

MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS

ARTHAMĀTEVA

In the October number of this Journal, p. 1192, Mr. Berriedale Keith criticizes Dr. Hertel's rendering *arthamāteva* (Pariśiṣṭa Parva, ii, 317) "like the mother of Artha" (i.e. Artha, son of Dharma and Buddhi, according to a fanciful account of the sixteen (allegorical) daughters of Dakṣa in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, iv, 1. 48 ff.), and he tries to remove the objection Dr. Hertel advances to Böhtlingk's rendering "eine Mutter mit zutreffendem Namen", viz. that the following *iva* renders it impossible.

I think Dr. Hertel is on the right track in interpreting *arthamātā* allegorically, but he is wrong in referring to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. For it is highly improbable that Hemacandra should have studied that sectarian work of the Bhāgavatas, even if it was already in existence at his time; and an allusion to details related in it would most certainly have been lost on his readers, Jaina monks or laymen. Hemacandra's allegory becomes intelligible by reference to the Upamitibhavaprapaṇcā Kathā, which has always been very popular with the Jainas, as is evidenced by the number of paraphrases and compendia of this work.¹

The phrase in question (*arthamāteva*) occurs in the tale of Maheśvaradatta, ii, 315 ff. His father was Samudra : *ajātatr̥ptir v̥itteṣu samudra iva v̥ariṣu*. The next verse runs thus : *māyāprapaṇcabahulā Bahulā nāma tasya ca | arthamāteva mātā 'bhūd ajātavipulāśayā ||*

¹ See Ambrogio Ballini, "Contributo allo studio della Upamitibhavaprapaṇcā Kathā di Siddharṣi": Reale Accademia dei Lincei, Roma, 1907, p. 80 ff.

Now Samudra and Bahulā, under the slightly different forms Sāgara and Bahulikā, occur as the names of allegorical persons playing an important part in the Upamitibhavaprapaṇcā Kathā. In the fifth Prastāva, which relates the adventures of the Worldly Man (Samsārijīva) in his birth as Vāmadeva, Māyā (Deceit) and her brother Steya (Theft) are his “internal” companions, who lead him into all sorts of mischief. Māyā is usually called here Bahulikā; on p. 730 of my edition in the *Bibliotheca Indica* we read: *Māye’ti supra-siddhā ’pi janaiś caritaranñjitaiḥ | iyaṃ Bahulikā tāta priyanāmnā ’bhidhīyate* ||. On p. 1060 Bahulikā says that Sāgara is never, even for a moment, without her. Sāgara is the personification of Covetousness, of the inordinate love of money; in the sixth Prastāva he is introduced as the “internal” companion and corrupter of the Worldly Man in his birth as Dhanaśekhara (see p. 860 ff.).

Sāgara and Bahulikā are therefore names of **typical** personifications of vices well known to all Jain readers. When both are brought into close connexion and, besides, indications of their characters are given, as is done in Hemacandra’s verses, they could not fail to awake in the Jain reader recollections from the Upamitibhavaprapaṇcā Kathā, just as the mention of names and persons occurring in the *Pilgrim’s Progress* would similarly impress an English reader. But Hemacandra has added one particular. For according to Siddharṣi, Bahulikā, Deceit, is but the inseparable companion of the Desire of Gain; according to Hemacandra she is also the Mother of Gain—naturally, since money is frequently made by dishonest means. A word like *arthamātā* was necessary in Hemacandra’s simile in order to distinguish the *upamāna*; for the name Bahulā, just as well as the other attributes, apply both to the *upamāna* and *upameya*: they are the *tertium comparationis* in this artificial simile. The verse must

therefore be translated as follows: “Bahulā by name, fertile in all kinds of deceit, and destitute of noble thoughts, like the mother of gain, was his mother.”

HERMANN JACOBI.