

原ブリハットカターの内容区分について

土田 龍太郎

Guṇāḍhya 作 Bṛhatkathā [BK] の現存諸傳本の中で特に重要なものは以下の四本であらう。

カシミール系	Bṛhatkathāmañjarī Kathāsaritsāgara
ネパール系	Bṛhatkathā-Ślokasaṃgraha [BK-ŚS]
ジャイナ系	Vasudevahiṇḍī [VH]

F. Lacôte は、BK-ŚS の内容分析の結果、このネパール系傳本がカシミール系傳本よりはるかに原 BK の内容構成を忠実に留めるものであることを確認し、さらに BK-ŚS のコロフォンを吟味しつつ、原 BK の導入部が Kathāmukha であり、主要部が 26 lambha に区分されてゐたことをつきとめた。

その後、VH が BK のジャイナ系傳本にほかならぬことを指摘した L. Alsdorf は、VH の 6 ahigāra 区分に注目し、ジャイナ系・ネパール系・カシミール系三傳本の比較考究にもとづいて、原 BK の内容区分の復原を試みた。

本稿では、Lacôte と Alsdorf の研究成果を基礎としながらも、さらに 6 ahigāra 区分に類似する演劇理論家の 5 saṃdhi 説をも考慮に入れ、両学者の所説を批判し修正しつつ、原 BK の内容区分の概略の復原を試みた。

原 BK は、もしくは現存諸傳本の祖本たる BK は、Piṭha, Mukha, Pratimukha, Śārīra, Upasaṃhāra といふ五部分からなり、主要部たる Śārīra はおよそ 26 lambha に分たれてゐたと考へられる。

On the Textual Division of the Original *Bṛhatkathā*

Ryūtarō TSUCHIDA

1

The *Bṛhatkathā* [*BK*], or “Grand Story;” has as its main subject the marvellous career of Naravāhanadatta the son of King Udayana of Kauśāmbī, starting with his birth and culminating in his accession to the throne of the overlord of sky-roving fairies (*vidyādhara*s). The original *BK* is generally believed to have been composed by the legendary poet Guṇāḍhya in the language of goblins (*piśācas*). Although on the life of Guṇāḍhya we possess practically no other source than the fabulous account given in the Kashmiri redactions¹, there is not any particular reason for us to doubt the real existence of Guṇāḍhya and his authorship of the original *BK*. At any rate, it is certain that unlike such anonymous compilations of myths and legends as the two great Sanskrit epics, the *BK* came into being as the creation of a single poet. Most probably this poet was in fact called Guṇāḍhya by his contemporaries and successors, though the designation seems to have been a nickname or epithet rather than the real name of the author of the original *BK*.

Since this original had already got lost at an early stage, we have no means of acquiring any exact knowledge of its contents and structure. As for its language, the existence of Paiśācī fragments of the *BK* quoted in some Sanskrit and Prakrit works² might well support the general belief that Guṇāḍhya composed his story of Naravāhanadatta in the dialect of goblins. We cannot, however, regard all of these quotations as having directly been made from Guṇāḍhya’s own Paiśācī text. These fragments suggest rather the former existence of several different Paiśācī versions of the *BK* besides the original one by Guṇāḍhya.

Except for the Paiśācī citations just mentioned as well as the brief references and allusions to Guṇāḍhya and his work found in several genres of Indian texts, all that remains of the *BK* at the present time consists of some later redactions made in the Sanskrit, Prakrit, and Tamil languages. Among them the most important, which we must by all means take into account for our present study, are Kṣemendra’s *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* [*BKM*], Somadeva’s *Kathāsaritsāgara* [*KSS*], Budhasvāmin’s *Bṛhatkathā-Ślokaṣaṅgraha* [*BK-ŚS*] and Saṅghadāsa’s *Vasudevahiṇḍī* [*VH*].

Both Kṣemendra and Somadeva lived in Kashmir in the eleventh century. Their versions of the *BK*, which tally closely with each other in many respects, do not descend directly from Guṇāḍhya’s original work but were undoubtedly modelled on a lost version that was

¹ The fabulous story of Guṇāḍhya is related also in *Nepālamāhātmya* 17–30 and *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 27 (Lacôte pp.21–39). On the historical reality of Guṇāḍhya as the author of the *BK*, cf. Lacôte 9–20.

² The citations from the lost Paiśācī versions of the *BK* are found in Bhoja’s *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (the story of Geṅṭākārāla. Raghavan pp.834–840), the eighth chapter of Hemacandra’s grammar called *Haimavyākaraṇa* (Lacôte pp.201–206), and Uddyotana’s *Kivalayamālā* (Master, Kuiper).

current in Kashmir during the time of these poets³. This lost version, which had certainly existed as an established literary work composed by some unknown Kashmiri author, is to be designated by us as *BK-K*⁴. We can thus regard both the *BKM* and the *KSS* as well as their common source the *BK-K*, as representing the Kashmiri branch of the tradition of the *BK* literature.

This state of affairs was first brought to light by Félix Lacôte, who through his edition of the *BK-ŚS* (1908–29) and his work entitled “Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Brhatkathā” (1908) provided a solid basis for further research on the *BK* literature at large. Because Lacôte’s publication of the entire extant text of the *BK-ŚS* was based on four manuscripts found in Nepal, this work has usually been designated as the Nepali version of the *BK*. This designation is, however, merely a provisional one, since we know nothing at all about the native land of Budhasvāmin, whose composition does not reveal any particular elements of Nepali culture.

As a result of his detailed investigation into the extant versions of the *BK*, Lacôte arrived at the conclusion that the general narrative plan and plot of Guṇāḍhya’s original were far more faithfully preserved in Budhasvāmin’s work than in the redactions of the two Kashmiri poets⁵. The main part of Budhasvāmin’s composition, which begins with the fourth chapter, consists of Naravāhanadatta’s life story related by the hero himself in the first person. The three preceding chapters, which one can look upon as the prologue to the main story, are devoted to narrating the course of events that take place after Naravāhanadatta’s final conquest and coronation. According to the narrative account given in the prologue, it is as a consequence of these events that the hero pays a visit to the hermitage of Kāśyapa on Mt. Asita and recites at the request of the sage his own life history in the assembly made up of his own retinue, the sage and his fellow ascetics. Among the eighteen books (*lambakas*) into which each of the Kashmiri poets divides his composition, it is the *Suratamañjarīlambaka* that corresponds to the prologue of the Nepali version. In both of the Kashmiri redactions, however, this *lambaka* does not precede the life history of Naravāhanadatta, but is relegated to a position after the *Mahābhīṣekalambaka*, with which the main story concludes. Most probably this change of scheme is to be attributed to the anonymous compiler of the *BK-K*, if not to one of his direct predecessors, who preferred to follow the chronological sequence of events in arranging the narrative material about Naravāhanadatta⁶.

³ Cf. Lacôte pp.61–62.

⁴ From his comparative observations of the two extant Kashmiri versions Lacôte draws the conclusion that the anonymous author of the *BK-K* laid at the foundation of his work a concise abridgement of Guṇāḍhya’s original *BK* (pp.134–138). The same scholar even attempts to reconstruct the table of contents of this abridgement (pp.137–138).

⁵ Cf. Lacôte pp.61–62.

⁶ According to Lacôte (p.137), the abridgement of Guṇāḍhya’s original *BK* which lay at the foundation of the *BK-K* began with the *Kathāmukha* and concluded with the *Mahābhīṣeka*. As regards the narrative contents, this *Kathāmukha* corresponds to the first three chapters of the *BK-ŚS* as well as to the *Suratamañjarīlambaka* of the two Kashmiri versions.

The same compiler did not adopt a first-person narration of the hero such as we find in the Nepali version. In each of the Kashmiri redactions of the *BK*, the main story is not put into the mouth of any specific character but is related by the general narrator of the whole work. On the other hand, our attention is drawn to the fact that both the *KSS* and the Conclusion (*Upasaṃhāra*) of the *BKM* contain a few verses alluding to Naravāhanadatta's role as the true narrator of his own personal history. The very presence of these verses, which only results in the incoherency of the narrative scheme in both redactions, clearly indicates the priority of the first-person narration in the development of the *BK* literature⁷.

In view of the fundamentally conservative character of the Nepali tradition of the *BK*, it is incumbent on us to carry out a detailed investigation into the textual structure of the *BK-ŚS* if we want to obtain any valuable insight into the constitution of the lost work of Guṇāḍhya. Such investigations had already been launched by Lacôte himself, who attempted to restore the plan of the original *BK* on the basis of a close scrutiny of Budhasvāmin's chapter divisions, and were then continued by Ludwig Alsdorf, who shed some new light on the subject by his careful comparison of the Nepali, Kashmiri, and Jaina traditions of the *BK*. In the present study we intend to pursue the same investigation a little further, taking into account the theory of *sandhi* as set forth in some treatises on dramatic art.

2

The extant text of the *BK-ŚS*, comprised of more than 4500 verses, is divided into 28 chapters (*sargas*)⁸. It is beyond question that this division into *sargas* goes back to Budhasvāmin himself, since we find almost all these chapters, made up for the most part of *śloka* verses, ending with the verse(s) composed in the so-called *kāvya* metres such as the *vaitālīya*, the *vasantīlakā*, and the *śārdūlavikrīḍita*⁹. With such an arrangement of *śloka* and non-*śloka* verses he was probably following the example of the two Sanskrit epics.

The text of Budhasvāmin edited by Lacôte on the basis of the four manuscripts in Nepali characters, designated by him as A, B, m, n, has not been handed down to us in its entirety, but breaks off quite abruptly with the 28th *sarga* in the midst of the story about Naravāhanadatta's acquaintance with a maiden named Bhagīrathayaśas. Manuscript A contains no more than the first 9 chapters, while the text of B ends with the 101st verse of the last *sarga*. It is, therefore, only the two other manuscripts (m and n) that preserve the text of all 28 chapters¹⁰.

At the end of each of the 28 *sargas* we find a colophon which, except for a few cases, gives the title of the chapter. Surveying all these colophons together, however, we can easily detect a lack of unity among them as well as some inconsistencies or incoherency regarding

⁷ On the vestiges of the first-person narration of the hero still remaining in the Kashmiri versions, cf. Tsuchida 2002.

⁸ Cf. Lacôte p.152.

⁹ Cf. Lacôte p.149.

¹⁰ For the description of the manuscripts used by Lacôte, see his introduction to the *BK-ŚS*, pp.iii–xii.

the *sarga* titles given therein. Although Lacôte has already drawn up the list of *sarga* titles in his “Essai”¹¹, we deem it worthwhile to produce a similar table here again, quoting the full text of the colophons. As the readings of these colophons do not deviate very much from one manuscript to another, we register only significant variants in the following table.

1. *iti Buddhasvāminā viracitāyāṃ Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokaṣaṃgrāhe prathamāḥ sargaḥ*//
 2. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ dvitīyaḥ sargaḥ*//
 3. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokaṣaṃgrāhe Kathāmukhaṃ tṛtīyam*//
 4. *iti Piṅgalikākhyānaṃ caturthaḥ sargaḥ*//
 5. *iti Dohadaṣaṃpādano nāma pañcamāḥ sargaḥ*//
 6. *iti Kumārajanma ṣaṣṭhaḥ sargaḥ*//
 7. *iti Yauvarājyābhiṣekaḥ saptaṃ sargaḥ*//
 8. *iti Mṛgayāvihārasargaḥ*//
 9. *iti Pulinadarśanasargaḥ*//
 10. *iti Rathyāsaṃlāpo nāma sargaḥ*//
 11. *iti Ślokaṣaṃgrāhe Madanamañjukālābhāḥ*//
 12. *iti Vegavatīlābhe Udyānaniyamo nāma dvādaśaḥ sargaḥ*//
 13. *iti Vegavatīdaśano nāma trayodaśaḥ sargaḥ*//
 14. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokaṣaṃgrāhe Vegavatīdaśano nāma caturdaśaḥ sargaḥ*//
- I. 1–28, II. 28–125
15. *iti Vegavatīlābho nāma pañcadaśaḥ sargaḥ*//
 16. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Gandharvadattālābhe Campāpraveśo nāma ṣoḍaśaḥ sargaḥ*//
 17. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokaṣaṃgrāhe Gandharvadattāvighrahaḥ*//
 18. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokaṣaṃgrāhe Sānudāsakathā*//
- | | |
|--------------|---------------|
| I. 1–92 | V. 307–422 |
| II. 93–132 | VI. 423–518 |
| III. 133–252 | VII. 519–613 |
| IV. 253–306 | VIII. 614–703 |
19. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokaṣaṃgrāhe Ajinavatīlābhe Nalinikākhyānam*//
 20. *iti Ajinavatīlābhāḥ*//
- | | |
|------------|--------------|
| I. 1–92 | III. 167–260 |
| II. 93–166 | IV. 261–438 |
21. *iti Priyadarśanālābhe Daivākhyānam*//
 22. *iti Priyadarśanālābhe Puruṣakāarakathā*//
- | | |
|--------------|--|
| I. 1–133 | (<i>iti Puruṣakāarakathāyāṃ prathamodhyāyaḥ</i>) |
| II. 134–239 | |
| III. 240–312 | |

¹¹ Cf. Lacôte pp.150–152.

23. *iti Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokasaṃgrāhe Priyadarśanālābhe Nandopanandakathā/*
24. *Priyadarśanālābhe ... //* (n: *Priṣadarśanālābhaḥ*, m: *Priyadarśanalābhaḥ*)
25. *Priyadarśanālābhe Gomukhavivāhākhyānam//*
26. *Priyadarśanālābhe Priyadarśanāstanadarśanasargaḥ//*
27. *iti Priyadarśanāvivāhaḥ//*

I. 1–57 II. 58–117

28. *iti Śrībhaṭṭabudhasvāminā kṛte Ślokasaṃgrāhe Bṛhatkathāyāṃ [Priyadarśanā-
lābhaḥ]¹²//*

<Table A>

As the above table shows, each of *sargas* 14, 18, 20, 22, and 27 is further divided by Lacôte into several subsections. This subdivision of chapters is certainly not Lacôte’s mere invention but derives from some scheme of Budhasvāmin himself. As Lacôte rightly remarks, the end of each subsection, which coincides quite well with the close of an episode, is marked off from the rest of the text by the employment of a metre other than the *śloka*¹³. In the manuscripts used by Lacôte we can hardly detect any vestige of this subdivision, except for the first subsection of *sarga* 22, designated therein as the first *adhyāya* of the *Puruṣakāarakathā*. Owing to a lack of any other evidence, it is difficult for us to determine whether all 19 subsections were really named *adhyāyas* by Budhasvāmin himself¹⁴.

Among the colophons gathered together in Table A, inconsistencies with regard to the manner of presentation are too apparent to escape our notice. It is only *sargas* 1–7, 12–16 which are numbered, and the designation *sarga* is not given to any chapters other than 1–2, 4–10, 12–16, 26. Moreover, some of the colophons contain the title of the whole work, designated as “*Bṛhatkathāyāṃ Ślokasaṃgrāhe*,” “*Bṛhatkathāyāṃ*” or “*Ślokasaṃgrāhe*,” while others give only the chapter titles.

The *BK-ŚS* does not show any trace of a *lambaka* division such as we find in the two Kashmiri redactions of the *BK*. What attracts our attention on examining its colophons is the occurrence of the word *lābha* in some of the *sarga* titles as the last member of the nominal compounds. It was precisely Budhasvāmin’s use of this word in his naming of *sargas* that Lacôte took up as an important clue for elucidating the original constitution of the *BK*¹⁵. Most of the arguments he develops on *lābha*, *lambha(ka)*, and *lambaka* as the units of division in the Nepali and Kashmiri versions of the *BK* can still be considered valid in their essence¹⁶.

When Budhasvāmin uses the word *lābha*, which usually means an act of acquiring some-

¹² The title of the 28th *sarga* given in its colophon is put in brackets by Lacôte, because he holds it to be inexact (p.152). In fact, we find the episode of Naravāhanadatta’s ‘acquisition’ of Priyadarśanā already concluded with the 27th chapter.

¹³ Cf. Lacôte p.149.

¹⁴ Cf. Lacôte *ibid*.

¹⁵ Cf. Lacôte p.225.

¹⁶ Cf. Lacôte pp.220–225.

thing, as a component of his chapter titles, it always has the implication of Naravāhanadatta's getting married to, or at least, becoming intimate with a particular fair maiden. In the main part of the *BK-ŚS*, Naravāhanadatta's conquest of women begins with that of the heroine called Madanamañjukā. The series of events from the first encounter up to the conjugal union of the hero and the heroine are related in chapters 7–11. The subsequent 16 chapters can be divided into four blocks, each dealing with Naravāhanadatta's marriage with a new maiden, while the last chapter contains only the initial part of the story of his acquaintance with Bhagīrathayaśas¹⁷. These maidens, apart from the last mentioned, are namely Vegavatī, Gandharvadattā, Ajinavatī, and Priyadarśanā, whom the hero encounters and marries one after another on his wanderings in quest of Madanamañjukā, who has been kidnapped by a wicked *vidyādhara* prince called Mānasavega.

In the *sarga* titles given in the colophons it is only in combination with the names of Madanamañjukā and other four maidens that the word *lābha* appears as the final member of a nominal compound.

The occurrence of the word, however, is not quite regular. In the block consisting of chapters 12–15, for example, in which Vegavatī plays a decisive role for the turn of events, we find the title *Vegavatīlābha* used only in the colophons of chapters 12 and 15. Similar irregularities are observed in the four other blocks, i.e. chapters 7–11 (Madanamañjukā), 16–18 (Gandharvadattā), 19–20 (Ajinavatī) and 21–27 (Priyadarśanā). We find, indeed, the title *Ajinavatīlābha* in both of the colophons of chapters 19–20, but the compound occurs at each place in a different case-form. As for the Madanamañjukā block, only the title of chapter 11 ends in *-lābhaḥ*.

With all these irregularities, the occurrence of the word *-lābha* in the chapter titles listed in Table A provides an insight into the constitution of the lost *BK* version which served Budhasvāmin as the model of his own composition, for from the colophon of the 12th chapter, which runs: *iti Vegavatīlābhe Udyānaniyamo nāma dvādaśaḥ sargaḥ*, we can already infer that the *sarga* originally made up only one section of some larger division designated *Vegavatīlābha*. As we find exactly the same manner of presentation in the colophons of *sargas* 16, 19, and 21–26, we can conclude that each of the four afore-mentioned blocks narrating the stories of so many maidens once constituted a single *lābha* as a division of the main part of Budhasvāmin's model.

On the other hand, we do not find any single occurrence of the word *-lābha* in the colophons of those chapters which precede the five blocks. Apparently the unknown author of Budhasvāmin's source restricted the application of the term to the titles of those divisions which constituted the central part of his own *BK* version. It is, indeed, in this part alone that the hero 'acquires' fair maidens one after another.

Most striking is the discrepancy we notice among the colophons of the first three chap-

¹⁷ See note 12.

ters. The colophon of the third chapter runs: *iti ... Kathāmukhaṃ tṛtīyaṃ*. This manner of presentation suggests that not only the third but also the two preceding chapters are to be subsumed under the larger framework of the *Kathāmukha*. The first two chapters are, however, not presented as the components of the *Kathāmukha* but are merely designated as the first and the second *sarga* in their respective colophons. Such inconsistencies might have naturally arisen when Budhasvāmin tried to retain the older framework of the *Kathāmukha* in his own text newly divided into *sargas*. The existence of the *Kathāmukhalambaka* as the second book of the Kashmiri redactions also indicates that the *Kathāmukha* as a division of the *BK* goes as far back as to the common source of both the Nepali and Kashmiri versions. From this state of affairs it follows that the lost version on which Budhasvāmin modelled his composition had begun with the introductory section named *Kathāmukha*, which had almost the same narrative contents as the first three *sargas* of the *BK-ŚS*.

Most of these observations were already made by Lacôte when he attempted to restore the original plan of Guṇādhya's work on the basis of the *BK* versions available to him. According to the same scholar, the part of the original *BK* which corresponds to the extant portion of the *BK-ŚS* looked like this:

- I: *Kathāmukha*:
- 1 *Gopālasaṃnyāsa*.
 - 2 *Pālakasaṃnyāsa*.
 - 3 *Surasamañjarī*.
- Kāṇḍa* II: *Sahasrānīka* (or *Śātānīka*?).
- III: *Vāsavadattā* (or *Ujjayinī*).
- IV: *Lāvānaka*.
- V: ? (*Maḡadha*?)
- VI: *Naravāhanadattajanma* (three subdivisions at least)
- VII: *Madanamañjukāmbha*.
1. *Yauvarājyābhiṣeka*.
 2. *Mṛgayāvihāra*.
 3. *Pulinadarśana*.
 4. *Rathyāsaṃlāpa*.
 5. (*Madanamañjukāmbha*).
- Kāṇḍa* VIII: *Vegavatīlambha*.
1. *Udyānavicaya*.
 2. *Vegavatīdarśana*.
 3. (*Vegavatīlambha*).
- Kāṇḍa* IX: *Gandharvadattāmbha*.
- X: *Ajināvatīlambha*.
- XI: *Priyadarśanāmbha*.

Kāṇḍa XII: Bhagīrathayaśolambha.

<Table B>

In this table all the titles of *Kāṇḍas* VII–XII are presented as ending in *-lambha*. It is mainly on the evidence of the passages from Subandhu's *Vāsavadattā* and Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa* that Lacôte restored the form *-lambha*¹⁸. *Lambaka* as the designation of a book in the Kashmiri versions can also be regarded as corruption of *lambhaka*. The authenticity of *-lambha* will further be supported by the use of the same term as a subsection within the main part of the Jaina version.

On the other hand, the same table makes us suspect that in reconstructing *Kāṇḍas* II–V Lacôte relied too heavily on data supplied from the second and third *lambakas* of the Kashmiri versions. In fact, we do not have any means of confirming Lacôte's conjecture about the constitution of the stories on Sahasrānīka (Śatānīka) and Udayana in the oldest *BK*. It is, nevertheless, certain that the original *BK* already contained the history of the royal family before the birth of the hero. There, the history must have occupied a position between the *Kathāmukha* and the series of *lambhas*, as we see in Table B.

Lacôte holds it highly probable that Guṇāḍhya made use of the old term *kāṇḍa* in naming major divisions of his own work. In view of a few important motifs shared by the *BK* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, such as the abduction of the heroine by a demonical being and her invulnerability, we can, indeed, well imagine that Guṇāḍhya designed his plot under the strong influence of Vālmīki's epic. But there is no sufficient ground for believing that the author of the original *BK* adopted even the *kāṇḍa* division from the *Rāmāyaṇa*¹⁹.

It is only with the aid of the Jaina version that we can bring to light the scheme of the major divisions of the *BK*. As for the main part of the original *BK*, Lacôte apparently takes it for granted that it had exactly the same subdivisions and titles as we find them in Budhasvāmin's version. This supposition cannot be accepted by us without reservation.

With all these questionable points, Table B might be regarded by us as representing the structure of Budhasvāmin's direct model, if not of Guṇāḍhya's original, in its main outline.

3

Lacôte's arguments about the original scheme of Guṇāḍhya's work and on the priority of Budhasvāmin's version over those of the Kashmiri poets would perhaps have remained indecisive in some respects had it not been for Ludwig Alsdorf's penetrating investigations

¹⁸ The change from *-lambha* to *-lābha* is to be ascribed to Budhasvāmin. He seems to have regarded the latter form as more regular than the former.

¹⁹ Koṅkuvēḷir divides the text of his Tamil version of the *BK* entitled *Peruṅkatai* into several *kāṇṭams* (Vijayalakshmy pp.3–4). This *kāṇṭam* division does not seem to descend from the original *BK*, because it does not agree at all with the *lambhaka* division presented in table B.

into the Jaina versions of the *BK*. In his article entitled “Eine neue Version der verlorenen *Bṛhatkathā*” (1938) Alsdorf proves beyond doubt that Saṅghadāsa composed his *VH* in archaic Māhārāṣṭrī on the model of some lost *BK* version, adapting the entire Naravāhanadatta story to the context of the Jainistic cycle of legends about Kṛṣṇa and other members of his clan, and that, like the *BK-ŚS*, the same old version still retained the essential characteristics of Guṇādhyā’s original composition²⁰. In the main part of this Jaina version it is Vasudeva, the father of Kaṇha (Kṛṣṇa), who takes over the role of Naravāhanadatta and relates in the first person in the presence of his grandsons how he espoused more than thirty fine maidens one after another in the course of his long wanderings. As we find the *VH* referred to thrice in the *Āvaśyaka Cūrṇi*, its date cannot be later than the 6th century. In view of Saṅghadāsa’s archaic language²¹ Alsdorf thinks that his composition came into being still centuries earlier²².

A more detailed analysis of the contents and structure of Saṅghadāsa’s text is conducted by the same scholar in his work on Puṣpadanta’s *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* (1936). Although in this work Alsdorf announced his plan of publishing another book with the title “Die Jainaversion der *Bṛhatkathā*”²³, this plan does not appear to have ever been carried out. In a continuation of Alsdorf’s fundamental research, scholars such as Jagadishchandra Jain, Donald Allan Nelson, and Colin Max Mayrhofer have made useful expositions and explorations of the stories related in the *VH* and other Jaina versions of the *BK*.

Alsdorf draws our attention to the statement made by the author of the *VH* in his introduction (*Paṭhāvanā*) that the entire work consists of six *ahigāras* (*adhikāras*). In fact, we find the printed text of the *VH*, which breaks off towards the end of the *Sarīra* and does not thus contain the *Uvaṣaṃhāra*, divided into five *ahigāras*. As this *ahigāra* division is of utmost importance for our present study, the constitution of the text of the *VH* edited by Caturvijaya and Punyavijaya is to be presented in the following table.

<i>Paṭhāvanā</i> (<i>Prastāvanā</i>)
<i>ahigāra</i> 1 : <i>Kahuppattī</i> (<i>Kathotpattī</i>)
<i>Dhammillahīṇḍī</i>
<i>ahigāra</i> 2: <i>Peḍhiyā</i> (<i>Pīṭhikā</i>)
<i>ahigāra</i> 3: <i>Muha</i> (<i>Mukha</i>)
<i>ahigāra</i> 4: <i>Paḍimuha</i> (<i>Pratimukha</i>)
<i>ahigāra</i> 5: <i>Sarīra</i> (<i>Śarīra</i>)
divided into 28 <i>lambhas</i>
[<i>ahigāra</i> 6: <i>Uvaṣaṃhāra</i> (<i>Upasaṃhāra</i>)]

<Table C>

²⁰ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, pp.345–346.

²¹ Cf. Alsdorf 1935–37.

²² Cf. Alsdorf 1936, p.35.

²³ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.347.

Nelson points out that the *VH* presents the most complicated set of narrative frameworks among the extant versions of the *BK*, saying that for most of its text there are at least four narrators speaking coincidentally²⁴. Here we need not dwell on the quite intricate narrative structure presented in the first *ahigāra*. On this subject it should suffice to repeat Nelson's precise formulation of the whole state of affairs. He sums up the different levels of discourse as follows: The *Kahuppattī* tells us that "the whole text is Suhamma (Sudharma)'s narrative to Jambū about his (Suhamma's) narrative to Koṇia [Kaunika] which is in turn a report of the dialogues between Koṇia's father King Seṇia [Śreṇika] and Mahāvīra."²⁵ Almost all the essential parts of the *VH*, including Vasudeva's long recital of his own romantic adventures, are thus put into the mouth of Mahāvīra himself. The discourse of Mahāvīra in the presence of King Seṇia of Rājagaha (Rājagṛha) is a favorite narrative framework in the traditions of Jaina literature. As Alsdorf remarks, the *Kahuppattī* is nothing more than a Jainistic addition (*Zutat*) to the subsequent sections of the *VH*, which are more or less combined with narrative material from the *BK*²⁶.

In the edition of the *VH* we find the *Dhammillahiṇḍī* inserted between the first and second *ahigāras*. Since the story of Dhammilla, not registered in the *ahigāra* list, does not betray any intrinsic connection to that of Vasudeva, we can safely assume that the whole *Dhammillahiṇḍī* was only later incorporated by some scribe into the work of Saṅghadāsa²⁷.

The *Peḍhiyā* is devoted to the stories of Kaṇha and his two scions. After some preliminary accounts, Bhagavaṃ (Mahāvīra) narrates how Kaṇha acquired a number of wives one after another and then proceeds to relate at some length the deeds of Pajjuṇṇa (Pradyumna), a son of Kaṇha. These stories are immediately followed by full accounts of the adventures of Samba (Śāmba), another son of Kaṇha, and his consort Suhiraṇṇā, daughter of a courtesan named Kalindaseṇā²⁸.

In the *Peḍhiyā* it is Samba and Suhiraṇṇā who play the roles of Naravāhanadatta and Madanamañjukā. Except for the different names, the story of this couple as narrated in the last portion of the second *ahigāra* shows surprisingly close agreement with Budhasvāmin's narrative, even in particular details. As Alsdorf remarks, this state of affairs confirms the faithfulness of the *BK-ŚS* to Guṇāḍhya's original, asserted by Lacôte, in all essential points²⁹. The story of Samba and Suhiraṇṇā might be looked upon as a replica of the *BK*³⁰. In other words, Saṅghadāsa incorporated the Naravāhanadatta story into two different parts of his own work, i.e. the last portion of the *Peḍhiyā* and the main part, which begins with the *Sarīra* and concludes with the *Uvasaṃhāra*.

²⁴ Cf. Nelson p.200.

²⁵ Cf. Nelson p.201.

²⁶ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.347.

²⁷ Cf. Alsdorf 1936, p.36; 1938², p.281.

²⁸ For the synopsis of *ahigāras* 1–5, cf. Alsdorf 1936, pp.36–40; Nelson pp.200 et seq.

²⁹ Cf. Alsdorf 1936, p.36; 1938, p.348.

³⁰ Cf. Nelson p.235.

The same Samba still plays the leading role in the subsequent *ahigāra*. His deeds narrated in the *Muha* consist of a sequel of knavish tricks, of which the last and most audacious is his cunning way of marrying 107 maidens originally engaged to his half-brother Subhāṇu. Suhirannā was thereafter added to them as the 108th wife of Samba.

The circumstances under which Vasudeva launches the long discourse of his own adventures are related at full length in the *Paḍimuha*. One day the women in the harem of Vasudeva praise Samba because he has succeeded in acquiring a larger number of wives in a far shorter period than did his grandfather. Offended at this disparaging remark, Vasudeva expresses his disdain for Samba, calling him a frog in a well. Pajjuṇṇa, another grandson of Vasudeva, who has been present in the harem, loses no time in requesting his grandfather to relate his own marvellous adventures. Although Vasudeva gives his consent to this request, the recital of his personal history is preceded by a set of narratives which might be called *Harivaṃśa*. This *Harivaṃśa*, which occupies the rest of the *Paḍimuha* and continues even into the first *lambha* of the *Sarīra*, contains among others the stories about the previous lives of himself and his father.

We find the whole *Sarīra* divided into 28 *lambhas*. Vasudeva's discourse on his conquest of brides, which begins in the first *lambha*, accounts for all the rest of the printed text.

The present text of the *VH*, however, shows a few uncertainties in regard to the *lambha* division of the *Sarīra*. The text of *lambhas* 19–20 is totally missing in the present edition. For the purpose of elucidating these difficult points we have to rely on information afforded by Dhammasenaṅgaṇi from his Māhārāṣṭrī work presented as the *Majjhimakhaṇḍa* of the *Vasudevahiṇḍī* [*VH-M*].

The *VH-M*, which contains a long series of Vasudeva stories, was written about 700 A.D. as the supplement to Saṅghadāsa's work³¹. It is to distinguish it from the *VH-M* that Saṅghadāsa's previous composition is given the title of *Paḍhamakhaṇḍa* of the *VH* by its editors.

The last two *lambhas* of the *VH* are named after the mothers of Baladeva and Kaṇha, i.e., Rohiṇī and Devakī. In all the manuscripts available to the editors of the *VH*, the text of the *Sarīra* breaks off quite abruptly in the middle of the *Devakīlambha*. The authenticity of this last incomplete *lambha* is quite doubtful, because in the passage to be quoted below Dhammasena states to the effect that Saṅghadāsa's *Vasudevacarita* concludes with the *Rohiṇīlambha*. It is, however, not only the *Devakī-* but also the *Rohiṇīlambha* that we suspect of being a later addition³². At least, it is quite inconceivable that Saṅghadāsa has taken over any story about these two well-known wives of Vasudeva from the *BK* version which served him as his direct source. In the *Rohiṇīlambha* the long wanderings of the hero come to end. This *lambha* relates how Vasudeva, after his marriage with Rohiṇī, returns home to-

³¹ This date of the *VH-M* is only tentatively proposed by Bhayani and Shah (p.75) on account of some archaic features of Dhammasena's language.

³² Cf. Nelson p.208.

gether with all his wives at the entreaties of his elder brothers. However, the scene of a happy ending such as this can take place only after Vasudeva's chastisement of Mānasavega and his reunion with Somasirī. Within the whole remaining text of the *VH* we find the narrative about this final reunion of the couple nowhere else but in the quite short and spurious passage at the outset of the *Keumatīlambha*. Most probably Saṅghadāsa entertained the idea of narrating this reunion in the final section named *Uvasaṃhāra*. Thus, the existence of *lambhas* 27–28 only disturbs the general plot of Saṅghadāsa's Vasudeva story. It seems reasonable to suppose that these two *lambhas* were tacked one after another onto the end of the *Sarīra* by two different redactors, and that the copy of the *VH* used by Dhammasēṇa had already contained the *Rohiṇī*- but still lacked the *Devakīlambha*.

As Nelson points out, the *lambhas* are both numbered and titled, each after the maiden wedded by Vasudeva. There are, however, a few exceptions to this general rule of the one-to-one correspondence of *lambha* and maiden. Each of *lambhas* 1, 6, and 23 deals with Vasudeva's acquisition of two different maidens, while *lambhas* 13 and 15, on the one hand, and *lambhas* 5 and 12, on the other, are entitled *Vegavatī*- and *Somasirilambha* respectively. *Lambha* 15 is practically a continuation of *lambha* 13, whereas the heroines of *lambhas* 5 and 12 are two different persons with the same name³³. In the printed text of the *Sarīra*, therefore, the hero acquires 30 maidens in 28 *lambhas*, including the two unknown heroines of *lambhas* 19–20. Dhammasēṇa's statement in his foreword to the *VH-M* clearly shows that the copy of Saṅghadāsa's work used by him did not contain the *Devakīlambha*. The whole passage, cited below, deserves our close attention.

suvvai ya kira vasudeveṇaṃ vāsa-sataṃ paribhamanteṇaṃ immammi bharahe vijjāharenda-naravati-vāṇara-kula-vaṃsa-saṃbhavāṇaṃ kaṇṇāṇaṃ sataṃ pariṇītaṃ / tattha ya sāmā-viyayamādiyāṇaṃ rohiṇipajjavasaṇṇāṇaṃ eguṇatīsaṃ lambhatā saṅghadāsa-vāyaeṇaṃ uvaṇibaddhā, egaṣattariṃ ca vitthārabhīruṇā kahāmajjhe chadditā / (VH-M Part I, p. 2, ll.21–24)

And, as the tradition goes, Vasudeva during his wanderings on our continent of Bharaha, which lasted for one hundred years, married one hundred maidens born in the families of rulers of sky-rovers, kings of human beings, and monkeys. But Master Saṅghadāsa composed [only the narratives about] his acquisitions of twenty-nine among these [maidens], from Sāmā and Viyayā to Rohiṇī and omitted [the episodes about] the other seventy-one [maidens] from the middle part of his story for fear that [the whole work] would become too voluminous.

There is no doubt that the figure 29 “*eguṇatīsaṃ*” does not denote the number of *lambhas* but refers to that of maidens, because we can hardly imagine that the text of the *Sarīra* consulted by Dhammasēṇa would have consisted of more than 27 *lambhas*, even if we include the two missing *lambhas*. The reading to be expected is: ... *-pajjavasaṇṇāṇaṃ eguṇatīssa*

³³ Cf. Mayrhofer p.77, n.1.

lambhatā. Most probably the genitive form *eguṇatīsassa*, attracted by the following word “*lambhatā*,” was changed to the stem-form so that both were fused into a kind of nominal compound. This figure 29 given by Dhammasena in the passage just quoted coincides exactly with the number of heroines dealt with in the present text of the *Sarīra*, if we exclude Devakī from them.

As for *lambhas* 19–20 now missing, the matter is a little complicated. Although *lambha* 22 is named after Pabhāvātī, we find therein only a meagre account of the heroine, except her wedding with Vasudeva. Bhayani and Shah consider that Pabhāvātī must have played some important role in one or both of the missing *lambhas* and conclude that these two *lambhas* were already missing in the codex of the *VH* known to Dhammasena³⁴. According to these scholars, it was the absence of the two *lambhas* that provided the opportunity for Dhammasena to start his long supplementary narration with the story of Pabhāvātī³⁵. On these points we can fully agree with the editors of the *VH-M*. Dhammasena must have thought that the lacuna created by the absence of *lambhas* 19–20 should be filled by a succession of stories about Vasudeva’s acquisitions of 71 maidens left out by Saṅghadāsa in his *VH*. On the other hand, we cannot but assume that the two missing *lambhas* were assigned by Saṅghadāsa to two unknown heroines other than Pabhāvātī. Otherwise, we would not be able to obtain the figure 29 given by Dhammasena as the number of Vasudeva’s wives. However important role Pabhāvātī may have played in *lambhas* 19–20, neither of these sections is entitled to be called *Pabhāvātīlambha*, since Vasudeva’s ‘acquisition’ of this maiden in the form of marriage takes place only in *lambha* 22³⁶.

Excluding the *Rohiṇī*- and the *Devakīlambha*, which we suspect to be later additions from the *Sarīra*, we are to reckon the number of Vasudeva’s wives at 28. It is worthy of our notice that this figure coincides approximately, though not exactly, with the figure 26 given by Budhasvāmin as the number of Naravāhanadatta’s wives. In *BK-ŚŚ* 3,103–104 the lotus-shaped aerial car of the prince is depicted in some detail. He sits in the middle of the emerald pericarp, while each of his wives occupies one of the 26 petals of the lotus. Further, in the prophecy of an astrologer in *BK-ŚŚ* 5,50 the wives of the still unborn son of King Udayana are compared to 26 pearls studded on a precious stone. Almost the same number of Naravāhanadatta’s wives is given in a Kashmiri version of the *BK*. In *KSS* 17,1,5 he is presented as being accompanied by his 25 wives during his stay at the hermitage of Kaśyapa. To the question as to which figure is prior to others, we cannot give any definite answer. We can, however, easily imagine that the story of Naravāhanadatta must have undergone alterations not only in names of characters but also in other particulars when it was adapted

³⁴ Cf. Bhayani and Shah p.70.

³⁵ Cf. Bhayani and Shah pp.69–71; Jagadishchandra 1977, pp.91–94.

³⁶ On the problems about the Pabhāvātī-story and the two missing *lambhas* in the *VH*, cf. Jagadishchandra 1975. According to Bhayani and Shah (pp.70–71), Dhammasena, finding two different versions of the story of Pabhāvātī in his sources, tried to accommodate both of them by splitting Pabhāvātī into two different characters, i.e. the daughter of Pavaṇavega and that of Piṅgalagandhāra.

by Saṅghadāsa to a Jaina setting. This consideration, as well as the generally ascertained faithfulness of Budhasvāmin's version to his model, may lead us to suppose that the hero had originally been represented as having 26 wives as we see at present in the *BK-ŚS*. Nelson, for his part, tries to demonstrate that in the Saṅghadāsa's source there were 26 *lambhas* relating Naravāhanadatta's acquisitions of these 26 wives³⁷. Although we can hardly follow his too forced manner of reckoning, he is essentially right in suggesting that the "*VH* reflects a model in which there was an exact one to one correspondence of *lambha* to wife."³⁸ We would thus not be greatly mistaken in supposing that the main part of the original *BK*, as well as that of the *BK-ŚS*, was divided into 26 *lambhas*, each dealing with Naravāhanadatta's acquisition of one particular maiden, although it is not certain whether the one-to-one correspondence was so exact as Nelson assumes.

The present edition of the *VH* does not contain a single line of the *Uvasaṃhāra*, because, as noted above, in all the manuscripts consulted by the editors the text abruptly breaks off in the midst of the 28th *lambha*. We can, therefore, obtain no exact knowledge as to Saṅghadāsa's plan for the last *ahigāra*. There is, on the other hand, little doubt that in the *Uvasaṃhāra* Saṅghadāsa intended to narrate Vasudeva's final reunion with Somasirī, without which the whole story can never come to a happy ending.

The scene of this final reunion is, however, not totally absent from the printed text of the *Sarīra*. At the beginning of the *Keumatīlambha* we come across a passage which describes Vasudeva's encounter with Somasirī, his battle with Mānasavega, and the return of the couple to Mahāpura³⁹. The editors of the *VH* question the authenticity of this passage and hold it to have been incorporated by some scholar whose concern was to preserve consistency with the narrative contents of the *VH-M*. In their footnote to the passage, they say that they retain it in their text only because they find it in all the manuscripts they used⁴⁰. This passage, quite ill-placed in its position at the start of the 21st *lambha*, appears to be nothing but a later insertion. Because of its elliptical and incomplete manner of description, Bhayani and Shah suspect that the passage is but a hurried translation of the same episode in Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita*⁴¹.

Other Jaina authors such as Dhammasēṇa, Puṣpadanta, and Hemacandra give a full account of the final reunion of Vasudeva and Somasirī in their own versions of the Vasudeva story⁴². These authors seem to have composed the concluding part of the Vasudeva story not on the basis of Saṅghadāsa's narration, but either with their own resources or in reliance on some non-Jaina versions of the *BK*. According to Dhammasēṇa's narration of the concluding

³⁷ Cf. Nelson pp.208–210.

³⁸ Cf. Nelson p.209.

³⁹ *VH* p.308, l.13–p.309,l.4.

⁴⁰ Cf. *VH* p.308, footnote.

⁴¹ Cf. Bhayani and Shah p.69.

⁴² Cf. Jagadishchandra 1977, pp.142–151.

part, translated by Jagadishchandra⁴³, it is through the mediation of a *vidyādhara* monarch called Balasīha that Somasirī is finally taken back from Māṇasavega to her husband. The same author describes the fierce battle fought by the armies of Vasudeva and Mānasavega. In the *VH-M*, however, Vasudeva does not slay his enemy, as does Naravāhanadatta in the *BKM* and the *KSS*, but pardons him at the solicitation of his mother, and both are reconciled to each other in the end. As a devout adherent to Jina's religion, Vasudeva must sometimes put into practice the doctrine of non-injury (*ahiṃsā*). Further, in contrast to Naravāhanadatta in the Kashmiri versions of the *BK*, Vasudeva in the *VH-M* neither conquers the world of *vidyādhara*s nor ascends to the throne of their emperor. As Alsdorf remarks, it is quite natural that the conquest and coronation of the hero should inevitably fall out of the framework of the Jaina versions of the *BK* since such narrative events do not go with the role Vasudeva plays within the cycle of Kṛṣṇa legends⁴⁴. With all these differences, the closing part of the Vasudeva story composed by Dhammasēṇa corresponds in its main outline to the last portion of the *Pañcalambaka* and the entire *Mahābhīṣekalambaka* of the Kashmiri versions of the *BK*.

We might well doubt if Saṅghadāsa had ever set out to compose his *Uvasaṃhāra*. It is more likely than not that in his lifetime the last *ahigāra* remained unwritten even after he had almost completed all the other sections of the *VH*. It is above all the narrative contents of the *Rohiṇīlambha* that make us suspect that Saṅghadāsa never composed the *Uvasaṃhāra*. This *lambha* is most likely to have already been added to the *Sarīra* by some redactor before Dhammasēṇa set out to write his *Majjhimakhaṇḍa*. As Jagadishchandra says, the episode of Vasudeva's return to Mahāpura with all his wives as related in the *Rohiṇīlambha* should logically take place at the end of the entire story⁴⁵. Most probably it was the absence of the *Uvasaṃhāra* that induced the said redactor to substitute his own version of the happy ending for the original conclusion of the Vasudeva story that Saṅghadāsa had planned to present in the last *ahigāra* of his work.

4

The analysis of the *VH* conducted by Alsdorf has shed ample light on the history of the *BK* literature. Not only has it reaffirmed Lacôte's theory on the priority of Budhasvāmin's version to those of the Kashmiri authors, but it has also demonstrated that such words as *pīṭha/pīṭhikā*, *mukha*, and *upasaṃhāra*, occurring as division titles in different branches of the *BK* tradition, all have their origin from the terminology of Guṇāḍhya himself or, at least, of his direct successors⁴⁶.

⁴³ Jagadishchandra 1977, pp.143–149.

⁴⁴ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.346.

⁴⁵ Cf. Jagadishchandra 1977, p.142.

⁴⁶ From several passages of the *Śṛīgāraprakāśa* we know that its author Bhoja had a good acquaintance with both Sanskrit and Pāli versions of the *BK* (Raghavan p.824 et seq.). In some of these passages

The title of the *Peḍhiyā* resembles that of the first book of the two Kashmiri versions, *Kathāpīḥalambaka*, although the resemblance does not extend to the contents of the respective texts. It is almost needless to say that the genesis of the *BK*, which constitutes the main subject matter of the *Kathāpīḥa*, cannot be fitted into the Jaina setting of Saṅghadāsa's work.

Almost the same state of affairs can be observed concerning the title of the second *ahigāra*. The *Muha* of the *VH* bears a similarity to the *Kathāmukha* of the *BKM* and the *KSS*. In spite of the similarity between these titles, the contents of the 'introduction' (*mukha*) differs remarkably from one tradition of the *BK* to another. In the *Kathāmukha*, which includes practically all the three chapters at the beginning of the *BK-ŚS*, Budhasvāmin narrates at full length the series of events that precede Naravāhanadatta's recital of his own life story, whereas the *Kathāmukhalambaka* of the Kashmiri versions is devoted to the narration of the deeds of King Udayana before the birth of the hero. The *Muha* of the *VH* does not deserve the title of 'introduction', as this *ahigāra* gives no more than an episodic account of Samba's childish pranks. It is this very discrepancy between the title and contents of the *Muha* that provides proof of the antiquity of the *ahigāra* division.

Among the *BK* versions now extant, it is only Kṣemendra's composition that still contains a section called *Upasaṃhāra*. The main subject matter dealt with in this appendix to the *BKM* is:

1. An introduction, which tells how the hero began to relate his life story.
2. A summary of Naravāhanadatta's life story related by himself.
3. A list of the 18 *lambakas*.
4. A brief account of the translation of Guṇāḍhya's *Paiśācī BK* into Sanskrit.
5. Kṣemendra's account of his father and himself, as well as of the circumstances under which he embarked upon the composition of his own text of the *BK*⁴⁷.

Since there exists no parallel section in the *KSS*, both Speyer and Lacôte considered it impossible for the common source of the Kashmiri versions to have already been provided with its own *Upasaṃhāra*⁴⁸. The antiquity of this concluding section is, however, proved beyond doubt by Saṅghadāsa's reference to the *Uvasaṃhāra* as the last *ahigāra* of his Jaina version. From this evidence Alsdorf deduces that the *Upasaṃhāra* is by no means such a later addition to the *BKM* as Lacôte seems to believe, saying that it even goes back to the original *BK*⁴⁹. As regards the contents, the oldest *Upasaṃhāra* cannot have been the same as that of

we come across such section titles as *Kathāpīḥa* and *Kathāmukha*. According to Raghavan (p.825), these titles should not necessarily be taken as those of the first two *lambakas* of the present Kashmiri versions. Bhoja's references to them render it plausible that he had before him some unknown version(s) of the *BK* which contained such sections as *Kathāpīḥa* and *Kathāmukha*.

⁴⁷ For the analysis of Kṣemendra's *Upasaṃhāra*, cf. Tsuchida 2002², pp.237–243.

⁴⁸ Cf. Speyer p.33; Lacôte p.121.

⁴⁹ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.347.

Kṣemendra's redaction⁵⁰. Our above considerations on the last missing *ahigāra* of the *VH* induce us to assume that the most original *Upasaṃhāra* also had as its main subject matter the final reunion of the hero with his most beloved wife abducted by Mānasavega. Within the main part designated as the *Sarīra* in the Jaina version, which seems to have consisted of a series of *lambhas*, there remained little room for the narrative of this final reunion, for it could hardly be counted as an 'acquisition' of a new bride by the hero. The happy ending of the Naravāhanadatta story could, therefore, be dealt with nowhere else but in a separate section concluding the entire work, for which the title of *Upasaṃhāra* was undoubtedly the most suitable.

On the basis of his inquiry into the *VH* in comparison with the Nepali and Kashmiri versions, Alsdorf attempts to restore the original structure of Guṇāḍhya's composition. According to this scholar, the oldest *BK* was made up of the following four sections⁵¹:

1. *Kathāpīṭha*: the stories of Udayana and his wives.
2. *Kathāmukha*: the frame story, in which Naravāhanadatta is introduced as the narrator of his own amorous adventures.
3. The series of *lambhas*, narrated by Naravāhanadatta himself.
4. *Upasaṃhāra*.

<Table D>

As mentioned above, Alsdorf is certainly right in saying that the *Kahuppattī* of the *VH* is merely a Jainistic addition. He further excludes the *Pratimukha* from his list of components of the original *BK*. Apparently he denies that there ever existed in Guṇāḍhya's work any section that corresponded to the fourth *ahigāra* of the *VH*. As for the title *Śarīra*, he supposes that it was given to the main part consisting of *lambhas* not by Guṇāḍhya himself but composed only later by Saṅghadāsa or some redactor of the *BK* prior to him⁵².

5

The oldest structure of the *BK* presented by Alsdorf cannot be accepted by us without any modification. The division of a literary work into sections such as *mukha*, *pratimukha*, and *upasaṃhāra* was not Guṇāḍhya's own invention as Alsdorf apparently believes. The principle of this textual division is likely to have once been of wider currency and applied not only to *kathās* but to several other genres of literary work also.

It is the theory of *saṃdhi* (joint) expounded in the 19th chapter (*adhyāya*) of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* [NŚ] that bears a striking resemblance in terminology to the division of the *VH* into *ahigāras*. The five *saṃdhis* enumerated by Bharata in NŚ 19,35 are: 1. *mukha*, 2. *pratimukha*, 3. *garbha*, 4. *vimarśa*, and 5. *nirvahaṇa*. Here we need not dwell upon the quite

⁵⁰ Cf. Tsuchida 2002, pp.459–460.

⁵¹ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.348.

⁵² Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.347.

intricate system of Bharata's dramaturgy, in which the theory of five *saṃdhis* is inseparably connected with that of five *arthaprakṛtis* (elements) and that of five *avasthās* (conditions)⁵³.

The same topic is discussed in the treatises of Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha. In his list of five *saṃdhis*, Dhanañjaya gives *avamarśa* as the fourth item, while both of these authors call the last 'joint' *upasaṃhṛti*. In *Daśarūpaka* [DR] 1,49 Dhanañjaya still uses the term *nirvahaṇa* as the designation of the fifth *saṃdhi*, whereas in DR 1,24 the same author gives *upasaṃhṛti* as the last item in the *saṃdhi* list.

Further, it is worthy of our special notice that in DR 1,50 one of the 14 *aṅgas* (components) of *nirvahaṇa* is termed *upasaṃhāra*. This is obviously a synonym of *kāvyaśaṃhāra*, which Dhanañjaya defines in DR 1,54 as *varaprāpti*, i.e., fulfillment of the wish (by the hero). Most probably Dhanañjaya has taken over this concept from Bharata, who gives the same definition of *kāvyaśaṃhāra* in NS 19,103. As far as the terminology of the fifth *saṃdhi* is concerned, Viśvanātha is not essentially different from Dhanañjaya. Defining the last *saṃdhi* in *Sāhityadarpana* [SD] 6,80–81, Viśvanātha uses the term *nirvahaṇa*, while the same author calls it *upasaṃhṛti* in his enumeration of all five 'joints' in SD 6,75.

The five *saṃdhis* according to the ancient theories of dramatics can be tabulated as follows:

1. *mukha*
2. *pratimukha*
3. *garbha*
4. *vimarśa* (*avamarśa*)
5. *nirvahaṇa* (*upasaṃhṛti*)

<Table E>

The similarities between these five *saṃdhis* and the six *ahigāras* can hardly be regarded as a mere coincidence.

On the basis of these similarities we should suppose that there once existed among those engaged in literary arts and theories a certain trend to divide or analyse a literary work into several different components such as *mukha*, *pratimukha*, and *upasaṃhāra*. We cannot say anything certain about the relative chronology of the *BK* and the *NS*. Considering the high antiquity of the *BK*⁵⁴, however, we cannot ignore the possibility that the theory of *saṃdhi* came into being in the school of Bharata under some influence from the literary tradition of the *BK*. Be that as it may, we should take into account not only the *ahigāra* list and other evidence we find within the *BK* texts, but also the list of *saṃdhis*, as well as relevant passages in dramatic treatises, when we attempt to restore the original structure of Guṇāḍhya's narrative

⁵³ On the theories on the inner structure of dramatical composition set forth by Bharata, Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha, cf. Konow pp.18–20; Lévi pp. 30–57.

⁵⁴ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, pp.345–346.

work.

6

As mentioned above, Alsdorf considers that the title *Śarīra* was given only secondarily to the central section of the *BK* in which all the *lambhas* had been brought together⁵⁵. Viewed in the light of Bharata's theory of *saṃdhi*, this opinion of Alsdorf becomes unacceptable to us. In Bharata's *saṃdhi* list we do not find *śarīra* (body) but *garbha* (embryo) as the third item. Being semantically related to each other, both terms as literary concepts might perhaps be regarded as deriving from one common idea. Moreover, the term *śarīra* is not entirely absent from Bharata's *saṃdhi* theory, in which it occupies a certain important position. At the beginning of the 19th chapter of the *NS* the term is defined as follows:

*itivr̥ttaṃ tu nāṭyasya śarīraṃ parikīrtitam/
pañcabhiḥ saṃdhibhis tasya vibhāgaḥ samprakalpitaḥ*|| (*NS* 19,17)

Now the plot of a dramatic representation is generally designated as 'body'. It is by means of five 'joints' that the division [of the 'body' into several sections] is contrived.

In this verse Bharata presents *śarīra* as a concept superordinate to the *saṃdhis*. Unlike the fifth *ahigāra* of the *VH*, the term does not refer to any particular component of a work but denotes the general plot of a drama⁵⁶. We might, nonetheless, deem it possible that the same term, if somewhat modified in its denotation, could be applied to the main part, rather than the entirety, of a narrative composition, as was done by the author of the *VH*. It is thus probable that the sequence of *lambhas* had already been provided with the title of *Śarīra* in the *BK* version that served as the model for Saṅghadāsa.

The existence of such divisions as *Muha*, *Kathāmukha*, and *Kathāmukhalambaka* in all three traditions renders it almost incontestable that the original *BK* was also furnished with a section entitled *Mukha*. Among the extant versions of the *BK*, it is no doubt that of Budhasvāmin which preserves almost intact the original contents and position of the *Mukha*. This *Mukha* corresponds to the first three chapters of the *BK-ŚS*, in which the series of events preceding Naravāhanadatta's recital of his life story is narrated at full length.

In the original *BK* the *Mukha* must have been immediately followed by another block entitled *Pratimukha*. Most probably this block had essentially the same narrative contents as chapters 4–6 of the *BK-ŚS*. The main subject matter of these chapters is the birth and growth of the hero. As this subject matter does not yet concern any of his 'acquisitions', it must inevitably fall out of the main block called *Śarīra*, which is made up exclusively of the *lambhas*. Alsdorf omits the *Pratimukha* from his plan of Guṇādhya's oldest version (see Table D)⁵⁷. We can, however, hardly imagine that the section about Naravāhanadatta's

⁵⁵ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.347.

⁵⁶ Cf. *KA* 8,3,95 (vol.1,p.435).

⁵⁷ According to Alsdorf (1938, p.348), the *Pratimukha* was only secondarily split off from the *Mukha*.

boyhood had not been provided with its own title. The *saṃdhi* list examined above also testifies to the antiquity of *pratimukha* as a term denoting a component part of a literary composition. There is thus little doubt that in the oldest *BK* the story of Naravāhanadatta as a minor, which occupied an intermediate position between the *Mukha* and the *Śarīra*, was presented as the *Pratimukha*.

Naravāhanadatta's recital of his own adventures must have continued into the final section designated *Upasaṃhāra*. This *Upasaṃhāra* had probably the same contents as the *Mahābhiṣekalambaka* (including the last portion of the *Pañcalambaka*) of the two Kashmiri versions, which gives a full account of how the hero is again united with his most beloved wife and how he ascends to the throne of the emperor ruling over the entire *vidyādhara* world.

Although neither the Nepali nor the Jaina version relates the happy ending of the whole story, we might well imagine that the first-person narration of Naravāhanadatta, which had begun with the *Pratimukha* and continued throughout the *Śarīra*, did not extend as far as the very end of the *Upasaṃhāra*, but was terminated just before the finale of the entire work. We might conjecture that this finale consisted of a scene of general admiration and congratulation by Naravāhanadatta's audience as well as of the enumeration of merits to be acquired by listening to the recitation (*śravaṇaphala*) of the "Grand Story."

The series of stories about Udayana's marriages with Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī, which we find related at length in the *Kathāmukha*- and *Lāvāṇakalambaka* of the Kashmiri versions, is absent from the *BK-ŚS*. Nevertheless, chapters 4–6 of the same work contain several particular elements of the legends about Udayana and his queens⁵⁸ and about his parents Śātānīka and Mr̥gayāvati⁵⁹. It is evident that Budhasvāmin had at his disposal ample narrative material about King Udayana. Probably it was because of the popularity of the Udayana stories that he considered it unnecessary to incorporate them into his own composition, which he presented as a 'summary' (*saṃgraha*) of some longer version of the *BK*⁶⁰. Alsdorf is, therefore, quite right inasmuch as he believes that the original *BK* already included the Udayana stories⁶¹.

As for the original position of the Udayana stories within the *BK*, we cannot agree with Alsdorf in supposing that they constituted the main subject matter of the *Kathāpīṭha*⁶². This supposition implies that the Udayana stories had once lain outside the first-person narration of the hero and that the stories of King Udayana were separated from those about Naravāhanadatta's birth and growth by the intrusion of the *Kathāmukha*. Such an arrangement of narrative topics would have appeared rather unnatural. It seems more probable that from the first the history of the royal clan of Kauśāmbī formed a coherent whole and never suffered any such interruption as Alsdorf apparently assumes. The most suitable place for the

⁵⁸ *BK-ŚS* 5,288–323.

⁵⁹ *BK-ŚS* 5,89–175.

⁶⁰ Cf. Keith p.274.

⁶¹ Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.348. The present text of the *Peruṅkatai* consists for the most part of the Udayana story. This fact also indicates the antiquity of the Udayana legend as component of the *BK*.

⁶² Cf. Alsdorf 1938, p.348.

Udayana stories would, therefore, be the opening part of the *Pratimukha*. In other words, in this section the hero must have entered into his own personal history only after having fully recounted the amorous deeds of his father and grandfather.

Although Bharata's *saṃdhi* list does not give any such item as *pīṭha*, the titles of the first book of the Kashmiri versions and of the first *ahigāra* of the Jaina version, i.e., *Kathāpīṭhalambaka* and *Peḍhiyā*, suggest that the oldest *BK* had been provided with a general introduction called *Pīṭha*. From the existing versions of the *BK* we cannot obtain any evidence affording us insights into the contents of this introduction. We can only conjecture that the *Pīṭha* related the life of Guṇāḍhya and then described the circumstances under which his "Grand Story" came into being. We do not know whether the narrator of this introduction was Guṇāḍhya himself or whether he was represented therein by some unknown author as a poet of an older generation.

The results of our investigation into the textual division of the original *BK* are summarized in the table below. The corresponding chapters of the *BK-ŚS* are given in parenthesis.

I. <i>Pīṭha</i> :	(auto)biographical account of Guṇāḍhya and description of what motivated the poet to create the <i>BK</i> .
II. <i>Mukha</i> (<i>BK-ŚS</i> 1–3):	the series of events that finally induced Naravāhanadatta to recount his personal career.
III. <i>Pratimukha</i> (<i>BK-ŚS</i> 4–6):	Naravāhanadatta first recounts the deeds of his father and grandfather; he then proceeds to relate his birth and boyhood.
IV. <i>Śarīra</i> (<i>BK-ŚS</i> 7–?):	divided into 26(?) <i>lambhas</i> , in each of which Naravāhanadatta narrates the story about his acquisition of one particular bride. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Madanamañjukāmbha</i> (<i>BK-ŚS</i> 7–11) 2. <i>Vegavatīlambha</i> (12–15) 3. <i>Gandharvadattāmbha</i> (16–18) 4. <i>Ajinavatīlambha</i> (19–20) 5. <i>Priyadarśanāmbha</i> (21–27) 6. <i>Bhagīrathayaśolambha</i> (28–?) <p style="text-align: center;">⋮</p>
V. <i>Upasaṃhāra</i> :	Naravāhanadatta concludes the recital of his personal history with the account of his reunion with Madanamañjukā and his coronation as overlord of the <i>vidyādhara</i> kings. The whole work ends with the approbation of Naravāhanadatta's audience. <i>śravaṇaphala</i> .

<Table F>

In our present investigation we have repeatedly spoken of ‘the original *BK*’, as if we ever held it possible to trace the outlines of the oldest text composed by Guṇāḍhya himself. Strictly speaking, however, we cannot say anything definite about the most original shape of the *BK*. What we can discern even so from our available textual materials is little more than the textual division of the prototype from which all the extant versions of the *BK* are descended. Table F presents what this prototype seems to have looked like as regards textual division and general narrative contents.

Finally, we have to make a brief survey of the definitions of *kathā* and *mahākāvya* given by Daṇḍin in the first chapter (*khaṇḍa*) of his *Kāvyaḍarśa* [*KĀ*].

In *KĀ* 1,23–24 Daṇḍin defines *kathā* as a category of narrative composition in prose. He also states that the hero of a *kathā* can play the role of narrator. He further refers to the *lambha* division of a *kathā* in *KĀ* 1,27⁶³. In formulating this definition of *kathā* Daṇḍin must have had in mind a certain old version of the *BK*. Most probably the main part of this version, divided into *lambhas*, consisted of Naravāhanadatta’s own narration of his amorous adventures⁶⁴. In *KĀ* 1,38, in fact, Daṇḍin speaks of the *BK* as a *kathā* composed in the Paiśācī language.

In *KĀ* 1,14–19 Daṇḍin lists those characteristics that make up a *mahākāvya*. One of the conditions required of a *mahākāvya* is that it be divided into chapters called *sargas*. It is apparently because of this *sarga* division that a *mahākāvya* is also termed *sargabandha* in *KĀ* 1,14. In other respects too the Nepali version of the *BK* fits Daṇḍin’s definition of *mahākāvya* almost perfectly. Thus the task achieved by Budhasvāmin with his *BK-ŚS* turns out to have been the adaptation of a *kathā*, transforming it into a *mahākāvya*. It was this very process of adaptation that brought about a certain confusion which we have observed in the chapter colophons of the *BK-ŚS* (see Table A), for Budhasvāmin did not leave out entirely the elements of the older textual division from his colophons, but tried only clumsily to incorporate some of them, such as *Kathāmukha* and *lābha*, into his new framework of *sarga* division⁶⁵.

ABBREVIATIONS AND TEXTS

Kāvyaṇuśāsana [*KA*]

Kāvyaṇuśāsana By Āchārya Hemachandra with an Anonymous Tippana. Edited by Rasikhal C. Parikh. 2 vols. Bombay 1938.

Kāvyaḍarśa [*KĀ*]

Ācārya Daṇḍī-*Kāvyaḍarśa*. edited by Yogeśvaradattaśarmā. 4 vols. Delhi 1999.

Kathāsaritsāgara [*KSS*]

⁶³ Cf. *KA* 8,8 (vol.1,p.65).

⁶⁴ Cf. Lacôte pp.282–283; Tsuchida 2002, p.454.

⁶⁵ Budhasvāmin is certainly not responsible for all of the inconsistencies found in the colophons of the *BK-ŚS*. Some of them, e.g. *Priyadarśanālābha* as the title of the 28th chapter are to be ascribed to some later scribe.

The Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva edited by Pandit Durgāprasād & Kāśināth Pāndurang Parab. Third Edition. Revised by V. L. Sh. Paṅsīkar. Bombay 1915.

Daśarūpaka [DR]

Daśarūpaka of Dhanañjaya. edited by Bholāshankar Vyās. Varanasi 1973.

Nāṭyaśāstra [NS]

Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharatamuni with the Commentary Abhinavabhāratī By Abhinavaguptācārya. Edited by R. S. Nagar 4 vols. Delhi 1983 (Reprint 1987).

Bṛhatkathāmañjarī [BKM]

The Brihatkathāmañjarī of Kshemendra. Edited by M. P. Śivadatta. Second Edition. Bombay 1931.

Bṛhatkathā-Ślokaśaṅgraha [BK-ŚS]

Bṛhat-kathā Ślokaśaṅgraha. Texte Sanskrit par Félix Lacôte. Paris 1908–29.

Vasudevahiṇḍī [VH]

Pūjyaśrī Saṅghadāsagaṇi-vācakavinirmitaṃ Vasudevahiṇḍī-prathamakhaṇḍaṃ. 2 vols. Edited by Caturvijayamuni and Puṇyavijayamuni. Bhāvanagara 1930–31.

Vasudevahiṇḍī- Majjhimakhaṇḍa [VH-M]

Dharmasagaṇi Mahattara's Vasudevahiṇḍī Madhyama Khaṇḍa. edited by H. C. Bhayani and R. M. Shah. Part I. Ahmedabad 1987.

Sāhityadarpaṇa [SD]

Sāhityadarpaṇa of Viśvanātha. Edited by Durgāprasāda Dvivedī. Delhi 1982 (Reprinted from 1922 Edition of Nirnaya Sagar Press. Bombay).

REFERENCES

Alsdorf, Ludwig

1936 Harivaṃśapurāṇa. Ein Abschnitt aus der Apabhraṃśa-Welthistorie “Mahāpurāṇa Tisaṭṭhimahāpurisagaṇālaṃkāra” von Puṣpadanta. Hamburg 1936.

1935–37 The Vasudevahiṇḍī, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 8, pp.319–333.

1938 Eine neue Version der verlorenen Brhatkathā des Guṇādhya. Atti del XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti (Rom), pp.344–349.

1938² A new version of the Aḡaḍadatta story. New Indian Antiquary 1, pp.281–299.

Bhayani and Shah

1987 see *VH-M*

Jagadishchandra Jain

1975 The missing lambhas in the Vasudevahindī and the story of Pabhāvātī. Indo-Iranian Journal 17, pp.41–56.

- 1977 The Vasudevahiṇḍi- An authentic Jaina version of the Bṛhatkathā. Ahmedabad.
- Keith, A, Berriedale
1928 A History of Sanskrit Literature. Oxford.
- Konow, Sten
1920 Das indische Drama. Berlin and Leipzig.
- Kuiper, F. B. J.
1957 The Paiśācī Fragment of the Kuvalayamālā. Indo-Iranian Journal 1, pp.228–240.
- Lacôte, Félix
1908 Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā. Paris.
- Lévi, Sylvain
1890 Le Théâtre Indien. Paris.
- Master, Alfred
1948 An Unpublished Fragment of Paiśācī. Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 12, pp.659–667.
- Mayrhofer, Colin Max
1975 Studies in the Bṛhatkathā. A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of Australian National University. Canberra.
- Nelson, Donald Allan
1974 The Bṛhatkathā: A Reconstruction from Bṛhatkathāsamgraha, Peruṅkatai and Vasudevahiṇḍi. Chicago.
- Raghavan, V.
1978 Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa. Third Revised Enlarged Edition. Madras.
- Speyer, J. S.
1908 Studies about the Kathāsaritsāgara. Amsterdam.
- Tsuchida, Ryutaro
2002 On the Narrative Structure of the Kashmiri Versions of the Bṛhatkathā. Buddhist and Indian Studies In Honour of Prof. Sodo Mori (Hamamatsu), pp.449–474.
2002² Über die direkte Quelle für die kaschmirischen Versionen der Bṛhatkathā. Indologica Taurinensia 27, pp.211–250.
- Vijayalakshmy, R.
1981 A Study of the Peruṅkatai. Madras.

2007.3.16

Professor, the University of Tokyo