

Charming bouquet or wedding garland? : The structures of the Jain heroine "novel" in Prakrit from Kuvalayaml (779) to Manoram (1082)

Autor(en): **Chojnacki, Christine**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **70 (2016)**

Heft 2

PDF erstellt am: **02.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-696838>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Christine Chojnacki*

Charming bouquet or wedding garland? The structures of the Jain heroine ‘novel’ in Prakrit From *Kuvalayamālā* (779) to *Maṇoramā* (1082)

DOI 10.1515/asia-2015-0063

Abstract: It is undisputed that Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī* has marked a turning point in the history of Indian literature not only because it introduced an elegant prose form into the *kāvya* style, but also because it evinced a unitary and complex plot that was a complete innovation as compared to the juxtaposed structure of contemporary works like Daṇḍin’s *Daśakumāracarita*. As a much admired work, *Kādambarī* is known to have influenced many poets and playwrights in the following centuries throughout India. However, it is often ignored that with its romantic themes and narrative structures Bāṇa’s work has also inspired several Jain ‘novels’ named after a heroine in various forms and languages from the eighth to the eleventh century. The aim of the following paper is to concentrate on the Jain heroine ‘novels’ in Prakrit and to examine which aesthetic or religious reasons motivated the Jain monk-poets, to begin with Uddyotana, to deviate from the usual structure of a long Jain narrative, such as Haribhadra’s *Samarāiccakahā*, and to adopt for their heroine ‘novels’ in Prakrit a difficult and totally new model of narration.

Keywords: Indian novel, Jain narrative, *Kādambarī*, heroine, Prakrit literature

The choice of the designation ‘novel’ adopted in this paper for the genre of a long narrative named after a heroine is deliberate, but it is not straightforward.¹ Indeed, as it has been often underlined in literary criticism, the narrative genre has not been codified in the same way as poetry or drama and had very disparate embodiments in content (marvellous, realistic), as well as in

¹ This paper is a much revised version of a talk I gave during the Deutscher Orientalistentag organised in Münster in September 2013.

*Corresponding author: Christine Chojnacki, Professor and Director of the Department of Indology, Université Lyon 3, 6 cours Albert Thomas, Lyon 69008, France.
E-mail: christine.chojnacki@univ-lyon3.fr

form (prose or verse), which has led to various designations.² Moreover, the term ‘novel’ in English does not have the same connotations as the corresponding word ‘roman’ in French. As a matter of fact, the French term was created according to the popular language in use, Roman instead of Latin, and had its roots in medieval narratives in verse;³ as for the English word, it was adopted as the expression of the change in the society of the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries and its reflection in the content of “a long prose narrative whose well-constructed plot stays close to everyday life and whose characters have both virtues and faults”.⁴

A first consequence of this complex situation has been that, in order to take into account the difference between the French and the English, modern critics have felt the need to add an adjective to the French and to speak of a modern form in prose “roman moderne” in opposition to an ancient form insisting on the marvellous content and corresponding to the English “romance”.⁵ A second consequence has been the dual attitude towards the label ‘novel’. Indeed, on the one hand, in spite of the great liberty of the genre, there has been the tendency, not unaffected by ideology, to refuse to designate as ‘novel’ any narrative of world literature that was not in prose and that was prior to the seventeenth century, a period that saw the rise of the Spanish and the French novels composed, respectively, by Miguel de Cervantes and Mme de Lafayette, or to the eighteenth century with the apparition of the English novel as created by Daniel Defoe or Samuel Richardson.⁶ As a result, scholars of classics had to argue for extending the term ‘novel’ to ancient Greek and Latin prose narratives. As recalled by A. Billault, this was done for instance by the seventeenth century scholar Pierre-Daniel Huet in his *Lettre sur l’origine des romans*, but it remains

2 While some rather dwell on the type of discourse (narrative, story), others utilise distinctions depending on the length (short story, novel) or the content (tale, romance, novel); and in some other cases, adjectives are added in order to specify the form (poetic novel), the content (heroic novel), or the aim (didactic novel). Cf. Raimond 2015: 28–30; Valette 2005: 6–8; Chartier 1996: 1–6.

3 Cf. Raimond 2015: 27; Rey 1997: 6; Pavel 2013: 17.

4 Cf. Pavel 2013: 6, and particularly, 1: “There is a widespread view that the novel emerged relatively late in history, as a literary expression of modernity. Just as the Enlightenment swept away obsolete kinds of narratives – sometimes called romances – looked at life through distorting lenses, and portraying idealized, implausible characters, the novel, we are told, turned its attention to the ordinary lives of real people in the real world.”

5 Cf. for instance Raimond 2015: 30 (quoting the classification made by Larousse in the nineteenth century); Rey 1997: 3–4. On the differences between a romance and a novel in English, cf. Pavel 2013: 17.

6 Cf. Pavel 2013: 1.

disputed whether Greek narratives can be considered ‘novels’.⁷ Similarly, if there have been attempts since the last century to designate as ‘novels’ classical Indian narratives,⁸ the idea is still well-established in contemporary writings that the ‘Indian novel’ started with the first English novels written in India.⁹ Thus, while the differentiation in labels between ‘romance’ and ‘novel’ shows an awareness of the remarkable innovations introduced into the narratives of the eighteen–nineteenth centuries, it also tends to occlude the fact that the modern forms of narratives called ‘novels’ could come into existence only through continuous literary innovations in world literature, as Samuel Richardson had realised.¹⁰

In contradistinction, there has also been the temptation to designate as ‘novel’ every form of narrative. Thus, in 1862, A. Chassang placed under the term ‘novel’ every Greek text relating invented facts of a marvellous nature.¹¹ Much more recently, S. Moore stated in his book *The Novel: An Alternative History: Beginnings to sixteenth Century*: “In my ecumenical view – schooled by the wild variety of forms, the novel has taken in the last century – any book-length fictional narrative

7 Cf. Billault 1991:10–11, referring to the work of Pierre-Daniel Huet, who wrote to Segrais his *Lettre sur l'origine des romans* in order to rehabilitate the ancient novels in their roles and rights and defined them as “histoires feintes d'aventures amoureuses écrites en prose avec art pour le plaisir et l'instruction des lecteurs” distinct from the other forms of fiction.

8 Thus while Glasenapp 1929: 182 stated that the Indian long narratives were not ‘novels’ like the Bengali works of the nineteenth century because of their fabulous content, he further said that they should nevertheless be counted as ‘novels’ since their plot was not deprived of suspense (“Es sind dieses keine Romane im Sinne der modernen bengalischen Prosaisten, die wie Bankimcandra Caṭṭopādhyāya, Tāraknāth Ganguli, Rabindranāth Ṭhākur ein realistisches Bild indischen Lebens geben, sondern durchaus Märchenbücher, bei denen das Überirdische eine grosse Rolle spielt [...] Trotz dieser preziösen Form des Ausdrucks und des durch sie bedingten langsamen Fortschreitens der Handlung sind diese Werke darum doch nicht ohne Spannung und dürfen mit Recht als Romane gelten”). On the contemporary hesitation between ‘romance’ and ‘novel’, cf. n. 5.

9 Mukherjee 2008: 106 states that “Literary historians have cited different dates for the first Indian novel, with Bengali and Marathi vying for first prize, but it is by and large agreed that the novel came into existence in India in the second half of the nineteenth century. This was roughly a generation after Macaulay’s ‘Minute’ decreed English as the language of higher education, exposing an entire class of urban Indian men to British narrative models. But before the new paradigms got indigenised, pre-novel forms of fiction existed in most Indian languages”.

10 Cf. Pavel 2013: 5, “While the early period should *not* be seen as mere preparation for a genuine rise of the novel in the eighteenth century, its achievements did play a major role in the subsequent history of the genre. Samuel Richardson, a self-taught writer, realized that the best features of the older narrative subgenres could be mixed together”.

11 Cf. Billault 1991:12.

can be called a novel”.¹² And further, “a ‘novel’ is a prose composition longer than a short story, either fictitious in content or in its treatment of historical events, ‘worked out with an eye toward a strategy of effects’”.¹³ Indeed the presentation of tales, short stories or romances as ‘novels’ reveals a desire to rehabilitate ancient forms of artistic narrative, as was the case with the ancient Greek novel,¹⁴ and to show how the various narrative forms and their continuous inventiveness have contributed to the novel of today. However, it is unfortunate that this attitude tends to serve the contrary purpose. In effect, how can one prove the boldness and innovation of an ancient narrative (such as the much admired *Kādambarī* of Bāṇa), if one uses a single term that favours the confusion between a work with a complex plot and simple tales or collections of stories?¹⁵ Besides, in the case of Indian literature, such a position does not do justice to the variety of literary forms which the theoreticians had already recognised and distinguished.¹⁶ Thus the generalisation of the term ‘novel’ rather results in opposing again all the ancient narratives to modern ‘novels’ and in ignoring, at least on the surface, the modernity of many a brilliant work from the classical or medieval period. That is probably why S. Moore resorts to other ways to distinguish the Indian fictitious narratives he presents, such as degrees in the appreciation or differentiations in the structure.¹⁷

Therefore, instead of insisting on an opposition of ‘romance’ against ‘novel’ that cannot be satisfactorily answered, since part of the definition is based on the content,¹⁸ it seems appropriate in order to see the originality of Indian narratives

¹² Cf. Moore 2010: 5.

¹³ “The quoted phrase is from Italo Calvino’s *Uses of Literature* (p. 109) and encompasses form, technique, style, tone, rhythm, intention, and other aspects of the novel. (Content does not matter: a novel can be about anything.)”: cf. Moore 2010: 5. See also the definitions given for the novel by Littré “une histoire feinte, écrite en prose, où l’auteur cherche à exciter l’intérêt par la peinture des passions, des mœurs, ou par la singularité des aventures” or by the *Robert* “une œuvre d’imagination en prose, assez longue, qui présente et fait vivre dans un milieu des personnages donnés comme réels, nous fait connaître leur psychologie, leurs destins, leurs aventures” (Raimond 2015: 30).

¹⁴ See Pavel 2013: 17; Billault 1991.

¹⁵ For instance: *Pañcatantra* (Moore 2010: 409–411); Daṇḍin’s *Daśakumāracarita* (Moore 2010: 434–437); *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* (Moore 2010: 438–439); Vikramāditya’s *Simhāsanadvātriṃśikā* (Moore 2010: 444–445).

¹⁶ Cf. infra, n. 19.

¹⁷ Thus, “the great Bāṇa, author of the two finest novels of this period” (Moore 2010: 427); *Kādambarī* is an ‘ambitious novel’ whose writer “chose to challenge himself and his readers with an achronological narrative in an embedded structure five levels deep” (Moore 2010: 430); “Daṇḍin wrote the most readerly of these learned, writerly novels” (Moore 2010: 434).

¹⁸ Not only is the ‘novel’ multi-faceted, but also its content is variously defined. For example, if one reason to exclude a work from the genre is marvellous content (Rey 1997: 6), there have been also many debates on the meaning of ‘realism’ (Rey 1997: 7): cf. Piegay-Gros 2005: 30–39. And it is an

of the past to combine formal and structural criteria deriving from modern literary criticism (tale, short story, mini-novel, romance, novel) and classical Indian categories (*kathā*, *ākhyāyikā*, *kāvya*, *gadya* and *padya*) – also not without ambiguities¹⁹ – as scholars such as H. von Glasenapp, L. Renou and S. Lienhard have done since the last century. Thus, they make a distinction within the Indian narratives between ‘tales’ with a simple structure and archetypal characters (such as the *Pañcatantra*), and ‘novels’.²⁰ If the first category was easy to define, since there were clear-cut formal criteria according to both Indian and Western theoreticians, the second one on inspection turned out to be composite. As a matter of fact, in respect to Indian theoreticians, the second group of Indian narratives belonged to the genre of *kāvya* that could be *padya* ‘in verse’ or more often *gadya* ‘in prose’ and that was characterised by exigent formal criteria.²¹ But this *kāvya* narrative could only partially fit the category of the ‘novel’ or ‘romance’ as defined by Western critics.²² This is visible through both the inconsistencies in respect to designations employed²³ and the subdivisions they proposed for the genre of the *kāvya* narrative between extended tales with a simple and juxtaposed

irony of fate that D. Defoe who did not want his work to be labelled as a novel ended up by representing one of the first specimens of the genre in English literature (Raimond 2015: 28).

19 *Kāvya* ‘poem’ and *kathā* ‘story’ in particular can be genres, but they can also respectively designate ‘ornate’ and ‘simple’ styles; besides, other categories evolved: while *ākhyāyikā* was at first an ‘experienced’ story as opposed to *kathā*, a ‘fictive’ story, the two terms merged and the distinction was no longer valid (Lienhard 1984: 228–231).

20 Thus Glasenapp and Renou divide the narrative literature as follows: Glasenapp 1929, “Fabel und Märchenwerke” (pp. 178–182) and “Kunstromane” (pp. 182–183); Renou 1985.2, ‘contes’ (§ 1808–1834) ‘roman’ (§ 1835–1844); The same division does not occur in the book of Lienhard, since he deals with *A History of Classical Poetry*, but he also uses both Western and Indian categories: cf. n. 23.

21 See Glasenapp 1929: 182; Renou 1985, § 1835.

22 Cf. Glasenapp 1929: 182; cf. also Renou 1985, § 1835: “le petit groupe des romans n’est pas sans analogie avec la masse des contes; le sujet en effet est emprunté à la littérature narrative, les procédés de composition (récit-cadre, etc.) sont similaires. Mais le roman est avant tout et foncièrement un *kāvya*, c’est-à-dire une œuvre d’art soumise aux mêmes conventions de forme et de fond que la haute lyrique ou l’épopée savante”.

23 On the one hand, L. Renou 1985 adds adjectives more precisely to define the works he places under the label ‘roman’: ‘roman picaresque’ for Daṇḍin’s *Daśakumāracarita* (§ 1836), ‘sorte de roman historique’ for Bāṇa’s *Harṣacarita* (§ 1839), ‘roman fantastique’ for Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī* (§ 1842) (cf. also Glasenapp 1929: 182–183, ‘Kunstromane’); on the other hand, he expresses the difficulty in placing the Indian *kāvya* narratives under a unique label by using dual expressions, such as ‘conte amplifié’ for Subandhu’s *Vāsavadattā* (§ 1837) and ‘roman-conte’ for *Kādambarī* (§ 1838). In a similar way, S. Lienhard speaks of Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī* sometimes as a *mahākāvya* in prose (1984: 138) or ‘prose poem’ (1984: 252), sometimes as a ‘novel’ (1984: 151, 244).

structure, such as Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita*,²⁴ and composed 'novels' with a complex central plot (all episodes of which are necessary) and developed characters (who evolve in the narrative), such as Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*.²⁵ Thus, with the clear-cut criterion of the structures, scholars established, within the *kāvya* narrative literature, a gradation from the loosest up to the most complex and intricate structure and unanimously singled out Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* as a prose masterpiece.²⁶

Indeed, if it is still debated whether *Kādambarī* is a romance or a novel,²⁷ it is undisputed that it has marked a turning point in the history of narrative literature, not only through its poetic achievements or its new conceptions,²⁸ but also through its achronological and embedded structure that becomes even more complex because of the various and uneven incarnations of its main characters.²⁹ Thus, firstly, while the heroines Mahāśvetā and Kādambarī, both the daughters of celestial beings (a Gandharva and an Apsaras), remain the same throughout the narrative, the male characters have several incarnations during which their souls not only transmigrate from one body to another but can also revert to a previous existence (Table 1).

24 Renou 1985, § 1836: "Le *Daśakumāracarita* est de tous les romans le plus voisin des contes dont il emprunte la présentation à tiroirs et le riche matériel folklorique".

25 Cf. Renou 1985, § 1841: "l'affabulation est particulièrement complexe"; see also Lienhard 1984: 252; Shulman 2014: 277.

26 *Kādambarī* is presented as a Sanskrit prose masterpiece (Pollock 2006: 434), as "arguably the finest extant exemplar of sustained Sanskrit prose" (Shulman 2014: 277); as "der Höhepunkt der kunstvollen Prosa" (Glasenapp 1929: 182), as "a great novel" (Lienhard 1984: 151), as "un spécimen achevé de *kathā* en prose" (Renou 1985: § 1844). As compared to Daṇḍin's *Daśakumāracarita*, Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* "reflects an extended moment of creative experimentation, not only with the possibilities of prose of as a style but also with the system of genres". cf. *Innovations and Turning Points* 2014: 233.

27 It is called a 'novel' by Glasenapp 1929: 182, Renou 1985: § 1838, Lienhard 1984: 194, 200, Warder 1994, vol. IV: § 1696), a 'romance' by Winternitz 1991: 463, Tieken 2014: 89, Shulman 2014: 277; a 'prose poem' by Tubb 2014a: 314.

28 Cf. Glasenapp 1929: 183, "Wie Jasmingirlanden, denen kunstvoll Goldblumen eingewoben sind – um ein von Bāṇa selbst gebrauchtes Bild zu verwenden – sind seine Wortgebilde mit äusserstem Geschick in ihrer verwirrenden Fülle aneinandergewunden, wie an einem schimmernden Geschmeide leuchten hier die mit raffiniertem Geschmack ausgewählten Wortedelsteine in vielseitigem Glanz von Sinn und Doppelsinn und zaubern dem Leser, der sich in sie vertieft, jeden Augenblick kaleidoskopartig neue Bilder vor, die andern neuen Erscheinungen in schnellstem Tempo Platz machen". Tubb 2014a: 308–356 defines four types of boldness in his article: A. striking verbal technique (1. Expressive repetition of sounds; 2. Expressive choices in the length of compounds); B. Conceptual courage (1. Daring choices in subject matter; 2. Daringly novel or complex conceptions).

29 Cf. Moore 2010: 430–432; see also Shulman 2014: 277–307.

Table 1: Incarnations in *Kādambarī*.

Life 1	Life 2	Life 3	Life 4
Puṇḍarīka <i>ascetic</i> Mahāśvetā <i>Apsaras</i>	Vaiśampāyana <i>Minister</i>	Parrot	Puṇḍarīka <i>ascetic</i>
Kapīñjala <i>ascetic</i> moon	Indrāyudha <i>horse</i> Candrapīḍa <i>prince</i>	Śūdraka <i>King</i>	Kapīñjala <i>ascetic</i> Candrapīḍa <i>prince</i>
Kādambarī <i>Apsaras</i>			

Secondly, the author does not start with the beginning of the story to reach the end but he begins in the middle of the story, continues with flashbacks, and then after a cascade of narrations finishes his novel with a parrot telling a king named Śūdraka a story that eventually appears to be the story of their own adventures in previous lives.

Thirdly, contrary to the tales of the *Pañcatantra*, for example, the embedded stories are not independent tales but are related to the main story with the same heroes, and all the four levels of stories integrated in the first level of narration are perfectly linked to each other (they are named respectively A to E: Table 2).

Table 2: A structural analysis of *Kādambarī*.

A		Story of Śūdraka
	B	Story narrated by the parrot
		C
		C
		D
		E
		C
		D
		D
		C
	B	Story narrated by the parrot
A		Story of Śūdraka and Kādambarī

Therefore, I have chosen the convenient term ‘novel’ notwithstanding all its ambiguities for this narrative named after its heroine, since it can highlight the modernity of its narrative structures, the remarkable innovations it involved and the new paths it opened to successors in Indian narrative literature.

Indeed, as stated by S. Lienhard in his book *A History of Classical Poetry* (1984) and by Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb in their book *Innovations and Turning Points: Toward a History of Kāvya Literature* (2014), *Kādambarī* was much admired soon after its composition and had a considerable influence on the following generations of poets and readers as well.³⁰ For instance, a passage from the *Kharataragacchabhṛhadgurvāvali* shows how Bāṇa's work, a *kathā* in the *gadya-kāvya*, was considered to be the best representative of the poetic narrative genre;³¹ and later on, as noted by Filliozat and Shulman, its title in Kannara and in Marathi became the generic term for 'romance'/'novel'.³² *Kādambarī* was summarized and adapted,³³ inspiring many an author to create original works in various forms. If some of them were written in prose like their model, paradoxically (or maybe not so, if we consider the convincing argument of G. Tubb that *Kādambarī* is rather 'a poem in prose' than a 'poetic novel'³⁴), most of them were composed in verse³⁵ or in a mixed form of prose and verse.³⁶ Another oddity is that Bāṇa did not initiate among Hindu authors a literary movement of heroine 'novels' in prose, but rather inspired either plays (Bhavabhūti's *Mahāvīracarita*, Rājaśekhara's *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, Murāri's *Anargharāghava*) or versified poems in Sanskrit or in Prakrit (Vākpatirāja's

30 Cf. *Innovations and Turning Points* 2014: 355–490, V. *The Sons of Bāṇa* (Abhinanda; Bhavabhūti; Rājaśekhara; Murāri); Lienhard 1984: 257: "It is obvious that Bāṇa rapidly gained the reputation of being the greatest master of Sanskrit prose so far to appear. His work was regarded as unsurpassable and his name was soon mentioned together with Kālidāsa and other famous poets. To future generations of poets the *Harṣacarita* and *Kādambarī* were the models both for prose style and for prose novels". See also Glasenapp 1929: 183 "vom Standpunkt der indische Kunstdichter stellt das Werk eine unübertroffene literarische Glanzleistung dar"; Renou 1985: § 1842: "Du point de vue indien, *Kādambarī* est une oeuvre réputée, citée avec admiration, maintes fois imitée et traduite".

31 For each genre, only one work is given (cf. KhG 39.33–40.1): *haimavyākaraṇa-prabhṛtīni lakṣaṇa-śāstrāṇi*, *māgha-kāvya-ādi-mahākāvyaṇi*, *kādambarī-ādi-kathāḥ*, *murāri-mukhyaṇi nāṭakāni*, *jayadevādi-chandāṃsi*, *kandalī-kiraṇāvaly-abhayadeva-nyāya-pramukhās tarkāḥ*, *kāvya-prakāśa-pramukhā alaṅkārah*, *siddhāntāś ca sarve'pi*.

32 Filliozat 1994: 24; Shulman 2014: 277.

33 From the ninth century summary called *Kādambarīkathāsāra* by Abhinanda (Lienhard 1984: 200; Renou 1985: § 1784) to Bhālan's Gujarati adaptation of *Kādambarī* in the fifteenth century (Renou 1985: § 1844; Pollock, 2006: 434).

34 Cf. Tubb 2014a: 308–354.

35 Bāṇa is considered to stand among the best poets by Vidyākāra who quotes his verses in his anthology *Subhāṣitaratnaśoḥa*: cf. Lienhard 1984: 87–88; it is also noteworthy that, despite being mainly an author of poetic prose, Bāṇa inspired many authors who chose to write in verse: see Tubb 2014a: 308–354.

36 If *Kādambarī* was considered to be the best specimen of the *kāvya* in prose, it "also introduced a new level of vigor, recognized by later poets as a kind of attractive boldness (*prāgalbhya*), even in his Sanskrit verse": *Innovations and Turning Points* 2014: 234.

Gauḍavaha, Abhinanda's *Rāmacarita*) dealing with topics different from fanciful love stories.

The first Indian writers to have taken up this model of heroine 'novels' over a period of about four centuries were Jain authors. Admittedly, the Jains had produced novels associated with heroines from an early date. Indeed, they often quoted among their own models Pādalīpta's *Tarangavaī*³⁷ whose text has not survived. Yet there seems to have existed a real fascination with Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*'s attractive formal beauty, since no less than nine heroine 'novels' were produced from the eighth century to the twelfth century in Sanskrit or in Prakrit, in the form of a 'mini-novel' or in the longer form of a 'novel', in verse or in *campū*. They are as follows:³⁸

- 779 *Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyotana (prakrit, 13000 granthas; *campū* form)
- ca. 800 *Līlāvaī* of Koūhala (prakrit, 1333 verses)
- 918 *Bhuyaṇasumḍarī* of Vijayasimha (prakrit, 8941 verses)
- ca. 970 *Tilakamañjarī* of Dhanapāla (sanskrit, ca. 4300 granthas, *campū* form)
- 1035 *Nivvānalīlāvaī* of Jineśvara (prakrit, 15000 granthas; *campū* form)³⁹
- 1038 *Surasumḍarī* of Dhaneśvara (prakrit, 4001 verses)
- Before 1050 *Udayasumḍarī* of Soḍḍhala (sanskrit, ca. 4500 granthas?, *campū* form)
- 1083 *Maṇoramā* of Vardhamāna (15000 granthas; *campū* form)
- 1129 *Nammayāsumḍarī* of Mahendra (prakrit; 1117 verses)⁴⁰

If the Jain heroine 'novels' in Sanskrit have found their way into various histories of Indian literature, their counterparts in Prakrit have been unevenly

³⁷ There already existed before *Kādambarī* a famous work in Prakrit named after a heroine: *Tarangavaī* of Pādalīpta whose date is debated (in the first centuries of the Christian Area: Filliozat 1994: 325; before the fifth century: Winternitz 1991: 522; see also Warder 1990, vol. II: § 835–850). Unfortunately, the work is now lost and known only through its adaptations, the earliest being "possibly of the tenth century", also in Prakrit (Bhayani 1979: *preface*).

³⁸ After Bāṇa, there exists in Sanskrit a work named after a heroine composed by King Bhoja: *Śṛṅgāramañjarīkathā* (composed before 1050). There also exists a short work in Apabhraṃśa based on a feminine character dealt with in Haribhadra's *Samarāiccakahā*, Sādhāraṇa's *Vilāsavaī* dated 1066.

³⁹ The work of Jineśvara is now lost, but its structure can be perceived through its epitome *Līlāvatīsāra* composed in 1284 by Jinaratna (ca. 5000 granthas; *campū*): cf. Fynes 2005 and 2006; see also Chojnacki 2016a and Chojnacki 2016b (forthcoming).

⁴⁰ For most of the works in Prakrit, a date is given in the final *praśastī*. *Līlāvaī* is not dated, but A.N. Upadhye attributes the work to ca. 800 (cf. Upadhye 1949: 69–75); as for Vijayasimha's *Bhuyaṇasumḍarī*, the date is not mentioned at the end of the work, but in the *Brhatṭipāṇikā*, an old list of Jaina works dated 1383, as V.S. 975 (cf. Velankar 1944, s.v.).

explored.⁴¹ The first two pioneering compositions – *Lilāvai* among the ‘mini-novels’⁴² and *Kuvalayamālā* among the ‘novels’ – are the most well-known thanks to A.N. Upadhye’s remarkable editions and comprehensive introductions.⁴³ The fact that the former has an intricate structure has been highlighted by this scholar;⁴⁴ as for the latter, continuing the pioneering work of A. N. Upadhye, I have tried to show in the study I have dedicated to the work of Uddyotana that his *Kuvalayamālā* was innovative in many ways and constituted a milestone in Prakrit literature, comparable to Bāṇa’s works in Sanskrit literature.⁴⁵ Contrary to this, the four Jain heroine ‘novels’ in Prakrit that succeeded remained largely ignored in literary histories except Caudharī’s *Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās* and Warder’s *History of Kāvya Literature*.⁴⁶

As indicated in their prefaces,⁴⁷ the Jain monks who composed heroine ‘novels’ in Prakrit continued to have the same edifying intentions as in their

41 For the works in Sanskrit, Dhanapāla’s *Tilakamañjarī* (Lienhard 1984: 262; Warder 1988, vol. V: § 4210–4289; Renou 1985: § 1844; Winternitz 1991: 534); Soḍḍhala’s *Udayasundarī* (Lienhard 1984: 263; Warder 1992, vol. VI: § 4585–4629; Renou 1985: § 1844; for the works in Prakrit: S. Lienhard mentions only *Kuvalayamālā* in his “History of Classical Poetry” (Lienhard 1984: 82, 266) and even A.K. Warder who takes many Prakrit works into account in his *Indian Kāvya Literature* (see *infra* n. 46) does not include Vijayasimha’s *Bhuyaṇasumdarī*, since this work existed only in a manuscript form when he finished his volume V and became a book only in 2000 thanks to the work of the Jain monk Vijayaśīlacandra.

42 This work, and also Mahendra’s *Nammayāsumdarī*, will not be taken into account in this paper on the grounds of brevity and because the intention is not religious as in the other Jain Heroine ‘novels’ under investigation.

43 Cf. Upadhye 1949 (introduction: 1–87); Upadhye 1959 (for *Kuvalayamālā*’s text) and 1970 (introduction: 1–112).

44 Cf. Upadhye 1949: 45–46.

45 Cf. Upadhye 1970; Chojnacki 2008a, vol. 1: particularly ch. 2: 43–74; ch. 4: 131–146. In the same way as Bāṇa, Uddyotana breaks on several occasions the narrative illusion, for instance, when he pretends to have forgotten to speak of the evil and the virtuous men and begins his narrative afterwards again.

46 Thus: *Nivvāṇalilāvai* (Caudharī 1973: 343–346; Warder 1992, vol. VI: § 4668–4712); *Surasumdarī* (Caudharī 1973: 347–349; Warder 1992, vol. VI: § 4715–4775); *Maṇoramā* (Caudharī 1973: 350; Warder 1992, vol. VI: § 5424–5503); *Bhuyaṇasumdarī* (Caudharī 1973: 347). This can be explained by the fact that only Dhaneśvara’s *Surasumdarī* was edited long ago in 1916; the others were edited only relatively recently: Vardhamāna’s *Maṇoramā* in 1983 and Vijayasimha’s *Bhuyaṇasumdarī* in 2000; furthermore, apart from Jinaratna’s *Lilāvatisāra*, epitome of Jineśvara’s lost *Nivvāṇalilāvai* (edited in 1983) that was translated in 2005 and 2006, the other works exist in limited editions that do not present an English introduction.

47 On the innovation of Bāṇa for *Kādambarī* and on the Sanskrit literary texts with preface, cf. *Innovations and Turning Points* 2014: 88–93, 103.

short stories.⁴⁸ Indeed, they all indicated the religious purpose either by a specific category (*dharmakathā*) or by a qualifying expression.⁴⁹ At the same time, however, as shown by the words *kāvya* or *kathā* to designate their works,⁵⁰ they wanted to continue a movement initiated by Dharmasenagaṇi⁵¹ and Haribhadra to attract a larger audience with the seductive content and beautiful form of long narratives written in *kāvya* style.⁵² But, while the forerunners composed their works with the usual linear structure of the collection of stories, the structural innovations introduced by Bāṇa tempted the authors of Jain heroine ‘novels’ to amplify formal beauty and to change the usual linear structure for the intricate plot of *Kādambarī*. Yet, did the Jain authors manage to introduce in their heroine ‘novels’ in Prakrit both the *kāvya* themes and the complex structures of Bāṇa’s work? If so, why did they take a special interest in adapting *Kādambarī*’s complex structures? And if these five heroine ‘novels’ shared similar features, was it because they were continuously attracted by Bāṇa’s prose poem as the best form of narrative or because they constituted a literary school inspired by *Kuvalayamālā*, the pioneering work of Uddyotana?

It is certain that Uddyotana knew Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī*, since he locates it among the admired compositions of his illustrious predecessors in following terms:

48 Cf. *Kuvalayamālā* (1.19-7.3) – see also Chojnacki 2008a: 31–42; *Bhuvanaṣuṇḍarī* (v. 6–31); *Surasuṇḍarī* (1, v. 17–44); *Maṇoramā* (v. 13–56).

49 Thus Dhaneśvara (*saṃvega-karīṇ kathām*: v. 17); Vijayasīṃha (*dharmma-uvaesa-ppayāṇa-suvissuddham kaham*: v. 31); Vardhamāṇa says the religious purposes of each *avasara* of his work (v. 30–34).

50 Thus Uddyotana names his narrative: *kahā* (5.20), *dharmakathā* (5.11); Dhaneśvara *kathām* (v. 17; *praśasti*, v. 249) and *kāvya* (v. 39); Vijayasīṃha *sukaittāṇa* (v. 12), *kahā* (v. 31); Vardhamāṇa *kathā* (v. 34; v. 1233).

51 Dharmasenagaṇi’s preface to his *Vasudevahiṇḍimajjhimakhaṇḍa* (1.14-2.8): “Since people keep hearing the stories dealing with the passionate loves of profane heroes such as Nahuṣa, Nala, Dumdhumāra, Nikaṣa, Purūravas, Mandhātā, Rāma, Rāvaṇa, Yājñavalkya, the Kauravas, the Pāṇḍavas, Naravāhanadatta and others, people have become interested only in love stories and they do not wish in the least to listen to dharma which leads to good destinies. They suffer from such indigestion from sugar and candy that a bitter taste comes in their mouth. Besides, though all kinds of happiness come from the dharma, people do not care for it. Therefore, I shall act as a doctor who is facing a patient turning his head away because he does not want to drink the medicine that would make him immortal, and I will give him this medicine mixed with his preferred drink. I shall pretend to give these intoxicated people a story with erotic feelings and actually teach them the dharma.”

52 Thus, as regards the structure of the narrative, they introduced in the narration descriptions on expected themes and long reflexive dialogue, while as regards style they used several of the devices expected in an *kāvya*, for instance figures based on sounds, comparisons or long compounds. For a description in Uddyotana’s see Chojnacki 2008a, Chapter 3: 101–123.

She imparts the happiness of gracious words and shines with her gold and her jewels, she who was born of Bāṇa in the forest for Candrāpīḍa, Kādambārī.⁵³

There is no doubt either that, behind the usual modesty, the Jain monk intended to present his *Kuvalayamālā* as a heroine who could be similarly attractive, albeit in another manner:

With its ornaments, its beauty, its lovely words, its sweet and enchanting discourse, (this narrative) gives joy to its friends, just like a newly-wed bride who is led by in her wedding procession.

Even if the present narrative cannot win over to itself your hearts, which have already been delighted by the narrative told by the excellent poets (of the past), it shall give (to you) nonetheless that same particular pleasure that is given by a young bride, as distinct from the pleasures that can be granted by an experienced and expert woman.⁵⁴

The results do not fail to match authorial intention.⁵⁵ Indeed, beside its new *campū* form,⁵⁶ *Kuvalayamālā* has a surprisingly modern structure that is far from the usual linear scheme of the collections of stories. Thus, while the *Samarāiccakahā*, an extensive narrative work written by his master Haribhadra in the eighth century, presents in succession nine stories in order to relate the adventures of two souls in the course of their existences, *Kuvalayamālā*'s plot intertwines several levels of narration (A, B, C).⁵⁷ In a first level of narration (A), Uddyotana narrates the adventures of Kuvalayacandra, son of the king of Ayodhyā, who is destined, according to a prophetic dream, to marry princess Kuvalayamālā after many perilous adventures. During his forced stay in an impenetrable forest, the prince happened to meet the monk Sāgaradatta who satisfied his curiosity by narrating a story. *Here begins a second level of narration*

53 *Kuvalayamālā* 3.26:

lāyaṇṇa-vayaṇa-suhayā suvaṇṇa-ṛayaṇ'ujjalā ya bāṇassa |
caṇḍāviḍassa vaṇe jāyā kāyaṃbarī jassa ||

The author plays also with the double meaning of *candrāpīḍa*, epithet of the god Śiva.

54 *Kuvalayamālā* 4.18-19:

sālaṃkāṛā suhayā laliya-payā mauya-maṃju-saṃlavā |
sahī-yāṇa dei harisaṃ uvvūḍhā ṇava-vāhu ceva ||
su-kai-kahā-haya-hiyayāṇa tuṃha jai vi hu ṇa laggae esā |
poḍhā-rayāo taha vi hu kuṇai visesaṃ ṇava-vahu vva ||

55 On the prologue presenting Uddyotana's aesthetic aims, see Chojnacki 2008a, chap. 1: 31–42; on *Kuvalayamālā*'s structures, *ibidem*, chap. 2: 43–74.

56 For a discussion regarding the emergence of the *campū* genre before the tenth century, see Chojnacki 2015.

57 In the following outlines of the works, the narrative levels are indicated in italics and the analepses are presented in a table.

(B) with the life of king Purandaradatta and his devoted minister Vāsava who under the pretext of admiring the beauty of the spring season in the royal park took the opportunity to bring the ruler to the monk Dharmanandana's preaching assembly. *Then starts a third level of narration (C)* with the successive stories of five souls who suffered each from the consequences of one of the five main passions, were enlightened by Dharmanandana and came to the agreement that the first one to acquire the right faith in his next existence would enlighten the four others. *Here ends the level C.* And, while the audience has gone deeper and deeper in the layers of the narrative, the narrator reassembles all the threads together. As a matter of fact, the monk Sāgaradatta further relates *on the level B* that during the heavenly life that followed for the five souls, one of them reminded the others of the promise they made to each other during their human existence. It is he who came first as a human being again and led the life of a merchant who suffered many misadventures before becoming a monk. *Here ends the level B* with the astonishing revelation made to the prince that the merchant in question was in fact Sāgaradatta himself, and that Kuvalayacandra was another of these five souls.

A		Kuvalayacandra meets Sāgaradatta
	B	Story of king Purandaradatta, who meets Dharmanandana
		C
		C
		C
		C
		C
		C
		C
	B	Divine destinies of the five souls
		C
	B	Story of Sāgaradatta, soul of Lobhadeva
A		Story of Kuvalayacandra, soul of Mānabhaṭa

At that point, the story reaches the level A again. The audience can follow the prince Kuvalayacandra in his adventures on his journey towards Vijayapurī town in which he eventually married princess Kuvalayamālā after various twists and turns, before returning to his father's kingdom in Ayodhyā. If the circle is complete for this life (actually the third existence of the five souls), the narrative does not stop there. Indeed, in a second part, the audience meets again the five souls in their last life before their liberation from the circle of existences. Consequently, if Uddyotana seems to be mainly interested in describing the chivalric and amorous adventures of prince Kuvalayacandra which he introduces *in medias res*, he actually presents his audience with the enlightening lives of five souls through their numerous existences. While doing so, he

managed the feat of combining two narrative structures, on level C, the linear and juxtaposed structure of Haribhadra's *Samarāiccakahā*, and on the levels A and B the achronological and embedded structure of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*.⁵⁸

If Vijayasimha did not explicitly refer to Bāṇa among his predecessors and humorously said that while being seized by the demon of the poetic creation, he would perhaps arouse mockery,⁵⁹ he nevertheless opted for a similar complex plot for his *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* in *āryā* verses.⁶⁰ Thus, the Jain author begins his narrative with the life of prince Harivikrama *on a first level of narration (A)*. While he was sent by his father to discuss an alliance with neighbouring kings, this prince was taken away by a Vidyādhara and offered hospitality by a *kulapati*. *On a second level of narration (B)*, this sage told him how he had come to live in the forest, beginning with the story of princess Candraśrī who had fallen in love with a prince but lost sight of him. Her friend Vilāsalakṣmī asked a brahman nearby. The latter related the story of Prince Virasena *on the level C* (between v. 1415 and v. 2099). Soon after his birth, this prince disappeared and was raised in the forest. One day, Virasena met the afore-mentioned *kulapati* and asked him to narrate his adventures. The *kulapati* agreed to the request and began his narrative.⁶¹ He was a minister of Śūrasena, the king of Campā and after being imprisoned several times, he decided first to become a *kulapati* and then a Jain monk. When the narration of Virasena's past adventures ends, one reaches again *level C*. Then, after some time Candraśrī *on level B* again met the prince she fell in love with but she was taken away by the Vidyādhara Aśoka. While searching for the villain, Virasena met two monks and adopted the vows of a layman. After many adventures, he eventually

58 Clearly following Uddyotana's model, Jineśvara also gave his *Nivvāṇalīlāvaī* a complex structure to the extent that this can be assessed from his adaptation in Sanskrit by Jinaratna. The story begins like Uddyotana's novel in a courtly setting with the life of king Vijayasena *in the level A*. The scenario that follows, however, is more in keeping with the Jain box-stories and testifies to less originality. After some time, the prince met a Jain monk, Samarasena, who told him *in the level B* why he had renounced the world. He himself became acquainted with another monk, Sudharman, who awakened him *in the level C* by relating the stories of ten souls who had suffered from evil passions before adopting the Jain dharma. As in Uddyotana's work, this narration of the monk Samarasena *in the level B* expands over a great part of the work, since it occurs in Jinaratna's *Līlāvatisāra* from Chapter II, v. 1 to Chapter XVII, v. 4. On the principles of the summaries' faithfulness to the structure of the long narratives, see Chojnacki 2016a and Chojnacki 2016b (forthcoming).

59 Cf. *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* v. 12 : *sa-cchaṃda-paya-payāro nirabhippāya-ppahāsaṇa-paro ya | su-kaittaṇa-gaha-gahio buhāṇa hāsaṃ gamissāmi || 12 ||*

60 Vijayasimha seems to inscribe himself in the literary traditions of both Prakrit (Pādalīpta, Bappahattī, Haribhadra: v. 10) and Sanskrit (Vyāsa, Kālidāsa, Dhanapāla: v. 11).

61 In actuality, the same *kulapati* Babbhu who is relating his adventures to Harivikrama on level B is also acting as the *kulapati* narrating his story to Virasena on level D.

encountered Candraśrī again, and after returning to his town, he married her. However, soon after the two young lovers were separated again. When the prince returned, he became the king and had a son Amarasena. After many further adventures, the royal family decided to renounce the world. Only Candraśrī was not allowed to become a nun, since she was pregnant. Later, she was taken away by a Vidyādhara and gave birth to a girl, who happened to be named Bhuvanasuṃdarī. When the princess became an adolescent, the Yakṣa Malayamegha looked for a suitable husband for her and during his quest saw Prince Harivikrama, who pleased him. That is why he abducted him and led him in the forest where Bhuvanasuṃdarī and her mother lived under the protection of the *kulapati* Babbhū whom the prince saw at present. *This is the end of level B with its analepsis of about 7000 verses.*

A		Story of prince Harivikrama	
	B	Story of the <i>kulapati</i>	
	B	Story of Aśoka, Śekhara, Candraśrī and Vilāsavatī	
		C	Story of prince Vīrasena
		D	Story of the <i>kulapati</i>
		C	Story of prince Vīrasena
	B		Story of Candraśrī and Vīrasena
		C	Story of Viśvasena
	B		Story of Vīrasena
		C	Story of Bandhujīvā
	B		Story of Vīrasena
		C	Story of Bandhudatta
	B		Story of Vīrasena
		C	Story of Bandhudatta
	B		Story of Vīrasena, Bandhudatta and Candraśrī
		C	Story of Vīrasena narrated by Vajrabāhu
	B		Story of Vīrasena
		C	Monk Mahāpramoda
	B		Story of Vīrasena
	B		Story of Candraśrī and Bhuvanasundarī

The narrator continues *on level A* to narrate prince Harivikrama's adventures. Because of the mission the prince had to fulfil for his father, the marriage was delayed. During the prince's absence, Bhuvanasuṃdarī met a girl who told her story *on level B*. She was a Vidyādhari abducted by the Vidyādhara Cittavega and left in a basket. Bhuvanasuṃdarī took her place in order to save her. Upon his return, the prince Harivikrama was desperate not to see Bhuvanasuṃdarī. After several episodes, he found her again, whereupon the couple were married. After enjoying a happy marital life, they met Vīrasena, now a monk, who told them the

prior life of Bhuvanasuṃdarī. Thereupon, they renounced the world and all the protagonists of the novel attained liberation. Thus, it clearly appears that the plot is as complex and as well organised as those of *Kādambarī* or *Kuvalayamālā*.

As for Dhaneśvara, even if he tells his audience that before writing new poetry a poet fears the comments of evil-minded men in the same manner as the mouse is afraid of the cat, and that he will write a clear text in Prakrit verses with the caressing words one uses for infants,⁶² he actually did not at all refrain from composing a narrative which is, according to A.K. Warder, “perhaps the most complicated ever written (because of the large number of characters with their successive lives and of the usual novel form of a mystery)”.⁶³ The Jain poet begins *on a first level of narration (A)* with the two stories of the king Amaraketu who married princess Kamalāvati and of the merchant Dhanadeva. During one of his journeys, Dhanadeva helped Devaśarman to retrieve the son of a Bhilla king named Supraṭiṣṭha. Thus, later on, when the merchant was captured by Supraṭiṣṭha’s men, he was soon after treated like a host. Answering Dhanadeva’s question, Supraṭiṣṭha presented himself as the son of a king, whose second wife wanted her own son to become crown prince. That is how he became the chief of the Bhillas. When Dhanadeva took his leave, Supraṭiṣṭha offered him a wonder jewel and explained *on level B* how it came into his possession.

This is a very long tale that extends from Chapter 2, v. 225 till Chapter 9, v. 144. One day, Supraṭiṣṭha heard a cry and found a divine man hampered by snakes. He is the Vidyādhara Cittavega who began to relate his adventure *on level C* (from Chapter 3, v. 3 to Chapter 8, v. 71). During one festival, he fell in love with Kanakamālā who answered his feelings. But soon after, because of a misunderstanding, her father promised her to king Naravāhana. When Cittavega wanted to commit suicide, he was saved by another Vidyādhara, Cittagati, who consoled him with his own story *on level D*. His sister Citralekhā was married to king Jvalanaprabha but was later on abducted by Jvalanaprabha’s brother. During his

62 *Surasūṃdarī* I, v. 18 : *annaṃ ca tassa kīrai paḍhamam ciya patthaṇā khala-jaṇassa |*

Bihei kavi-jaṇo jassa mūsao iva biḍālassa ||

For ‘clear’ the author uses *payaḍa* (v. 40); cp. also *Bhuvanasuṃdarī*, v. 8945 (*phuḍa-viyaḍa*); for ‘caressing words’ he employs the expression *uttāṇatthā pāiya-gāhāhiṃ laliya-payā*, suggesting that there are the same words one uses for an infant. ‘*Laliya-paya*’ and *laliy’akkhara* are the expressions used by Uddyotana (4.18; 5.21). While the first one is used by Dhaneśvara (1, v. 42), the second one is employed by Vijayasimha (v. 8945).

63 Warder 1992, vol. VI, § 4719. Warder 1992 gives a detailed summary (§ 4715–4775). The sub-stories of the prior lives of the characters of the novel given at intervals by Jain monks from Chapter 6 to Chapter 15 have not been integrated in the present outline of the story which is meant to present to the reader the constant connections between all characters of the plot in its different levels.

search for her, he fell in love with the girl he saved from the fury of an elephant, but could not find her the following day. While looking for her, he met Cittavega. *This is the end of Cittagati's story on level D. Again on level C*, Kanakamālā tried to commit suicide and was saved by Cittavega and Cittagati. While taking the place of Kanakamālā in the bridal procession leading her to marry Naravāhana, Cittagati found the girl he was looking for, Priyaṅgumañjarī, who narrated her story *on level D*. Together they went to meet Cittavega again and warned him from the fury of Naravāhana. During his flight, Cittavega met a god who gave him a wonder jewel that protected him against Naravāhana. The helpful god, Vibhuprabha, whom he had met beforehand manifested himself again and explained to him how they came to know each other in a previous life. *The story is narrated on level D*. That is the very jewel given by Vibhuprabha that Cittavega offered to Supraṭiṣṭha who saved him. *There ends the narrative on level C*. The same jewel was now given by him to Dhanadeva. *This is the end of the long narrative of level B that had started in Chapter 2*.

A				Story of merchant Dhanadeva
	B			Story of Supraṭiṣṭha
		C		Story of Cittavega
			D	Story of Cittagati
		C		Story of Cittavega
			D	Story of Priyaṅgumañjarī
		C		Story of Cittavega
	B			Story of Supraṭiṣṭha
		C		Story of Vibhuprabha
	B			Story of Supraṭiṣṭha
A				Story of merchant Dhanadeva

On level A again, after saving Śrīkāntā, Dhanadeva married her. After a journey, Dhanadeva wanted to visit his friend Supraṭiṣṭha, but he found the village of the Bhillas burnt down. The only survivor, Devaśarman, told him what happened, but did not know what had become of Supraṭiṣṭha. Later, Dhanadeva and Śrīkāntā had a son. This event made Amaraketu's spouse, Kamalāvatī, a friend of Śrīkāntā, desiring to have her own son. On one occasion, she was taken away by an elephant and brought back by Amaraketu one month later. She told him in a flashback what had happened to her during their separation. She gave birth to a son who disappeared and escaped from the evil-minded Suratha. One day later, in Chapter 11, the porter Samantabhadra found a girl fallen from the sky. She was Surasūṃdarī, daughter of king Naravāhana, who had been abducted. Kamalavatī took care of her and sent a servant of her age, Haṃsikā, to win her trust.

Surasuṃdarī related to her in the level B between Chapter XI, v. 189 and Chapter XII, v. 232, that one day she saw a young girl trying to fly. She was Priyaṃvadā, daughter of Cittavega, and half-sister of Makaraketu whom she wanted to meet. When Priyaṃvadā was about to leave, Surasuṃdarī noticed the portrait she had of Makaraketu and fell in love with him. Later on, she mocked an ascetic woman, Buddhilā, who took revenge by persuading king Śatruñjaya to marry her. Upon her refusal, he besieged the town. Meanwhile, a Vidyādhara Nahavāhana abducted her and placed her in a grove. She ate a poisonous fruit and was saved by Priyaṃvadā accompanied by Makaraketu. As she was worried about her father, Makaraketu went to assist him, but he did not come back. *This is the end of the story Surasuṃdarī narrated to her friend Haṃsikā.*

One day, the merchant Dhanadeva came back from his journey and narrated to king Amaraketu his marvellous adventures. When the monk Supraṭiṣṭha became omniscient, king Amaraketu and his wife went to meet him and to ask him about their son who disappeared after his birth. The monk explained everything on level B. Makaraketu found his parents again and married Surasuṃdarī. First she had a son, Madanavega, who was taken out of the palace because he was predicted to cause the ruin of the family. Then she had another son, Anaṅgaketu, who fell in love with Anaṅgavegā and married her. But since Jvalanavega had already asked her in marriage, he was furious and revealed to Madanavega his real birth so that he would kill his father Makaraketu. Infuriated, Madanavega assaulted his father who was disgusted with the mundane life and renounced the world. All the protagonists of the novel in the end obtained liberation except for Madanavega who was condemned to wander in the cycle of existences. That is why good people should behave according to the dharma.

The structural outlines make it clear that with the exception of *Maṇoramā*, which displays a much simpler structure, heroine ‘novels’ in Prakrit are characterised by a complex plot and interconnected sub-stories that are akin to Bāṇa’s project and have their own specific threads of story.⁶⁴ Besides, very long analepses have been inserted by all the Jain authors, as was the case in *Kādambarī*.⁶⁵ Furthermore, as in Bāṇa’s work, the heroine who gives her name to the ‘novel’ appears very late in the narrative: Kuvalayamālā (3/4: p.153

⁶⁴ On the exception which is *Maṇoramā* see *infra*. *Nivvāṇalīlāvai* also betrays a complex structure, but on the one hand its complexity has limitations (see *infra*) and on the other hand, the work cannot be assessed in the same way as the other novels since it is seen only through its adaptation, *Līlāvatīsāra*.

⁶⁵ Thus over 79 pages (p. 31–110) for *Kuvalayamālā* ; v. 861 to v. 7899 for *Bhuvāṇasūṃdarī*; from Chapter II, v. 1 to Chapter XVII, v. 4 in Jinaratna’s epitome of *Nivvāṇalīlāvai*; from Chapter 2, v. 225 till Chapter 9, v. 144 for *Surasuṃdarī*.

out of 217 pages);⁶⁶ *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* (7/8: v. 7822/8945); *Surasuṃdarī* (3/4: Chapter 11, v. 143/Chapter 16) and *Maṇoramā* almost at the end (p. 316 out of 337 pages).

If such complex structures undoubtedly demonstrate that the Jain monks wished to produce refined literary compositions that could rival those of renowned predecessors in Indian literature,⁶⁷ did they serve only to show the ingenuity of their authors and to surprise a demanding audience that would be critical of too simple and repetitive scenarios? Or did they contribute to conveying a religious purpose, as seemed to have also been the case in *Kādambarī*'s difficult narrative structures? Indeed, as noted by D. Shulman, the many narrative voices of the text make it easy to lose track of the story, and difficult to ascertain who is actually telling the story and who is listening to it. However, the resulting confusion is a deliberate feature of the emplotment and conveys a message to the audience: the heroes Candrāpīḍa and Puṇḍarīka are not the characters they seem to be, but are actually someone else.⁶⁸ Moreover, since at the same time the heroines Kādambarī and Mahāśvetā remain the same, they fail to recognise the reality of the situation. Thus, while Puṇḍarīka who has become Vaiśampāyana has the same feelings for Mahāśvetā, she does not perceive that he is her former lover and curses him. In the same way, in a passage analysed by D. Shulman, Patralekhā reports to Candrāpīḍa who has left her alone without a word in order to see his father, how Kādambarī has expressed her despair, saying that while she is the same and he is the same, the situation has changed.⁶⁹ Jain authors could not but be interested in such a depiction of ignorance and passionate misconduct in a world of illusions, as it fitted their own beliefs in the futility of the circle of existences.

As a consequence, they used the same devices of analepses, nonlinearity as well as a system of characters in order to convey their ideals of monastic life in their heroine 'novels'. Thus, in *Surasuṃdarī*, Dhaneśvara introduces a very long analepsis told by Supraṭiṣṭha, a prince who has lost his kingdom and become the chief of the Bhillas. In this long passage comprising about half of the entire text on level B (including a long level C which in turn comprises several levels D), there are five main narrative voices:

⁶⁶ The history of *Kuvalayamālā* occurs in the first part of Uddyotana's novel (pp. 1–217) which in the edition of A.N. Upadhye (Upadhye 1959) comprises a second part (pp. 217–284). See Chojnacki 2008b: 451.

⁶⁷ The authors who are mentioned are both of Prakrit literature and Sanskrit literature. For *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* see *supra* n.60; for *Kuvalayamālā*, see Chojnacki 2008a: 36–37; Uddyotana is the only one to precisely define the stylistic devices which he would employ in his *Kuvalayamālā* (Chojnacki, 2008a: 37–38).

⁶⁸ Cf. Shulman 2014: 278.

⁶⁹ Cf. Shulman 2014: 296–297.

-
1. Supraṭiṣṭha narrates a story to Dhanadeva (B)
 2. Cittavega to Supraṭiṣṭha (C)
 3. Cittagati to Cittavega (D)
 4. Priyaṅgumañjarī to Cittagati (D)
 5. Vibhuprabha to Cittavega (D)
-

This means that, beside himself, Supraṭiṣṭha represents four other narrators – three male (Cittavega, Cittagati, Vibhuprabha) and one female (Priyaṅgumañjarī). Dhaneśvara even enhances the difficulty, when in a paronomastic play he gives these two Vidyādhara names beginning with Citta.⁷⁰ Indeed, as D. Shulman has noted for *Kādambarī*, this structure is confusing for the audience, but in case of *Surasuṃdarī*, it is also very efficient. As a matter of fact, the purpose here is twofold. On the one hand, not only the merchant Dhanadeva but also the audience of Dhaneśvara's novel are shown that human birth, difficult to obtain, is the best way to reach liberation and that one should not waste it. On the other hand, the Jain author wants to prove to the audience that one should not envy the destiny of the marvellous beings who can fly and enjoy many pleasures, since Cittavega and Cittagati also suffer immensely from the pangs of love, hate and other associate passions in the terrible cycle of existences (3, v. 3–6; 5, v. 52; 8, v. 106) and have to be able to become human beings (4, v. 74) in order eventually to be liberated. That Dhaneśvara has such an intention is further indicated by the vocabulary he uses in this long analepsis: thus there are verbs indicating emotions, qualifying attributes or adjectives⁷¹ suggesting the trouble of minds affected by a passion and its extreme degrees – amorous ecstasy (3, v. 123; *passim*); despair (4, v. 106; 4, v. 149–176). And at the end of Cittavega's narrative, in case the audience would still have any doubt about the message of the analepsis, Dhaneśvara gives a clear reminder with the conclusive straightforward verses with which Supraṭiṣṭha addresses Dhanadeva. It reads as follows:

70 Many other names have similar beginnings or endings that suggest the assimilation between one character and his double (for instance Dhanadeva; Dhanavāhana; Dhanavai) or the intended confusion: for instance Vihuppaha, Vijjuppaha and Sassippaha; Caṃdappahā and Caṃdarehā; Amarakeu, Samarakeu, Mayarakeu and Anaṅgakeu; or Naravāhana and Nahavāhana.

71 E.g. – sad (3, v. 147; 4, v. 22; 6, v. 14); frozen in place because of love (3, v. 172); exhaling long sighs (3, v. 186; 6, v. 11); sobbing (6, v. 12); having eyes full of tears (3, v. 215); having the heart filled with joy (4, v. 2; 7, v. 88; 7, v. 139); unconscious (4, v. 245; 9, v. 92); frightened (5, v. 103; 5, v. 196; 6, v. 152; 7, v. 3; 8, v. 5); suffering (2, v. 229; 8, v. 67); trembling (5, v. 110; 5, v. 159; 6, v. 175; 9, v. 32); furious: 7, v. 231; 8, v. 30; 9, v. 24; 9, v. 48) – and nouns – cries or laments (2, v. 231; 4, v. 127; 8, v. 15; 8, v. 62); burning heart (3, v. 224; v. 232); harsh words (5, v. 108; 6, v. 172); anxious thoughts (*passim*).

They know deep suffering in this world and in the world beyond,
 The men who are deluded by passion and do not distinguish right from wrong.
 For all souls, the first cause of unbearable spiritual and bodily pains
 In this world and in the world beyond is the terrible passion.⁷²

In *Bhuyaṇasumdarī*, the main action is no longer in the heavenly realm, as in *Surasumdarī*, but in the human world. Therefore, even though the number of narrative voices is similar in the two works, the analepsis takes a different turn.

-
1. The *kulapati* narrates a story to prince Harivikrama (B)
 2. Brahmin Govardhana to Vilāsalakṣmī, Candraśrī's friend (C)
 3. The *kulapati* to prince Vīrasena (D)
 4. King Viśvasena to prince Vīrasena (C)
 5. Vidyādhara Vajrabāhu to princess Candraśrī (C)
 6. Monk Mahāpramoda to prince Vīrasena (C)
-

Indeed, Vijayasimha does not show here the illusion in the world of gods, but he insists on the initiatory life of the heroes. In effect, the analepsis brings to the ears of prince Harivikrama the spiritual progression of his double, Vīrasena, and all the narrative voices converge toward this aim. As a matter of fact, there are several speakers, but one main listener: Vīrasena within the analepsis and his double Harivikrama in the frame story. Thus, when in the discourse of the Brahmin (narrated by the *kulapati* to Harivikrama), the *kulapati* presents himself to prince Vīrasena, he actually explains at the same time to prince Harivikrama who he is. The other listeners are also connected to Vīrasena, since his conduct is the subject of the discourse addressed to Candraśrī, who is destined to marry Vīrasena, and to Vilāsalakṣmī, Candraśrī's friend, and they can see his spiritual progress. Consequently, the analepsis as a whole conveys to Harivikrama and the audience the necessity to practice the dharma. It is the same convergence of narrative voices that occurs in Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā*, since the religious discourses addressed to the five souls – two of them being Sāgaradatta and Kuvalayacandra – (C) enlighten as well King Purandaradatta (B) and Prince Kuvalayacandra (A).⁷³

⁷² *Surasumdarī* 8, v. 74–75: *acchau tā para-loge iheva pāvīṃti garuṇa-dukkhāṃ | rāga-vimohiya-cittā kajjākajjaṃ ayāṇaṃtā ||* 74 *|| sārīra-māṇasāṇaṃ dūsaha-dukkhāṇa kāraṇaṃ paḍhamāṃ | iha para-loe ghorā rāgo cciya sayala-jīvāṇaṃ ||* 75 *||*

⁷³ On Uddyotana's long analepsis, see Chojnacki 2008a: 54–56.

-
1. A monk (Sāgaradatta) narrates a story to Prince Kuvalayacandra
 2. Monk Dharmanandana to king Purandaradatta
 3. Jina Dharma to the five souls in the preaching assembly
 4. A girl to Sāgaradatta
-

But the element that renders the structure more complex is that Uddyotana decided to enact several lives of his characters. In this case especially, the non-linear plot used by Bāṇa proved to be efficient for both the aesthetic and the religious project. As a matter of fact, while Uddyotana chose to surprise his audience by revealing the name of the narrator of the analepsis only at its very end, he avoided the rather mechanical scheme of a linear presentation and highlighted one of the many lives lived by the characters. Thus he introduced firstly the third life in which they were already devoid of evil passions but still needed to be properly educated in order to be on the right path toward liberation. It was also edifying for his audience, since they could see both what had originated the present life and which type of successful future the present life would bring them. But it required Uddyotana's ingenuity: to have begun with the last life, as Jineśvara did in his *Nivvāṇalīlāvaī*, did not produce the same edifying effects.⁷⁴

In the complex plot of *Kādambarī*, Bāṇa has also used the device of previous existences, although it remained rather peripheral and limited to the male characters. On the contrary, for Jain authors, the motivation of the destiny of such and such character by the design of the past actions was very common in the short edifying stories, and this articulation was the source of many sub-stories that were consequently only tenuously connected to the main story. So the question at stake for the Jain poets who wanted to compose literary works in the vein of a masterpiece such as *Kādambarī* was how to integrate skilfully the prior lives for their religious purpose. The issue was resolved in various ways. Indeed, Uddyotana did not break with the Jain tradition as taken up for instance by his master Haribhadra even in a long narrative such as the *Samarāiccakahā*.⁷⁵ But he deftly used the non-linear plot in order to highlight them. Thus, while he first presented the life of Kuvalayacandra in a courtly atmosphere and his adventure in the forest with the lion, the divine man and

⁷⁴ Since there is no vivid spiritual progression to which the audience can identify itself.

⁷⁵ Haribhadra made use of the extended narrative space and presented one good soul and one bad soul affected by all the passions through nine of their multiple existences. Indeed, the message is as clear as in the short stories: the Brahmin Agniśarman plunges deeper and deeper in the world of evil (Prince Ānanda, housewife Jvālīnī, housewife Dhanaśrī, Prince Vijaya, housewife Lakṣmī, Prince Viṣeṇa, Vidyādhara Vānamantara, Caṇḍāla Giriseṇa), while Prince Guṇasena (King Siṃha, Minister Śikhin, Businessman Dhana, Prince Jaya, Businessman Dharaṇa, Prince Sena, Prince Guṇacandra, Prince Samarāditya).

the monk, he created surprise among his audience at the end of the analepsis narrated by the monk Sāgaradatta. As a matter of fact, it is at this point that one understands that Sāgaradatta, the prince, the divine man and the lion are actually four of the five souls (the last one being the princess Kuvalayamālā) who had suffered from evil passions in a prior life (cf. Table 3) and whose spiritual progress would be fulfilled in a next destiny. The monk (Sāgaradatta) who speaks to Prince Kuvalayacandra is the soul of the greedy one (Lobhadeva), the god accompanying him has been previously the voluptuous Mohadatta and the lion has been the violent Caṇḍasoma.⁷⁶ Kuvalayacandra himself has been the proud Mānabhaṭa and he receives from the monk the mission to marry and awaken Princess Kuvalayamālā who has been the treacherous Māyāditya.⁷⁷ By doing so, not only does Uddyotana create seductive, lively and plausible characters, but he also takes the opportunity given by the space of the ‘novel’ to give a central role to a set of five embodied passions and to teach their obnoxious results, but also the possibilities to thwart them. One sees again all these five characters live another life at the end of which they reach liberation.⁷⁸

Table 3: Two lives of *Kuvalayamālā*’s five souls.

	Life 1:embodied passion	Nickname of the archetype	Life 2:main character
Anger	Brahmin Bhadrāśarman	Caṇḍasoma	lion
Pride	Vassal Śaktibhaṭa	Mānabhaṭa	Kuvalayacandra
Deceit	Businessmen Gaṅgāditya	Māyāditya	Kuvalayamālā
Covetousness	Businessman Dhanadeva	Lobhadeva	Sāgaradatta
Delusion	Prince Vyāghradatta	Mohadatta	god

While Jineśvara simply enlarged Uddyotana’s model by doubling the number of souls suffering from passions,⁷⁹ Vijayasimha and Dhaneśvara tried to adapt the

⁷⁶ *Kuvalayamālā* 110.4–9: *āsi Lohadevābhīhāṇo puṇo saggammi Paumappaho devo tatto vi esa Sāgaradatto tti | imaṃ ca daṭṭhūṇa ciṃṭiyaṃ mae ‘aho je uṇa tattha cattāri aṇṇe te kahiṃ saṃpayam’ ti ciṃṭayaṃto uvautto jāva diṭṭham | jo so Caṇḍasomo so mariūṇa Paumacaṃdo samuppaṇṇo | tatto vi saggāo caviūṇa jāo Viṃjhāḍaie siho tti | Mānabhaḍo mariūṇa Paumavaro jāo | tatto vi caiūṇa Aojjha-puravarie rāiṇo Daḍhavammasa putto kumāra-Kuvalayacaṃdo tti | Māyāicco vi mariūṇa Paumasāro | tatto vi caviūṇa dakkhiṇāvahe Vijayā-ṇamāe puravarie raiṇo Mahāseṇassa duhiyā Kuvalayamālā jāya tti* (Chojnacki 2008b: 339).

⁷⁷ For a translation of the stories, see Chojnacki 2008a: 170–262.

⁷⁸ This is the second part of Uddyotana’s heroine ‘novel’: *Kuvalayamālā* 216.13–280.16 (Chojnacki 2008b: 604–766).

⁷⁹ Beside stories on the five passions (anger, pride, deceit, covetousness, delusion), Jineśvara included in his ‘novel’ another set of five stories embodying the effects of the five organ senses: touch, taste, smell, sight, hearing: cf. Fynes 2005: 465–523 and Fynes 2006: 29–269.

pattern of the prior lives inside the complex frame of their own ‘novels’. Thus Vijayasimha reduced the explanations of the prior lives for two main characters, Virasena, the double of Harivikrama, and Bhuvanasumdarī, and placed them at two major points in the text: for Virasena, they are related just at the end of the analepsis so as to better impress Harivikrama and the audience; for Bhuvanasumdarī, they occur just before her ordination together with her husband.⁸⁰ As for Dhaneśvara, who has the most complicated set of lives, he felt the need to enlighten his audience as to who was who at different intervals in his ‘novel’ for aesthetic and religious reasons.⁸¹ As a matter of fact, on the one hand, just as he motivated the episodes of the novel in the manner of a gifted storyteller,⁸² he also wanted to motivate, as the omniscient narrator can do, the relations between all the most important characters of his ‘novel’. On the other hand, one can also see how the riddle of the connections between the characters and the events of their life is gradually solved during the ‘novel’ according to the growing level of knowledge the various speakers possess.⁸³ Thus the first narrator to give a clue about past lives is Priyaṅgumañjarī, a princess who on a key-occasion remembers her past life (Chapter 6); the second narrator is the god Vibhuprabha who knows by his clairvoyance the relations he had with Cittavega (Chapter 8); as for the other two, they are omniscient monks: Ghanavāhana (Chapter 9) and the famous Supraṭiṣṭha (Chapters 14 and 15), who narrated the long analepsis. Thus, all of them aim at highlighting by their discourses the lives of main characters from the frame story of the ‘novel’ and at explaining to them who every character actually is. For instance, king Amaraketu and his wife Kamalavatī learn how their son, Madanavega, has inherited from his past lives an otherwise inexplicable hatred, and this is the cause of their renunciation of the world. Once the illusion of the *saṃsāra* and the destructive ignorance are destroyed by the omniscient teachers and all the

⁸⁰ Cf. *Bhuvanasumdarī* v. 8806–8899.

⁸¹ The explanations occur in Chapters 6, v. 133–250; 8, v. 101–250; 9, v. 18–62; 14, v. 98–250; 15, v. 198–224: cf. Warder 1992, vol. VI: § 4732, § 4737; § 4739; § 4755; § 4758.

⁸² In *Surasumdarī*, Dhanadeva helps Devaśarman out of compassion and saves the child of the chief of the Bhillas who was under his responsibility. As a consequence, later on, when he is attacked by Bhillas and led to their chief, Supraṭiṣṭha, he is treated as a host thanks to Devaśarman who has explained to Supraṭiṣṭha who Dhanadeva was (1, v. 34–69). In a similar manner, the hatred of the villains is on several occasions logically motivated: thus, Jvalavega, an evicted lover unveils to the exiled Samaraketu the secret of his princely birth and uses him to be revenged (16, v. 124–126).

⁸³ Priyaṅgumañjarī remembers (6, v. 142) that she has been Vasumatī, then Candraprabhā before her birth as Priyaṅgumañjarī. It is only in Chapter 14, v. 98, that the omniscient Supraṭiṣṭha tells her that she has also been Sarasvatī in a prior life.

Table 4: The lives of *Surasumdarī*'s main souls.

Soul	Life 1	Life 2	Life 3	Life 4
1	Lakṣmī	Sulocanā	Svayamprabhā	Surasumdarī
2	Mandana	Kaṇakaratha	Vibhuprabha	Makaraketu
3	Nimnaya	Subandhu	Kālabāṇa	Madanavega
4	Malhana	Dhanapati	Candrārjuna	Cittagati
5	Sarasvatī	Vasumatī	Candraprabhā	Priyaṅgumañjarī
6	Mohila	Sumangala		Suratha
7	Candana	Dhanavāhaṇa	Vidyutprabha	Cittavega
8	Saṃpadā	Anaṅgavatī	Candralekhā	Kaṇakamālā

threads joined together, the audience can see through the lives of eight souls during four lives, as can be seen in Table 4.⁸⁴

It remains to see why Jain monks adopted the complex structure of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* especially for their heroine 'novels' in Prakrit. In religious Jain literature, edifying sermons, moralising maxims and vivid short stories recurrently expressed that women and love were an obstacle to liberation. For instance, Dhaneśvara says that women are like *guñjā*-berries, beautiful outside but poisonous inside;⁸⁵ he also shows how one of his characters, who was very attached to the love of his wife, was first ordained with her and had to be educated afterwards.⁸⁶ Such ideas and motifs are in keeping with the canonical teaching of the fallacious seduction by women as illustrated by the parable of princess Mallī who created a statue that looked like her but was full of rotting food in order to discourage the pretenders who all came to marry her because of her external beauty.⁸⁷ It is therefore plausible that Jain authors found in the lengthy and complex structure of the heroine 'novel' set up by Bāṇa a most convenient means for both seducing the audience and teaching Jain values. Indeed, the fact that the heroine of the 'novel' appears very late in the narrative space was used to change the quest for love into a quest for religion. For instance, when Uddyotana begins with a courtly scene in Ayodhyā and with the life of a prince, the audience is led to think that it will be a novel dealing with several feminine conquests. But the narrator soon deceives his audience and takes the characters toward unexpected

⁸⁴ On several occasions, Dhaneśvara points out how a fact can be wrongly interpreted because of ignorance: for instance, when the painter laughs in seeing the king Amaraketu fainting in front of the portrait of a princess (1, v. 97). The ignorant people trounce him, because they think he is mocking them (1, v. 99). But in reality, he laughs out of joy since he knows that it is the sign that the king is the right husband for the princess (1, v. 107–159).

⁸⁵ Cf. *Surasumdarī* 8, v. 151.

⁸⁶ In the same way as the well-known example of Nala and Damayantī in the Jain versions.

⁸⁷ Cf. *Nāyadhammakahāṇa*, 8. *Mallī* and Schubring 1978: 24–35.

adventures. And thanks to a monk who narrates in an analepsis the prior consequences of passions, Kuvalayacandra receives a double mission: to marry the beautiful princess Kuvalayamālā but also to awaken her to the Jain dharma.⁸⁸ Besides, on several occasions, authors use a non-linear frame and several narrative voices in order to teach how love is a source of delusion. Thus, the sub-story of a beautiful but flirtatious prince, Kāmagajendra “Elephant of love” is an example where the narrative complexity serves a religious purpose. One first sees that Kāmagajendra’s wife is desolate because her husband is absent. The latter comes back not long after and narrates his adventures. He had gone with two Vidyādhari in order to save their friend, Bindumatī, who was dying of love for him. But she died before their arrival. Out of despair, the young Vidyādhari leapt into the pyre. Kāmagajendra wanted to take water in a well in order to make a libation for them, but soon after he saw himself in another country. He was then awakened by the Jina Sīmandhara who explained to him all the divine illusions he had seen. After narrating this tale to the queen, he told her that he was disgusted by all these illusions and wished to renounce the world. Therefore, he went to see the Jina Mahāvīra who was just telling Kāmagajendra’s adventures to the assembly of devotees. Because of the non-linearity of the events in the story and because of the narration of the story to several listeners – the queen, the assembly of Sīmandhara, the assembly of Mahāvīra, Kāmagajendra himself and the audience, it is easy to lose track of who is who.⁸⁹ Thus, this is a perfect example to show the illusory vanities of the amorous passions. With Uddyotana, it is not a random but a conscious intention, since he operates in the same way for the story of Mohadatta, the embodied delusion, who fell in love with his own sister, whereas their father did not recognize the young lady he once ardently loved and fell in love with the daughter she had from him.⁹⁰ It is also significant that in her prior existence, Kuvalayamālā was the treacherous Māyāditya, whose story is also as twisted as his character.⁹¹

Consequently Jain heroine ‘novels’ modelled on *Kādambarī* were given by their authors such complex and curved structures with the conscious intention of denouncing indirectly the delusions of love and the obstacles they constitute on the way to liberation. In short, the beautifully complex structures of the ‘novel’ illustrated on a macro-level what the theme or the parable effected on a micro-level in order to teach both the vanities of the world and the salutary

⁸⁸ Cf. *Kuvalayamālā* 111.22–23; Chojnacki 2008b: 342.

⁸⁹ Cf. Chojnacki 2008a: 69.

⁹⁰ Cf. Chojnacki 2008b: 254–255.

⁹¹ As for Jineśvara, he reproduced a similar complex plot for the sub-story of princess Surasūmdarī: cf. Fynes 2006: 382–489.

practice of the dharma leading to liberation. If the Jain monks used a deceptive plot in their heroine ‘novels’ and seemed to present the stories of heroes rather than of heroines, at the same time, however, the titles of the works truly suggest in which direction the ‘novel’ is to be read. *Kuvalayamālā* is the ‘garland of nympeas’ for Kuvalayacandra, the prince who is ‘the moon awakening the nympeas’; *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* is the ‘beauty of the human world’ wherein one can be liberated; *Nivvāṇalīlāvaī* is the ‘frivolous leading to liberation’; *Surasuṃdarī* is the illusory ‘beauty of the world of gods’ and *Maṇoramā* is the ‘charming’ way to get education in the Jain dharma. Can further evidence suggest that, while taking inspiration from Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī*, Jain monks also created their own tradition of complex religious heroine ‘novels’ in Prakrit? And if so, why did this literary movement end after a period of four centuries?

Not only did Uddyotana clearly cite Bāṇa as one of his predecessors, but he also played on several occasions with the model of *Kādambarī* either to create surprise or to criticise unlikely events or practices contrary to Jain values. Thus, while he takes up the scene during which the queen is desperate not to have a son, he plays with the expectations of his audience. Indeed, it is not the queen as is the case in *Kādambarī* who accomplishes various rituals in order to obtain a son, but rather the king who propitiates a deity for this purpose.⁹² Moreover, he presents in a sub-story a heroine, Suṃdarī, who is inconsolable over the loss of her husband and embraces him in the hope that he will live again, Uddyotana has probably in mind the well-known episode of the embrace of *Kādambarī*. But, while Bāṇa depicts the beloved Candrāpīḍa coming back to life in his previous body, Uddyotana shows that the embrace of Suṃdarī cannot prevent the body from decaying and only results in the mockery of the villagers.⁹³ As for later writers of Prakrit heroine ‘novels’, they mentioned neither Bāṇa nor Uddyotana, but it is clear from their works that they knew both authors. As a matter of fact, many motifs and scenes that are taken over by the authors of the heroine ‘novels’ clearly show an interrelation between those works. Thus, in *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* as in *Kuvalayamālā*, the king expresses his joy, when his wife has guessed his thought and said aloud that it would be time for them to renounce the world without delay.⁹⁴ In *Surasuṃdarī* as in *Nivvāṇalīlāvaī*, an evil female ascetic who had been rejected by a princess or a queen makes a king fall in love with her in order to take her revenge.⁹⁵

92 Cf. *Kuvalayamālā* 14.4–31; Chojnacki 2008b: 64–68.

93 *Kuvalayamālā* 224.26–225.32; Chojnacki 2008b: 631–634.

94 *Kuvalayamālā* 214.19–33; Chojnacki 2008b: 599–600; *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* v. 8761–8771.

95 *Surasuṃdarī* 12, v. 66–80; *Līlāvatīsāra* VII, v. 49–50.

The numerous common motifs also point to the fact that the parallel episodes are not just copied from one work to the other but adopted with variations. Take for instance the motif of the queen desiring a son. In *Bhuvanasuṃdarī*, the Jain monk explains to the queen Vijayavatī how to obtain a son through the propitiation of the goddess Ambā; in *Surasuṃdarī*, in answer to the longing of the queen Kamalā, the king prays to the Jina and fasts for three days to propitiate a god, who explains to him that he will become the queen's son; in *Maṇoramā*, after the queen has propitiated a Yakṣa, then the goddess Caṇḍī, and has tried several other means to obtain a son, but all in vain, omens eventually arise predicting the birth of a son.⁹⁶ Another scene from *Kādambarī* appears with some changes in *Kuvalayamālā* and in *Bhuvanasuṃdarī*. The prince Candrāpīḍa, who is thirsty because of a long journey, searches for a place with fresh water. He follows the wet tracks of elephants and the movements of birds and arrives at the lake Acchoda with many birds, fish and flowers "which was most beautiful and gratifying to the sight". On the southern bank of this lake, he sees many beautiful, phallus-shaped idols of Śiva and not long after he discovers a holy shrine sacred to the divine Śiva.⁹⁷ But the scene changes from *Kuvalayamālā* to *Bhuvanasuṃdarī*: while the prince Kuvalayacandra sees two beautiful young ladies, the prince Harivikrama contemplates a temple dedicated to Lord Śāntinātha.⁹⁸

While several motifs thus indicate the aesthetic influence of Bāṇa, many other religiously oriented motifs are clearly inherited from *Kuvalayamālā*. For instance, in *Nivvāṇalīlavai*, Jineśvara introduces, as did Uddyotana, the motif of a painted scroll and imagines that a god describes all the manifestations of misery and happiness.⁹⁹ Besides, the attack of the Bhillas in *Surasuṃdarī* is reminiscent of the episode in *Kuvalayamālā*, but while in the latter work, the chief of the Bhillas feels remorse as soon as he hears prince Kuvalayacandra uttering the prayer to the five supreme beings, in the former, he does not fight at all, since he learns how the hero has saved his son earlier.¹⁰⁰ The same scene of the effect of the prayer to the five supreme beings occurs with some variation in *Bhuvanasuṃdarī*, but the surprise is that while in *Kuvalayamālā*, the anti-hero is the prince Darpaparigha, in *Bhuvanasuṃdarī*, he is a Vidyādhara.¹⁰¹ Two other examples will suffice. In *Nivvāṇalīlavai*, the story of Yaśoravi evinces many similarities with the story of Lobhadeva in *Kuvalayamālā*: a dialogue between

96 *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* v. 947; *Surasuṃdarī* 10, v.41–53; *Maṇoramā* 6.17–7.27.

97 *Kādambarī* 376–391; Kale 1968: 166–172.

98 *Kuvalayamālā* 113.31–115.26; Chojnacki 2008b: 349–353; *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* v. 2284–2344.

99 *Kuvalayamālā* 185.13–193.31; *Līlavatīsāra* 15.15–104; Fynes 2006: 494–515.

100 *Kuvalayamālā* 136.8–137.15; Chojnacki 2008b: 403–405; *Surasuṃdarī* 2, v. 4–54.

101 *Bhuvanasuṃdarī* v. 2779–2783.

the merchants about the products of their trade, the transformation of the deceived merchant into a Vyantara who creates a dreadful tempest and the prayers of the seamen.¹⁰² In *Maṇoramā*, Vardhamāna includes an episode that is reminiscent of relations between the good friend Thāṇu and the bad friend Māyāditya in Uddyotana's *Kuvalayamālā*. But, while in both stories, the bad friend pushes his friend into a well in order to enjoy the riches all alone, the reaction of the virtuous character varies. In *Kuvalayamālā*, Thāṇu is so innocent that he does not want to believe in his friend's villainy; in *Maṇoramā*, in contrast, Samudradatta fully realises what has happened, but, since he wants to save his life, he pretends that he has slipped and that there are many jewels in the well.¹⁰³

Not only were Uddyotana's successors skilled in adapting episodes and creating new situations, but they also enriched the complex form of the Jain heroine 'novel' in several ways. In fact, Vijayasimha and Dhaneśvara understood that *Kuvalayamālā*'s long Jain sermons interrupted the narrative, so they shortened or omitted them and rather used other devices in order to bring their religious message. As it was suggested earlier with the analysis of the analepses, Vijayasimha refined the model of the initiatory 'novel'. Thus, the prince Virasena is at first irascible but gradually becomes compassionate toward other beings. That is how he can adopt the vows of a layman and learn the prayer to the supreme beings.¹⁰⁴ Not only does this formula protect him, but it reminds him of benevolence when he hears his enemy pronouncing it.¹⁰⁵ After his meeting with the omniscient teacher Mahāpramoda, Virasena initiates others in the Jain dharma, for instance his father whose dream he is able to interpret.¹⁰⁶ In a similar way, for Harivikrama, who is the double of Virasena, the meeting with princess Bhuvanasaṃdarī has become an initiatory journey that led both of them to the liberation from the cycle of existences.¹⁰⁷ As for princess Bhuvanasaṃdarī, she was predisposed to be a virtuous heroine, since she had spent her childhood and adolescence in doing pious actions in a forest.¹⁰⁸ Dhaneśvara refined the narrative illusion of the marvellous 'novel' and, in the tradition of Haribhadra, insisted on the aberrant relationships that souls can have from one existence to another. For instance, without knowing it, Lakṣmī becomes the illegitimate wife of Kanakaratha who was his husband Maṇḍana in

¹⁰² *Kuvalayamālā* 64.27–69.7: Chojnacki 2008b: 222–233; *Līlāvatīsāra* VI.1–145: Fynes 2005: 367–391.

¹⁰³ *Kuvalayamālā* 56.21–64.26: Chojnacki 2008b: 201–222; *Maṇoramā* 142.10–17.

¹⁰⁴ *Bhuvanasaṃdarī* v. 2585.

¹⁰⁵ *Bhuvanasaṃdarī* v. 2783.

¹⁰⁶ *Bhuvanasaṃdarī* v. 7428.

¹⁰⁷ *Bhuvanasaṃdarī* v. 7900–8945.

¹⁰⁸ *Bhuvanasaṃdarī* v. 7822–7891.

a previous life and because of his ignorance, Haridatta would like to marry Priyaṅgumañjarī who was previously his daughter Anaṅgavatī.¹⁰⁹

However, because of the difficulty of the genre, not all the authors were able to master the model in the same way. A first subtle degeneration appears in the shorter *Surasumḍarī*, inasmuch as Dhaneśvara – voluntarily or not – does not master in the same way the means of the *kāvya*. Thus, he does not leave much space for descriptions or for thoughts of his characters but insists on a simple and efficient style of narration. The limits of the model and the changes are much more visible in Jineśvara's *Nivvāṇalīlāvāī* and in Vardhamāna's *Maṇoramā*. Indeed, as far as we can judge by the summary, Jineśvara wants to do too much and unfortunately makes the wrong literary choices by unnecessarily complicating the model or by outrageously simplifying it. Thus, on the one hand, the author of *Nivvāṇalīlāvāī* presents the illustrations of ten passions instead of the five dealt with by Uddyotana, while he also describes three lives for each of the passionate souls and adopts a non-linear structure in these archetypical stories. On the other hand, he begins with the last life of his main characters and does not let them experience another further existence in front of the audience once they are educated; and especially, instead of waiting to present the heroine Līlāvāī as the object of an amorous and spiritual quest as in *Kuvalayamālā*, he makes her marry king Vijayasena at the beginning of the 'novel'.¹¹⁰

As for Vardhamāna, who is the last Jain author to compose a long narrative named after a heroine, the 'charming' *Maṇoramā* on the model of Bāṇa's and Uddyotana's 'novels', he does not master in the same manner as his predecessors the structure of a complex unitary narrative. Indeed, the first chapter of his work recalls the model of *Kuvalayamālā* with a scene at the court of king Narakesarin and of his wife Priyaṅgumañjarī and with the birth of a son, Prince Narasiṃha, who later marries Rambhāvalī, and it also presents a complex structure with an integrated analepsis. In the next three chapters, however, Vardhamāna appears not to care any longer for the intertwined plot of the 'novel'. He takes over a linear structure and one can see, as in Haribhadra's *Samarāiccakahā*, the progression of the main characters in their successive lives. King Narasiṃha and his wife Rambhāvalī become in the second chapter the merchant Samudradatta and his spouse Ratnāvalī, in the third chapter, a Vidyādhara couple Bhūrivasu and Ratnaprabhā, and in the fourth chapter the king Śūrasena and his wife Manoramā. But, on the one hand, the role of the main characters and the space they occupy is very limited. Indeed, the main narrative which comprises a total of only 46 of the 339 pages of the 'novel' is

¹⁰⁹ *Surasumḍarī* 8, v.192–193; 15, v. 35: Warder 1992, vol. V: § 4737; § 4756.

¹¹⁰ *Līlāvātīsāra* I.145–155: Fynes 2005: 54–59.

distributed as follows: 20 pages out of the 138 pages of the first *avasara* (that is about 15%), 7 pages out of the 105 pages of the second *avasara* (that is about 6%), 5 pages out of the 65 pages of the third *avasara* (that is about 7%) and 14 pages out of the 29 of the last *avasara* (45%). And on the other hand, while Haribhadra integrated prior lives of the characters in order to provide a motive for their actions and their feelings in a present situation, Vardhamāna is instead preoccupied with giving illustrative edifying stories that are if at all only very loosely connected to the main narrative: 15 sub-stories in a second level of narration for the second chapter, 29 in the third. So the complex wedding garland of *Kuvalayamālā* has merely become in Vardhamāna's hands a charming bouquet of short edifying stories.

At the end of this survey, it appears that the pioneering work of Uddyotana inspired by the much admired *Kādambarī* of Bāṇa, has, in the same manner as did Bhavabhūti and Abhinanda for the Pāla poets,¹¹¹ acted as an intermediary for the creation over a period of four centuries of a new literary school of Jain heroine 'novels' that had aesthetic and religious aspirations. Thus, three of the four successors of Uddyotana managed to compose their work as wedding garlands whose flowers are artistically intertwined and arranged, and to convey at the same time their religious message. Even Vardhamāna, who opted in the course of his project for the easier form of the bouquet that was usual in Jain edifying narratives, has kept a complex structure for the first chapter of his work. This shows a *contrario* that the complexity of the plot was an expected component of the Jain heroine 'novels', but as regards form, style and content, they appear to have been left to the taste and the orientations of the authors, who could thus create their own innovations. If Vijayasimha and Vardhamāna both opt for the *kāvya* style and structures in their works, the former chooses to write his entire 'novel' in a verse typical of Prakrit literature, while the latter continues the genre of the *campū* inherited from Uddyotana. And while Dhaneśvara also composes his 'novel' in *āryā* verse, he decides to write in a simpler narrative style without any descriptive or dialogical pause typical of the refined *kāvya* style. Besides, according to their literary project, all of them also chose different options to provide either a realistic or marvellous content of their work.

Consequently, the complex unitary plot of the Jain heroine 'novels' as well as the dominating role of narration and the literary maturity of their authors may

¹¹¹ Cf. *Innovations and Turning Points* 2014: 355; Tubb 2014b: 355–394. Bhavabhūti is recognised as belonging in the same way as Vakpatirāja to the legacy of Bāṇa (both cited as such by Rājaśekhara and Soḍḍhala: Tubb 2014b: 361–363) and to have influenced Abhinanda for his lighter Vaidarbhi style (Tubb 2014b: 358–359). In the same way, Bhavabhūti seems to have been one of the sources of inspiration for Dhaneśvara (cf. Warder 1992, vol. VI: § 4769).

entitle them to be labelled as novels, if it is accepted that novels can be either marvellous or realistic in content. Then, while Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*, although in prose, appears to be a 'prose poem', because of the importance it gives to descriptions and to a vision of the world, it would be adequate to designate the Jain narratives named after a heroine as 'poetic novels' if one takes into account that they are partly or totally versified but place the narration in the foreground. Anyway, this school of Jain 'novels' no doubt constitutes a significant moment in the literary production of medieval India and as such deserves fully to be reckoned among masterpieces in histories of Indian literature.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Udayasum̐darīkathā* of Soḍḍhala, ed. C.D. Dalal and E. Krishnamacharya, Baroda: Central Library, 1920.
- Kharataragacchabhṛhadgurvāvali*, ed. by Jinavijaya Muni, Bombay: Singhi Jain Series, 42, 1956.
- Kādambarī* of Bāṇa, ed. P.V. Kane, Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press 1911; ed. S.R. Sharma, Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Granthamala, 41, 1979; translation by M.R. Kale, Bombay: Motilal Banarsidass, 1968.
- Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyotana, ed. A.N. Upadhye, Bombay: Singhi Jain Series, 45, 1959.
- Tilakamañjarī* of Dhanapāla, ed. by Pandit Bhavadatta Sastri, Bombay: Kavyamala, 1903; ed. N. M. Kansara, Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1991.
- Nāyadhammakahāo*, ed. by Muni Jambūvijaya, Bombay: Shri Mahavira Jaina Vidyalaya, 1989.
- Bhuvanasum̐darī* = *Siribhuyaṇasum̐darīkahā* of Vijayasim̐ha, ed. by Vijayaśīlacandrasūri, Ahmedabad: Prakrit Text Society Series, 39, 2000.
- Manoramā* of Vardhamāna, ed. R.K. Pagariya, Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1983.
- Līlāvāī* of Kōṭhala, ed. A.N. Upadhye, Bombay: Singhi Jain Series, 31, 1949.
- Līlāvātīsāra* of Jinaratna, ed. H.C. Bhayani, Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1983; cf. also Fynes 2005 and 2006.
- Sam̐khittataram̐gavaīkahā*, ed. H.C. Bhayani, Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, 1979.
- Surasum̐darī* of Dhaneśvara, ed. Rajavijaya, Varanasi: Chandraprabha Press, 1916 (reedition 2002); ed. Sadhvi Shree Mahayashashri, Surat: Omkarasuri Aradhana Bhavan, 2004.

Secondary sources

- Billault, A. (1991): *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l'époque coloniale*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bronner, Yigal / Shulman, David / Tubb, Gary (eds.) (2014): *Innovations and Turning Points. Toward a History of kāvya Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Caudharī, G.C. (1973): *Jaina sāhitya kā bṛhad itihāsa, bhāg 6*. Vārāṇasī: Parshvanatha Vidyashrama Shodh Samsthan.
- Chartier, P. (1996): *Introduction aux grandes theories du Roman*. Paris: Dunod.
- Chojnacki, Ch. (2008a): *Kuvalayamālā: Roman jaina de 779 composé par Uddyotanasūri*, Vol. 1: Etude. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica, 50.1.
- Chojnacki, Ch. (2008b): *Kuvalayamālā: Roman jaina de 779 composé par Uddyotanasūri*, Vol. 2: Traduction et Annotations. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica, 50.2.
- Chojnacki, Ch. (2015): "The emergence of the Campū genre before the 10th century". In: *Sanmati, 80th Birthday, Essays in honour of Prof. Hampa Nagarajaiah*. Edited by L. Soni and J. Soni. Bangalore: Sapna Press, 97–117.
- Chojnacki, Ch. (2016a): "Preserving and Transmitting the Indian Cultural Heritage: On the Genre of Jain Epitomes in the thirteenth century". In: *Jaina Narratives*. Edited by P. Flügel. London/New York: Routledge (forthcoming).
- Chojnacki, Ch. (2016b): "Summarising or adapting the Great Indian Epic? Jain *Mahābhārata*'s Epitomes from the thirteenth century". In: *Jaina Narratives*. Edited by P. Flügel. London/New York: Routledge (forthcoming).
- Filliozat, J. (1994): *Dictionnaire des littératures de l'Inde*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, Quadrige.
- Fynes, R.C.C. (ed. and tr.) (2005): *The Epitome of Queen Lilavati*, vol. 1. by Jinaratna. New York: New York University Press, Clay Sanskrit Library.
- Fynes, R.C.C. (ed. and tr.) (2006): *The Epitome of Queen Lilavati*, vol. 2 by Jinaratna. New York: New York University Press, Clay Sanskrit Library.
- Glaserapp, H. von (1929): *Literaturen Indiens von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Wildpark-Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion.
- Lienhard, S. (1984): *A History of Classical Poetry*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Moore, S. (2010): *The Novel. An Alternative History. Beginnings to 1600*. New York: Continuum.
- Mukherjee, M. (2008): "The Beginnings of the Indian Novel". In: *A concise History of Indian Literature in English*. Edited by A.K. Mehrotra. Delhi: Permanent Black, 105–116.
- Pavel, T.G. (2013): *The lives of the novel: A History*. Paris: Hachette (French version: Paris: Gallimard, 2003).
- Piegay-Gros, N. (2005): *Le roman*. Paris: GF-Flammarion.
- Pollock, S. (2006): *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men. Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Delhi: Permanent Black.
- Raimond, M. (2015): *Le roman*. Paris: Armand Colin (revised edition; first edition 1987).
- Renou, L. (1985): *L'Inde Classique*. Paris: Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient.
- Rey, P.-L. (1997): *Le roman*. Paris: Hachette (first edition 1992).
- Schubring, W. (1978): *Nāyādhammakahāo. Das sechste Anga des Jaina-Siddhānta*. Mainz: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Shulman, D. (2014): "Persons Compounded and Confounded: A Reading of Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*". In: *Innovations and Turning Points. Toward a History of kāvya Literature*. Edited by Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 277–307.
- Tieken, H. (2014): "Bāṇa's death in the *Kādambarī*". In: *Innovations and Turning Points. Toward a History of kāvya Literature*. Edited by Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 263–276.
- Tubb, G. (2014a): "On the Boldness of Bāṇa". In: *Innovations and Turning Points. Toward a History of kāvya Literature*. Edited by Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 311–354.

- Tubb, G. (2014b): "Something New in the Air: Abhinanda's *Rāmacarita* and its Ancestry". In: *Innovations and Turning Points. Toward a History of kāvya Literature*. Edited by Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, and Gary Tubb. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 357–394.
- Upadhye, A.N. (ed.) (1949): *Līlāvaī* of Koūhala. Bombay: Singhi Jain Series, 45.
- Upadhye, A.N. (ed.) (1959): *Kuvalayamālā* of Uddyotana. Bombay: Singhi Jain Series, 46.
- Upadhye, A.N. (ed.) (1970): *Kuvalayamālākathā* of Ratnaprabha. Bombay: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Valette, B. (2005): *Le roman. Initiation aux méthodes et aux techniques modernes d'analyse littéraire*. Paris: Armand Colin (first edition 1992).
- Velankar, H.D. (1944): *Jinaratnakośa*. An alphabetical register of Jain works and authors. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Warder, A.K. (1988): *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol. 5. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Warder, A.K. (1990): *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol. 2. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Warder, A.K. (1992): *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol. 6. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Warder, A.K. (1994): *Indian Kāvya Literature*, Vol. 4. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Winternitz, M. (1991): *A History of Indian Literature*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. (third edition).