliṅga 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 Vairasīṃha 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 Cāṇḍāla 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 Prabhāvati in the city of Vārāṇasī. 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 Śubhodaya and queen Nijacārutā, too, happened to be his friend. This latter prince was married to a princess named Buddhi, 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 Buddhi 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 Śubhodaya. 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, Śrāvasti, Vinatā, Rājagṛha, 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 Rāgakesarī. Once he ordered his minister Viṣayābhilāṣa 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, Rasanā, Ghrāṇa, Cakṣu and Śrotra 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-vyāsaṅga met him and informed that king Mahāmoha has already started from the Karma-pariṇāma country with a great army for punishing Santoṣa. Hence, the king Rāgakesarī 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, Rāgakesarī, too, mounted, along with Viṣayābhilāṣa 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 Rasanā. For full information they should enquire with Viṣayābhilāṣa. 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 Rāgakesarī. 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-citta, 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 Śailarāja, to the rear body-guard Makaradhvaja, to the minister Viṣayābhilāsa the father of Rasanā, to the minister's servants named Hāsyā, Arati, Bhaya, Jugupsā, etc., to the feudal chiefs named Jñānāvaraṇa, 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 Rasanā 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 Lakṣmīvātī of Dhanyā in the city of Viśālā. 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 Samyaktva, 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 Nirvṛti or Anuttara-vimāna.

When this report was given to king Moharāja, he stroke 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 Lakṣmīvātī and entered her body. As a result, Lakṣmīvātī 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 Viśvasena, 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 Rājasimha. 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 Cāritra was afraid and ran away to a mountain fortress named Viveka. The Saṃsāri-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 Saṃsāri-jīva, and was curious about his whereabouts and fate at the moment. At this the Muni replied that he himself was the same saṃsāri-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 lores and arts and out of curiosity went to Mahāvīdeha country where he happened to listen to a story of Tirthaṅkara at the feet of Bhadrāṅkara. 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 Cārītradharma, 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 Maṇipravāla 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*)<sup>6</sup>, 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 Maṇipravāla 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 Siddharṣi (A. D. 906), in which the author's intention is that the reader should compare himself with the hero *Samsāri-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 *Samsāri-jīva* himself is such an allegorical character, being typical of all such souls<sup>7</sup>.

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. *Parikṣya satkulaṁ vidyāṁ śīlaṁ śauryaṁ surūptāṁ /  
vidhir-dadāti nipuṇaṁ kanyāṁ-iva daridratāṁ //1.410. p. 32.<sup>8</sup>*

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

2. *Akṣi-pakṣma kadā luptaṁ chindyante'tha śiroruhāḥ /  
vardhamānātmanām eva prasaṅgīnyo vipattayaḥ // 1.672, p. 53.*

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

3. *Yadi bhavati dhanena dhanī kṣititala-nihitena bhoga-rahitena/  
vasmād vayam api dhaninaḥ tiṣṭhati naḥ kāñcano 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 nidhanam tathā /  
jānāhi janakādhīnam sarvasatputra-ceṣṭitam //1.1038, p. 82.*

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

5. *Sakhyā buddhyā na yat sādhyam sahasā sāhasena ca /  
tat syād vacanamātreṇa kāryam puṇyavātam dhruvam//  
1.1053, p. 83.*

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

6. *Rājye saram vasudhā vasudhayam puram pure saudham /  
saudhe talpam talpe varāṅganā'naṅga-sarvasvam //1.1136, p. 89.*

This is quoted in support of the proposal of princess Rāyaṇamañjarī to marry with the prince Samarasimha. It occurs in the *Kāvyaḷamkāra* of Rudraṭa (7.97) and has been quoted by Mammata also in his *Kāvyaṭprakāśa* (10,37) as an illustration of the *sāra* figure of speech.

7. *Sattvānām caritaṃ citraṃ vicitrā karmaṇām gatiḥ /  
nārī-puruṣa-toyānām śrūyate c-āntaraṃ mahat //*

1.1155(1154 ?) p. 90.

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

8. *Bhāva-śudhir-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-kāṅkṣodbhavaṃ sukhaṃ prāpyate sarāgeṇa /  
tad-ananta-koṭi-guṇitaṃ 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 kṛṣānuḥ sandhyayor dvayoḥ /  
loke nītam iti śītaṃ jānubhānukṛṣānubhiḥ //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 śītaṃ mayā nītam' in the third quarter.

11. *Punar-apī sahanīyo duḥkha-pātas tavāyam  
na hi bhavati vināśaḥ karmaṇām sañcitanām/  
Iti saha gaṇayitvā yad yadāyati saṃyak  
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. *Yadīched vipulāṃ prītiṃ tṛiṇi tatra na kārayet /  
vivādaṃ artha-samrambhaṃ parokṣe dāra-darśanam //*

3.62, p. 226.

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

13. *Na viśvase grāma-kūṭasya jivī(? va)to 'pi mṛtasya vā /  
eka-grḍhrāparādhenā sarve grḍhrāḥ 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 viśmṛtam naṣṭam sthitam sthāpitam-āhitam /  
adattam nādadīta svam parakīyam kvacit sudhīḥ //*  
3.745, p. 279.

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

15. *Kallolād api budbudād api calad-vidyud-vilāsād api  
jīmutād api marutād api tarat-tārksyorddhva-pakṣād api  
Citram citram ayam calā tribhuvane kim śrīr-na te śemukhī  
naivam kim khala-saṅgatiḥ na na nanu śrī-jātir asyai namaḥ //*  
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-ārdhhen-aiva tad vakṣye yad-uktam grantha-koṭibhiḥ /  
tṛṣṇā ca saṁparityaktā 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 jīvo brahm-aiva nāparah'.

- 17 *Samprāpyam mokṣa-saukhyam  
yatibhir-asilatā-vāsa-tulyais tapobhir  
matvaivam viśva-vettā namī-vinamī-  
bhujā-daṇḍa-nistṛimśa-yaṣṭau /  
Śaṅke saṅkrānta-mūrtiś-carati guru-  
tapo yaḥ svayam mokṣa-hetum*

*pratyūha-vyūha-nāsaṃ diśatu (sa)*  
*bhagavān ādimas- tīrtha-nāthaḥ // 3.1756-57 (3.1756 ?), p. 358.*

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-bhīma-durgama-tamaṃ nirgamyā yaḥ prāntaram*  
*pratyakṣī-kurute jagat-traya-patiṃ viśva-priyaṃ bhāvukaḥ /*  
*Śrīman-Nābhi-narendra-gotra-tilakaṃ devaṃ dhruvaṃ vīkṣite*  
*mokṣas tena tu (saṃ-)vyatīpa (? tyā) rabhasā saṃsāra-*  
*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 dīyate vā na kiñcana /*  
*aho amūlya-krīteyaṃ sāmāya-mātreṇa nirvṛtiḥ // 4.491, p. 426.*

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

20. *Upādhyāyād daśācaryā ācāryāṇāṃ śataṃ pitā /*  
*sahasraṃ tu pitur-mātā gauraveṇātiricyate // 4.491, p. 429.*

This is quoted to justify the honour given to his mother by a son. This verse occurs in the *Manusmṛti* (2.145) with a slight variation, namely 'upādhyāyān' and 'pitṛn'.

21. *Bījina eva hi bījaṃ kṣetraṃ bhavatīha tadvatām eva /*  
*durlalītaṃ ahināthe nirṇayaṃ enaṃ svayaṃ cakre // 4.547, p. 430.*

This verse is but almost a Sanskrit version of a previous similar *gāthā* in which the author says : 'Loḷe pasiddham eyaṃ biyam naṇu hoī bīyavaṃtassa / khittam tu khettiyassa itha vi ittham vicimṭeha // (4.542).

22. *Śreyo viṣam upabhoktum kṣamaṃ bhava krīditum hutāśena /*  
*saṃsārabandhana-gatair na tu pramādaḥ kṣamaḥ kartum //*

23. *Tasyām-eva hi jātau naram upahanyād viṣam hutāśo vā /*  
*āsevitaḥ pramādo hanyāj janmāntara-śatāni // 4.731-732, p. 445.*

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 vasundharā // 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 *Śārṅgadharma-paddhati* (1477).

25. *Yat paraloka-viruddham yal-lajjākaram-ihaiḥva jana-madhye /  
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 *kāpālika* asks him to kill a maiden.

26. *Apāya-śata-labdha-sya prāṇebhyo'pi garīyasaḥ /  
Gatir-ekaiva vitta-sya dānam-anyā vipattayaḥ //*

27. *Grāsadd-ardham-api grāsam-arthibhyaḥ kiṃ na dīyate /  
icchānurūpo vibhavaḥ kadā kasya bhaviṣyati //  
4.1059-1060, p. 471.*

These two verses are quoted in support of the Jaina vow of *Atithi-saṃvibhāga* or sharing the food with a guest or supplicant mendicant. Out of these two verses, the first is a composition of the famous Bhartṛhari<sup>9</sup> 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 ḍimbhāms-taruṇimaṇi yūnaḥ pariṇatāv  
apīcchāmo vṛddhān pariṇaya-vidhau naḥ sthitir iyam /  
Tvayā 'rabdham janma kṣapayitum amārgeṇa vidhinā  
na me gotre putri kvacid api satī-lāñchanam 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 *Śārṅgadharma-paddhati* (3761), with slight variation, namely, 'bālān' for 'ḍimbhān' in the first quarter, and 'anenaikapatinā' for 'amārgeṇa vidhinā' in the third quarter.



29. *Asraddheyam na vaktavyam pratyakṣam yadi drśyate /  
tathā vānara-saṅgītam tathā tarati sâ 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-bhāṅḍāgāra* (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 'gītam gāyati vānarah' with the exchange of the third and the fourth quarters.

30. *Jīvantiyām api yady upaiti dayito manye kalaṅkas tadā  
tasmin snigdha-jane viyoginī katham prāṇān nidadhyām aham /  
Mṛtyuś-cen na hi tat-samāgama-sukham tasyāpi mṛtyur-dhruvam  
kaṣṭham tad-viraho vikalpa-bahulam dolāyate me manaḥ //  
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  
krta-parikaram svedodvāri pradhāvati dhāvati /  
Guṇa-samuditam doṣopetaṁ praṇindati nindati  
dhana-lava-parikṛitam jantum praṅṛtyati 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. *Ārādhya bhūpatim-avāpya tato dhanāni  
bhoksyāmahe kila vayam satatam sukhāni /  
Ity āśayā bata vimohita-mānasānām  
kālah prayāti maraṇāvadhīr-eva puṁsām // 4.1277, p. 488.*

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 *Subhāṣitāvalī* (3258) of Vallabhadeva, with some variations, namely, 'bhūñjāmahe' for 'bhoksyāmahe' and 'vayam iha' for 'kila vayam' in the second quarter, and 'jagāma' for 'prayāti' in the last one.

33. *Kartum na prakatām sphuran-nava-nava-praudhārtha-dṛṣṭim mayā  
no tattvāni niveṣṭum atra bhagavat-siddhānta-siddhāni vā /*

*Naiva khyāpayitum vyadhāyi caritaṃ rītim vidarbhodbhavāṃ  
bhaktiṃ kintu punaḥ punar na gaditaṃ śrī-padma-lakṣma-  
prabhoḥ // 4.1399, p. 498.*

This verse is meant to express the author's intention behind undertaking the composition of this *Carita-mahākāvya*, and is a part of the *Prāśasti* composed in Prakrit Gāthās.

34. *Tarkān adhītya devendra-guroḥ siddhāntam-āditaḥ /  
Śrī-Haribhadrasūribhyaś-caritaṃ nirmame mayā // 4.1401.*

This verse is also a sort of acknowledgement about his teachers by the author, and forms a part of the Prakrit *Prāśasti*, 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<sup>10</sup>. And, further, it is noteworthy that the poet seems to have given the colophones, marking the intervening sub-stories, in Sanskrit, as for instance '*Iti dāna-dharme Harṣapāla-kathānakam*' (p. 35), '*Iti tapasi Rohiṇīkathā samāptā*' (p. 99), '*Ity-antaraṅga-kathā samāptā*' (p. 162), '*Iti śrī-Padmaprabha-caritaṃ samāptam*' (p. 499), etc. At the end of the work, the final *Prāśasti* by the Saṃgha and the scribe is also in Sanskrit.

#### Annotations :

1. *Siri Devasūri's Paumappahasāmi Cariyaṃ* (PPC), L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad 1995 (L.D. Series 116), Ed. Rupendrakumar-Pagariya, *Prastāvanā* (Hindi), p. 25.

*Śrī-Haribhadrasūribhyaś-caritaṃ nirmame mayā // Bālacando ... (4.1385) ...  
Guṇabhaddasūri guruṇo ... (4.1386) ... Savvāṇamdaguru ... (4.1387) cariyaṃ  
siri-Pāsāsāmissa ... (4.1388) ..siri-Dhammaghosapahuṇe .. (4.1389) ... Tappaya-  
payatṭhiehīṃ kaihiṃ siri-Devasūri-nāmehiṃ / Paumappahassa pahuṇo cariyaṃ  
raiyaṃ kayacchariyaṃ // 4.1391; 4.1401 : Tarkān adhītya Devendraguroḥ  
siddhāntam āditaḥ /*

2. *Ibid.*, 4.1393 : *...veri-Bhīma-bhīmassa / Cālukka-vaṃsa-muṇiṇo niravajje rajja-  
samayammi //*
3. *Ibid.*, 4.1392 : *Veya-sara-sūra-paramiya (1254) varise niva-Vikkamassa varisāo/  
4.1394 : Siri-Vaddhamāṇa-nayare ṭhieṇa Pajjunna-seṭṭhi-vasahīhē/ Siri-*

*Paumappaha-cariyaṃ padipunnam ināṃ mae vihiyaṃ //; Colophon - Kṛtir iyaṃ śrī-jālihara-gaccha-maṃḍana-śrī-dharmmaghoṣasūri-śiṣyaśrīdevasūrīṇām iti bhadram / Śrīḥ //*

4. (PPC), the editor's *Prastāvanā* in Hindi; *ibid.*, p. 499.
5. PPC, p. 136 : *Atha dharma-deśanā-paryanta-prastāve sādaram Aparājitamahārajas taṃ mahāmuniṃ aprākṣīt ..*
6. Rajasekhara - *Kāvya-mimāṃsā*, Ed. Kedarnath Sharma Sarasvat, Bihar Rashtra Bhasha Parishad, Patna 1954, p. 48 : *Yas tu tatra tatra bhāṣā-viśeṣe teṣu teṣu prabandheṣu tasmins-tasminś-ca rase svatantraḥ sa kavirājaḥ /*
7. A. K. Warder, *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol. V, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi 1988, pp. 713-714.
8. The page numbers of PPC here and hereafter refer to the above-noted 'Siri Devasūri's *Paumappahasāmi Cariyaṃ*' Ed. Rupendrakumara Pagariya, Ahmedabad 1995.
9. D. D. Kosambi, *Bhartṛhari-subhāṣita-saṃgraha*, Singhi Jaina Series, No. 400 Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Mumbai 1948.
10. Vardhamānasūri's *Jugāī-jīṇimda-cariyaṃ*, Ed. Pt. Rupendrakumar Pagariya, L. D. series Ahmedabad 1987, pp. 2, 35, 52, 58, 59, 65, 71, 72, etc.; also *Śrī-candrasūri's Siri Muṇimda-suvvaya-cariyaṃ*, Ed. Pt. Rupenrakumar Pagariya, L. D. series Ahmedabad 1989, pp. 173, 174, 175, 323, 324, 331, 332, etc.

