C. M. MAYRHOFER

TRADITION AND INNOVATION IN JAIN NARRATIVES

A STUDY OF TWO APABHRAṂŚA VERSIONS
OF THE STORY OF CĀRUDATTA

The student of Jain literature is confronted with a prodigious amount of material that, if left to the care of almost any other community, would have largely perished, leaving behind only a few works selected by chance or particular devotion. That so many works survived until the age of printed books, and that so many have been printed, is a monument to the piety and scholarship of the Jain community. But in any general history of Indian literature, the contribution of the Jains, however important, is in the last analysis secondary because their works can be accounted for as imitations and adaptations of primary works, or, where they have no actual predecessor, as works newly created according to a formula or using established motives of plot, character and style. In the history of Jain literature too certain works become classics of primary importance, but there again the existence of classics and formulas encourages imitation, and of necessity the secondary works which so arise outnumber the primary. This process is of course not peculiar to the Jains; it summarizes the literary activity of any literate community. However, the survival of so many works and especially narrative works (since the narratives are the flesh of their tradition, of which the canonical literature is the backbone and articulation) is exceptional, and much narrative material of inherent quality has been saved thanks to the hospitality of Jain literature, even if sometimes in an unaesthetic form. For example, the story of Cārudatta disappeared from the later *Bṛhatkathā* tradition represented by the *Bṛhatkathā-mañjarī* and the *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Were it not for the survival of a fragmentary masterpiece, the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, which includes the story, it would only be found in Jain narrative works, yet it is a fine story; like all fine stories it presents an analogue of the human condition through observation of a particular society. The name of Cārudatta survives in the play of Bhāsa of which it is the title and in the *Mṛcchakaṭikā*, but not the story. It may be that certain motifs in the plays are

vestiges of the story, that they are the *disjecta membra* of that clear paradigm of merit in a new context of sentimentality and pathos; if so, then they testify to the dissipation of narrative material which the Jain authors fortunately reversed [1].

Recognition of services rendered to the domains of folklore and narrative studies by Jain authors does not indeed constitute a literary judgement. Nevertheless it points the way to a due appreciation of their achievement. Some Jain narratives are better than others in that they are better proportioned, more clearly imagined and expressed and so on, but the most remarkable feature in general is their conservatism. Now if this conservatism were no more than a mindless copying of existing material, there would be no case for speaking of literary achievement. But if it can be shown that each version of a story is a self-conscious recreation, then the question of originality can be set to one side and the survival of a story intact through so many recreations can be seen as the remarkable phenomenon that it is: the result of clear understanding and the deliberate suppression of fantasy. In this essay I attempt to show that this is the case, by a close study of a molecule in the vast body of narrative, namely the story of Cārudatta, giving prominence to two Apabhraṃśa versions, the *Kahakosa* of Śrīcandra and the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa* of Nemicandra [2].

In the universal history of the Jains, the story of Cārudatta finds a place in the adventures of Vasudeva, who wandered about the world and won many wives by his various talents. One of his wives was Gandharvadattā, or Gandharvasenā, who passed for a daughter of Cārudatta but was in fact the daughter of a *vidyādhara*; Vasudeva won her hand in marriage by defeating her in a musical contest. Cārudatta told his story to Vasudeva by way of explaining how Gandharvadattā came to be his ward. Now the story of Vasudeva is itself included in the life of his son Kṛṣṇa, the *mahāpuruṣa*, as part of the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* or — after the *tīrthaṃkara* in whose time the events took place — the *Nemicarita*; it also has an independent existence in the famous *Vasudevahiṇḍi* of Saṅghadāsa [3].

1. On the preservation of interesting narrative material in Jain literature, see M. WINTERNITZ, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, vol. 2, Leipzig, 1920, p. 318; for an appreciation of the story of Cārudatta, see J. C. JAIN, *Stories of trading merchants and* Vasudevahiṇḍi (sic), in ABORI, 55 (1974), pp. 73-81.

2. *Muni Śrīcandra's Kaha-Kosu*, ed. H. L. Jain, Ahmedabad, 1969 (Prakrit Text Society series no. 13), pp. 353-66; *Ācārya Nemicandra's Ākhyānakamaṇikośa with Ācārya Āmradeva's Commentary*, ed. Punyavijaya, Varanasi, 1962 (Prakrit Text Society series no. 5), pp. 210-17. References to Śrīcandra are by *saṃdhi, kaḍavaka* and line; to the story of Cārudatta in the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*, by the numerals in the printed text, each representing 10 lines, and by line within these decades.

3. *Vasudevahiṇḍiprathamakhaṇḍam*, ed. Caturavijaya and Punyavijaya, Bhavnagar, 1930-31 (Sri Atmananda Jain Grantharatnamala nos. 80-81), pp. 133-54. On the place of the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* in the story cycle, see L. ALSDORF, *Harivaṃśapurāṇa*, Hamburg, 1936 (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien no. 5), p. 11.

The *Vasudevahiṇḍi* is acknowledged to be the oldest surviving narrative of Vasudeva's adventures[4]. Apart from its antiquity and its remarkable literary qualities, it has the special interest of being a transitional work. Apparently, the story of Vasudeva was the medium through which narrative material from the *Bṛhatkathā* entered the narrative treasury of which the Jains made themselves the custodians[5]. The *Vasudevahiṇḍi* itself bears traces of Saṅghadāsa's efforts to incorporate certain attractive but incongruous material from, in particular, the story of Naravāhanadatta as told by Budhasvāmin, the author of the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*[6]. The material was attractive because of its combination of satirical realism and illusionist narrative technique[7]; Saṅghadāsa reproduces these features, the former successfully, the latter less so[8]. But the more daring aspects of Budhasvāmin's narrative, in which the hero falls in love successively with a prostitute's daughter, a *cāṇḍālī* and a man (or so they seem at first sight to the reader)[9], were unacceptable to the Jain author. Indeed the story of the merchant's son Sānudāsa, which is the name of the Cārudatta character in the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, ridicules the beliefs and practices of the Jains. Saṅghadāsa adapted these aspects as best he could. The result of this adaptation served as a model for his successors.

But it is time to look at the story of Cārudatta itself. I do not propose to narrate the story in full, merely to consider the essential structure of the story as told by the Jain authors. Cārudatta, son of a merchant at Campā, is a young man of good education but no experience

---

4. Stylistic criteria for the early date (probably before the sixth century A.D.): L. ALSDORF, *The Vasudevahiṇḍi, a specimen of archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī*, in BSOS, 8 (1936), pp. 319-33.

5. ALSDORF examined the material in the Jain *Harivaṃsapurāṇa* which probably comes from the *Bṛhatkathā*, cp. his *Harivaṃsapurāṇa* pp. 95-6; he also proposed that Jain cosmology was influenced by the *Bṛhatkathā* as represented by the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* of Kṣemendra and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, in *Zur Geschichte der Jaina-Kosmographie und -Mythologie*, in ZDMG, 92 (1938), pp. 464-93, but as he notes (*op. cit.*, p. 470 ff.) this material does not appear in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* or the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* of Budhasvāmin. See too his *Zwei neue Belege zur « indischen Herkunft » von 1001 Nacht*, in ZDMG, 89 (1935), pp. 275-314.

6. *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, ed. F. Lacôte, Paris, 1908-28; P. K. Agrawala, Varanasi, 1974. The dates of the works are uncertain; LACÔTE hesitantly dated the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* to the ninth or tenth century (*Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā*, Paris, 1908, p. 148). V. S. AGRAWALA dated it to the Gupta period (*Kathāsaritsāgara*, ed. K. Samra, Patna, 1960, preface p. 7). I am certain that the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* is posterior to a version of the story which had all the marks of Budhasvāmin's narrative style, though Saṅghadāsa seems to have used a version in (or including) *gāhā*-s; see p. 288, lines 24-28.

7. On these features see chapters 2 and 3 of E. P. MATEN, *Budhasvāmin's Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, Leiden, 1973.

8. See my *Studies in the Bṛhatkathā* (Canberra, 1975: unpublished dissertation) and *Budhasvāmin's Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha continued*, in IIJ, 17 (1975), p. 61.

9. Namely Madanamañjukā (the surviving fragment does not explain her case), Ajinavatī (in fact a *siddhā*) and Priyadarśanā (in fact a woman in disguise).

of the world. He is led by others into sensual enjoyment; the conse-
quence of this is the dissipation of his wealth and the ruin of his family.
He takes it upon himself to recover his reputation and his family's
fortune. So the story falls naturally into two parts: how he committed
his error, and how he repaired his error by setting forth into the world
and trying to gain wealth. The agent of his recovery is a friendly *vidyā-
dhara*. There is therefore a prologue, as it were, to the first part of the
story, in which he earns the friendship of this *vidyādhara* by a compas-
sionate act. In the second part of the story, which shows Cārudatta as
a traveller and trader in search of wealth, there are several episodes, of
which two are developed at length. In the first of these Cārudatta is
persuaded by a *parivrāja*, a mendicant, to go in search of a certain
magical juice; the *parivrāja* lowers him into a well on the end of a rope;
he collects the juice and sends it up to the *parivrāja* who then abandons
him in the well with no apparent means of escape. In the second,
Cārudatta is persuaded by a friend or relative to take part in an expe-
dition to a land of gold or a land of precious stones, Suvarṇabhūmi or
Ratnadvīpa; the final stage of the expedition obliges the travellers to
cover themselves with the skins of freshly-flayed beasts so as to attract
the *bhāruṇḍa*-s, the huge birds which live in the land of gold and which
will carry the men dressed in their gory skins, believing them to be
lumps of meat, to their nests. Like the other attempts to gain wealth,
this too is disastrous for Cārudatta, because his bird drops him in a wild
place far from human habitation, but it is also providential because
he meets in the wilderness the same *vidyādhara*, who, in gratitude for
his past kindness, gives him hospitality, honours him and takes him
home to Campā laden with riches.

   Such is the essential stucture of Cārudatta's story in all the Jain
versions known to me. Now let us consider the context in which the
two Apabhraṃśa versions of the story are introduced. In the preface
to his work, Śrīcandra explains its intention: to explicate the *gāthā*-s of
the *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā* and give the stories to which they allude. He
stresses the importance of the former; as there can be no painted
picture without a wall to paint on, so the citation and explication of
the *gāthā*-s are a necessary preparation for the telling of the stories [10].
Similarly the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa* of Nemicandra is a set of 52 *gāthā*-s,
each of which enunciates a moral precept and provides the names of
characters whose stories illustrate the precept. The bulk of the volume
is the *vṛtti* of Amaradeva, who first explicates the *gāthā*-s and then gives
the stories of the characters named. The *gāthā* of the *Bhagavatī Ārā-
dhanā* which names Cārudatta, and which serves as the basis for Śrī-
candra's version of the story, blames bad company and a taste for wine
and women for the hero's becoming the destroyer of his family's for-

---

10. 1.8.6-1.9.2.

tune [11]. A *gāthā* of Nemicandra in the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa* leads to the story of Cārudatta by a more circuitous route: its message is that young women are not to be trusted [12]. One of his examples of this precept is Bhāvaṭṭikā. Her story does not concern us in detail; briefly, she is too intelligent and independent for her own good, and deliberately creates a scandal to avenge an insult to her family pride. When the scandal breaks, she is exposed to a test of her innocence in the form of spending a night in a temple inhabited by a *yakṣa* who is known to be merciless with wrongdoers. Like Shehrezad, she saves her life by telling stories until dawn, and one of her stories is that of Cārudatta [13]. Whereas most of the other stories in the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa* are in Prakrit, this is in Apabhraṃśa; the *Kahakosa* stories are of course all in Apabhraṃśa.

We know that these two authors did not invent the story; where then did they find it? Śrīcandra traces the descent of his treasury of stories from the *jinapati* down to the present age, saying that it was passed down from teacher to pupil for generations. He declares his dependence on his teachers, and prays that Sarasvatī will compensate the inferiority of his ability to theirs [14]. A. N. Upadhye in his preface to the Prakrit Text Society edition of the *Kahakosa* demonstrated that Śrīcandra knew and used the *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Hariṣeṇa, noting that it was not Śrīcandra's only source, but without speculating what the other source or sources may have been [15]. One thing seems to be sure, that there is a written tradition behind all versions of the story. A comparison of the different versions reveals that the story remains essentially the same; even details which have no necessary connection with the structure of the story survive retelling, and that can hardly be so without a written tradition. For example, when Cārudatta eventually escapes from the well in which he was abandoned by the treacherous *parivrāja*, he is attacked by a wild buffalo; he evades it by climbing on to a pile of stones; a huge snake then attacks the buffalo, and Cārudatta escapes while the two beasts are locked in combat. This incident in no way contributes to the working of the intrigue, and it has (as far as I know) no allegorical significance and no mnemonic value. Our authors may have heard the story from their teachers, but when they came to write their own versions, they made careful use of written texts. I should like to go further and show that an author in writing a story showed more knowledge of the story than could be gained from any single written text.

---

11. *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā* 1082, quoted *Kahakosa* 35.9.1-2.
12. *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa* 29 (p. 188).
13. For a discussion of the « time-gaining frame » see M. I. GERHARDT, *The Art of Story-telling*, Leiden, 1963, pp. 397-401; there is a parallel to the ordeal of passing a night in a *yakṣa-temple* in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, the story of Śaktimatī 2.5.165 ff.; see further N. M. PENZER's note in *The Ocean of Story*, vol. 1, London, 1924-28, pp. 162-63.
14. *Kahakosa* 1.8.1-4.
15. *Op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

To continue the example of Cārudatta's escape from the well: in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* when Cārudatta emerges from the well, not by the same way as he went in, he begins to look for the entrance. Apparently, despite his bitter experience, he is still greedy for the magical juice which has the power to turn base metal into gold[16]. In Śrīcandra's *Kahakosa*, when he has almost made good his escape from the well by a lateral passage that surfaces in another place, he finds himself unable to break out quite to the surface, the way being blocked by the root of a tree[17]. That is to say, whereas in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* Cārudatta searches for the *entrance* to the well, here he searches for the *exit*. Fortunately a herd of goats is passing by at that moment on the ground above; one of the goats puts a foot in the hole in which Cārudatta is caught, and can not get free; when the herdsman comes to release his goat, Cārudatta calls to him and asks for help.

This particular development in the story does not occur in the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*. Nor does it occur in Śrīcandra's principal source, the *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Hariṣeṇa[18]. But it does occur in another Jain collection of edifying stories, which includes the story of Cārudatta, the *Puṇyāsravakathākośa* of Rāmacandra Mumukṣu[19]. Now Rāmacandra refers to one of the great Jain narrative works, the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* of Jinasena, in which the story of Cārudatta is told as part of Vasudeva's adventures[20]. No doubt Rāmacandra used the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* as a source of narrative material, but he did not find the above mentioned incident there[21]. Apparently a later author than Saṅghadāsa created the incident, consciously or unconsciously, as a variation of the incident in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* where Cārudatta searches for the opening of the well. To summarize: these are two cases where an author diverges from his source to include an incident which yet is not freely invented, but part of the tradition. On the evidence available it is not possible to decide whether Śrīcandra and Rāmacandra developed the variant incident from a version of the story as it appears in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, or found the variant version already in an existing text. In either case, there existed a sort of repertoire of motives connected with this particular story.

I take another example. In the prologue, as I have called it, Cārudatta earns the gratitude of the *vidyādhara* Amitagati by releasing him

16. *Op. cit.*, p. 147, lines 21-22.
17. *Op. cit.*, 36.1.11.
18. *Āchārya Hariṣeṇa Bṛhatkathākośa*, ed. A. N. Upadhye, Bombay, 1943 (Singhi Jain Series no. 17); the Cārudatta story is *kathānaka* 93; Cārudatta emerges from the underground passage in line 138.
19. *Puṇyāsravakathākośa*, ed. A. N. Upadhye, H. L. Jain, B. S. Shastri, Sholapur, 1964; the Cārudatta story (in prose) is found on pages 65-75; the goatherd, on page 71.
20. See the introduction, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-1; the citation on p. 74 of the text is from Jinasena *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (ed. P. Jain, Varanasi, 1962), 21.156.
21. Jinasena's version of the Cārudatta story is to be found at 21.6-180; Cārudatta emerges from the underground passage in line 95.

from a tree. He has been brutally treated by a rival for his wife's affections; his rival nailed him to the tree and made off with his wife. Cārudatta comes upon the suffering *vidyādhara* by chance while passing a day in a pleasant park in the company of friends. These friends have in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* the names of Naravāhanadatta's companions in the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, with one addition [22], and the incident seems to have been borrowed from the *Bṛhatkathā*. It is part of the material which made its way into the Jain tradition through the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*. In both the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* and the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, the hero and his companions are playing on the sandy bank of a river when they come upon footprints in the sand that lead them to the *vidyādhara*; as they follow the footprints, they try to deduce the nature of the creatures that made them. Of the Apabhraṃśa versions, Amaradeva's mentions the sandbank and the footprints, without further development. Śrīcandra omits the motif; I say « omits the motif », implying intention, because the motif is present in Śrīcandra's principal source, the *Bṛhatkathākośa*. Likewise Rāmacandra Mumukṣu omits the motif of the footprints, which is found in the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* of Jinasena [23]. In Rāmacandra's version however there is a curious variant that may reveal something of his artistic aims. Cārudatta and his companions are passing the day together in the countryside, as in all versions of the story. They would have liked to play by the river, but they were driven away by the king and his party who were attending a *yātrā* at the river. Since the river bank was forbidden to them, they go to a nearby garden, and it is there that they find Amitagati. This variation of the motif, though apparently gratuitous, is in fact an allusion to the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, in which Naravāhanadatta and his friends are in the royal party attending a *yātrā* at the river [24]; Rāmacandra is demonstrating his knowledge that the meeting with Amitagati belongs to the *Bṛhatkathā*, and that the merchant's son Cārudatta is a later arrival on this narrative scene. This is a remarkable example of « intertextuality », in which the author selfconsciously as author draws the reader's attention to their shared knowledge of the narrative tradition.

It would be tedious to describe all the similarities and differences between each version and another. An exhaustive comparison would show that every version preserves the structure of the story as established in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*; that along with the structure many minute material details are scrupulously preserved; and that however important the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* may have been in giving to the story the form which it was to preserve in the Jain tradition, it did not displace entirely the other sources of the story. For the Jain authors, in other words, the story existed in a way that transcended its representation in any single text.

---

22. *Op. cit.*, p. 134, lines 3-4.
23. Compare *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* 9.8-42; *Vasudevahiṇḍi* pp. 134, lines 28-138, line 12; *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa* 3.1; *Bṛhatkathākośa* 93.10; *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* 21.14.
24. *Puṇyāsravakathākośa* p. 66.

Some aspects of storytelling are of course understood to be at the discretion of the individual author. The simplest cases are the moralizing and descriptive passages. For example, the well in which Cārudatta is trapped invites comparison with the miseries of the *saṃsāra*. As it turns out, Cārudatta is not alone in the well; he meets there a previous victim of the *parivrāja*, and this man tells him how to escape. In Śrīcandra's *Kahakosa*, Cārudatta so to speak exchanges his own advice on escaping from the *saṃsāra* for the other man's advice on escaping from the well [25]. In the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*, before meeting the man in the well, Cārudatta praises self-restraint and worships the Jina; the man in the well overhears this, and his advice on how to escape from the well comes like a reward to Cārudatta for his devotion to the Jina [26]. There are other moralizing passages in the *Ākhyānakamaṇikośa*, and several descriptive passages, of which the most remarkable is a sustained comparison of the river Vegavatī in terms of a woman's beautiful features [27]. Here the author is freely inventing, or rather (since these are conventional elaborations) freely mixing together the elements of his text.

The descriptive and moralizing elements fill out the text but do not alter the story. There is another aspect of composition which is not simply a matter of adding conventional elements, and which nevertheless does not involve changing the essence of the story, and that is the repetition of a structural element in the story. Already in what we may call the essential story, the story as it occurs in all the versions, there is a repeated element: the hero on two occasions by his compassion wins a friend who reappears later in the story. Firstly and most importantly, as we have seen, Cārudatta releases Amitagati from the nails that fasten him to the tree, and Amitagati in return later saves Cārudatta from his wanderings. The second instance occurs during the expedition to the land of gold. As described before, the participants must dress in the skins of freshly-killed animals. Cārudatta is horrified to discover himself participating in this slaughter, but as he is powerless to save the animal's life, all he can do is to teach the animal on the point of death the words of the Jina. Later in the story the animal reappears, having been reborn as a *sura*, and offers thanks and does honour to Cārudatta. Jinasena introduces a third element on this model by bringing back the man of the well, also reborn as a *sura*, to offer his homage to Cārudatta [28]. This is apparently an invention, and it is a plausible invention, because for all that Cārudatta reveals the teaching of the Jina to the man in the well, and so enables him in the next birth to be free from the grosser miseries of material existence, nevertheless Cārudatta escapes from the well while the other man is left behind. It is reassuring

25. *Op. cit.*, 35.18.5, end of *saṃdhi*.
26. *Op. cit.*, 10.1-7.
27. *Op. cit.*, 12.4.10.
28. *Op. cit.*, 21.152 ff.

to have a demonstration that Cārudatta did indeed perform an act of compassion [29].

My last example concerns that point in the story where Cārudatta has just escaped from the well. At that moment he meets a certain Rudradatta; the name is constant in all versions of the story though they differ in their identification of this Rudradatta. In most versions this is his first appearance in the story, but in Jinasena's, Rudradatta has already been introduced: he was the person immediately responsible for leading Cārudatta into a life of sensual pleasure [30]. Cārudatta, as we have seen, was a devoted student innocent of the ways of the world. His marriage did not change his studious habits or his innocence, and that was of course unsatisfactory not only to his wife, but also to his mother and mother-in-law. This motif of neglecting his duties as a householder, which is also known to us from the *Dhammilahiṇḍi* [31], is developed in different ways. Of the Apabhraṃśa versions, the *Ākhyāna-kamaṇikośa* ignores it; Cārudatta is simply corrupted by his friends who take him to a *gaṇikā*, and his corruption provides the occasion for homilies on evil associations and the depravity of prostitutes. The *Kaha-kosa* makes his mother responsible, like most other versions, though not the *Bṛhatkathākośa*, Śrīcandra's model. Jinasena too blames Cāru-datta's mother, and introduces Rudradatta as a man of the world who at the mother's request ensures that Cārudatta is initiated into the pleasures of the senses by a *gaṇikā* [32]. I take it that this is an innovation of Jinasena's. Not a radical innovation; he has modified the story to fit an existing pattern by which characters appear twice in the story, and at the same time has tied up a loose end of narrative on the level of motivation.

There are other examples where an author in recreating the story of Cārudatta has used motifs from other stories; to what extent he is making knowledge of their origin a part of the narrative (as in the example of the *yātrā* in Rāmacandra Mumukṣu mentioned above) is difficult to decide. One of the mishaps that befall Cārudatta while he is trying to repair his fortune is that the horse on which he is riding dies, so that he has to continue his journey on foot. This motif is used by Hariṣeṇa in the *Bṛhatkathākośa*, and also by Hemacandra in his version of the story in the *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra*, but not by the other authors. It is a simple enough motif, which occurs for example in Devendra's version of the story of Sanatkumāra, and, perhaps more

---

29. The man in the well, though he knows a way of escape, has not attempted to do so because he is frightened and on the point of death in the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* (p. 147, line 17). Jinasena may have been the first to add the explanation that the juice had corroded his body and to introduce the story of his life (*op. cit.*, 21.86-87): like Cārudatta, he is a shipwrecked merchant.

30. *Op. cit.*, 21.52-53, by a device which recalls *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* 10.5 ff.

31. The story of Dhamilla's travels is included in Saṅghadāsa's *Vasudevahiṇḍi* as the *Dhammillacarita* pp. 27-76.

significantly, in Budhasvāmin's *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha*, when Go-
mukha is accompanying the troops sent to Campā in search of Nara-
vāhanadatta, and his horse, wounded by an arrow, bolts and carries him
into the wilderness [33]. A more complex motif is that of the young girl
who has a special skill and who will marry the man who can defeat her
in a contest of that skill; it is an element of several stories in the *Vasu-
devahiṇḍi*, one of which is that of Gandharvadattā, in the context of
which Cārudatta tells his own story, and it occurs in the story of Pippa-
lāda which is included in the Jain versions of the Gandharvadattā
episode. Another example is the motif already mentioned, the husband
who neglects his marital duties. Jinasena presumably knew the *Vasu-
devahiṇḍi* in the form in which we have it, which includes the *Dham-
millahiṇḍi*; it may be that he was imitating the *Dhammillahiṇḍi*, because,
like the author of that work, but unlike all the other authors of the
Cārudatta story, he uses the motif of the dancing girl whose skill awakens
the hero's interest in women [34]. Rāmacandra Mumukṣu, who as we have
seen certainly consulted the work of Jinasena, does not use the motif of
the dancing girl, but as if in compensation he develops the theme of the
domestic discord provoked by Cārudatta's innocence in a manner similar
to that of the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, with some amusing satire in the exchange
of words between Cārudatta's wife and mother [35].

It is time to draw this examination of a multitude of details toward
a conclusion. Śrīcandra's account of his art may be taken as typical.
It has two components: the assertion that his material is traditional,
and the hope, expressed in his prayer to Sarasvatī, that he will not prove
to be an unworthy heir. A handy metaphor for this process is indeed
that of an inherited treasure, but needless to say a story is not like a
material object, it must be created anew by each teller. The accuracy
of the Jain tradition with regard to content is such that some further
explanation is needed than that offered by the authors, namely that
they received the stories from their teachers or found them in an autho-
ritative text. No one text can contain the whole story, because every
telling involves some silences, ambiguities, incoherences that in principle
must accumulate as the story is passed on from hand to hand. Our
authors must have compared several versions of the story before
producing their own, though whether they in practice drew on the
resources of a library or their own memory of literary studies we can
not say. Whatever the resources, they seem to have included primary

---

33. *Bṛhatkathākośa* 93.68; *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacaritra*, translated by H. M. JOHN-
SON, vol. 5, Baroda, 1962, p. 51; *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrî*, ed.
H. Jacobi, Leipzig, 1886, p. 21; *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṃgraha* 20.433 (I thank Professor
K. Bruhn for reminding me of this last).

34. *Op. cit.*, 21.43 ff. The source may ultimately be the *Bṛhatkathā*, cp. *Bṛhat-
kathāślokasaṃgraha* 11.

35. *Op. cit.*, p. 67. Rāmacandra like Jinasena introduces Rudradatta at this
point, as the go-between. He is Cārudatta's paternal uncle; curiously, when he
returns later in the story, he is accompanied by Cārudatta's friends, p. 71.

works like the *Vasudevahiṇḍi* of Saṅghadāsa and even the *Bṛhatkathā*, in whatever form it may have existed at the time. This comparison ensured the accuracy of the story in respect of the content in general and certain peculiar details besides. Then in the production of their own text they used, as any storyteller must, their imagination and experience of life to establish the characters' reasons for action and to control their readers' involvement in the story. The expression of their imagination and experience was shaped, like all storytellers', by literature, but to an exceptional degree, to the extent of restricting innovations to the repetition of story material occuring either in the story itself or in associated stories. At a certain stage, this system becomes self-perpetuating and indefinitely expanding, because of the two factors of conservation and repetition. A story, being composed of parts that can be re-used elsewhere, is capable of generating other stories or contributing to their generation, but the coming-into-being of new stories of the same type does not prejudice the continued existence of the matrix, which is kept alive by the author's meticulous attention to its unique combination of elements. Naturally, the system had a beginning somewhere, namely in seminal works like the *Vasudevahiṇḍi*. If the literary historian prefers the seminal works to later productions, as more original, he should not neglect the works of the later authors, because they testify to a remarkable creative process which has much in common with literary scholarship, whether in the form of source criticism, the structural approach to narrative, or even the belief that fictional biographies constitute a significant part of the world's store of wisdom.